Faculty Standards & Affairs Committee
Minutes
May 4, 2017

Present: Steven Winter (Chair /Sci & Tech), Armand Gilinsky (Bus & Econ), Viki Montera (Educ), Rita Premo (Library), Sandra Feldman (A&H), Deborah Roberts (Assoc Vice Provost), Matthew Paolucci Callahan (Soc Sci), and Elaine Newman (CFA).

Absent: Emily Hinton (AS rep), SSP (no rep),

Meeting Recorder – Armand Gilinsky

Called to order at 1:04 pm

Approval of Minutes from 4/6/17 –

Agenda Adopted.

Standing Reports: [no time]

Chair (Winter) – AS will take up SETE Policy in last meeting of AY.
AVP (Roberts)
AFS (Premo)
FSSP (Winter)
PDS (Paolucci)
URTP (Gilinsky)
ASI (Hinton)
CFA (Newman)

Business Items: (items discussed in boldfaced type)

16-17:3 Revision of RTP Policy Regarding SETE Data
[Chair proxy notes from AS meeting on 4/27/17

- Several senators argued that only 2 SETE are not comprehensive
  - FSAC does not agree with this view
- Others argued that SETE across different courses may reveal common problems…or common strengths
  - **Could replace "Only two classes" with "A minimum of, jointly determined by candidate and department RTP committee"**
  - **Candidates determine after consultation with department which two SETE best represent you as a teacher**
  - **Remind Senators that all who were awarded tenure and promotion did so under the prior RTP / SETE policy**.

- Will this revised policy also result in elimination of the summary tables in Promotion documentation?
- Interim Provost noted that some candidates' evaluations referred to low SETE response rates, which are out of candidates' control (not sure how FSAC needs to respond to this)
- Should FSAC revise criteria for teaching effectiveness to also include language about self-assessments of teaching? (It is already in the policy, but,,,)
- Are the SETEs problematic to begin with inasmuch as they may reveal certain biases among students vis a vis certain instructors?
- Should FSAC address criteria for promotion / early promotion / early tenure (I responded that agreeing upon and establishing these criteria are best left to the individual departments, which can then submit any revised RTP policies to FSAC)
- Can FSAC remove burden on staff to store materials "in department offices for faculty" (cf **I.B.3** regarding "candidates may place additional materials in their department office and reference them by index" by inserting language that states, to the effect, "Candidates may place additional materials in electronic or other repositories and reference them by index."
- Can FSAC make available an electronic copy of the proposed revisions to RTP Policy to all faculty for comment (Laurel H. said she could do this but you may want to follow up)

16-17:9 Departmental RTP Criteria — ELSE, Sociology, and GEP

ELSE

A. Educational Leadership & Special Ed. [Guests, Emiliano Ayala and Jennifer Mahdavi]

EA thanked JM for leadership in creating criteria and clarify expectations for candidates for both tenure and promotion. Noted that ELSE are teacher-educators and thus want to hold our candidates to a high standard, in alignment with RTP guidelines from two other credential programs in the School of Ed. (Literary Studies & Elementary Ed. and Curriculum Studies and Secondary Ed.)

Chair expressed concern with the "minimum 3.75 mean score on SETE standard."

EA noted that this was drawn from two other departments' (LSSE and CSSE) RTP criteria in School of Ed.

AVP Roberts noted that when referring to Course Outlines, both words should be capitalized. Asked what "consistently positive student comments and peer recommendations/observations" means.

MP expressed concern that there was almost too much specificity in terms of criteria.

VM noted that one way that department makes accommodations is via the annual written self-assessments.

EN wonders if department has had problems that this document is trying to solve (e.g. vague course outlines). Also, what about workload — are all of these requirements taken together potentially burdensome to candidates?

EA this finally clarifies the expectations that we have had as a department — on paper.

JM It's so rare in a department with average SETE around 4.5 that a candidate would be lower than a 3.75.

AVP Roberts: recommend removal of procedures from the policy.

B. Sociology [Guest, Melinda Milligan]

MM: mostly cleanups to current policy with added specificity for candidates to "Meet with Department RTP Committee." Discussion on how many SETE to include.

AVP Roberts: cannot have hold candidates in one program to a different standard than candidates in other programs. Committees have access to all SETEs regardless of how many SETE a candidate and committee determine should be chosen for review.

Proposed policy will be resubmitted as is or revised pending outcome of AS vote on SSU RTP Policy.

C. Geography, Environment & Planning [Guest: Caroline Christian]

CC: ENSP has never had an RTP policy. Geography had a policy from 2012 (?). Due to the pending merger of the two departments, we will need a new policy, captures currency in different fields. Much of the language is pulled from Geography policy. Do we need a procedure with respect to number of SETE etc.?

MPC: SETE "scores comparable to Department, School, and University norms?" Do candidates have access to that data?

SW: Strike section on pp. 6–7 regarding 2 year reappointment.

EN: Confused about scholarship expectations…2 products or 4 products? Please clarify.

SF: Perhaps use language from ELSE (proposed) criteria on dissemination of intellectual contributions.

AVP Roberts: (bottom of p. 5) Is what you have under Service to the University / Service to the Discipline really just scholarship?

CC: Would like to see RTP process become more developmental for faculty

AVP Roberts: That's in the policy.

SF: Any issues with respect to expected workload under the proposed policy?

AG: Are these policies retroactive and impinge on current probationary candidates as well as candidates for promotion?

VM: Not just workload creep, but are these criteria consistent with our University's mission? Who gets caught in that trap?

[FSAC will review the above proposed new or revised Department RTP policies in revised form and vote on them in our next meeting.]

16-17:11 Tenure-Track Hiring Policy Add Diversity Selection Comm.

16-17:16 Lecturer's Range Elevation Policy

Revisions to Lecturer Range Elevation Policy:

Strike added language in I. under Eligibilty, "Eligible lecturers may inform department chairs in writing…" [As noted in 1st reading at AS.]

In **IV.B.1**, strike (after "each eligible") "candidate considered" and replace those two words with "applicant."

Motion: accept both changes. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

Chair will encourage each department to establish range elevation policies at AS today.

16-17:17 Intellectual Property

Motion: FSAC is endorsing San Jose State's AS subcommittee's statement in response to the proposed new policy. Seconded. Passed.

Motion: FSAC acknowledges the AFS subcommittee's statement in response to the proposed new policy. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

Discussion Items: [No time]

Meeting adjourned: 2:59 pm. Items below were not discussed and remain on the agenda.

ON THE HORIZON

16-17:4	Periodic Evaluation of Unit 3
16-17:5	NCAA Violations by Coaches Information to Personnel Action File
16-17:13	SETE's Confidential versus Anonymous (attached)
16-17:15	Course Outline Policy
16-17:18	Dep't. / Division Chair Roles & Responsibilities
16-17:19	FSSP Policy Revisions

A. Animal Care and Use
B. Cost Sharing
C. Misconduct in Research and Creative Activity