

AMENDED MINUTES FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Wednesday, February 20, 2019, 2:00-3:50 PM, SF 329

In attendance:

James Murray, Chair

Kim Geron, Political Science

Kathy Hann, Mathematics

Chandrakala Ganesh, Health Sciences

Sarah Taylor, Social Work

Jiannan Wang, Library (secretary)

Linda Dobb, Presidential Appointee

Jason Smith, Guest, Health Sciences/Vice Chair of the Academic Senate

Mitch Watnik, Guest, Assoc Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Lisette Poole, Guest, Communication

Mark Karplus, Guest, Chemistry/Senate Chair

Michael Lee, Guest, Ages Chair

Called to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Appointed Secretary – Wang
2. Approved the agenda – Murray moved, Hann seconded, all in favor
Moved to add calendar item back to agenda 5a
3. Approved [2/6/19](#) minutes
4. Reports:

- a. FAC Chair – emailed in advance

Report of the Chair:

Chair Lee and I are finishing work prioritizing and listing needed changes to the C&B.

Yesterday Excom sent our calendar proposal back to FAC for more clarification so I will propose revising the agenda to make this our priority.

Mitch Watnick will come to the FAC meeting tomorrow to help us craft something that Excomm can accept at their meeting of Feb 26 so that it can go to the Senate and Murray can ask for it to go to a 2nd reading so that it can be passed for the Registrar's March 15 deadline and that programs will know what language will be needed in the finalized fall schedule

Issues to address.

1. Do we want to restrict depts to using only A-F or are other solutions acceptable?
2. Can a given dept use different solutions for different courses? I think FAC meant yes...
3. Specific mechanisms for how to communicate with students.
4. Specific language to add to the university schedule and catalog.
5. Specific mechanism and timelines for dept to send their solution to OAA/APS (so they can ensure it meets WASC standards). March 15 deadline for preliminary schedules.
6. Explain why FAC did not favor options A or B as a university wide solution (i can add that)
7. Explain why not force blanket solution on all departments.
8. Explain how F can work without making it university wide.
9. Remove memo to CIC since FAC not allowed to ask CIC to do stuff. And note that the course modification request does not require CIC approval, only approval by a college curriculum committee and its Dean for non GE approved courses with a portion taught online - it is not CICs jurisdiction over this approval. Unless a course meets a graduation requirement such as GE it has to go to CIC and Excomm or the Senate (13-14 CIC 5 governs this).
10. The wording "change the class to hybrid if possible" needs to be more clearly articulated to the Senate as to what this involves and procedurally how it might best be accomplished (i.e. specific wording changes that would need to take place to 16-17 CIC 6 Policy on Online/Hybrid Instruction to do so).
11. Excomm thought Senate needed to know which of these options would work best for classes that had labs that meet on Mondays - isn't clear from the background info.
12. Add separate Background and Policy titles before each section.

Hybrid instruction policy:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/files/docs/policies/12-13-new-policy-page/online-hybrid-instruction-policy-16-17-cic-6-prez-app-4-10-17.pdf>

b. Presidential Appointee

5. Business:

a. [18-19 FAC 8](#): Proposed solution to Monday only courses in Fall 2018 having only 12 class meeting days (*failed at Excom 2/19*)

1. Do we want to restrict depts to using only A-F or are other solutions acceptable?

- Murray summarized the feedbacks and said we may be a little behind schedule in order to get it done by March 15. Lee said we would be on the same schedule as excomm, and there were 3 members from excomm, hopefully can create something that will work.
- Murray: do we need explain every solution explicitly.
- Lee: It might be ambiguous and the language need be clear.
- Smith: What do we do if one department choose one methods, and another department choose another solution and they conflict with each other? Perhaps too many options?
- Dobb: give one solution
- Watnik: Suppose biology department chose Wednesday one week, what if students have class conflicting with it, they may not attend both classes. Business school conducting one Monday class may not have classrooms on Wednesday or Friday. More concerned with the science labs or something can't be done online. There has to be some accommodations. This will be given to WASC. If ad hoc, it has to be added to the schedule and be published.
- Karplus: It is not fair to say just need one option. If FAC propose different options, explain why they are appropriate and why they are needed.
- Lee: reasons for these options need be clear.
- Dobb: take first week out of suggestion. It can be some day in the semester, but not the first week Wednesday or Friday. A and B won't work because they talk first week session.
- Watnik: If so, it will screw Wednesday only classes. If shift, use later holidays like we used before.
- Hann: spent too much time on B, but B is not included
- Lee: we do have B in the doc.
- Watnik: Suppose it is the department to decide, how to get a room for 3 hours on Wednesday to accommodate a business, theatre, or music class?
- Dobb: You choose the options to use
- Lee: need add that sentence to the doc
- Lee: every Monday class need be clear if students have class at the other time, does that invalidate the student from registering the other class?
- Watnik: need be on the class schedule more appropriately
- Dobb: Instructor need to put it in syllabus, not in course schedule
- Lee: policy of not to affect the grade if miss that class because of conflict
- Watnik: make up the class
- Ganesh: how to communicate with the lectures? What about if the demanded solutions are not in the syllabus?
- Karplus: survey results from chairs?
- Murray: all have different answers
- Linda: suggest to vote all options be included
Vote for excluding A and B to avoid Chemistry, biology and conflict situations:

Hann

Vote for all options be included: Geron, Ganesh, Taylor, Murray and Wang

- Lee: make bullet points for reasons
- Smith: need clarifications for conflictions from lectures
- Lee: if so, no feasible option for the department
- Taylor: department need discuss and make the best decision
- Dobb: make “collaboration in the department is important” in the doc

2. Can a given dept use different solutions for different courses? I think FAC meant yes...

- Yes
- Watnik: option F is not feasible

3. Specific mechanisms for how to communicate with students.

- Lee: let students know in syllabus
- Dobb: “some Monday classes may be rescheduled” be in syllabus GS and labs are big ones, about 70 sections

4. Specific language to add to the university schedule and catalog.

5. Specific mechanism and timelines for dept to send their solution to OAA/APS (so they can ensure is meets WASC standards). March 15 deadline for preliminary schedules.

