

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
Faculty Affairs Committee

Approved

Meeting Minutes of January 20, 2010

Members Present: Dennis Chester, Mitchell Craig, Linda Dobb (Presidential Appointee), David Larson, Xinjian Lu, Julie Norton, Lynn Paringer, Craig Wilson (Acting Chair)

Members Absent: Dee Andrews (Chair), Doug Highsmith

Meeting called to order at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of the agenda (M/S/P)
2. Approval of the minutes (January 6th meeting): No minutes.
3. Report of the Chair: none.
4. Report of the Presidential Appointee: A brief presentation on, and discussion of, date-of-appointment-based “seniority” within academic and administrative units.
5. Old Business
 - a. Administrative Review Document: Clarification/revision of Article V, Sections B & C: Acting Chairs
The only change is to item #7 on the document updated by Craig Wilson on December 12th, based on the notes of FAC Meeting on December 4th, 2009. The recommendation is that item #7 read as follows (new wording in quotes): “The Provost’s Office shall review the recommendations made by the dean and” shall appoint a chair from the name or names submitted or return the recommendation to the advisory committee for reconsideration.
 - b. Policy on Student Evaluation of Courses, incorporating updated referral regarding evaluation of online teaching
The committee cited numerous issues that centered on the implementations of a universal online evaluation system. Among them were the following:
 - Timing of the evaluation: can there continue to be flexibility as to when instructors request the evaluation to be conducted? The current policy allows for course evaluations to be administered anytime from the 7th week through the end of the quarter.
 - Suitability for various course configurations: Will there be flexibility to suit the various configurations of online and face-to-face classes, including classes that meet during an intense one- or two-week period?
 - Assuring high numbers of responses: If students are not in class together to do an evaluation, what enforcement procedures, if any, can be imposed to enforce

students to submit and evaluation? Could release of course grades be contingent on submission of an evaluation?

- Assuring anonymity: Can we guarantee that student evaluations will not be traceable to the writers through electronic means? That is, will there be the same degree of protection now afforded by the paper-and- #2-pencil Scantron evaluations?
- Will departments still have the opportunity to add their own questions to the survey?
- Will instructors be able to receive the evaluations in a short period of time?

c. Policy on Emeritus Faculty, revisited: No action taken; deferred to a future meeting.

6. New Business

a. New Policy for RTP Professional Achievement Guidelines: No action taken.

b. Clarification regarding revised RTP document: No action taken.

c. Review of Post-Tenure Review Timeline

The committee believes that a timeline with particular dates is needed, similar to the fixed dates in the RTP document. Also, the rules for sabbatical leaves need to be clearer – does it count as “time” according to the timeline, or are sabbaticals not counted, so that someone could have their review after six years, for example, when one year was a sabbatical? The committee also believes that the criteria for evaluation (the four areas: instructional and professional achievement, and university and community service) should be included.

d. Review of Administrative Review Document for currency: No action taken.

e. Policy on Evaluation of Coaches and Assistant Coaches: No action taken.

f. Single Updated Policy Pertaining to Emeritus, FERP and Retired Faculty: No action taken.

7. Adjournment: 3:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
David Larson
Acting Secretary