

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee  
Minutes  
February 15, 2018

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

**Excused:**

**Meeting Recorder:** Maureen Buckley

1. Approval of Minutes
  - a. Minutes for February 1, 2018 approved
2. Standing Reports
  - a. Chair (Gilinsky):
    - i. Department of intercollegiate athletics criteria and procedures is going to Senate today.
    - ii. Procedure for placing NCAA violations in files is going to Senate informationally only; Michael Balasek submitted some recommendations. Elaine found the comments to be substantial enough for this to be withdrawn so that the committee could review further. Deborah noted that the coaches and compliance officer are happy with the document as is and expressed that she did not believe the process should be stopped given this state of affairs. She also noted that there are two compliance issues are pending and in need of the process being in place to move forward. Elaine suggested that we could use what we have to move forward with these two issues and continue to revisit edits. Steve added that we must consider how we want to handle feedback moving forward – do revisions go through FSAC continually? Elaine reiterated her stance that the comments from Balasek should be considered before going to Senate. Armand concluded that he will informationally present to Senate an “interim” process but is continually reviewing and revising this moving forward.
    - iii. Educational Experience Enhancement went to faculty affairs with a revised application and timeline. Target chairs could be targeted with this announcement to reach out for appropriate faculty. The committee gave a green light for FA to disseminate.
  - b. AVP (Roberts):
    - i. There have been a few accepted offers for faculty searches.
    - ii. Letters for reappointments (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> TT) have gone out.
    - iii. Laurel wants people reminded to RSVP for Emeritus dinner. The numbers are low.
    - iv. Excellence in Teaching Award is on the horizon. This is a Senate procedure, but Deborah would like for FSAC to review the criteria for selection vs. what candidate is asked to present. All agreed to consider this.
    - v. Record number of applications for RSCAP funding and increased funds for both awards. FFSP is looking at these applications.
    - vi. First meeting for A & H Dean search is next week.
    - vii. Open forum tomorrow for AVP for Research; and two more to follow.
    - viii. Call out for faculty to sit on the CIO and VP for Development positions.
  - c. AFS (Premo):

- i. They are still working on the issue of recording of class lectures. It is up to the faculty member's discretion. For DSS students, a statement in the paperwork will note that if student uses the material for anything than their own personal educational process, this will be a violation of the student code of conduct.
  - d. FFSP (Premo):
    - i. As noted above, they are focused on RSCAP funding.
    - ii. The AVP search is in full swing; FFSP will meet with each candidate and they welcome questions that faculty would like answered.
  - e. PDS (Premo): No Report (no meeting)
  - f. URTP (Gilinsky): No Report
  - g. ASI (No Representative at Present): No Report
  - h. CFA (Newman):
    - i. A number of actions are coming up. The Governor's budget fell short of CSU requests thus requiring lobbying for funding with the legislature. CFA is planning an April 4 protest in Sacramento and SSU representation will be needed. CFA lobby day is May 1, then the May revise budget comes out.
    - ii. Equity conference March 16/17. We can send 5 SSU faculty paid to LA. The theme is "Equity Interrupted in the Academy: Rights, Resistance and Power."
    - iii. Political Agenda moving forward with a number of bills, including one requiring a counselor to student ratio.
    - iv. Social at Lobos 5-7 of February 28, 2018.
- 3. Discussion Items:
  - i. SETE Revisions
  - ii. SETE Reporting (Sean Johnson)
    - 1. ExComm has charged FSAC to revisit SETE issues that have arisen since it went online, such as end date for submission of surveys and reporting of SETE data. There is also an issue about how SETEs can be used inappropriately to express bias against faculty. Elaine also raised the issue of anonymous vs. confidential.
    - 2. Should there be a uniform end date? Armand asked if there is data to inform this and how end date influences response rate. Sean said there is no data, but he has anecdotally from students and faculty about the different end dates. When the options were given to schools there was concern that there would be bias against faculty for difficult finals. Sean supported a unified end date that would create consistency and allow for uniform analysis and response, deferring to FSAC and larger academic senate for guidance on what is appropriate. He can provide guidance regarding what is feasible.
    - 3. Sean shared that there are models available that incentivize SETE completion, such as a system that requires students to go through SETE process before accessing grades and/or registration.
    - 4. Emiliano asked for confirmation that argument is that there is lesser response if the end date is the last day of classes (compared to last day of finals) and Sean concurred in theory, but there is currently not data to make hard conclusions. He expressed a belief that consistency alone would improve response rates.

5. If FSAC were to pick a date the SETE policy would have to be changed to reflect this.
6. Sean reminded the committee that schools and department can do their own additional teaching evaluation steps.
7. In terms of tabulation, Armand raised the issue of the data should be presented over time or over courses. The template for performance over time was perhaps the main issue. Deborah confirmed that this summary table is for 3-year contract and tenure line review. Steve raised the issue of looking at growth over time. Can we change the nature of the document that runs through the RTP process? Is a question for FSAC. Sandra added that there is a question as to whether looking across time/classes is valid as an indicator? Sean said he would work to adapt document to the needs outlined by faculty. The first step is for the faculty as a whole to decide what that should look like and then he can say if this request is feasible.

iii. Confidentiality vs. anonymity in SETEs (Bill Kidder)

1. Bill explained that there is a Title 9 complaint exists regarding comments made on a SETE that were harassing in nature, which raises the question of how to prevent against such things. SETES now are entirely anonymous and while the comments can be removed from RTP files there is no way to identify the student who made the comment. There are things that can be done to change this, but faculty would need to weigh in regarding changing the policy.
2. Bill cited the fact that this is an issue with highly gendered effects.
3. Sandra asked if there is consensus across the CSU. Sean could not state definitively but posited that there was likely not consistency.
4. Elaine highlighted Article 17 evaluation in the faculty contract that mentions student evaluations being anonymous, and wondered how this could be finessed.
5. Bill outlined a need to distinguish inappropriate vs egregious comments.
6. This is only a beginning discussion that requires much further consideration.
7. Deborah noted that a question on the table is "are SETEs causing harm"? She noted that lecturers may be particularly vulnerable.

4. Business Items:

i. Chair of FSAC

1. Rita was nominated as possible Chair and will give this some thought.

ii. Anthropology RTP Revisions

1. Maureen and Sandra reviewed this and found it solid. Others concurred that the policy was clear and appropriate.
2. Deborah pointed out under Teaching Effectiveness candidates in their first year will not have student evaluations in their dossier. She also recommended against the use of the words "deficiencies" and perhaps use a word like "developmental suggestions."
3. We approve this with changes. Maureen will notify Richard.

iii. Nursing RTP Revisions

1. Emiliano and Steve reviewed this. Steve talked to Nursing department about this being primarily a “clean up”. He did point out that the SETEs had a number attached and he advised changing language to “moving toward effective or very effective” rather than a number and she agreed to bring this to the department. Emiliano expressed being comfortable with the changes.
2. Deborah expressed some confusion under the “notes” area.
3. Steve noted that we might recommend “service” should be combined going forward. Emiliano expressed that the separation of service may vary due to discipline.
4. Steve will communicate with the Nursing chair with suggested edits.
5. We can invite Nursing to come for a second read with the revised document in two weeks.