

Amended MINUTES

FAC Meeting, Wednesday, November 20, 2013, 2:00 p.m.-3:50 p.m., LI 2250

Attendance: Liz Ginno (Chair), Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Lynne Grewe, Linda Ivey, Linda Smetana, Mitch Watnik, Meiling Wu

Members Absent: Vish Hege, Grant Kien

Guests: Endre Branstad

1. Approval of the agenda

(secretary missed vote)

Added 5.B Elections Uniformity referral

Approved as Amended

2. Approval of the minutes of 11/6/13

(secretary missed vote)

Approved

3. Report of the Chair

- Noted that FAC would have to address online student evaluations soon. Suggested that perhaps an email vote would suffice, depending on the level of controversy.
- Chair asked again for volunteers for an FAC representative on the RTP subcommittee; Linda Smetana volunteered.

4. Report of the Presidential appointee

- Reported that \$80/month raise starts with December paycheck, and will be retroactive to July. Noted that because all faculty will receive the raise, it is not likely that these particular raises will be reported in the PAF files of every faculty member, due to extraordinary paperwork burden.
- Requested a discussion at FAC regarding one aspect of the RTP document. As it stands now, the final arbiter of RTP decisions is the President, not the Provost, noting that the Provost (who has a significant role in hiring) actually has no role in RTP. Suggested this could be a discussion item for the RTP committee.
- Encouraged development of professional guidelines for RTP process, and once again suggested that this message be sent out to all departments

5. Old Business:

- a) School Directors [referral](#) i. Excom suggests these reviews be placed in the separated Chairs Review [1003 FAC Appointment and Review of Department Chairs Policy and Procedures](#)

FAC members who researched Directorships of Schools at other CSUs reported back:

Grewe reported that she found no policies for review, and when there were references to “schools,” they are really not talking about the same organizational structure as we are speaking of at CSUEB. In the other CSU’s versions of “schools,” Dean was responsible for electing director of program or centers, and in some cases, the Provost, a community advisory board, or the founding faculty. Grewe suggested policy should be synonymous with a Chair (i.e., elective). Also warned of potentially restrictive. Dobb reported essentially the same lack of

appointment policies. Found many "schools" were equivalent to our Colleges, with Deans in leadership roles. Also found schools were prevalent in the fields of Engineering and Nursing, but again, with MPP-types leading. Wu further confirmed the findings of Dobb and Grewe. Also agreed we need to determine whether "directors" of schools at CSUEB will be more akin to Chair or Administrator/Dean/MPP role.

Discussion: Ginno suggested that perhaps we should put "Directors" into our chair review policy. Grewe noted that we must designate "director of school" so as to not confuse with Directors of Centers or Programs already established on campus. Ivey reminded the committee that this policy was about appointment policy only, not job duties. Dobb pointed out that we must know if these School Directors will be MPP or faculty in order to proceed. Ginno confirmed that the current practice indicates that Directors of School will be part of the Faculty. Committee concluded that we are going equate School Director with Department Chairs in terms of appointment and review, but that we will need to define what a "school director" is.

b) Election Uniformity Referral

Proposal that Senate becomes involved with the last phase of College elections. Watnik introduced proposal, stemming from last year's issues with Spring elections. Noted that CLASS finished their elections late, causing some issues with the organizational meetings at the end of year and that CEAS allowed somebody in a standing committee to run for another committee. Watnik proposed that the Senate office become involved in College elections, by looking over the final ballots, and sending out the ballots for the official election. This would result in simultaneous and separate elections by all colleges and library. Colleges would call for nominations, and pull together their respective ballots. Also suggested a college may opt-out if they wanted to. Watnik also noted that Senate already pays for ballot service.

Committee decided ExCom could author the memo, and FAC would support.

c) Discussions for 13-14 FAC:

i. Are/should interim appointments be considered as part of the years served for administrative review due date calculations?

Discussion continued from previous meeting. Dobb noted that if duties significantly change after the "interim" is removed from the title, then the interim year should not count. Watnik noted that interim is only, by policy definition, a one-year position, and during the previous year, ExCom brought this point to the attention of the President.

Motion WU: interim appointment (defined as one year) should be included. FAN seconded. In discussion, Wu noted that Interim status counts in retirement calculations. Grewe added that this was comparable to tenure clock, for faculty. Dobb requested that the motion be tabled until we could get a read from Deans, etc.

TABLED.

ii. Consideration of smaller senate and committee memberships

GINNO reiterated the difficult process of getting nominees and faculty willing to serve. Faculty numbers have plummeted from a one-time high of about 410 faculty, now down to about 260, but we still same number of representation on senate and committees. Committee discussed proportionality vs. basic representation -- an issue when trying to lower the number on standing committees. WATNIK suggested two ideas: 1) lowering arbitrary numbers, or 2) that each college gets one seat on each committee, two seats become at large seats, and those seats become at large on Senate. IVEY expressed concern about junior faculty expectation for university service for tenure, and noted that the committee roles requiring tenure or full professor status are hardest to fill; also noted a lack of hires in previous several years, also hurting numbers of potential members, a dearth which is ostensibly being addressed by new tenure lines. WATNIK noted that junior faculty can serve on subcommittees, which are still quite difficult to fill. Committee discussed role of recruitment by senior faculty/Chairs.

GREWE: MOTION: lower numbers. 9 to 7 (standing committees); 10 to 6 (senate at large); 25 college reps proportional, drop to 17 (college rep drop). Fan seconds.

Discussion: IVEY opposes, concerned regarding the message this will send in terms of faculty retreating from shared governance. Fan noted the workload problem. GREWE questioned whether this drop in seat would really have an impact in Senate strength.

FAN suggests that the number of college reps should be reduced from 25 to 21, rather than 17. GREWE accepts as friendly amendment. IVEY requests that the 10 senate at-large seats be reduced to 8 rather than 6. GREWE accepts as friendly amendment. 4/0/0

iii. Consideration of internal hires on the waiver form attached to the Appointment and Review document

Conversation TABLED

iv. Range Elevation discussion; [current policy](#) last updated by 08-09 FAC 2

Currently in discussion in Lecturers' Subcommittee.

d) SET updated [draft policy](#) with 5/15/13 FAC changes (updated language regarding statistical measurements in 4.1)

i. Discuss adding language about departments adding own questions (possibly keeping 2.2 from [current policy](#)) TABLED.

e) Digital Dossiers [referral](#)

Discussed possibility of moving to digital dossiers for the RTP process. Fan expressed concerns about security of submissions. DOBB assured that the use of .pdf files and security measures would be secure. SMETANA noted that this measure would speak to sustainability (i.e., saving paper). DOBB shared an example of an electronic dossier presented on Blackboard. GINNO noted that faculty would need access to technology, like scanners. GREWE expressed concern about the limits of digital skills among faculty. Fan concurred that faculty training would be needed, and SMETANA suggested that this would be a role for Faculty Development. WATNIK noted that there

is a digital integrity policy coming to Senate, which will speak to issues of Blackboard having technical difficulties during due date periods. Grewe noted that the familiarity of the Blackboard platform would be a bonus. Dobb suggested that Mary Fortune, who had gone through this process, could come and share experience.

7. Adjournment, 4:00pm.