

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee
Minutes
September 14, 2017

Members in Attendance: Emiliano Ayala, Maureen Buckley, Sandra Feldman, Armand Gilinsky, Elaine Newman, Deborah Roberts, Steven Winter

Absent: Isabel Briseno, Rita Premo

Meeting Recorder: Maureen Buckley

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Minutes for May 18, 2017 approved
 - b. Minutes for August 31, 2017 approved with changes
2. Standing Reports
 - a. Chair (Gilinsky):
 - i. Time ceded in the interest of time
 - b. AVP (Roberts):
 - i. Sabbatical and DIP applications due tomorrow
 - ii. All GSIs and SSIS entered and moving on to promotions
 - iii. RTP processes is in motion, with training meetings being offered
 1. 5 candidates will try new pilot software
 - iv. moving forward with 16 TT hires with some changes to smooth the process, integrating lessons learned from last year's hires, including efforts to enhance diversity advertising; search committee workshops to follow
 - v. if faculty affairs wants to schedule Skillports, can they make this mandatory? Elaine wondered what would be the consequence of noncompliance? Deborah will instead "strongly recommend", with a rationale for the importance.
 - vi. Question for committee, can we consider learning management system (Moodle), unit 11 (ISA, GA, TA) what level of access would this campus like to support, in light of FERPA and similar regulations? And when someone asks to grab something from a faculty Moodle site (e.g. dispute resolution board), how do we want to deal with that? there are many problems in this area, with questions often driven from the Faculty Center. Elaine recommended that the student piece go through Student Affairs (e.g. editing teacher aspect). Deborah said she believes there should be a learning management policy. And maybe different committees will then review from different angles. Perhaps would could look into the practices for other CSUs? Faculty Center staff are instructional designers not gatekeepers.
 - c. AFS (Premo):Absent, no report
 - d. FFSP (Gilinsky):
 - i. Jeff Wilson is resigning; Sean Place from S & T will be liaison to Faculty Center; there will be a workshop on Scholarly Creativity and Research
 - ii. Provost is considering name change for Sponsored Programs
 - iii. There was discussion about the Excellence in Teaching Award and who it comes under. And also the Goldstein Award. FSSP will discuss.
 - iv. Deborah raised the issue of what would we like our mission to be around awards.
 - e. PDS (Premo): Absent, no report

- f. URTP (Gilinsky):
 - i. First meeting held with 36 files, plus promotion; perhaps 13 sabbaticals
 - ii. Exact numbers not ready
 - iii. With the new TT hires, what is the impact on workload for URTPs? FSAC may want to consider this and whether the member numbers of URTPs should be increased.
- g. ASI (Briseno): Absent, no report
- h. CFA (Newman):
 - i. The CFA has asked for a meet and confer on EO 1100 and 1110
 - ii. There is a resolution at the Senate today about these Eos
 - iii. There is uproar across the CSU about these Eos
 - iv. CFA's official position, policies cannot be implemented as long as the meet and confer is in motion. While implementation is stalled, there is no guarantee of changes.
 - v. There will be first social on October 4, 5-8 at Lobos

2. Business Items:

- a. Business Degree Completion Program, College of Marin, Faculty Qualifications
 - i. Karen Thompson (DBA), Gregory Milton (SEIE) & Rob Eyler (SEIE) presented
 - ii. Karen explained about the process of coming to the Degree Completion program idea, and collaborations with the College of Marin; the idea is to reach people who are motivated by for whom economics and other impediments get in the way. College Marin has a more diverse student body. They are here as part of due diligence for setting up off campus program
 - iii. The School of Business is accredited and thus has specific standards that must be met for faculty hiring. Extended Ed will facilitate hiring but it will fall under SBE. Rob clarified that for payroll purposes, the hire is in EE on record but SBE makes the decisions.
 - iv. Deborah clarified that the program is already in process, but now wants to house it off campus. Nursing already does existing programs at various campuses. They were not required to go through all the committees. She also requested the edit of removing reference to "overload pay" which creates the appearance of requiring faculty to do "overload" (cover letter, second page, second paragraph); Elaine asked for differentiation between overload and replacement time.
 - v. Emiliano suggested this should then just be an information item to us, since the program has been vetted and is up and running.
 - vi. Elaine noted that new programs will go through faculty governance, like EPC. She asked about the mechanism of faculty hire. Since all are lecturers and article 12 does not apply. Given that, the school should have a very clear and transparent way that articulates how faculty are selected for this opportunity which may involve considerable earning potential. Karen noted that they have done so. Elaine also asked about the voluntary nature of these appointments. If faculty has a 125% cap on work (about one class)...what happens if they cannot get enough faculty to fill the need? Karen noted that accreditation gives a one year grace period, which would allow the department to re-assess the viability of the program. Elaine asked about advising issues for students who don't commute. Karen articulated a 3 tier advising system. There will be someone on sites, as well as a designated advisor and there is an existing, trained advisor. Elaine raised the issue of "supplanting".

