

Faculty Standards & Affairs Committee
Minutes
February 16, 2017

Present: Steven Winter (Chair / Sci & Tech), Sandra Feldman (A&H), Matthew Paolucci Callahan (Soc Sci), Rita Premo (Library), Deborah Roberts (Assoc Vice Provost), Emily Hinton (AS rep), and Elaine Newman (CFA).

Absent: Armand Gilinsky (Bus & Econ), Viki Montera (Educ)

Meeting Recorder – Premo

Adopt Agenda – Adopted

Approval of Minutes from 2/2 –w/o corrections

Standing Reports:

Chair (Winter)

- Regarding FSAC's resolution for combining faculty and undergraduate support into a single research center, the resolution is up for a second reading at Academic Senate today. The first reading went pretty well and mainly returned questions about adequate funding.
- Office hours policy. Will be at Academic Senate for a 15-minutes discussion. Ben Ford came up with the text that ExecComm will be taking forward to AS.

AVP (Roberts)

- Currently in the throes of the provost search; have completed some of the searches for tenure track. With great certainty, more than 25 tenure-track teaching faculty and librarians are being hired, including CAPS. For visiting faculty: approximately 6 new hires. There will also be one postdoc in CAPs and a research fellow (instructional postdoc) in Biology. Hiring for numerous temp pools is also going on. She will be asking search committees to see if her meeting with candidates has had any value added. Also in the throes of the RTP cycle. Went all Moodle this year; have not had any major complaints. Moodle is temporary. Have a platform called OnBase: Office is currently scanning all of the documents into this one. Plan is that next logical move is to OnBase, hopefully next year. Will be some kind of authorization process (sticking point previously – one had to go into FA office to use one particular computer).

PDS (Paolucci Callahan)

- Primary thing talking about is role of PDS in orientation for new faculty, at the beginning and throughout the year. Different units are involved. The monthly events offering nuggets of wisdom have been well received. Also, he sent out peer observation toolkit to us. Hold off on discussing until next meeting? (OKed). MPC will not be here, perhaps send Justin. SW: Can discuss briefly and then go to Senate. Put on agenda for 3/23. MPC has been asked to develop an entire training program for the Biology department.

ASI (Hinton)

- Working on campaign about the possible tuition increase: doing a video campaign, postcards, lobbying. Other than that, the big focus is a potential reduction in IRA (instructionally related activities) fee. Goal would be to put it up for student referendum. Also, elections starting right now. Asks members to let their students interested in student government know. She is sitting on two search committees: VP for Advancement and the Executive Director for GMC. SW mentioned the IRA fee may involve a freeze for 4 programs that get a guaranteed amount.
- CFA (Newman)
First social of the semester is Feb 22, 5-8 at Lobo's. Will be free beer and pizza for members and guests (i.e., DR). Big focus on Equity Interrupted paper and summary: Looks into data about how state funding has declined as the percentage of disadvantaged and at-risk students (who typically require more support services) has increased. The report is part of a campaign to get more funding for CSU. Lobby Days will be held the first week in April: EN is looking for a team of faculty to go. Attended the president's budget meeting: There is not terrible news, but depending on what happens with federal funding (e.g., withdrawal of Medicare expansion funds), things could get really grim. The big issue is the governor's rainy day fund; it's a rainy day now.

No reports:

AFS (Premo)

FSSP (Winter)

URTP (Gilinsky)

Business Items:

16-17:2 Office Hours Policy (Ex Com 2 sentences attached)

Discussion of the office hours policy by committee. SW: The paragraph of a policy, which will go to Academic Senate in 2 weeks, is based on Sacramento State's, whether we approve or not, barring us getting mad and stomping feet. This is what the Executive Committee thinks we can get through. EN: Notes that they wanted a separation of procedure and policy. Discussion occurred regarding the background to this policy. Agreement is to let this go out of Executive Committee as opposed to being from FSAC.

16-17:3 Revision of RTP Policy Regarding SETE Data (attached)

EN took 2 sections of RTP process, going back to 2 classes. EN: Still need sentences about being added to the PAF. SW: last week at Exec Comm, provost brought back concern about having criteria for early tenure. Don't have anything in the policy about criteria. Had been an informal policy under the prior president that early tenure would not be approved. Do we want to put something in, particularly about what it means to be exceptional. Since we're bringing the RTP back anyway, why not throw that in there? DR: When she sat on the URTP, they did bring up candidates for early approval. Thinks that we could do something very simple by stating that departments should decide for themselves what must be done to be considered exceptional.

