

FAC AMENDED Minutes
12/02/2015

Members Present:

Jim Murray (Chair), Linda Dobb, Maria Gallegos, Diana Wakimoto, Michael Moon, Linda Smetana, Lindsay McCrea, Holly Vugia

Members Absent: Nidhi Mahendra

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson

Meeting called to order.

1. Changes to the agenda.
 - a. Delete 5c.
 - b. Add 4a: Continue to revise the wording on the document involving Shorter Sessions under Semesters.
2. **All approved the Agenda. None opposed.**
3. **FAC Chair Report:** Jim went to the Senate meeting. He reports that 14-15 FAC 16 and 14-15 FAC 15 passed through the Senate. FAC 17 was sent back for rewording. Did not get to FAC 1, 2 or 3.
4. **Presidential Appointee Report (Linda Dobb):**
 - a. At the senate, there was a discussion of title IX. By Jan 30 training will be necessary for all.
 - b. Looking for mentors for new faculty. Let Jessica Weiss know if you are interested.
 - c. Searches: Dean of Science search is ongoing. Undergraduate Dean search starting next week.
 - d. Chair selection procedure needs to be modified. There is no policy that a person on the committee does not need to step away if there is a conflict of interest.
 - e. Contractual Reassigned time. 5 applications were submitted only. Discussion about what to do. One idea, we do not need to give it all away now. We can put out another call in the winter.
 - f. Professional Leave committee will not happen until January because there were not enough people on the committee from the College of Science.
5. **Semester Conversion Report:** There will be a meeting this coming Friday to discuss the following:
 - a. Fitgap analysis. The final budget that will be sent to the president is nearly complete.
 - b. Moving the summer session from leading to trailing will be discussed.
 - c. Administrative support committee will provide a report. They are looking for documents that need revision. These documents will wind their way to FAC eventually.
 - d. Announcement: Curriculog will be going live January 1. Trainings will become available. Access will be variable by department.

6. **AGENDA: TIME CERTAIN. PeopleAdmin** is here to talk about their system:

Highlights:

- a. Online automation for colleges and universities (Higher Ed).
 - i. Easy
 - ii. Intuitive
 - iii. Customizable (routing, forms, questions)
- b. > 700 institutions using their software.
- c. Around for 15 years.
- d. CSUs using the system: Cal Poly, Chico, Channel Islands, Monterey Bay (started 3 months ago).
- e. PeopleAdmin is responsible for all the software and they secure the data. Nothing is outsourced. Therefore the software is flexible. Fixes, changes and adjustments are all included in the contract.
- f. **PeopleAdmin and Applicant tracking.**
 - i. Strong customizable workflow for applicant tracking (i.e. the system passes documents around for approval). Alerts come via email. Links within the email take you into their system.
 - ii. Reporting is built in and also customizable.
 - iii. Mobile friendly (applicants will love it). ALSO, mobile optimized sites get ranked higher in Google.
 - iv. Design will be seamless with our design/logo but hosted completely by PeopleAdmin.
- g. **Integration is flexible:**
 1. **INPUT:** i.e. HigherEdJOBS (may cost extra). Others available.
 2. **OUTPUT:** i.e. PeopleSoft (may cost extra). Expensive. Others available.
- h. **Workflows in general:** You work with PeopleAdmin to reorganize basic “vanilla” configuration:
 1. Requisition Approve a Posting.
 2. Applicant screening.
 3. Hiring Offer.
- i. Coming in Jan or Feb: full blown analytics (i.e. comparisons can be made between departments).
- j. **A WALK THROUGH SYSTEM:**
 1. Email alerts let you know something is in your TODO list.
 2. For Create New postings (you can have boiler plate templates).
 3. One of the workflow steps could be “Assign committee members”. PeopleAdmin can decide who has admin authority to assign roles.
 4. Everything is customizable. The form for a position is built.
 5. Workflow includes the collection of references. PeopleAdmin automatically emails the list of people the candidate provides.