- Murray: 3/15 to the university
- Watnik: need be done before schedule goes live to students on 4/7
- Lee: presumably this get passed at the senate, will make it before the April deadline
- Murray: will vote by email, and then for senate pass
- Lee: also give heads up to dept chairs about FAC outcome

6. Explain why FAC did not favor options A or B as a university wide solution (i can add that)

7. Explain why not force blanket solution on all departments.

8. Explain how F can work without making it university wide.

- Murray: F can be off table.

9. Remove memo to CIC since FAC not allowed to ask CIC to do stuff. And note that the course modification request does not require CIC approval, only approval by a college curriculum committee and its Dean for non GE approved courses with a portion taught online - it is not CICs jurisdiction over this approval. Unless a course meets a graduation requirement such as GE it has to go to CIC and Excomm or the Senate (13-14 CIC 5 governs this).

- Murray: FAC will identify and talk potential problems
- Lee: CIC onlu pass review existing courses

- Watnik: have to look up WAST documents. Not really concerned too much with it, more concerns with labs that are GE.
- Dobb: restrictions preventing them doing that option
- Murray: will address those potential problems in the doc

10. The wording "change the class to hybrid if possible" needs to be more clearly articulated to the Senate as to what this involves and procedurally how it might best be accomplished (i.e. specific wording changes that would need to take place to 16-17 CIC 6 Policy on Online/Hybrid Instruction to do so).

- Dobb: Can FAC count on CIC?
- Watnik: It wasn't time to deliver this. Need tell WASC we covered the hours needed. Don't think online or hybrid works for labs in GE classes.
- Smith: add in doc: don't schedule any session highly different from what it should be

11. Excomm thought Senate needed to know which of these options would work best for classes that had labs that meet on Mondays - isn't clear from the background info.

- Dobb: take the draft to CIC off

12. Add separate Background and Policy titles before each section.

- Murray: will need feedback for the draft
- Lee: will work out timeline with James in Google doc, the more robust the better
- Murray: outline tonight to Lee
- Lee: by Monday for feedback/ input

b. Week of Scholarship nomination and awards schedule in FAC P&P

- Murray: ambiguous language need be fixed, difficult to make the change, and will talk to excom what should do next, keep going with old P&P, or with the current one?
- Lee: need be updated before the due date in March

c. 5th member from which college on University RTP committee in 2019-2020?

i. Memo from Provost Inch

- Murray: switch from 2 members in CLASS to 2 in Science
- Dobb: suggested Library faculty be the 5th person. Library faculty are classified as college faculty, so they need be on this list
- Murray: we need make sure this is not conflicting with other documents
- Dobb: It would conflict this year. Also need discuss with the library, they may not want this extra work
- Murray: proposed to have 1 member from CLASS and 2 from Science for this year: all aye (Linda no)

d. 18-19 FAC 7: Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty revised by RTP

subcommittee to provide more guidance about content of their portfolio

i. [Google doc](#)

- Murray moved, Hann second, all in favor
- Dobb: “the dossier may be submitted in paper or electronic” need be added, but should inform the chair of the department about which method to be used
- Dobb: think - does it tell you what you need to do?
- Hann: didn’t talk about the volume, does say sample syllabi
- Lee: should be one syllabus for each course, not for every class taught
- Murray: this is not in a hurry, if the subcommittee needs to discuss again
- Ganesh: suggested highlight syllabi and publications
- Taylor: people could submit giant binder without limiting words in the doc
- Hann: need words on something other syllabi
- Murray: other relevant materials? Scholarly works?
- Taylor: should not intend to be exhausted
- Lee: evidences should be illustrated rather than exhausted, highlight them
- Dobb: electronic link to achievements recommended
- Murray: current in favor of this language? All in favor

e. [16-17 FAC 9](#): Revisions to POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY

PARTICIPATION IN APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICERS
[document](#)

i. [Referral](#) from Excom

ii. [Cover page](#) with highlights

iii. [Organizational chart Nov. 2018](#)

iv. Include [13-14 FAC 7 amended](#)

v. Invite feedback from [members of UARC](#)

- No feedbacks yet. Lee will see what he has and help with this. Murray will look at it and give feedback.

f. [18-19 FAC 3](#): Updates to FAC policies and procedures (*referred from Excom 1/22*)

i. Slight mods [version](#)

- It is suggested to take all changes out and list them separately

6. Discussion:

- a. Referral from Excom to review election procedures under the [Constitution and Bylaws](#) and consider making recommendations on amendments

i. Murray [comments](#) on the C&B

ii. [RegFac google doc with comments](#)

iii. Nominations for special subcommittee convening Fall 2019

- Murray and Lee are currently compiling the comments received, trying to prioritize and plan for the next. Murray is for comments on constitution and Lee for bylaws comments. Things need be fixed, gaps, raising or new suggestions are categorized into different groups. Should come up with something by next week. Murray will share it in Google drive. Linda suggested split screens for better review.

b. [Referral](#) from Excom regarding standing committee meeting times

i. Time Modules Task Force working (Carpenter/Lee/Dobb)

ii. Senate chairs will discuss schedules at other campuses

- Dobb: pass to Lee who works on time modules.
- Lee will compile concerns and modeling future calendars.

c. What if student jury duty interferes with class? FAC policy? CIC policy?

i. Other [CSUs](#)

- Will discuss next time

7. Adjournment at 3:50p.m.