

Faculty Standards & Affairs Committee
Business Meeting Minutes
12/18/2008
1:00-3:00 PM Sue Jameson Room

Present: Sunil Tewari (chair), Paula Hammett (until 2:20), Richard J. Senghas (recorder), Janejira Sutanonpaiboon, Helmut Wautischer, Beth Warner

Absent: Carlos Ayala, Melinda Barnard

Convened at 1:05 PM

Approved agenda

Do we need / want a proxy for absent members (e.g. Melinda)

Approve minutes

Clarifying comment on Business Item #2: Nominations are considered active for two years. Candidates do not remain in the pool more than two years without re nomination. APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS.

Reports:

SUNIL (Chair): Last Senate meeting suspended the regular business, and met as a committee of the whole. Statement of Collegiality first reading will be at today's meeting, as well as the Academic Freedom Subcommittee Position on SSU Job Fair Code of Conduct. Sunil or Richard plans to move that the position statement be adopted as the senate position. Charge from ExCom: SETEs: do we need to add comparative statistics to contextual the rankings cross-campus? (See Item 7, below.)

Academic Freedom Subcommittee: no report/no business since last FSAC meeting.

Professional Development Subcommittee: Jan provided meeting report – see attached.

URTP: Y2 RTP cycle files will be coming in on Monday, RTP files moving along normally. Comment: might we think about increasing the size of the committee due to workload? Issue being considered, but waiting on impact of revised policy before any action.

Business Items:

Item #1: SSU Job Fair Code of Conduct – Sunil
Will try to have first reading waived and push for adoption at today's meeting.
[Note: Position statement was indeed adopted by the Senate that afternoon.]

Item #2: Excellence in Teaching Awards – Beth

Revised Policy Draft presented. Changes include that nominations are active for two years, committee members will recues themselves from decisions on their own cases, nomination vita documents must focus calendar modified. Beth will work with Laurel Holmström strikeout/compare version to be advanced to ExCom. APROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Item #3: Departmental RTP Criteria – Paula & Carlos

Only 4 or 5 departments have not submitted criteria yet; Carlos & Paula will begin reviewing them over break. We'll need to put this item back on the business agenda in February.

Item #4: Textbook Adoption Policy in light of ATI – Richard & Beth

Richard is getting input from ATI Steering Committee members and will be working with Beth in January on drafting the policy. Thane Stearns indicates that EPC might have reason to co-sponsor due to curricular implications, so Richard & Beth may try to meet with Thane while drafting. Issue of commercial neutrality will need to be considered as policy is formed. Can the issue of textbook acquisition be disarticulated from textbook adoption? Policy is being developed so as to maintain academic freedom without being established in conflict with any ATI implementations required as part of the CSU ATI policy.

Item #5: Policy on Enrollment Load

Our positions on this may be moot, given the dynamism of budget and other circumstances. Unable to predict what issues may be coming such that development of any policy

Item #6: Revision of AFS Charge

Need for new language recognizing role of AFS in grievance process, as mentioned in the grievance process. If the subcommittee is still seen to be valuable, can we/should we develop a new permanent charge for the AFS, one not so outdated as the existing charge, and possibly more in line with academic freedom as promulgated by the AAUP. Will this subcommittee be called in, for example, on issues like the "N-word" issue that flared on Senate-Talk in December, 2008.

Item #7: SETE results comparison – Sunil (attachment)

Terry Lease (APC) brought the issue of potentially revising the SETE reports so that comparative statistics might be presented in ways that contextualize the instructors' scores. What is needed to make such comparative statistics available? This request from ExCom raises the following issues:

- 1) What are the potential advantages and disadvantages of having these comparative statistics available and widely distributed? There are concerns about how the numbers now seem meaningless, and also concerns about how these numbers might be used in punitive or inappropriate ways (including ways not initially intended, – is this why such comparative numbers aren't already included?)?
- 2) Might we want to compare university, school, department, *course*, and instructor SETE values, and possibly compare the average grades for

the given course vs. other courses? Are there changes over time, and if so, what might explain those?

- 3) There may be too many implications for this to be implemented successfully by Spring '09.
- 4) What about the differing rates in differing departments?
- 5) What are the technological constraints; are aggregates tallied and accessible? (Beth intendeds to pursue some of this line of inquiry.)

Adjourned at 2:52 PM.