6. What does the applicant see? Very simple and streamlined. Application forms can be created as well (for screening purposes). Can see “Apply with Vitae” on the page. Applicant will receive a confirmation email when the submission is successful. Can go in and out of the software to continue working on an application.
7. Jim: Can applicants be evaluated with names masked? A: Don’t know.
8. Privacy? Data are on PeopleAdmin servers. A: I don’t know.

7. AGENDA Item 4a:

- a. Summer session states, “at least four weeks” which implies it could be longer. PEM is concerned. With a change in the length of the session, PEM doesn’t want to change add drop dates etc., “on the fly”.
 - i. PROS: Some people will appreciate flexibility
 - ii. CON: It is true determining new add/drop dates is a pain.
 - iii. ONE option: the length of the summer session could remain flexible (shorter or longer) but the add/drop dates would NOT change at all. Murray will confirm with the registrar that this is ok with them.
 - iv. What do other CSUs do? *We could look into it.* Has Angela Schnieder looked into this already?
 - v. What about terms that are short but start in the middle of the session? Nursing currently has 2 x 5 week rotations (and they came up with add/drop dates for the second rotation). With semesters, they plan to have 2 X 7 week rotations.
 - vi. **RECOMMENDATION: Do a little more research.**
8. AGENDA 5B 14-15 FAC 14. Delay.
9. AGENDA 5C. Pulled.
10. **AGENDA 5D. Emeritus Policy.**
 - a. What does the president want? Word from the President (via Dr. Hedrick): **CSUEB has NO process for determining who qualifies. It is currently automatic even though the document states that you need to show exceptional professional activity.** Other CSUs have a process (i.e. the chair or other peer needs to write a letter).
 - b. Jim (the Chair) did some work to look at what other CSUs do:
 - i. Bakersfield: “You must apply for it. . . . Nominations have to be submitted by a peer group. . . .”
 - ii. San Jose State says, “It is automatic unless there is cause”.
 - c. Near consensus: **We need to determine “How to recommend someone for emeritus status”.**
 - d. *Some argue, this is NOT all the president wants.*
 - i. What about lecturers? How do we determine the accomplishments of lecturers?

- ii. Dobb: We need separate policies for how one becomes a lecturer emeritus or professor emeritus. This was also brought up in the previous meeting by FAC.
- iii. There was a discussion about whether or not we should expect continued professional achievement. The reason why this matters is about what the wording would look like if we add lecturers. But see ii above.

e. **GOING FORWARD:** Use the old **12-13 FAC 8** as a template. Change the **procedure** so that it does NOT read as automatic (Review the policy from Bakersfield. Looks like a good model). Move the new language of current document into the old format. Keep the 12 years. No reason to change it. Jim will work on the document.

11. **AGENDA 5ei.** Teacher/Scholar Program/Task Force. Still working on this.

12. **AGENDA 5eii.** Peer evaluations.

- a. We need to think about should we make it mandatory.
- b. I (Maria) argued that we should let the office of faculty development take on this role.
- c. Linda Dobb argues we should keep it as *peer* evaluation and that the Office of Faculty development is not equipped to handle the number of evaluations that would be necessary if we made it mandatory.
- d. Where did this Philosophical statement on Evaluating Teaching come from? Jim thought it may have come from him.
- e. Doesn't the PTR document allude to peer evaluation? We think so. Nursing has a rubric. It was not a punitive piece. It was designed to provide constructive criticism. She would be happy to provide the document.
- f. Do all lecturers have to be evaluated? In the third year of their contract, yes.
- g. Comments:
 - i. We are talking about peer observation with feedback.
 - ii. Making it mandatory is bothersome. Too burdensome.
 - iii. Create a teaching feedback toolkit. Include learning assessments. That might show what is actually being learned. Put the responsibility on the faculty person. They have to gather the evidence that shows they are effective teachers.
 - iv. There seems to be a lot of focus on the pre-tenure evaluation. It might be a positive move to make it occur throughout someone's tenure at the University.
 - v. The deadline for turning off student evaluations is too early. Why?

h. **GOING FORWARD:** The chair will continue to gather additional information.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Maria Gallegos