

In attendance: Jim Murray (Chair), Nidhi Mahendra (Chair), Linda Smetana, Holly Vugia, Caron Inouye, Diana Wakimoto, Kimberly Kim, Michael Moon, Linda Dobb

Absent: James Ahiakpor,

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson, Jessica Weiss, Sarah Taylor, Provost Nelson

Meeting called to order at 2:03 pm with quorum

### **1. Approval of Agenda**

Murray motions/Wakimoto seconds/passed unanimously

### **2. Approval of the 2/3/16 minutes**

Minutes of 02/03/2016: Murray motions to approve/who/passed with 1 abstention

Discussion: Last page of minutes, suggest the first time “CR” is noted in the document that it should be spelled out to Committee on Research (CR); Sophie will add vote count

### **3. Reports**

#### **3a. FAC Chair**

Jim sent FAC members his notes ahead of the meeting. Murray mentions that there are two more applicants, requesting release time in the category of Exceptional Service to Students.

#### **3b. Presidential Appointee**

Arrived late to meeting. Shares that several items referred by FAC to ExCom are being referred, in return, back to FAC. Department Chair policy document and Emeritus policy documents are generating many questions at ExCom. Dobb suggests that we be much more thorough and very careful in sending documents forward. Reports that InterFolio and PeopleAdmin have been vetted with IT services; has consulted with San Jose State University where they are very much in favor of InterFolio. Dobb moves for consideration of Interfolio/Mahendra seconds/all approved/none opposed nor abstained.

Discussion: Vugia asks Dobb what FAC could do better with documents being sent forward. Dobb says to read carefully and request copies be produced for hard copy inspection before we send things up; Moon suggests we use more in-person deliberation than on email; Mahendra suggests we go to the ExCom meeting when major documents are up for consideration. Wakimoto suggests we be pragmatic that regardless of our efforts at deliberation, some policy documents may still be returned.

### **3c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) report**

Moon reports that much of last SCSC meeting was spent on reviewing the models for four different time modules under consideration by Academic Senate.

## **4. Referrals**

### **4a. 15-16 FAC 5**

**Discussion:** Sophie shares Dobb's email (sent ahead of time) about circular logic in the proposed amendment. Original language is that WPAF will be returned to candidates. Dobb mentions we want to return WPAFs to Provost's Office, who in turn will return to candidate. Should be referring to whole section 3.3.3.b and not make reference to section 15.4. No pending issue on 12.1; this is completed. Issue on 2.2. is that we must add the language 'Lastly, I understand....'

3.3.3.b.4 Suggested Language - 'The original letters of recommendation in tenure and promotion actions shall be disposed by the Provost's office'.

## **5. Business Items**

### **b. 14-15 FAC 14 Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy**

**Time Certain 2:20 pm            Dr. Jessica Weiss – OFD**

Suggested revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) policy

Discussion: Weiss gives background on why the document will be called as Student Evaluation of Learning (not Student Evaluation of Teaching) to keep focus on domain over which they have best understanding, i.e., their own learning. Moon and Inouye ask if it could be called *Student Evaluation of Learning Experience*. Wakimoto asks whether document can simply be called *Student Course Evaluation*. Wakimoto suggested that Semester Conversion documents already state that student learning is not assessed merely by evaluations of teaching. Vugia points out that we previously called this the Student Evaluation of Learning Experience (13-14 FAC 16 previously agreed upon and passed in May 2014). Suggestion is to change our document to match the title Student Evaluation of Learning Experience.

Mahendra asks about this document in Section 2, 2.1 why service learning is noted as an exception at the bottom in the footnote since service learning is a High-Impact Practice and we don't want courses including SL excluded from evaluation. Murray says there is a CIC document which provides a list of exempt courses. Instructor or faculty member of record for such exempt course is not the direct supervisor and/or does not play a primary instructional role, e.g. student teaching, practicum). FAC members discussed that certain field placements, clinical practica, internships, off-site study experiences fall under this exempt category but this should not apply to regular courses that have a significant service learning component.

**c. 14-15 FAC 7: Resolution to address the inequity across colleges of 'assigned time' for special registration courses such as Independent Study, Senior Thesis, Graduate Thesis, and Practicum**

Guest: Provost Nelson (3:00 pm time certain)

**Discussion:** Would like to have FAC have a subcommittee with FAC Chair, one other FAC member and Provost and maybe an AD/Dean. Deans and provost agreed on a few principles:

-Theses/projects really need to be addressed in terms of time.

-Independent/individual studies in the last quarter of student enrolment could be agreed upon, across 4 colleges. We are currently funded by FTEs, not by older algebraic formulas that were once in place (no longer used since 1994 per Dr. Nelson).

-Method of compensation – no clear consensus on how to do it. Consider enrollment values.

All policy proposals need to have a cost analysis.

Moon mentions maybe this conversation needs to get out to Department Chairs as Q2S process moves forward so we don't close doors and can include theses/independent study as we transform or convert our curriculum.

**d. 15-16 CR 3: Response to referral to review the appointment procedures for membership on the Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

Discussion: Committee on Research Chair Sarah Taylor explains that current IRB Chair Kevin Brown shared the more organic approach at CSUEB to consider departments that have a lot of proposals going forward and so he appoints faculty from representative departments (e.g. Psychology, Social Work, Comm Sci and Disorders etc) to be able to lend their expertise. Therefore, does not make sense that there may be a regular university-wide election when there is a specific composition of Board that would indeed serve better, given the data on the types of proposals that come up through IRB at our institution. FAC members suggested that moving forward, some areas for improvement may be that IRB vacancies should be clearly posted, and that there are agreed-upon criteria to be fulfilled by faculty appointed to the IRB board.

Adjournment at 3:51 pm by acclamation.

Minutes respectfully submitted,  
Nidhi Mahendra