

Faculty Affairs Committee
APPROVED Minutes
March 1, 2017

In attendance: Michael Moon, Jim Murray (Chair), Kathy Hann, Diana Wakimoto, Linda Dobb, Kimberly Kim, Linda Smetana

Absent: Grant Kien, Holly Vugia, Zinovy Radovilsky

Guests: Gretchen Reeve, Kevin Pina, Mark Robinson

Called to order at 2:06 pm with quorum.

1. Approval of the agenda

Murray/Moon/amended agenda approved unanimously

Amendment to agenda: inclusion of Office Hours Policy as Old Business item 4c.

Amendment Murray/Moon/approved with one abstention

2. Approval of 2/15/17 minutes

Murray/Wakimoto/approved unanimously

3. Reports

3a. FAC Chair

Murray reported that he received feedback from Kim Geron who suggested adding a student to the appointment committee for the University Diversity Officer. Geron also inquired about the possibility of decoupling the role of the DELO with the role as Chair of FDEC. Murray asked Geron to have FDEC discuss and send suggested language for the request to FAC for consideration.

Excom approved FAC Policies and Procedures document, but changed Footnote 2 to read "nine faculty members" for clarification. FAC has no objections to this change made by Excom.

3b. Presidential Appointment

Dobb noted that Excom also approved the Appointment and Review of Department Chairs Policy and Procedures document and Evaluation of Tenured Faculty document along with the FAC Policies and Procedures document as noted previously by Murray. On the agenda for the next Academic Senate meeting is the FAC document on FERP with quarter to semester changes and the Exceptional Levels of Service to Students policy. Murray will move for a waiver of the first reading of the Exceptional Levels of Service to Students policy so the call for proposals can be sent out in a timely manner. Murray also noted that there may be concern over having a subcommittee review the applications, but it is within the purview of the committee to create a subcommittee. Moon noted that creating a subcommittee is the same procedure that FAC uses for reviewing other awards and asked if there were objections to that arrangement. Murray said no.

Dobb talked with a Dean who wanted the RTP document to clarify whether a faculty member can submit a rebuttal electronically as faculty members receive their reviews electronically. Dobb is in favor of allowing submission of rebuttals electronically in order to make deadlines, but suggested that a hard copy should also be submitted.

3c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) report

Dobb noted that the University Hour that was approved as part of the semester time module is in fact a 3-year pilot and Excom will create a committee to review and assess the University Hour.

4. Old Business

4a. Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers document

Murray notes that FAC didn't have to make any decisions during the meeting on this document as the Chair of the Senate is still talking with the President on this matter. The President asked the Chair of the Senate if changing the positions listed in Table A automatically subjected those positions to review. Murray believes that appointment and review are decoupled.

Hann expressed concern about the committees that have nine members as too many members can make it unwieldy to schedule times to meet. There was also discussion of potentially lowering the number of staff members on committees to address this concern, but this could be detrimental to representation for those positions that oversee a large number of staff members.

Murray reviewed the new table layout he created to make it easier to see the breakdown of members for each appointment committee. The rest of FAC is in favor of this new table structure. Kim asked about needing an odd number of members on committees, but Murray noted the appointment committees only make recommendations to the President so it is not crucial to have an odd number of committee members. Murray inquired how the alum is selected for the VP, University Advancement appointment committee. Dobb noted that it is not the job of the faculty to figure out the rest of the selection of committee members and most likely the alum will come from one of the boards that alumni sit on. Murray asked the members of FAC to review the new table and add suggestions for revisions to the explanatory language.

4b. Constitution and Bylaws changes

Murray noted in regards to the elections that are necessary that it would be useful to have a Google Calendar that faculty members could subscribe to in order to keep track of deadlines. Moon asked who would be responsible for updating such calendars. Dobb said it would be the job of the Academic Senate. Murray agreed to talk with the Chair of the Senate about this possibility.

Murray shared the background information document with a slight change to the Constitution and Bylaws revisions FAC voted on last meeting. In #6 of the background information, Murray noted he changed the annual election dates for Faculty Marshal and the Academic Senators of the California State University to parallel other CSU campuses. There were no objections from the rest of the members of FAC. There was more discussion about the background information, specifically around the question about the timing of the hand-off of duties for the Faculty Marshal and Academic Senators of the CSU. Smetana asks about how other CSU campus handle it. Murray will look into this matter, but noted that a start date for service of June 1st should be fine because it is after the spring semester ends. Moon asked about what it means to have the hand-off during the summer recess. Murray thought it wouldn't make much difference as only in the case of emergencies would the new Faculty Marshal and Academic Senators be called into service over the summer, which doesn't seem likely to happen often.

4c. Office Hours Policy

Murray discussed this policy with the Chair of Senate, who noted the new policy for semesters will increase the workload for those with 4-7 WTU in semesters as compared to the equivalent WTUs in quarters. Murray presented a new proposal that could address the workload concern. Dobb disagreed with the changes as most courses in semesters will be 3WTUs. Murray noted that a full load in quarters means that the faculty member will have 99 office hours per academic year, while full time under semesters it would be 96 office hours. Moon asked for clarification of the issue by Chair of Senate. Hann noted that is one interpretation, but others have interpreted the policy differently. Moon noted that the changes FAC proposed make the office hour policy more explicit and as a result, depending on how one interpreted the old policy, it could lead to an increase or decrease in workload. He stated that we are translating the document so we are interpreting. Hann agreed that whenever you clarify a policy it looks like it has been changed. Smetana noted that the changed document that was approved last meeting is very clear without room for differing interpretations, which is good for anyone being hired to teach as they know what is expected of them going in. The new proposal by Murray was not accepted by FAC and he asked how he should change the background information. Dobb suggested that the sentence end at “proportional to semester units.”

