

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of October 19, 2011

Present: Eileen Barrett (chair), Jeanette Bicais, Mitch Craig, Linda Dobb (ex officio), Liz
Ginno (quarter secretary), Ching-Lih Jan, Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc
Absent: Scott Hopkins, Tony Lima
Guests: Sharon Green, Mike Mahoney

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (LeDuc/Bicais) as amended.

Eileen requested that we move item 6.d RTP to 6a.

2. Approval of the Oct. 5 minutes

M/S/P (Bicais/LeDuc) as amended.

Names corrected – LeDuc, Bicais, Ching-Lih.

Numbers edited for 6.d – “# regular faculty down from 360 to 298 (in 2008 and
2011, respectively).”

3. Report of the Chair

Eileen welcomed Mitchell Craig as he was officially made a member of the
Committee for the quarter; T. Lima and S. Hopkins could not make it today.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

None.

5. Formation of Regular Subcommittees

Eileen provided the official roster for the FAC subcommittees submitted to ExComm.

Outstanding Professor

Previous Winner = Steve Gutierrez (CLASS)

FAC member = Ching-Lih Jan (CBE)

Faculty member = Danika LeDuc (CSCI)

Faculty member = Dave Larson (CLASS)

Student =

Presidential Appointee = Linda Dobb (ex-officio)

Chair of FAC = Eileen Barrett (ex-officio)

Lecturers

FAC Member = Scott Hopkins (CLASS)

Faculty member = Margaret Rustick (CLASS)

Faculty member = John Tan (CBE)

Lecturer member = Gretchen Reevy (CSCI)
Lecturer member = Mark Karplus (CSCI)
Lecturer member = Diane Mukerjee (CEAS)
Presidential Appointee = Linda Dobb (ex-officio)
Chair of FAC = Eileen Barrett (ex-officio)

RTP Procedures

FAC Member = Liz Ginno (Library)
Faculty member = Xinjian Lu (CBE)
Faculty member = (CEAS)
Faculty member = Peter Marsh (CLASS)
Faculty member = Jean Moran (CSCI)
Presidential Appointee = Linda Dobb (ex-officio)
Chair of FAC = Eileen Barrett (ex-officio)

Sue Schaefer Award = Committee of the whole

Special Subcommittee on Student Course Evaluations

FAC member = Jeanette Bicais (CEAS)
Mitchell Craig (CSCI)
Sharon Green (CBE)
Tom Bickley (LIB)
Chair of FAC = Eileen Barrett (ex-officio)

6. Old Business

a) RTP Policy and Procedures document, Report from Chair and Presidential Appointee

Eileen handed out printed copies of the current RTP document in effect.

Eileen & Linda reviewed doc and found 8 changes to present to FAC for discussion. Eileen will post their recommendations and the committee will discuss fully at the next Committee meeting. They reviewed the areas under review:

Linda – 3.9.2 Bias – add paragraph about academic malfeasance.

4.0 Definition of uniform criteria – big debate on this; has new language re professional achievement.

10.2.5 (& 11.2.5) Tenure – changed to reflect the candidate's right to meet with each level of review, whether the recommendation is positive or negative; comply with CBA.

12.2.3 (e&f) Primary functions of the committee – language not in compliance with CBA. Candidate has right to rebut at each level of review.

Timeline – need to be changed to support the rebuttal deadlines (10 days, etc.)

Mike remarked that some campuses do not have a University Level review committee – it is not a requirement of the CBA.

Eileen & Linda recommend inserting language in each category of criteria that the committee or reviewer shall indicate whether the candidate ‘meets expectations,’ ‘exceeds expectations,’ or ‘does not meet expectations.’ Sections affected would be 3.6.5, 10.2.2, 10.2.6, 11.2.4, and 11.2.8.

Add new section on professional misconduct (3.9.2), using this language:

Professional Misconduct

From time to time, allegations of professional misconduct may be made against candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion. Examples of professional misconduct...

Uniform criteria – guidelines for professional achievement – new language would make it optional versus mandatory.

Section 8.1 – promotion from Associate to Full Professor, new language makes clear that the evaluation will be based on the candidate’s achievements since granted tenure.

Eileen will post their recommendations and the Committee will discuss at the next meeting.

b) Student Course Evaluations, Sharon Green (3pm time certain)

Eileen introduced Sharon Green to discuss issue of student course evaluations with the Committee. History of this was that we had a subcommittee working to revise the campus student evaluation forms; that committee’s recommendations, which included 12 questions, were approved last year in FAC. More background information was included in the Committee’s Annual Report of last year. Sharon requested that we pause moving forward on any new evaluation recommendations until we have official Institutional Learning Outcomes to use.

Sharon reported that this issue was referred to her, as she is responsible for oversight of any institutional assessment. Teaching evaluations are assessment that represent an element of assessment that reflects institutional effectiveness; long debate over what student evaluations assess; what the expectations from WASC on this; what is the latest research on the topic; bottom line issues WASC wants to see that any of the stakeholders in the assessment have a voice in the process (students, faculty); the CO wants to be sure we include diversity of students; doing everything we can to ensure that the purpose of the evaluation is being met and addressed; are the questions being asked allowing the review committees feedback re RTP decisions; what information needs to be gathered to help the candidates in the process? Need to be able to vet the questions – to students, faculty, to ask about the questions; is this what you want, do you understand the questions as stated; are you getting developmental feedback helpful for the RTP process, etc.?

Sharon has the responsibility to make sure that the assessments are fulfilling the institution's need for WASC. Her concern is to be sure that the campus vets the recommended student evaluation questions. Mitch asked about the time frame; Sharon responded that the feedback process starts asap, but that the work be completed (i.e. to Senate) by the end of January. She would take the recommended student questions out for review. Jeanette asked if we needed to get qualitative vs/and/or quantitative feedback; Sharon responded not sure as it depends on what we find, but from her research the first wave would be quantitative, second would include qualitative. Linda asked if there were some basic questions that the research recommended to gather student feedback reflective of the institution's ILOs? Sharon responded we are not there yet – as we do not currently have ILOs. Sharon's concern is about process...need to start the vetting asap. Eileen recommended that we include the 2 questions Linda suggested: (1) were the expected learning outcomes stated in the syllabus, and (2) do you think those outcomes were achieved.

Sharon has offered to serve on this subcommittee – Jeanette and Mitch volunteered to complete it. Liz checked and Tom Bickley agreed to serve on it, too. Sharon recommended that we invite Michael Moon to participate on the Special Subcommittee on Student Course Evaluations. He would be an additional member from CLASS, but Eileen would be serving as ex-officio. Michael has some relevant and helpful expertise in feedback processes within organizations, as well as recent experience with the RTP process.

c) Policy on Emeritus/a Status

Danika noted that the policy states that emeriti faculty are listed in the catalog, but only FERPing emeriti faculty are listed.

Eileen pulled up the CSU Chico form and discussion ensued about its merits; the Committee then went on to discuss how to edit the CSUEB document to be more inclusive and one that promotes a collegial and positive statement on serving as faculty on campus.

The Committee decided to save further discussion on this item for the next meeting.

d) Policy on Administrative Review

Tabled until the next Committee meeting.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Larson/Bicais) at 4:06pm.