

## Faculty Affairs Committee

## AMENDED Minutes

4/6/2016

Present: Jim Murray (Chair), Linda Dobb, James Ahiakpor, Caron Inouye, Kimberly Kim, Michael Moon, Linda Smetana, Holly Vugia, Diana Wakimoto (via phone)

Absent: Nidhi Mahendra

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson, Eileen Barrett, Mitch Watnik, Jessica Weiss (joined 3:15)

Meeting called to order at 2:03 pm with quorum

1. Approval of the agenda with slight reordering to accommodate time-certain commitments. Passed unanimously.
2. Approval of the [3/2/16](#) minutes
3. Reports
  - a. FAC Chair (Murray)
    - At Senate meeting item # 1 sent back (objection to deleting designated paragraph) and #2 could not be passed as the meeting lost quorum
    - Confusion and concern about need to clarify role of past chair sitting on Senate Executive Committee and how this sometimes changes the number of members on the committee. Watnik offered explanation of issue and expressed opinion that it is better to have a larger and consistent number of members rather than having a small number of committee members and thus, too little faculty representation. Murray will consult with Dr. Hendrick (Executive Committee Chair) about this issue: concern about term limits and past chair filling duplicate seats.
  - b. Presidential Appointee (Dobb)
    - provost candidates will be scheduled for visits soon; requests faculty/staff look for notices and attend open forums; timing somewhat uncertain due to possible strike; expressed hope that strike negotiations produce positive outcomes
    - Emeritus policy is being reviewed, with need to clarify word "exceptional"
    - Range elevations for lecturers are complete, with all 4 candidates receiving elevation
    - RTP policy review: a few issues spotted by Barrett and Weiss regarding wording for applying late for promotion (on agenda)

- c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) (*Dr. Mitch Watnik, 2:15 time certain*)
- Next semester conversion meeting 4/8 University Union 102, 12-2 PM; Michael Moon is representing FAC there ; scheduled guest Kim Costino from CSU San Bernardino where conversion is also underway; Moon will consult with Costino
  - Curriculum Development & Review is on schedule, aiming for 35-70 programs being completed by end of spring 2016, with the rest following in fall 2016
  - ASI working with co-curricular sub-committee on concept/format of University Hour in new class schedule models
  - Time Modules model [presentation](#) given by Watnick
    - Stressed need to focus on 1) lecture classes (not labs/activities), 2) convenient schedule for students, 3) flexibility for 3 or 4 unit classes, 4) improving classroom utilization and allowing for growth, and 5) providing 10 minute passing period (note: Parking staff recommend 15-20 minute minimum instead)
    - Classroom space challenge discussed, noting CSU's desire for CSUEB to use more Friday and evening class slots before any new classroom space is ever approved; idea arose to request re-assessment of that position after semester conversion is completed
  - Class schedule [models](#) reviewed (Models 1-4, see electronic file)
    - Similarities: all models allow for 1) Friday, Saturday, and evening classes meeting one time/week; 2) separate patterns for labs and activities 5 days/week; 3) ability for students to complete full time schedule (12 units) with classes starting after 4PM; and 4) scheduling 1 unit courses by splitting 3 or 4 unit course patterns up
    - Differences: 1) two models call for a University hour with no lectures scheduled at that time (although labs & activities may be scheduled); 2) variable start time for evening classes; 3) some models restrict when 4 unit classes could be offered; and 4) some models offer more flexibility (see Model 4), but the sense is that M-Th 10-2 (prime-time) will be impacted; some universities cope with this by establishing limits regarding what percentage of courses a particular department may schedule during "prime-time"
  - Feedback is requested concerning the modules; either send email to Watnik or place post-it on module posters. FAC does not vote on these modules—information only item.

#### 4. Awards (*closed session*)

- a. Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students (*1 applicant*); decision tabled until policy reviewed on matter of duplicate service awards

5. Referrals:

a. [15-16 FAC 5](#): Proposed amendment to add the Provost to the process of the University

RTP Procedures and other changes

- i. [Updated policy](#) with track changes/comments visible
  - ii. [Updated policy](#) with red/stricken text only
- Committee discussed changes needed to section 3.9.2; (Weiss joined the meeting)
    - Recommendation to switch order of section (a) (regarding promotion) and section (b) (regarding retention)
    - Recommendation to change wording of the original section (a) to: “candidate who does not submit a dossier or request an extension shall not be considered for promotion that year” and
    - In section (a) delete the phrase “and the Department Chair shall so notify the College Dean in writing”
  - Committee discussed section 6.5.1 regarding early tenure requests; Dobb reviewed previous memo from former Provost Houpis (4/27/15) exploring whether expectations should be higher the further the candidate is from the 6 year normal probation period
    - Suggested wording per Dobb: “The further away a candidate is from completing a full six (6) year probationary period the more strenuously the committee shall apply their criteria.”
    - Question arose whether changes impact section 7.1 regarding expectations regarding promotion
  - Committee discussed section 6.5.4 regarding documents moving forward at the end of a denied early request and concluded the document can still go up the review process
    - Recommended adding a new section 6.5.5 (causing re-numbering of current 6.5.5 to 6.5.6) making it clear that documents can still go forward even if college or department does not recommend promotion
  - General concern raised by Moon regarding the committee making so many changes. Murray emphasized need to make reasons for changes very clear, explicit and well-defined. Weiss commented that greater clarity will help faculty in the future.
  - Committee discussed section 10.2.6 regarding rebuttals and responses, with question concerning clarification of the 10 day response timeline: does the 10 day period refer to receipt of the letter or the deadline (deadline is listed on the timeline chart at end of document)?
    - Dobb and Murray will explore and continue to make

changes on the RTP policy document

6. Due to limited time, the FAC did not reach the remaining agenda items. For next meeting, Murray will move today's agenda item 5b (*b. [15-16 ASCD 8: FAC Policy or Procedures documents that require revisions for semester conversion that merit careful consideration](#)*) earlier in the agenda to be sure it can be accomplished.

Meeting adjourned at 3:53 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Holly Vugia

