FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE –AMENDED Meeting Minutes
Meeting Date: 11/18/15

PRESENT: James Murray (Chair), Nidhi Mahendra (Secretary), James Ahiakpor, Maria Gallegos, Lindsay McCrea, Linda Smetana (until 2:50 pm), Diana Wakimoto, Michael Moon, Linda Dobb, Holly Vugia.

ABSENT: None.

GUESTS: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson, IT Guests: Twinky Mistry (Director, ITS Service Quality) and David Corral from IT

Called to order at 2:04 pm with quorum.

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Approval of the agenda

Motion from Nidhi; Dobb seconds. Passed.

2. Approval of the 11/4/15 minutes

Motion from Diana; Mahendra acknowledges Ahiakpor's edits that have been made; Murray suggested some edits and clarification; Dobb also made a modification. Mahendra has made changes and will send amended minutes back to Sophie Rollins.

3. Reports

a. From FAC Chair

FAC 7 – Provost is very interested in supporting FAC 7 regarding equity of assigned time across colleges and departments, for student mentoring. One of the discussions in the Senate was that first year faculty should not be allowed to apply for this program given 2 years of generous release time being currently offered.

Murray addressed the Teacher-Scholar program – and said that the Provost is interested. There was discussion about how much this would cost and that the details of such a program need to be worked out with what some annual expected benchmarks/deliverables might be for faculty in this program. Murray commented that the Interim Provost inherited this Teacher-Scholar program from her predecessor; discussion in CR about how this would be funded.

Chair Murray also worked with Roger Wen on not sending out online course evaluations to students who have withdrawn from a class. Murray reported that he talked with ITAC about problems with TT faculty job applications and as part of discussing solutions, we

will be considering InterFolio (time-certain presentation of 2:15 pm by Zac Ulm, facilitated by Linda Dobb). Murray reported that he discussed with faculty/colleagues about CSUEB's amorous relationship policy and asked if they had gotten the mass mail sent out. Several told him they did not recall. Dobb mentioned mass mail was certainly sent out, and that there is a mandatory training (online) coming soon on this policy.

Presidential Appointee

Dobb reports this is a busy time on campus with a lot going on. Next big thing will be Curriculog to support Q2S efforts, and this will dominate attention for much of Winter quarter

She also reported that coming soon is information on the use of EAB – an advising product – this will be the focus in Spring quarter of 2016. Dobb shares that she is chairing the Advising Subcommittee for Q2S. Tomorrow (11/19) is the town-hall meeting of Q2S process (in the University Theater) and this is the biggest priority for campus. Three important searches underway as reported for Dean of Science, Interim CFO search – candidates on campus between 11/30-12/1 or 12/2. Dobb states that this is an incredibly important position—as structured now, HR and IT both report to the CFO. A third important search is for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies – Dobb encourages FAC members to go and participate and give input at all meetings with these candidates.

Mahendra asks a question about the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and asks for an update on that. Dobb has no update on this. Murray shares that he was involved with the College of Science dean selection and it was a very good process.

SCSC Steering Committee Report

McCrea echoes Q2S as the key priority for our campus. Visible work is all of the curricular work; departments readying themselves for conversion. Curriculog training is coming. Different groups are already being approached by Donna Wiley and Sarah Auber about this. McCrea reports that Curriculog is easy to use and she expects faculty and FAC members will like this new system. McCrea mentions there are minutes posted somewhere on the Senate Page on the time modules subcommittee (under Other Committees on Senate page). McCrea believes there will be a referral coming to us via ExCom regarding documents that will need revision/updating given the move to semesters. Her recollection is that there are 8 such policies that will need to be reviewed and updated. She added that in addition to the meeting for Q2S on 11/19, there are two meetings -one set up in Hayward in the first week of December and another in Concord as follow-up meetings.

4. Referrals:
a. Emeritus Policy referral

  i.   Current policy; not updated since 96-97 BEC 11
  ii.   12-13 FAC 8: New CSU East Bay Policy on Emerita and Emeritus Status

1. President's response

Dobb says President is saying if we want an Emeritus Lecturer title, then we need to develop a policy for considering lecturers for Emeritus status. McCrea agrees with Dobb's interpretation that we need a separate policy for lecturers versus tenure-track policy. Murray will take this matter for discussion to a lecturer subcommittee to work on a parallel policy for lecturers regarding Emeritus status. Also, Murray plans to ask Dr. Hedrick to work with President to check with him about whether we should leave current policy as is regarding considering Emeritus Status at 12 years unless there is a compelling reason to consider reducing this to 10 years.

