



FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: Wednesday, April 19, 2023, 2:00-4:00pm via Zoom

[PLEASE CLICK HERE FOR ZOOM LINK](#)

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendance: Duke Austin, Danvy Le, Alina Engelman, Chandra Ganesh, Shubha Kashinath, Stephanie Seitz, Stephanie Alexander, James Murray,

Absent: Silvina Ituarte, Michele Korb

Guest(s): Mark Robinson, Sarah Nielsen, Christian Roessler, Angela L, Meiling Wu, Lyn Scott

1. Elected Secretary - Shubha
2. Approval of the agenda
 - a. Moved by Jim, seconded by Alina.
 - b. Approved unanimously by acclamation
3. Approval of [4/5/23 \(draft\)](#) minutes (thanks Chandra?)
 - a. Moved by Jim, seconded by Shubha
 - b. Two abstentions (Danvy Le, Duke Austin). Minutes approved.
4. Reports:
 - a. Report of the Chair
 - i. SET could meet to start revision of [draft policy on peer observation](#) (Seitz, Korb?)
 1. To be followed up offline
 - ii. Lec subcommittee is meeting again May 2, 3pm
 1. Jim will follow up with the Lecturer subcommittee for follow up and plans for next steps.
 - iii. 23-24 chair nominations? Email vote?
 1. Spreadsheet was shared to self-nominate for FAC subcommittee. Nominations will close at the end of this week. Meiling Wu has self-nominated to be chair. Jim stated he has been reelected and willing to help new chair. Invited Meiling to speak about her position. Meiling shared that she has an agenda to look at the equity gaps for faculty members, continue collaborations with FDEC, and to continue to support lecturers. Duke Austin nominated Jim Murray to serve as chair. Jim accepted the nomination and will be on the ballot. But is happy to serve. Lyn Scott (new FAC member) wanted to ask what the various positions on the committee are. Had questions about role of chair and how it all plays out. Jim

answered the question for Lyn about process.

- b. Report of the Presidential Appointee
 - i. No presidential appointee present.

5. Appointments/Approvals

a.

6. New Business:

- a. Should URTP make the request for a 1-year request for extension of the tenure clock policy?
Section X.A: Candidate Deadlines?
 - i. Jim-not sure if this should happen every year. Seems to be ok to put into policy unless there is any reason not to. Seitz asked if there is language in the CBA about it. The issue came up because there is no systematic way of accounting for any candidate who may be on leave during their probationary period. Jim will review CBA and also check with Presidential Appointee to ensure there are no objections to adding this to the RTP document and making it policy. Stephanie-Section 13.7 and 13.8 deal with extensions to probationary period. Maybe redundant to add this to the RTP policy, but maybe we can refer to it in the RTP document.

7. Old Business:

- a. Excom has created one document to reconcile revisions by FAC and FDEC - [RTP with ExCom changes](#) - and this document shows the [two remaining issues to resolve between FAC and FDEC](#).
 - i. FAC version: V.E.2-3 (specify after 5 years)
 - 1. Jim to clarify “after 5 years” to clarify “expected time”
 - ii. Excom version: XI.B.3 (not exhaustive)
 - 1. Stephanie-not sure why this is needed. Department and university guidelines should be aligned. Duke commented in alignment with Stephanie. Shubha indicated it can cause confusion. Chandra provided an example of how department guidelines that offered specifics about professional achievement (for e.g., 3 publications). It has helped new faculty understand the expectations. Perhaps the person who made the comment had a similar experience. Lyn Scott (CEAS-Guest) also shared that perhaps having a choice would help faculty who were hired prior to department changes. Stephanie suggested that departmental policy cannot conflict with university policy; suggested clarification and change of language. Jim will discuss FAC’s position on this in future discussions with ExCom.
 - iii. Excom version: XI.B.3.A.16-19 (add to prof. Achieve same items that are in prof. service)
 - 1. Shubha suggested to leave room so the list is not exhaustive.
 - iv. Excom version XI.B.4.C (duplicate items 2 & 5 back into prof.service)
 - 1. Elina-suggests putting items where candidates feel it best fits. Stephanie-introduces vagueness and possibly can be reason for bias. Chandra wondered why it was in professional achievement and not service. Stephanie clarified reasons why FAC version addressed this matter in a way that would be equitable. Danvy-is in favor of the ExComm version because she feels it provides

the candidate choice based on their professional experience and field. There was a lot of discussion about this. Jim feels more comfortable with the FAC version where high impact service is moved to Professional Achievement and leaving the others in service. Chandra was not sure why we would vote on an issue FAC just recently voted on and agreed. Roessler (guest)-pointed out process inconsistencies and suggested that we use the cleanest version (the FAC version) so we don't have confusions. Chandra commented on how RTP should be from FAC and seeing a document with changes that do not reflect FAC's work was of concern. Shubha shared how FDEC and FAC had worked together on RTP document this year. Jim shared that any additional differences/clarifications will be resolved on the Senate floor.

