Faculty Affairs Committee
APPROVED Minutes
April 19, 2017

In attendance: James Murray (Chair), Maria Gallegos, Holly Vugia, Michael Moon, Pat Jennings, Kimberly Kim, Linda Smetana, Linda Dobb, Diana Wakimoto, Vish Hegde

Guests: Mark Robinson, Sophie Rollins

Meeting called to order with quorum at 2:03 pm

1. Approval of Agenda
Murray/Smetana/approved unanimously

2. Approval of 4/5/17 minutes
Murray/Moon/approved with 1 abstention

3. Reports

3a. FAC Chair
Murray emailed his report, the text of which is below:
I have gotten some more feedback on Constitution & Bylaws regarding timing of changing senators after an election.

Some former chairs of the senate suggested that we let the old senators handle last minute business until the last day of the semester (instead of changing on the last official meeting of the Senate). That seems fine by me and could be changed in:

Article V1- Section 2D (and maybe delete the start date from all subsequent sections?; or make redundant changes below)
Article VII- Section 3
Article VIII- Section 2
Article IX- Section 2
Article X- Section 2
Article X1- Section 2
Article XII- Section 1

I suggest we delete the redundant changes in each section and add only Section 2D.

I heard that Excom is sending back the Office Hour changes, but I don't know why yet.

RTP subcommittee will be finalizing changes to URTP and sending 2 documents to Excom—one for Fall 17, and one with additional changes for Fall 18 under semesters that might not be voted on until early Fall 17.

SET subcommittee will have a final revision of their policy before the May 3 meeting of FAC.

Murray also reported that he had attended the Semester Conversion Steering Committee meeting to report on the work that FAC is doing on revising policies with regards to semesters.

He also noted that he has not heard back from ExCom about why the office hours policy is being sent back to FAC. Robinson said that Chair Karplus will email the details. Dobb reported that there was much discussion about the office hours policy at ExCom. She stated that the proposed policy does not violate the contract. There were some on ExCom who felt that FAC was increasing workload and believed the document should be revised so those teaching one 3-unit class would have the same number of office hours with those teaching one 4-unit class. Also raised was the issue of faculty members spending more time communicating with students via email and that the office hours policy should take this into account. Dobb also mentioned that some wanted a chart that would graphically represent how many office hours were required for differing amounts of WTUs. Smetana noted that the issue of email was raised by the Lecturer Subcommittee and termed "student contact hours." Dobb suggested that FAC rework the policy and perhaps change the policy title to Office Hours/Student Contact Hours.

Moon noted again that the translation of the office hours policy from quarters to semesters by FAC also was an attempt to disambiguate the policy, which leads to arguments over the correct interpretation of the old, ambiguous policy. Moon asked if this was the time to also look into student contact hours. Dobb was in favor of rewriting the entire policy to include contact hours. Murray noted that he had supported attempting to do a simple conversion to semesters, but since it doesn't seem like anything put forward will be uncontroversial, FAC may want to work on including the idea of student contact hours and send forward the policy only one time to ExCom.

Vugia asked about the proposed survey on office hours. Moon noted that he has received information on setting up the survey in Qualtrics; however, he noted that we can already make an educated assumption about the results: students will want as much access as possible to faculty and faculty will want as much flexibility as possible. Therefore, what would we be surveying for? Moon suggested that we instead look into common practices at other universities and then create a survey with concrete options. He volunteered to research office hour policies at other universities and report back to the FAC. Murray stated that the office hours policy would probably not be finished then until next year, but that was fine as long as it is in place before Fall 2018 when we move to semesters.

Murray also noted that FAC should consider language about response time via email in the policy in relation to student contact hours. Wakimoto noted that the School of Information at SJSU has a 3-day response time for answering both student and colleague email. Moon stated that whatever response time was decided on, transparency and communication of the response time was crucial. Dealing with student contact hours in email is an important issue, especially with regards to workload.

3b. Presidential Appointee Report
Dobb noted that the CSU has drafted a new intellectual property policy, but has not promoted it extensively. There was not faculty input in this policy change. She does not believe it to be radically different than the previous policy, but it now includes patents. Cal State East Bay may need to review and revise its copyright policy to be in compliance with this new system-wide policy.

Murray asked if the new intellectual property policy covered student work. Dobb noted that it did and students own their work unless they were given "extraordinary support" by the university. According to Dobb, patents require "extraordinary support" because faculty members need an attorney to do research on other patents before submitting an application. And, if a faculty member uses grant money

to get an attorney for patent research it would still be considered "extraordinary support" by the university as the grant is run through the university and therefore Cal State East Bay would own part of the patent.

She noted that from her work on the Awards Subcommittee that it may be a good idea to create a separate award for Outstanding Lecturer. She suggested referring this issue to the Lecturer Subcommittee.

With regards to Semester Conversion, all Department Chairs have been asked to make a mock schedule of their course offerings in semesters. The change to semesters may make for long days and she has asked the Chairs to be humane in scheduling all faculty so a faculty member doesn't teach an early morning class and a night class on the same day. Smetana noted that her graduate students were concerned with night classes starting at 5:00 pm due to needing to wake up very early for their teaching assignments in theK-12 schools. Dobb stated that she did not believe they would be as strict about starting times for night and weekend classes, but it will be difficult to get classroom space. Vugia noted some problems with the Excel spreadsheet sent to Chairs and Dobb said she would look into getting the issues fixed.