b. Referral regarding emergency appointments for search committees

i. Appointment and Review document

Section II.B.13: Should a faculty member of a search committee be unable or unwilling to serve or continue serving on a committee, a replacement shall be appointed by the Executive Committee in accordance with the criteria of this policy. (*The criteria of the policy for some search committees calls a university-wide election, making this section vague/unclear on procedure*)

Suggested changes

Sophie cautions that you cannot just say same college, because there's also the inclusion of Library. Murray says the 'pool' has been defined already in another part of the document. Stay with language that suggests volunteers (assumes fresh call). **Passed; none opposed; Dobb abstains.**

c. Referral regarding definition/clarification of Immediate Past Chair term on

Excom
i. Suggested language

IPC will not exceed a term of one year – language added. **Murray moved; Vugia seconds; no discussion point; Motion passed; Dobb opposed; No abstention.**

d. Constitution and Bylaws referral regarding voting threshold discrepancies i. Suggested changes

Murray moved; McCrea seconds. Discussion – require clear stipulations for what constitutes a quorum of voters. In the absence of such a stipulated quorum, there is a danger that very few people actually vote, and by a simple majority of votes (erroneously based on a small voter sample), a measure might pass and this is not optimal.

FAC charge is to explore issues and provide solutions. We are identifying one solution that an amendment may be adopted when the University faculty when 2/3rds of the members voting will approve the amendment. If you make a change to the constitution, you need a majority vote. Dobb provides context that this was being discussed last year and a Constitution and Bylaws change went forward and passed. But then Constitution change was needed to amend the bylaws. In that precedent per Sophie, constitutional change passed and bylaws didn't. This makes no sense.

Per Murray, the Constitution should be harder to change and bylaws easier to change. However, on our campus, constitution is easy to change per majority vote and bylaws are harder to change. Our solution makes both of those equally difficult. Dobb's suggestion: In no case can bylaws be amended if less than a 1/3rd of our faculty votes on a motion.

Motion passed; no abstention; no opposing.

ii. Additional information

5. Business Items:

1. Interfolio presentation (*Twinki Mistry, 2:15 pm time certain*) By Zac Ulm, Regional Manager, University Partnerships – INTERFOLIO

Explore online submission of vitae, letters, and application given persistent problems with online application submission for TT searches. Interfolio has been around since 1999. Not new to CSUEB campus – letter-writing tools have been utilized by several faculty as an example. InterFolio supports the work of shared governance. Committees are important for every faculty decision. Presentation on context for supporting use of INTERFOLIO—can organize and rate applicants, committees can discuss this all confidentially, aggregate EEO data and visualize diversity reports.

Dobb asks question about other programs wherein you could click on a tab and be connected to the Chronicle ad. Moon asks question about whether dean level approval could be granted for search stages within this system. McCrea asks related question about whether an administrator can regulate the search process at a particular stage, and move on the search to the next stage. Similarly, would a final approval be able to be put into this system? Moon asks if there is built-in workflow management in INTERFOLIO. Twinky Mistry asks if the product has a work flow engine—where you could specify which documents/packets are routed to who for what type of search (e.g. staff/faculty). Is the workflow functionality built in for position approvals prior to receiving applications for the position? Zac says yes this can be done and will likely be available in 2016. Dobb thanks Zac for his participation.

2. Suggested changes to the RTP document
    i.   With changes visible
    ii. Without changes visible

    Sophie suggests these changes came from RTP subcommittee on which Moon and Smetana served. Moon responded these changes were in response to Provost's request to be included. Wakimoto asks to use non-gendered pronoun "their" rather than his/her throughout the document. Dobb asks a question about 15.2 – For 3 years, the university committee documents will not be made available to anyone apart from the grievant. Wakimoto, when reading for clarity, asks a question about moving the stuff in section 14, and puttin it under # 13 – Review by the Provost. Dobb says we want to refer people to the chart about RTP Timeline. Fix table of contents – Chart is # 18, we're missing # 15 = Conclusion of University Review. In section # 14- refer to the chart and say in parentheses (please refer to chart). Pg 32- Notification to candidate-title of 14. (See Section 18 for Summary Timelilne)

    Passed; no abstention; none opposed.

3. 14-15 FAC 14: Suggested revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) policy

    Per Sophie, ExCom had issues with these suggested revisions.

d. Discussions:
i. Philosophical statement on Evaluating Teaching (a combination of self- evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation)
1. Office of Faculty Development page with faculty services – ***Deferred discussion to next meeting.***

6. Meeting adjourned at 3:53 pm.