

APPROVED FAC Meeting Minutes, January 17, 2018

1. Approval of the agenda
 - a. Moved by chair, seconded by Grant
 - b. Passed
2. Approval of 1/3/18 draft minutes
 - a. Passed
3. Reports
 - a. FAC Chair:
 - i. Chair reports he did not attend Executive Committee meeting, in which creating committee to discuss “disruptive behavior” was discussed; Executive Committee reported that FAC needed to review and fix several “ambiguities” in this document; Also at this meeting FAC’s Office Hour policy was passed forward;
 - b. Presidential Appointee:
 - i. Linda Dobb was not present for today’s meeting, so no update from Presidential Appointee;
 - c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) report:
 - i. Jiannan Wang told us that: 90% of semester conversion reports have been entered into catalog; they are still have trouble with cohort program; on-site records report will conclude in May; organizers are also working with CSU San Bernardino, which is also on same schedule.
4. Business
 - a. Discussion of issues regarding Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students (Motion: James; second: Hann):
 - i. Discussion on whether those with 1 or 2 unit commitments can take this award as cash rather than time;
 - ii. Discussion about the maximum award being 3 WTU per year, per person, in the semester system. The question was raised: what to do in departments where 4 WTU is the standard?
 1. James, they could get 4, but this would drain units available for others;
 2. The committee discussed the need to be flexible on expenditures, i.e. either as time off or as cash;

- iii. Also discussed: the timeline for adopting this decision and the rubric for considering the applications. We looked at the rubric for AY 14-15, but didn't see a connection between it and the criteria listed in the new award description. Decision was made to not use the old rubric, and to say in the call that the committee will assess and rank applications based on the criteria listed;
- iv. Other minor wording changes;
- v. Approved unanimously by committee.

5. Discussion

a. Updates from SET committee:

- i. Policies on peer-reviewing faculty will be updated;
- ii. San Jose State Univ. has policies regarding using student evaluations/opinions;
- iii. The question of requiring at least some formative/summative evaluations for pre-tenure RTP procedures was discussed. Grant Kien stated this requirement could be difficult for smaller departments; Sarah Taylor suggested faculty reviewers could come from other departments;
- iv. The Committee saw the need for criteria on who can do evaluations;
- v. The Chair said details will be drawn up on how to do this for future meetings.

6. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted: Peter Marsh (Music)