Faculty Affairs Committee
APPROVED Minutes
February 3, 2016

In attendance: Jim Murray (Chair), Linda Smetana, James Ahiakpor, Caron Inouye, Diana Wakimoto, Kimberly Kim, Linda Dobb, Michael Moon

Absent: Nidhi Mahendra, Holly Vugia

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson

Meeting called to order at 2:00 pm with quorum

1. Approval of Agenda
Murray motions/Smetana seconds/passed unanimously

2. Approval of the 11/18/15 and 1/20/16 minutes
Minutes of 11/18/2015 Murray motions to approve/Wakimoto seconds/passed with 1 abstention

Minutes of 1/20/16 Murray motions to approve/Ahiakpor seconds/passed unanimously
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
Murray says he has nothing to report that will not be covered later in the meeting.

3b. Presidential Appointee
No report from Dobb.

3c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) report
Moon reports that graduate programs have a due date of next Friday to submit their revised curriculum proposals.

4. Referrals

4a. Emeritus Policy referral
Murray motions to accept policy/Wakimoto seconds/amended policy passed unanimously

Discussion: Murray drafted a policy influenced largely by policies at other CSUs and has received email input. Smetana questions including lecturers given the President's July 1, 2013 memo wherein he states that lecturers should be under a separate policy resolution. Murray wanted to make the policy relatively general. Dobb notes that "a regular member of the faculty," as written in #1 under Eligibility, does not include lecturers. Dobb asks about where the nomination shall come from under the Procedures section. Smetana notes that on Bakersfield's policy that the nomination can be from any peer or group of peers. Add a new #1 to Procedures: "A nomination may come from any peer or group of peers, preferably from the nominee's department or unit." Dobb asks about the "20 working days" under #3

Procedures, thinks it is too short, suggests 30 working days. Ahiakpor asks about the point of having posthumous emeritus status. Under Purpose, in first sentence, suggest change "award" to "awarded." Discuss Dean Emeritus, it is covered in policy under "administrative position" language. Murray asks for help with Responsibilities. Decision to delete #1 under Responsibilities as it is covered under Honors & Privileges. Under Procedures, #5 add to the end of the second sentence "after the President confirms the preferred honorific (emeritus or emerita)."

4b. 15-16 BEC 6: Referral to Review the Appointment Procedures for Membership on the Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Discussion: Murray notes that the membership is appointed without input from faculty governance, which is why ExCom referred this to FAC. Sarah Taylor, Chair of CR, and Stephanie Couch, Interim Associate Vice-President of Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), were in email conversation with Murray and noted that members on IRB need certain qualifications on and also had a concern about seating committee in time. Couch notes that ultimately the responsibility rests on the administration of the university for compliance with the laws governing IRB and suggests having nominations sent from Deans. Alternative suggestion made by Murray that nominations going forward could be an informational item to the Senate. Suggest that an election wouldn't be a problem if started it a year before to seat IRB. Membership is for one year. Moon asks about having a call for nominations so that the pool doesn't stay the same and IRB doesn't miss new faculty with backgrounds that may be useful on the board.

Discussion about IACUC membership and how the Chair of IACUC is elected. Chair is elected from the committee membership in the IACUC Policy, so we don't need to include this issue in FAC's recommendations.

Murray will work on a draft recommendation with justification from input from Stephanie Couch, Chair of Committee on Research, and Kevin Brown, Chair of IRB, and include recommendation of informational items (nominees and confirmed members) to ExCom. Murray will write up recommendations and we will hold an email vote.

4c. 15-16 ASCD 8: Policy or procedures documents that require revisions for semester conversion that merit careful consideration
Discussion: Murray notes that most of the changes requested were straightforward. Sophie notes that ExCom took out the layoff policy. Any place where "quarters" is mentioned it is changed to "semesters" although there are other places where units are changed. Everything in yellow is a suggestion from the Semester Conversion. Moon asks about red text included from San Jose State in the Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty; Sophie believes it was just extra information for FAC to make recommendations.

Murray motions to approve as amended/Smetana seconds/not passed, subcommittee formed to look more closely at proposed changes.

Further discussion: Moon notes that we need to take a look at the sample from San Jose State (on page 50 of 15-16 ASCD 8) because it differs from ours. Dobb suggests that we get a subcommittee to look at policies one by one. Dobb, Murray, and Smetana volunteer to look over the policies before FAC votes. FAC members agree; will revisit at later meeting.

