

## Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee

Minutes, November 7, 2002

Members present: C. Freund, S. Heft, B. Houghton (for J. Hunt), V. Lea, W. Poe, E. Stanny (presiding), J. Christmann (URTP Committee liaison)

Guests: S. Hayes, P. Marker

### Chair's Report:

E. Stanny reported that the Academic Senate was considering the revisions in the Emeritus Faculty policy recommended by FSAC. Questions were raised by Senators about whether FERP faculty are eligible for emeritus status at other CSU campuses. The Academic Senate is also considering the revisions in the Excellence in Teaching Award procedure. Questions have been raised concerning the history of the distribution of the awards to tenured and to non-tenured faculty.

Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs' Report: No report.

### Business

P. Marker introduced a proposal "that the University Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTP) be comprised of members representing each School/unit in the University that has faculty involved in the RTP procedure." Marker argued that the current practice was created when the University was smaller and that the change he proposes would solve the problem of lack of representation of certain schools. The revision would make the process more democratic since all schools and affected units would be represented.

S. Hayes commented that the units affected included not only the library but also Student Service personnel and the writing center. She also remarked that under the current system disciplinary differences could be accommodated by the ability of departments to establish criteria particular to the discipline. The current policy calls for such documents to be submitted to the URTP committee.

S. Heft expressed concern that it would be difficult to get people from the smaller units to serve on the committees. She remarked that the change would create a greater chance that people would represent constituencies.

P. Marker remarked that he has faith that people could set aside their differences.

J. Christmann commented that a strength of the URTP committee is that people do not represent schools, that members of the committee make a conscious effort not to represent schools. He said that the committee discusses criteria first and works hard to ensure that the evaluation document is complete, clear and representative of the candidate. The problem has never been in the evaluation of people in different disciplines. The problem is with the quality of the document. The question is whether or not the candidate has been unfairly disadvantaged by the department document. Sometimes the department gives advice that is contrary to or in ignorance of campus RTP policy and practice. He further remarked that if members of the URTP committee were elected within a unit then the candidates would be evaluated by persons not

subject to election by the candidates. The URTP committee does not function as advocates by schools and that they do not want it to be that way. They want to depend upon the documents that have been submitted. He concluded by objecting to the implication in the final paragraph of the document submitted by P. Marker that the process has not been fair, informed and deliberative

P. Marker commented that if a representative was on the URTP Committee then that person could take recommendations back to the department.

S. Hayes stated that in the past communication to the department has occurred.

V. Lea said that she understood P. Marker on the issue of different standards. The URTP Committee should be emphasizing quality rather than equality.

She asked how long each member of the URTP Committee served. Response from several persons, "Three years."

She also asked P. Marker whether Education had its own document?

P. Marker responded that Education has a different policy but has not sent it forward.

V. Lea asked whether sending the document forward would meet P. Marker's concerns?

P. Marker responded that it would not meet some of the issues.

S. Hayes stated that the proposal is based upon false assumptions and ignorance about RTP policy and practice. The proposal, if adopted, would in all likelihood produce no possibility of Economics Department faculty ever serving on the URTP Committee since it is significantly smaller than the other department in a two-department school. She also stated that currently different disciplines are treated in an equitable manner.

W. Poe commented extensively on the proposal. There is no summary here since he was taking the minutes of the meeting and was not able synchronously to take notes of his remarks as he was making them. He acknowledges that it is with a great deal of difficulty that he has overcome the temptation to insert some things that he really wishes he had said.

S. Heft asked why not have the election at the department level. That would be even more democratic.

V. Lea stated that it was her assumption that one is more likely to assess fairly a person within a familiar discipline. However, she noted, departments may not be constructed of people like us. The situation is more complex than what appears in the Marker proposal.

P. Marker commented that he believed that there is a stronger likelihood that the level of communication will be improved, that the problems of the present system, the department document, could be solved.

B. Houghton reported on concerns that J. Hunt had forwarded. It requires the entire population of faculty to produce the five persons with qualities appropriate for service in the URTP Committee. The representation by schools model assumes that such qualities are uniformly distributed among the schools.

S. Hayes remarked that B. Jersky argues that the proposal is less democratic. If the school representative is representative of individual disciplines, each of the school representatives would represent a different number of disciplines.

J. Christmann stated that the summary results for RTP actions are available and public, and that any differences in committee action by school should be clear. Ranking is only done for funded sabbaticals and promotion. It should be clear in the available data whether the committee disadvantaged or appeared to have disadvantaged anyone based upon school membership. In his first year on the URTP Committee there were three Natural Scientists on the committee. There was, however, no greater or lesser

similarity in the functioning within the group than there has been with a different distribution of membership. There is simply no systematic pattern. In the last five years there have been two meetings with candidates who were appealing the URTP Committee's recommendation and one meeting with a Department RTP Committee.

P. Marker remarked that there are people who believe that appeal is futile.

J. Christmann remarked that he was not promoted to Professor the first time that he applied and that the reason was not the process but rather his performance.

W. Poe moved to report to the Executive Committee that the proposal is without merit.

S. Heft seconded the motion.

W. Poe moved to table the motion until the next meeting, seconded and passed.

An informal discussion of the topic filled the few minutes remaining until the time of adjournment.