

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting of October 17, 2012

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Carlos Solomon

Absent: Vish Hegde, Tony Lima, Carl Stempel

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Sue Opp, Jiansheng Guo

1. Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Larson/LeDuc)
2. Approval of the minutes of October 3, 2012
M/S/P (Bicais/Larson)
3. Report of the Chair
Ginno: ExCom approved changes in wording for FAC Policies and Procedures for Outstanding Professor Subcommittee. Valerie Helgren-Lempesis from CEAS has agreed to serve on the Outstanding Professor Subcommittee. Need Presidential Appointees for all subcommittees. Sharon Green is stepping down as chair of Student Evaluations subcommittee after this quarter. A Senate appointee from CBE will be needed for Winter and Spring quarters.
4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
Dobb: The procedure for communicating with the President is to go through the Provost. One item that is currently in limbo is the Emeritus/a policy. Comments have been received back from the President on the range elevation policy and administrative review policy.
5. Old Business
 - a. FAC Policies and Procedures
Ginno introduced this for information only as ExCom did approve it. Dobb recommended that the word “agendum” be changed to “agenda.”
M/S/P (Fan/Larson)
 - b. Review of the following documents
 - i. URTP
 - ii. LIB-RTP
 - iii. Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Ginno reported that the sentence “Such a request shall not be considered beyond the Department level unless a positive recommendation is received from both the Department Committee and from the Department Chair” was deleted from URTP and LIB-RTP from

sections 6.5.2., 7.5.2, and 8.5.2, and that references to 2 course evaluations was changed to including all course evaluations, per the new CBA language.

The original goal with the “Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty” was to make it in line with the RTP documents with respect to being consistent with the most current CBA. The discussion started with a proposal that any reference to “two course evaluations” should be changed to “all course evaluations.” Fan asked “What is the difference between Policy on Teaching Evaluations and Policy on Student Evaluations?” The committee investigated on line. All three documents refer to “Policy on Teaching Evaluations” and “Policy on Student Evaluations”, The complexity of the situation was then realized. What was found was “Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy” from 1998. This document will need to be revised for various reasons: refers to the University as CSUH, refers to two course evaluations, etc... Ginno thought it might be a redundant policy, but Dobb stated that it does establish the use of a standard evaluation form, a procedure to modify it, and how the evaluations should be administered. As such, we need to have such a document, but it needs to be revised so that it adheres to the tenets of the current version of the CBA, “which may change over time.” An asterisk comment mentioning one evaluation if only one class is taught was deleted. The mention of “including full professors step 5” was deleted.

There was also some discussion about the choice of course evaluations included in one’s dossier. CBA Article 15.34 says that the department chair chooses what course evaluations are to be included for post-tenure review. The document says instead that the candidate chooses. As chairs, Bicais and Larson chose the evaluations. Bicais did so with the purpose of making sure evaluations existed for all courses for external evaluation by CTC. Larson did so with the purpose of making sure that every course taught over five years is evaluated at least once. Dobb says that everything will be in PAF. Bicais commented on how this increase in number of courses evaluated will change workload for chairs, administrative assistants, and testing services. Language of candidate choosing seems okay then. For post-tenure review, 5.1 is no longer true since all courses are now evaluated – nothing for chair to choose. 5.2 might need to be changed and needs to be considered.

One additional issue was that “Faculty participating in FERP no longer need to be evaluated unless the faculty requests it.”

Ginno asked if she draft the changes, and then have the committee vote via email. The Committee was in agreement.

6. Other Business

Lecturer subcommittee meets in LI2750 at 10 a.m. on October 31st.

We will look at administrative review at the next meeting. Dobb said that student evaluations need to be changed now. She suggested the addition of two questions “Were you aware there are learning outcomes?” and “Were the learning outcomes met?” Bicais is on the Student Evaluation subcommittee and mentioned that systems exist that allow the instructor to prioritize outcomes and that can correlate student responses with learning outcomes. The question was

asked if the Student Evaluations Subcommittee needed to be involved with revising the Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy. LeDuc suggested that after review by FAC, it can be sent by email to the sub-committee. That procedure was agreed upon.

7. Adjournment
(Solomon)