5. Business Items

5a. 14-15 FAC 14: Suggested revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) policy
Discussion of ExCom's concerns on 14-15 FAC 14. Discussion of changing "teaching" to "learning" and potential issues. Wakimoto notes that the semester course proposal form states that student evaluations are not evidence of student learning. Dobb suggests calling it "Student Feedback" Smetana notes that 2.1 in the policy notes that "students evaluate their teaching." Dobb suggests that FAC invite Jessica Weiss to come talk with the committee at the next meeting.

FAC suggests keeping "teaching" instead of "learning" in policy title. Moon suggests trying a pilot of two weeks instead of one week window for completing evaluations to see what happens to response rate. Dobb says that would be possible to change with this with the Testing Office, need to make recommendation to ExCom and get approval from Senate. Moon also suggests testing whether it makes a difference in response rate, etc. to give time in class to students to fill out evaluation. Ahiakpor doesn't think it will make any difference if we give them time in class or if we give students two weeks.

Moon argues that including finals week in the evaluation period makes sense as the final exam is included in the class. Murray notes that grades might be posted informally on Blackboard so students know their grades and then still have time to fill out the evaluation. Ahiakpor voices concern about how student evaluations are used primarily in RTP so having final exam week included could hurt faculty. Inouye notes that student evaluations shouldn't be the only way to evaluate teaching. Murray also notes that low response rate on the evaluations is potentially harmful to faculty.

Section 3.3 ambiguity in the meaning of "equivalent time period" discussed already. For five week classes, suggest explicitly saying that evaluation will happen in last, one week in class.

Discussion about higher return rate on evaluations in paper than online. Dobb notes that we do not have as many administrative assistants to do paper evaluations and some departments were not able to type up open-ended comments. Online seemed liked the way to go. Murray suggests including a line about having time in class to fill out online evaluations just like with paper evaluations. Dobb notes paper response rate was 75%, online response rate average is 42%. Moon asks about return rate from different departments. Dobb notes that Business has high return rate as does the Communication Department. Moon suggests asking the departments with high response rates what their practices are to see if there is something that can be implemented by other departments. Murray says that he could ask for it to be included in Chairs Academy. Dobb says she will ask them at the next Chairs' training. Inouye also suggests looking at return rate versus class size.

Discussion about meaning of "campus-wide assessment of learning"; Dobb notes that the motivation was not to compare learning in one department to another.

Murray notes that looking at average student grade in the course in conjunction with student evaluations could be interesting. Business looks at grade average for the course versus student evaluations. Ahiakpor discusses how Business uses the statistics and notes that a high evaluation without high average grades could mean that students appreciate that class and instruction more than simply because all the students received high grades. Moon asks if Business does this as a requirement for accreditation; Ahiakpor stated that he doesn't know if it is for accreditation.

In 4.6.4 Moon suggests inserting "as one element" between "committee" and "in" so it would read "department chairs and peer review committees as one element in reviewing the quality…"

Murray will do some editing to fix some of the issues before the next meeting when we invite Jessica Weiss to come for further discussion.

5b. Revision of Chair's Appointment and Review document
Dobb discusses issue caused if a member of the Advisory Committee's name is suggested as Chair. She suggests that if a member of the Advisory Committee has been ranked highly as a potential Chair, then they should recuse themselves from the process of appointing a Chair.

Murray motions that the policy is passed as amended/Smetana seconds/passed unanimously.

5c. Discussions
5.c.ii Teacher/Scholar Program/Task Force
Murray is working with CR on Teacher/Scholar Program/Task Force. He will share out document he has received from CR and FAC will determine eligibility for this program. Murray notes that there is the idea that faculty in first two years would not be eligible for this program because of the current practice of receiving course release already.

5.c.iii Peer evaluation policy on Evaluating Teaching
Murray suggests that we need a longer discussion on peer review recommendations. Murray suggests pairs of observers for classroom observations. Smetana notes that for teacher observations always have a meeting prior to discuss class objectives, etc. so the observer is on the same page as the instructor. Following the class observation do write-up and then have debriefing meeting. Inouye discussed the importance of holistic evaluation of teaching. Dobb notes the confusion of terms "peer evaluation" and "peer observation" and suggests calling this "peer observation." Ahiakpor brings up the concern that it would take too much time and effort for training and observation and wouldn't work after someone is tenured. Moon notes that it will take a lot of energy, but suggests that rubrics were a similar cultural shift on campus and has been adopted by many. Murray notes we have Office of Faculty Development that can help with workload, but need to discuss who is qualified to make observation. Moon notes it would make a great Faculty Learning Community in the "train the trainer" model to learn the methods of classroom observers and they would be the observers and train others. Need to make it part of the culture.

Murray will start outlining a draft of procedures for observations for the members to add to and revise.

Adjournment at 3:51 pm by acclamation.

Minutes respectfully submitted,
Diana K. Wakimoto