Will SSU students be farmed off to College of Marin? Karen said they would manage FTE on campus and would not cannibalize for the sake of the other program. This would not be in the SBE's interest. Finally, Elaine asked about where they will take upper division GE. Karen pointed out the place this is referenced in the plan.

vii. Steven asked for clarification on Page 2, under proposal criteria. Is anybody in the College of Marin counted in FTE for SSU? Karen said this was not the intention. She will edit the sentence.

viii. Deborah expressed her support of the program and asked for clarification for whether this program is any different than for a transfer student at SSU. Karen said no and Deborah articulated then that this is not a new degree program. Elaine disagreed, citing the two Liberal Studies programs that happened without consultation, where stateside programs morphed into self-supporting programs (Napa/Solano). Deborah and Elaine agreed to disagree on that. Emiliano noted that we should see what the actual definition of "new programs" is in the CSU. Is this a drastic change in the mode of delivery or not?

ix. Sandra asked for clarification that faculty will be delivering 50 or 60 units of instruction. Karen said for most it will be 60 but that may vary by individual student. Sandra asked about the price and Karen said it was \$400 a unit. The salary will be commensurate with the regular faculty pay. Greg clarified that there is a different pay schedule for summer/intercession.

x. Armand asked the committee whether this was a business item or an information item. Emiliano made a motion to waive first reading and this was seconded by Stephen. There was no discussion. We moved to second reading. Emiliano noted that the stickler for him is related to transparency in hiring. How will this be done? Will there be a pool? Will the process be public? Can we make a recommendation or require this? Will there be a rotation schedule? Karen felt a process could be articulated. Armand asked if the call from proposals would come from EE or the department and Karen said it would come from the department. Deborah shared that the SBE has put in place a procedure around hiring. Rob said the call for summer and winter will come through EE and that the SBE has a process in place for when there are adjunct needs. Elaine recommended a faculty hiring committee so that one person is not responsible. Emiliano agreed, and Karen expressed that this made sense. Emiliano motioned to approve the faculty qualifications component of this program with the recommendation of transparency in the hiring process, faculty hiring committee and open pool call. Steven seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.

b. Periodic Evaluation of Unit 3 Coaches

i. There is a request to pilot the student survey based on feedback from various parties

ii. In response to this feedback, they will ask students to unofficially complete survey at the end of Fall semester sports and do a focus group regarding their interpretations of the questions. And also a piece will be added to the document about how the piece could be used for promotion and multi-year contracts. Thus, the document will likely not come back until the next semester. Armand will leave it as a business item until completion. Elaine stated we could postpone until a certain date. Armand will put it to December 14, 2017.

c. NCAA Violations by Coaches Info to Personnel Action File

- i. Steven reported that no major revisions happened; last year the committee talked about the concept. The NCAA has a proclivity to be suspect of programs that does not turn in violations, assuming that the program is not paying attention. When you find a violation there should be a penalty. This penalty should be in line with what has been done by other places for similar issues. The information about the violation should go into the employment file, per the NCAA. FSAC is involved because of this last point. SSU athletic department has been called on this by NCAA.
- ii. Deborah also noted that the impacted coach needs to be notified when this reporting takes place. Coaches were not consulted if a student complained and then only heard when they were cited for the violation. She added that the violation might not be against the Head Coach and the language should reflect this. Steven clarified that the Head Coach should be notified about violations of those under them or related to their team. Deborah suggested then add "suspected violator" under notification.
- iii. Emiliano asked if this is changing the rules from when people were first hired as a coach. Deborah says no, based on NCAA. Elaine added that the CBA says this too.
- iv. Elaine asked to consider what other CSUs are doing. Deborah said they have looked into this and this is consistent. Elaine has a question in to CFA about this and we will continue this discussion at our next meeting.

d. FSSP Policy Revisions: (1) Animal Care and Use; (2) Cost Sharing

- i. Tabled due to time