EN: Agrees, could state that this should be done through department criteria that they're already supposed to have. SW: issue: provost said what she doesn't want is someone saying "the department said if I did these things, then I deserve early promotion." There's the discussion. EN: Suggests we back to provost and say that department should do this, and leave the RTP policy alone. SW: Let's say this document is currently in front of us, and what we've been working on, so we want to bring this in front of Senate without delay. EN: Has heard that maybe one thing we want to add to RTP is advising: can we throw that in there? SF: Are there timeframes between different departments: Is there a cutoff when early tenure is too early? Answer: not in policy. EN: Memory that someone's departmental policy that's come up before FSAC deals with early tenure; let's look for it and see what it says. We also need to look carefully at offer letters and what they promise.

Do we like this? EN: Add 2 sentences from prior version. Changing the first sentence. SETEs are required for all classes faculty teach. Second sentence should be preface by the two classes, insert that they should be representative and they should be placed in a path. "Student evals are required for all classes that faculty teach. Summaries for only 2 classes are included in the WPAF for evaluation.

Advising: List under section 2, tenured criteria and either Section A for departmental criteria, Section B for teaching effectiveness. Maybe put in A so departments can define what is expected for effective advising. Or maybe put under Service because that's where it is under the self-assessment. EN discovers that it's already there under service to the university. MPC: maybe want to put in an explanation because some candidates report being told that advising doesn't count as service. EN: Could sprinkle out, ask people to put in their self-assessment. Could maybe ask departments to throw in effective advising as something valued by the department. Provide examples, such as mentoring, writing reference letters.

For RTP: SW will rewrite and resubmit to us. Will also include the changes to advising as well.

16-17:4 Periodic Evaluation of Unit 3 Coaches (new attached / also see packets of 9/1, 9/29, & 2/2)

Working with coaches right now. MPC: Looked at coach SETEs across CSUs. They are out there, and there are a few instruments, but they have no info about validation and reliability. There is no evidence that coaches' evaluations go through any of that. EN: presents article provided by Lauren Morimoto. SF liked the changes to formatting and page numbering of forms for ease of access.

16-17:5 NCAA Violations by Coaches Information to Personnel Action File
Need to address this because no one knows where they are. Currently we have no policy about adding these to the file. SW will ask his fellow Faculty Athletic Representatives for their policies.

16-17:8 Departmental Temporary Faculty Hire Pool
DR wants a policy to say that every department should do this every 3 years.

16-17:10 Trigger Warning (Sensitive Material) Resolution
SW forgot to return our comments to AFS. He has now done so.

16-17:11 Tenure-Track Hiring Policy Add Diversity Selection Comm. (12/1 agenda)
Need to look at what diversity means holistically (e.g., departments that have no men, or no women). Must think about how we can incorporate this into the hiring process.

16-17:13 SETE's Confidential versus Anonymous (attached)
Document provided from Humboldt State that tells students that SETEs are confidential to professors but that their identity can be tracked by the administration, so the SETE is not the place to use foul language or make threats.

16-17:14 Educational Experience Enhancement Award

SW hands out a list showing the ad hoc committee's ranking of the 6 applicants. People are applying for 1 class of release time. How is it above and beyond normal the 3 units of release time they get. The number of units for the course is negotiated with Academic Affairs (some discussion whether the total available is 12 or 15 hours). EN: some departments have 3 unit classes and some have 4. Will affect how many we choose. SW: relates process for last year. Ranked them and then the hours were negotiated with AA, which affected whether 3 or 4 people received awards. MPC: rubric? SW: no rubric other than the person looking at them and ranking them, and the criteria listed in the application. Ex: considering a previous award as a reason for a lower ranking. But is there anything in the application saying that receiving a prior award will reduce your chances. Institutional history has been this, because this is seen as a reward for something you're already doing or release time to start something. If you continue to do something good, the department should find a way to support it. Was approached that way with the ad hoc committee: 2 of 3 members used that as a criteria. Amount of impact was also taken into account: e.g., single course vs. program redesign, running program or new activity, number of students impacted, are students from underrepresented groups or EOP and amount of work involved. EN: Discusses history of this award, way of dealing with "minority tax" to reward release time for exceptional service. Not sure if we'll be able to do this again because this was 1 year extension from prior contract. SW: If want to do again, FSAC will need to jump on early for the fall semester. MPC: perhaps look at criteria and rubric from other institutions since all CSUs are doing this. SW: moves that FSAC has been presented with ad hoc committee's report and that we turn over to AA to negotiate. Discussion ensued about the candidates rated 2-4; what dropped the 4th person was being a prior recipient. If # of hours is 15 instead of 12, then all could be chosen. DR: Also depends on # of hours of a course the person could be released from. She wouldn't give someone a second award; can't support that. EN: Instructions do not say that. MPC: parameters of this are not clear. Could be clarified in the instructions from AA/FA (Academic Senate guidelines) in the call for proposals. Anecdotally, faculty feel why put in this effort if you're not going to get it. Discussion ensues regarding contract language, purpose, how small the award is. Perhaps committee should be more explicit as this moves forward to Academic Affairs that we recommend that awards be given to the top 4 people.