

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee
Minutes
April 19, 2018

Members in Attendance: Emiliano Ayala, Sandra Feldman, Maureen Buckley, Rita Premo, Deborah Roberts, Steven Winter

Excused: Elaine Newman, Armand Gilinsky

Meeting Recorder: Maureen Buckley

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. No minutes to approve
2. Standing Reports
 - a. Chair (Gilinsky): No Report
 - b. AVP (Roberts):
 - i. Current tenure track searches: 4 are still open (art, music, library, business); a couple were cancelled/failed.
 - ii. Chancellor put forth 2.2 million for diversity and faculty recruitment and we received some of this money. Diverse advertising was part of this intervention, as well a team that will attend a training on recruitment.
 - iii. The housing initiative (housing and workforce) is looking at models throughout the community. One house has been secured with Sonoma Land Trust, where you own the home but not the property. The person who has the house must sell it to someone else from SSU. We are also looking at land we already own, and with developers. Deborah is also working with Student Affairs for faculty in residence program.
 - iv. RTP is moving along. Dawn is taking over for Vanessa.
 - c. AFS (Premo):
 - i. There is an academic freedom compliant in process.
 - d. FFSP (Premo):
 - i. The research symposium was this week. There were 5 minute “lightening talks” for those whose scholarship are not amenable to posters. The winners of the research awards were Don Romesburg and John Fukuto.
 - e. PDS (Premo):
 - i. Meets next week
 - f. URTP (Gilinsky): No Report
 - g. ASI (No Representative at Present): No Report
 - h. CFA (Newman): No Report.
3. Discussion Items:
4. Business Items:
 - i. Policy for Periodic Evaluation of Athletic Coaching Faculty: Gail Barksdale
 1. We reviewed newest changes since last review by Senate.
 2. Gail stated that she is pleased with the changes
 3. Emiliano motioned to approve and Rita seconded it. Deborah brought up the issue of the RTP steps timeline/dates reminder that goes out yearly and asked who would make the similar calendar for this. Steve expressed it would be the director of athletics or their designee. Gail noted “support

staff" p. 2 and p. 6, paragraph 4 does not have "support staff" – where does the sports supervisor get their information? Steve brought up limitations in the collective bargaining agreement, which resulted in this being written out (staff members cannot evaluate faculty members). Deborah concurred that this could not be included. Gail expressed that this feedback was crucial to the evaluation. We discussed ways this is already embedded in the process. The document was unanimously approved.

4. This is on the Senate agenda today
- ii. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty
 1. This is on the Senate agenda today
 2. It was kicked back by ExComm a few weeks ago.
 3. IIIa. "two courses for each year" vs. "all": it was suggested that this be left at two, not "all."
 4. Item F: it was suggested this be totally deleted, as it is redundant with Item C. Item C can have a line added indicating that if there is not a committee existing the department is responsible for forming it. Deborah respectfully disagreed with this. Others agreed these two items were not equivalent. Deborah suggested that the policy has not been discussed in totality and that we just deal with coaches at this point, revisiting the policy itself later. There can be a full vetting of the policy itself by FSAC next year.
 5. Reference to coaching will be removed.
 6. Emiliano motioned to approve the discussion on the revisions regarding coaching evaluation. We are recommending all approved language in this policy remain, except 3A. Sandra seconded it. The motion was unanimously approved. Going back to the original motion to approve the document, Emiliano motioned and Sandra seconded it. The motion was unanimously approved.
- iii. Faculty Athletic Representative Position Description
 1. NCAA required position for a faculty member overseeing athletics; appointed and overseen by the President. This person certifies academic eligibility as well.
 2. There has not been a description for this position yet.
 3. This is an information item.
 4. The document was praised for its clarity. Emiliano mentioned tying the last line with an asterisk to "position details."
- iv. LMS Policy Revision
 1. This was kicked back by academic technology committee. We reviewed their suggestions.
 2. There was some confusion as to where we are at in this process.
 3. Deborah weighed in on some of the feedback.
- v. Emeritus Faculty Eligibility Definition of "Distinguished"
 1. Deborah says there is a policy. Retiring faculty are reviewed every year as to meeting requirements and the list is generated and then sent to Senate and the President. The policy says the list shall be publically posted

- which in the history of SSU means going to senate, giving the opportunity to object. This can be an awkward method for resolving this.
- 2. We looked at other CSU policies. We also discussed having some emeritus faculty come to FSAC to discuss.

- vi. FSAC Chair 2018-2019
 - 1. Rita is likely to take this on.
- vii. Task Forces to Work On
 - 1. SETE Revision
 - 2. Excellence in Teaching Award Criteria/Committee
 - 3. Department Chair Job Description