- v. FAC version: XII.B.3 (add 'course release')
- vi. Excom version XII.C.2 (which language? S. Seitz email)
 - 1. Stephanie had emailed Jim with clarifying language. Sarah-changes can be made on the floor. Jim will use the input from FAC from the discussion today to provide recommended amendments (ahead of time)so everyone is clear on that.
- vii. FAC version XII.C.2 & D3 (Alina added clarity & fixed 'tenure' to 'promotion')
 - 1. Jim to make sure that language for promotion to full vs. tenure/promotion across several sections.
- b. FDEC will also revisit the [Mentoring Policy](#) - not sure if that should be a joint discussion between FDEC and FAC, but FDEC chair Christina put comments on it in an attempt to address Silvina's feedback. I think it might be too hard to pass this year but after talking to Keri, maybe she and the Diversity Fellows could work on some initiatives that could be separate from Senate? The Fellows work over the summer, whereas Senate does not.
 - i. Sarah Nielsen-Mentoring Policy was mentioned @Chairs and Deans meeting-there was support for the idea but not this specific policy. Feels like this is something that can be passed in the future in perhaps a pilot version. Nielsen doesn't feel this will pass this year.
- c. FAC [P&P revision for how to recruit students](#). Article V, Section 7B1 & D1 (no longer require ASI nomination)
 - i. Jim-shared the changes proposed in P&P to get students on subcommittees. Jim moved, Stephanie seconded. Motion passed by acclamation.
- d. Vote on [Winter calendar for 2024](#) now? Then vote on Winter 25 after AY 24-25 has been completed?
 - i. Jim proposed voting on the winter calendar 2023-24 now and waiting to vote on AY 24-25 after-in order to allow for 4 unit classes to fit into the winter schedule. Jim motioned, Duke seconded. 1 abstention, approved by acclamation.
 - ii. [Draft cover for changes for 23-24 and 24-25](#).
- e. Revise Summer 2024, 2025, 2026, & 2027 to allow full load of courses. [Existing dates through 2027](#). [Editable spreadsheet](#).
 - i. Need to revise to add duty days. Do not have the correct version of the spreadsheet to revise.
- f. Consensual relationships (14-15 FAC 8 last attempt – did not make it out of committee. [14-15 FAC 8](#): Proposed Amorous Relationship policy

- i. Original consensual relationships policy [referral request](#)
- ii. [CSULB policy](#)
- iii. [SFSU policy](#)
- iv. [CPP policy](#)
- v. [CSUC policy](#)
- vi. [SDSU policy](#)
- vii. [Fresno policy](#)
- viii. [CSUB policy](#)
- ix. CSUEB [sexual harassment](#) policy? ORSP
- x. [CSU Stan/Executive Order from Chancellor's Office 2015](#)
- xi. CSU language "A Prohibited Consensual Relationship is a consensual sexual or romantic relationship between an Employee and any Student or Employee over whom they exercise direct or otherwise significant academic, administrative, supervisory, evaluative, counseling, or extracurricular authority.
- xii. CP SLO: "In the event such a relationship already exists, the campus shall develop a procedure to reassign such authority to avoid violations of this policy."
- xiii. More [general policy on nepotism](#). Add a link to this in the new consensual policy?
- xiv. Committee members can add input above the above policies in this [document](#).
- xv. Should we ask Title IX office to review policy before a vote by FAC?

Per Nielsen's conversation with the President, given all the Title IX issues/conversations, we are currently covered by the Chancellor's policy and it may make sense to work on this later.

8. Information:

- a. Proposed changed to URTP was sent to Excom: [These slides](#) and [this summary chart](#) provide an overview of the 2022-2023 revisions, which build on the 2020-2021 revisions approved by senate but not signed by the president.
- b. A copy of the working draft of the 2022-2023 RTP revision for review and comment (sent out on 3/21) can be found [here](#).
- c. The most up-to-date drafts from collaborating committees are [RTP with FAC changes \(Spring 2023\)](#) and [RTP with FDEC changes \(Spring 2023\)](#).

9. Discussion:

- a. Workload issues -- how to reward service beyond RTP credit (exceptional service awards beyond cultural taxation)
- b. Other ways to count faculty labor that enable more than 11 units per summer? Contact hours?
- c. Faculty mentoring document?
- d. A large discussion on the horizon: workload and the autonomy of departments to determine how workload can be distributed within a department. Balancing across semesters? Banking across AYs?

- e. Drop in enrollment due to student interest in online courses? Work with Curriculum & Instruction Committee to address the problem and Faculty Development Center to train more of our faculty for online courses?

Discussion on these items so we can address them next year.

10. Adjournment