

FSAC COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of October 8, 2020 – Notes taken by Tom Whitley

Virtual Meeting started at 1:00 PM, over Zoom

Members:

- Paula Lane, Edu, Chair
- A&H, TBD
- Mary Wegmann, Lib
- Richard Whitkus, Biology
- Tom Whitley, Anthro
- Angelo Camillo, Bus
- Deborah A. Roberts, Faculty Affairs
- Emily Clark, CFA rep
- Victor Madrid, AS Rep

Members Present:

- Paula
- Angelo
- Mary
- Emily
- Richard
- Tom
- Victor
- Deborah

Agenda and minutes were approved with minor edits.

Standing Reports

- **Chair (Lane)** – Nothing of substance to report from Senate
- **AVP (Roberts)** – Sabbatical applications have closed, range elevation eligibility list will be posted soon. RTP is rolling right along. Announcements for book orders will be coming out soon. We want students to be prepared for the spring, and not have to purchase books at the last minute. Lecturer pools will be launched in spring.
- **AFS (Lane)** – Have not met since last meeting. Their statement on online harassment was discussed during New Business.
- **FSSA (Whitkus)** – No meeting in last two weeks, scheduled for next week.
- **PDS (Whitley)** – No meeting in last two weeks, scheduled for next week.

- **URTP (none)** – Currently no FSAC representative.
- **CFA (Clark)** – CFA met this week. A rep from Students for Quality Education (SQE) attended, to discuss their No Harm Disarm campaign. They are looking for an SSU student to work with that campaign, also a faculty advisor. Still concerns from lecturers about workloads. There are three text-banking events going on. Resources are available from CSU for disaster relief.

Old Business Items

1. *Hutchins Department RTP Policy Revisions*

- Richard and Emily reviewed and commented on the document.
- Document is in alignment with URTP and CBA.
- However, some of the evaluation criteria are too frequently combined. Recommending that specific criteria be discussed explicitly in each of the sections. The department should be clear in what is meant by their expectations. The current language is okay, but somewhat vague. Some examples of vague terminology include the words "completion" and "collegiality" – these should be made explicit if they are expected of RTP candidates.
- Paula asked for an example of a department policy that is not vague – that could be used to give other departments a template. Deborah suggested Biology, Richard suggested Math.
- Departments appear to be re-writing the things that are already in URTP policy. They should be focusing on specific criteria for how they measure and evaluate those things, not describe them.
- How do you measure or evaluate qualitative criteria? If those criteria are to be expected, then specify how they can be evaluated (if not measured).
- Hutchins might specify what they consider to be the "Hutchins Way."
- Comments are ready to go forward to Paula, who will recommend some examples of other departmental criteria, and return to Hutchins for changes.

2. *Chemistry Department RTP Policy Revisions*

- Mary and Deborah reviewed and commented on the document.
- The biggest issues were vague language around how certain things would be measured. For example, use of "may" is vague – should be changed to "should" or "shouldn't" based on type of item.
- FSAC is duty bound to make sure that the policy does not conflict with URTP and CBA policy. The self-assessment section needs to be consistent with URTP policy.

- Comment about an outside reviewer is incorrect. President can ask for an outside reviewer comments, not the RTP committee – as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Department cannot pick and choose who they are going to have outside reviewers for. This section needs to be changed by the department; recommend quoting the portion referring to outside review in the CBA.
- Appears that some of Deborah's comments were not saved in the Google Drive version of this document. May need another review by Deborah to make sure all of her comments are being considered.
- Both Mary and Deborah will finalize their comments and send it to Paula for submittal back to Chem.
- FSAC will provide:
 - 1) comments on sections they have to change, and
 - 2) suggestions for other edits.
- Chem will make the changes and FSAC will review again for final approval.

3. *URTP Policy revisions*

- Richard has gone through and organized FSAC comments on the policy.
- Biggest change is the grandfather clause. The idea is that when an RTP candidate is applying to go up for tenure/promotion, they are under the original policy. Do we want to give individuals the option to use a new policy, or the old one? Additionally, departmental criteria may also be changing at the same time – should the same grandfather clause apply? Discussion ensued.
 - Deborah brought up an example on changes in scholarship criteria. If they are made more stringent in their last year, then candidates may not qualify if there is no grandfather clause.
 - The CBA states that candidates need to be notified of changes, but does not state that RTP candidates must fall under the new changes.
 - Emily asked if there was any oversight on departmental criteria changes, other than FSAC making sure they are in compliance with the URTP and CBA. Deborah responded that there was not.
 - Richard suggested that because most of the remainder of the FSAC URTP policy revisions is a reorganization and clarification, it is likely that adding the grandfather clause might be a sticking point for full approval, so we might keep that out for the time being, and continue with the rest of the revisions to move forward.

- In the current URTP policy, minority reports are allowed – as something that differs from the majority review. Nowhere is it spelled out that candidates can respond to negative minority reports. But candidates have the ability to respond to majority reports.
 - The assumption is that if a negative minority report is submitted, it falls under the same paragraph allowing a response to a positive majority report – or vice-versa.
 - Richard will incorporate our comments into the current draft, and FSAC will move forward with reviewing another version at the next meeting.

New Business Items

1. EEEA

- Four applications received.
- Paula will give initial review based on the criteria, and send them to the voting committee members.
- Each committee member will review the individual packages and rank them from 1 (best) to 4 (lowest).
- Money for this is based on the FTEs, so total number may change.
- Deborah will take our recommendations on them to the provost.

2. Department Chair Ad Hoc Working Group Proposal

- Paula will prepare an outline for creating an Ad Hoc Working Group to draft a listing of departmental chair duties, and seek faculty support.
- This is intended as an educational/training tool for chairs and not as a review process. FSAC is supporting Faculty Affairs in this endeavor.
- This will be placed on the agenda again for next meeting for further review.

3. URTP Committee Follow-up from May

- Paula and Deborah met with Mary Gomes to discuss the sabbatical procedure.
- At SSU, the dean's review of sabbatical applications is later in the process, while the chair's is earlier. If the two do not communicate about the applicant's indispensability early on, the conflict will arise late in the process, and may not get resolved in time for approval.
- Two changes are being made:
 - 1) Ensuring that the sabbatical applications will be on OnBase starting next year. This will allow more timely review and processing.

- 2) There will be a communications check to make sure that the chair and the dean are in agreement on the indispensability of the individual earlier in the process.
- Emily mentioned that she has had several junior faculty ask about the requirement that the on-campus notary be used for the sabbatical application. No one knows where this confusion arose, but it has been resolved by Deborah. Any notary is fine – on campus is not needed.
- Angelo asked if there is an appeals process for someone to overturn a dean's finding of indispensability. Deborah reminded everyone that the URTP does not approve sabbaticals, they rank them and send it to the provost. The provost sends the final recommendations to the president. The provost and/or president can overrule the dean's indispensability finding.

AFS statement of online targeted harassment.

- Paula asked if we had any questions or discussion around this statement.
- The question arose as to why AFS is writing statements rather than writing resolutions that then go through senate and governance process. The structure of the statement suggests that they are asking for something with their bullet points at the end, rather than resolving issues.
- FSAC has often pushed back on the language they have forwarded because they may not see themselves as making policy, rather they expect another committee to do something on issues that they bring up.
- AFS should probably have member(s) attend senate so that they can more fully engage with the governance process.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:41pm