3c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) Report
Dobb reminded everyone that next year's push would be advising students for the semester conversion. Moon asked about catalog rights. Dobb noted that catalog rights have not been worked out yet. It was proposed that a student could go with the new catalog for semesters or they could choose to stay with the catalog rights from the year they entered. However, no formal decision has yet been made.

4. Old Business

4a. Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation
Murray/Vugia/approved unanimously to forward to ExCom

Murray talked with Chair Karplus about this document and Karplus stated he has talked to the President. It was Murray's understanding that there is nothing in the proposed document that is unacceptable to the President. The President has expressed interest in having two Presidential Appointees on some committees. Discussion ensued about including the University Diversity Officer on various search committees.

There was further discussion about Presidential Appointees and how increasing the number on the Provost search committee had been contentious, and ultimately rejected by the Senate, in the past. Moon noted it made sense that the President would want greater influence in the Provost search as the Provost is the chief academic officer. Jennings stated that the search committee doesn't actually make recommendations and simply presents a list of strengths and weaknesses of candidates. Therefore the search committee doesn't have a lot of power. The President has the final decision on hiring. It is already difficult to find faculty to serve and it may be more difficult if there are more Presidential Appointees on the committees.

FAC decided to leave the recommendations on search committee membership as is and not increase number of Presidential Appointees before voting on the document.

4b. 16-17 FAC 7: Senate Bylaws updates including semester changes

Murray/Smetana/approved unanimously to forward to ExCom

Murray explained the proposed revisions as noted in his FAC Chair report. He suggested removing the individual sentences about the terms of office for each officer and instead inserting a new section D under Terms of Office (Section 2) to specify when the terms of newly elected officers begin. FAC was in favor of this change. Murray noted he got feedback from previous chairs of the Senate that a better start date would be the final day before summer recess instead of the organizational meeting of the Senate because sometimes there is some business that needs to be completed in the final weeks of the term. The exception to this change to start times is the term of the Academic Senator of CSU because the term is specified in their bylaws.

4c. SET Policy latest edits
Murray expressed concern about running out of time to submit changes this year. The SET (Student Evaluations of Teaching) subcommittee will meet again and it is close to being done with its revisions on the policy. Murray noted that Section 4.1 explicitly called for the statistics to be provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. He noted that looking at average GPA for a class in context of the student evaluations may help in the RTP process. Jennings noted discussions in her department about grade inflation and how some instructors who hold students to standards may not have as good of evaluations as those who are inflating student grades. This is something to consider when reviewing student evaluations.

Discussion ensued about Section 4.7 and the need to use aggregated statistical data from student evaluations for assessment and norming. Moon noted that Institutional Research has been historically a weak point on campus so it was difficult to decide on this issue. What would the data be used for when we don't often use data effectively on campus? Dobb stated that in her experience the student comments, rather than the numbers, on the evaluations were more telling. Discussion continued about the possible misuse of data and too much reliance on course evaluations for assessing teaching when there is ample research in the literature about the problems with course evaluations. Moon said that his department had discussed including program-specific questions as is possible with the new course evaluation forms, but decided against it because they worried about the data would be used punitively. Unless the subcommittee can articulate a clear need and method to use this data, FAC is unlikely to support this section of the revised document.

The subcommittee will work on the changes and hopefully forward the revised document to the FAC at the next meeting.

4d. Sue Schaefer award letter update
Murray/Moon/voting will occur at next meeting

Smetana has created a draft template for use by those writing letters for the Sue Schaefer Award. She noted that she was on the Awards Subcommittee last year and that the letters were variable in quality and therefore variable in their usefulness for assessing the candidates. She suggested that more structure would help people write letters of support and help the committee evaluate the candidates. There was discussion about how the Sue Schaefer Award is specific to service that benefits the faculty. The template asks letter writers to include concrete examples of service, explanation of the impact of service, dates of service, and ranking of service in terms of importance and impact to faculty. The Awards Committee is also considering creating rubrics for Sue Schaefer and Outstanding Professor Awards.

Discussion ensued about the definition of service and whether it would be good to include examples or not. Smetana worried about a list of examples becoming prescriptive. Moon noted that service is defined in the RTP document; however, it is not specific to service that benefits the faculty.

Murray suggested a revision to the wording to make clear that the examples of service should go from most important impact to least. Murray volunteered to create a Google Doc from the template created by Smetana so all of FAC could review and add comments/suggestions to the template. A vote will occur at the next meeting.

Smetana also noted that the Awards Subcommittee had completed the award decisions for the Week of Scholarship. They may want to put forward suggestions on clarifying criteria for some of the awards to help with evaluation. The subcommittee is currently reviewing applications for Outstanding Professor and Sue Schaefer Awards. The subcommittee's next meeting is on May 3rd. They have received many Outstanding Professor applications this year.

5. Discussion

5a. Office Hour draft survey questions
Murray noted this discussion was obviated as we aren't moving forward with the survey at this time. He asked the members of FAC to talk with their colleagues about potential changes to the office hours policy. Moon will research other campuses' office hours policies. Murray suggested that perhaps one way to deal with so much student email is to give faculty a Horizon email account to use for their students. Discussion ensued over this suggestion. Wakimoto noted that if the issue behind wanting a separate email is the desire to tag and filter student email, the faculty email accounts already allow for setting up custom filters and labels. Moon noted that students are savvy and would find the other email account if we went to a two email account system so this would probably not solve the issue. Wakimoto suggested that the Online Campus could give a workshop or create a tutorial on setting up filtering email for faculty. Murray will follow up on the workshop idea.

6. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 3:22 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Diana K. Wakimoto