4d. Lecturer Subcommittee suggested changes to Constitution and Bylaws

Murray/Smetana/approved unanimously to forward to Excom

These changes were discussed during the last FAC meeting and formally voted on during this meeting. However, these suggested changes are not going forward until voting on the semester changes to the Constitution and Bylaws is complete. As background information, Reevy noted that the faculty voted to increase lecturer representation last year, but President didn't sign it. The Lecturer Subcommittee then discussed other ways to increase Lecturer representation resulting in these suggested changes.

4e. Final language for emails to student and faculty about course evaluations

Murray worked with Roger Wen to clarify the language and verified that only one reminder about response rate can be sent to faculty per term. Wakimoto noted that in the email to the students and the information provided on the website change the point of view from second to first person in the bullet points, which is confusing. Murray will talk to Wen about changing this before the emails are sent to students next week. He also asked FAC members to solicit feedback from their colleagues about any ideas for increasing response rate.

5. New Business

5a. Department name change request

5a.i. Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders to Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences

Murray/Moon/approved unanimously

Wakimoto asked about the desired punctuation of the name change for the department as the first instance the department is listed as “Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences” while subsequent instances listed it as “Speech Language and Hearing Sciences”. Murray suggested that these were probably typos, but would investigate with the Department Chair to ensure the name is correct in the new catalog.

6. Discussions

6a. Should FAC propose that office hours be offset by online student contact?

The Chair of Murray's department asked how he could prove that faculty were contacting students via email or in ways other than during office hours. Murray asked how often Department Chairs check that faculty members are in their offices during stated office hour times. Hann noted that this could be checked via negative responses and feedback from students if they note in evaluations that their instructors were unavailable or didn't respond to email or other forms of communication.

Murray asked what FAC wanted to propose as a change to the current structure of office hours. He suggested replacing one or two of the required office hours with contact hours online. Hann noted that no matter when faculty members schedule their office hours there are always students who can't come. Smetana suggested sending out a survey to faculty to gather data about how we are currently contacting students. Moon suggested expanding the survey to include students to see what they prefer. He noted that it might be that students are comforted by knowing that their professors are available in-person at specific times even if they don't make use of office hours. Murray stated that any changes in the policy should keep the requirement that faculty members meet with students when the students request an in-person meeting.

Murray will create a Google Document where members of FAC can share their proposed survey questions. All members agreed that the surveys need to be short so they will be completed. Moon noted that it is important to determine what identifying information would be important to collect so the data is useful. He suggests Murray talks with Veronica Salvador who may have suggestions on the survey creation as he worked with her on the University Hour survey.

6b. Should peer observation be required for review of any faculty? Trial basis?

Murray noted that the subcommittee is discussing this issue and wants the members of FAC to discuss this matter with their colleagues. Murray believes peer observation should be mandatory for those on the tenure track. Smetana asked about what it is now in RTP document. Peer observations are not required in the current document. Wakimoto voiced concerns about training peer observers. Murray noted the subcommittee is creating a best practices document and training would have to be mandatory in order for the peer observations to be useful. Murray suggested having two people per observation. Moon noted that if the peer observers were properly trained there would be no need for two reviewers unless the review was negative. Murray noted that Weiss said there should be no penalty for negative observations unless they are corroborated. Hann asked if a negative review would have to be included in the dossier. Moon suggested requiring the inclusion of peer observations in the same manner that student evaluations are required.

Murray suggested that as a start, one summative, peer observation should be included in the dossier during the years a faculty member is on the tenure-track. It would be recommended that more formative evaluations should also be done during these tenure-track years. Smetana asked if it would be possible to get volunteers for a trial. Moon noted that the Office of Faculty Development at other universities often have large budgets and a large number of support staff that allow these offices to provide well-funded trainings and research on such initiatives. For our campus, he suggested a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) for those who are interested in training as observers may be of use. These faculty members could be responsible for creating a feedback loop to advance practice so peer observations could continue to improve through learning from the previous year's experiences and reporting back to the rest of the faculty.

6c. Changes to CSUEB organization chart?

Dobb is looking into getting the chart updated and will report back.

6d. Should we change how we allocate faculty on the URTP committee in Section 12.1.1?

Murray noted that CLASS gets 2 representatives while Science gets 1 representative even though both colleges are very close in terms of number of faculty members (110 vs. 102). Hann suggested to change the policy so any college with more than 30% of the total faculty are allotted 2 representatives. The other members of FAC agreed. Moon noted that faculty can feel more affinity with other departments from other colleges, especially in the colleges that are quite large such as CLASS and there are concerns about the representatives on the URTP understanding the dossiers from faculty from other departments. A potential change suggested by Hann to Section 12.1.1 would allocate colleges with over 30% of the total faculty 2 representatives on URTP with a minimum of 4 members elected from the Colleges to URTP, which covers the event in which no colleges have over 30% of the total faculty.

7. Adjournment

Murray/Wakimoto/approved unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 3:39 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Diana K. Wakimoto