

FAC — February 5, 2014

AMENDED minutes

Attendance: Carl Stempel (Acting Chair), David Fencsik (Acting Secretary), Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Vish Hegde, Linda Smetana

Absent: Linda Ivey, Carlos Salomon

Guests: Endre Branstad, Mary Fortune, Mark Karplus, Sophie Rollins, Aline Soules, Mitch Watnik

1. Approval of agenda. M/S/P (Smetana/Hegde)
2. Approval of minutes from the January 29, 2014 meeting, with the following changes: M/S/P (Fan/Fencsik)
 - a. Add motioner and seconder to 5c.
 - b. Revise 5d to explain where the revised schedule goes next.
 - c. 6a is actually a 12-13 document, and needs the complete document identifier.
 - d. 6b: Changed to 2 separate documents, only one of which must be considered by FAC.
3. Mary Fortune presented her work on an electronic dossier submitted for tenure and promotion. The committee discussed how this could be incorporated into the RTP process.
4. Chair's Report
 - a. The Senate held a 1st reading of the SET document changes proposed by FAC. FAC discussed concerns expressed by the senators. It was suggested that FAC should revisit the full SET document. Hegde suggested that policy should include recommendations for maximizing response rates for online evaluations.
5. Deferred dealing with evaluation of UDO (Agenda 6.a.i.) until we hear from FDEC. M/S/P (Fencsik/Hegde)
6. Aline Soules reported on the Intellectual Property Policy (6.a.iv.).
 - a. The policy needs to be reviewed and likely revised. It needs to be brought in line with any institutional patent policies. It will need to address technology transfer. There are some CSU-wide policies, and some campus-specific ones as well.
 - b. FAC committee members should find people who have relevant knowledge and might be willing to serve on a task force starting in Spring 2014. Also, does CSU have lawyers with relevant expertise?
7. Defer consideration of lecturer's involvement in the chair selection process (Item 6.a.ii.). Dobb pointed out that this must be addressed soon, because it is based on a recent grievance. Deferred in order to give members time to review the arbitrator's decision. M/S/P (Hegde/Fencsik)
 - a. Discussion: How much should lecturer vote count? Can we get input from lecturers and chairs, if there is time?
8. Adjourned (Fencsik/Hegde)