

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee
Minutes
May 3, 2018

Members in Attendance: Puspa Amri (Proxy for Armand Gilinsky), Sandra Feldman, Emiliano Ayala, Maureen Buckley, Rita Premo, Elaine Newman, Deborah Roberts, Steven Winter

Excused: N/A

Meeting Recorder: Maureen Buckley

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Minutes for March 15, 2018 approved
 - b. Minutes for April 19, 2018 approved
2. Standing Reports
 - a. Chair (Winter): No Report
 - b. AVP (Roberts):
 - i. Laurel is retiring and Deborah is working on a search committee for that.
 - ii. Christina Baker came to discuss infusing into the RTP process diversity/inclusion/social justice.
 - iii. The RTP calendar is in process but should be posted soon.
 - iv. Regalia will be available at commencement and there is a website area for faculty with commencement related information.
 - v. Three TT searches are still in process
 - vi. PDS meeting: helping to set up new faculty orientation August 13, 14, 15. There will be some new features
 - vii. A survey will be sent to all TT finalists for feedback about the process.
 - viii. Members of PDS were talking about faculty code of conduct. If a code exists in a department and faculty don't comply, what happens? Deborah described some approaches she was familiar with. Elaine asked about the university hiring an ombudsman and Rita said PDS will be writing something to present to the Provost. Deborah said PDS may write a resolution on "the journey" and civility in the academy.
 - c. AFS (Premo): No Report
 - d. FFSP (Premo): No Report
 - e. PDS (Premo): See AVP report above
 - f. URTP (Gilinsky): No Report
 - g. ASI (No Representative at Present): No Report
 - h. CFA (Newman): No Report
3. Discussion Items: None
4. Business Items:
 - i. Policy for Periodic Evaluation of Athletic Coaching Faculty
 1. Second reading at Senate today
 2. Steve reported that most questions were related to the student athlete version of the SETE and the question of separating the forms from the policy itself. He asked for committee approval on this and all agreed. Elaine wondered if we even had the option to approve this now that it has been put before Senate.

- ii. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty
 - 1. Second reading at Senate today
 - 2. ExComm recommended only attending to parts specifically referring to coaches.
- iii. LMS Policy Revision
- iv. Emeritus Faculty Eligibility Definition of Distinguished (Victor Garlin and Rick Luttmann guests from ERFSA).
 - 1. We reviewed the current process for granting emeritus status, and the issue of lack of clarity around serving with “distinction” which is not defined.
 - 2. Victor shared his findings from a review of policies from other California campuses and found that they are largely similar. All have longevity requirement which assumes distinction because the person has served so long and not been terminated. He observed that most do not spell out what “distinction” means and that there is no system wide definition.
 - 3. Victor expressed support for moving from the assumption of distinguished service, based on longevity. If not, who has standing to challenge this presumption on a person on this issue? Who is going to hear the claim that a person has not served with distinction? (one would have to be created). The applicant must be entitled to due process, and thus rules and regulations around this. He added that this was not an issue at the CSU level during his time as CFA President, and thus given the rarity, is it worth the effort to devise these procedures? If the person is so unworthy, why has the department not done something in the past to rectify? In conclusion, he expressed a belief that things remain the same.
 - 4. Rick expressed a similar belief about keeping things as is, adding some additional points. It is simply an honor/title, with no real consequence or cost. He also shared information related to the history of this process and the awkwardness of changing the rules at this point. He described a case of a very troubling act by a colleague many years ago, and how this individual ultimately got emeritus status, setting a “standard” allows others to pass going forward.
 - 5. Elaine pointed out that there is some perceived harm for those who have been wronged by colleague’s inappropriate behavior. Rick stated that they could come to the senate to express their concerns. Deborah said that a department representative could speak for the group.
 - 6. Steve pointed out III.B. about the senate recommending for appointment as part of the existing protocol. Rick clarified that the senate would have a motion on the floor and if an objection was powerfully stated a Senator would have to move to remove that person’s name from the list.
 - 7. It was determined that there is a fact a process in place in the Senate, and that a cost-benefit analysis indicates that changes would be prohibitive. This conclusion was based on the advice of ERFSA and in accordance with a review of other CSU campus policy. FSAC recommends no changes to the policy. This decision was unanimously approved.
- v. English Department RTP policy change:
 - 1. This was brought to the committee’s attention for review at a later date.

2. The deadline for revisions has passed and given concerns outlined below there is not time to address this issue fully this year. We can give them feedback now and schedule them at the very start of next semester.
3. Deborah noted that this seemingly small change has some conflict with RTP policy. She expressed a belief that the administrative duties outlined should fall under existing categories of teaching, scholarship, service; they are in effect adding a 4th category. Also, she cautioned against using the term “administrative duties”. Finally, she said the methods of evaluation fall outside the lines.
4. Emiliano and Elaine provided some alternative ways to assess such administrative duties.

vi. FSAC Chair 2018-2019