FSAC Minutes
November 10, 2011
Sue Jameson Room
1:00 p.m. -3:00 p.m.

Attending: Richard Senghas (Chair), Sandra Newton, Chip McAuley, Paula Hammett, Richard
            Whitkus, Viki Montera, Melinda Barnard, Andy Merrifield (CFA), Emily Hurd (AS)

Guests: Nathan Rank, John Kornfeld

Convened: 1pm
Agenda: Approved
Minutes: Approved

BUSINESS
5. If there is no Academic Senate meeting on 12/15, should FSAC meet? Chair Senghas
proposed to have meeting schedule for FSAC match Senate and will check on Senate's last
meeting for this semester.

REPORTS

CHAIR (Senghas)
-Revisions to priority registration will be at Senate today.
-Disruptive Student Policy could be at next meeting.
-Trigger in CSU funding cut will likely happen.

AVP (Barnard)
-Sexual Assault and Discrimination awareness – very clear what must be done
-E-SETES are big all over the CSU. SSU is in the middle of the pack.
-Automated absence management system in CSU. Process has slowed down following a
grievance. Not rolling out for faculty other than 12 month faculty. It will come to FSAC first for
consultation.

AFS (Newton)
 • No report

FSSP (Whitkus)
 • No report

PDS (Montera)
 • Informational meeting with Provost. Discussed instructional engagement of the faculty.
   PDS lobbied for full-time Director for Faculty Center.

ASI (Hurd)
 • Discussion of 16 unit cap and implications for students.

CFA (Merrifield)
- Continued bargaining on new contract.
- Inquiry from Committee on whether any discussion from CFA on Gov. Brown's pension proposals. Answer is that impact on current faculty would be minimal due to State Constitution.

BUSINESS (cont.)

1. Sabbatical Policy

-Looking at policy.
-Not in keeping with current contract.
-Looking at revising structure and criteria.
-Provost should be president's designee.

URTP
-Clean up wording
-Track proposals

Barnard: Contract calls for one committee, SSU has three. Impact on department needs to be taken into account. Three main areas: department, curriculum and operations.

Criteria:
40 percent = merit of proposals
30 percent = amt. of service to university
30 percent – how long since last eligible

3. SETEs
- Responses from faculty as reported by members of committee on value use of SETEs
  - ❖ General lukewarm senses on utility of SETEs
  - ❖ Faculty who use SETEs do so as information on teaching effectiveness
  - ❖ Some questions appear problematic, such as "makes difficult concepts understandable".
  - ❖ Some questions the wording seems to set up expectations of student's responses.
  - ❖ Issue of enthusiasm, whether this should be an evaluation item.
  - ❖ If redone, should check to see if the questions make sense for the various uses of SETES.
  - ❖ Would like student feedback before moving forward.
  - ❖ Purpose of questions – are they to provide information or for evaluative use?
  - ❖ Should focus on obtainment of course objectives more than instructor's perceived ability.
  - ❖ Written comments are used and appreciated, electronic SETEs may increase student written input.

- Committee member provided three points for moving forward:

1. Obtain history and development of SETEs on campus
2. Take a look at the literature on student evaluations
3. Should we develop a broader survey to get wider campus input?

- Once information obtained will decide on next steps.
- Also need to insure actions aligned with Contract

Adjourned: 2:55 pm