**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Minutes**

Thursday, September 19th

10:00 –11:30 AM

**Education 123**

**Present:** Zachary Zenko, Sumita Sarma, Elijah Enos, Sarana Roberts, Amber Stokes, Deborah Boschini, Dan Zhou, Jackie Kegley

**I. Call to order:** 10:03 AM

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes:** Amber Stokes

**III. Approval of Minutes:** Sarana moved to approve, Elijah seconded.

**IV. Announcements**

1. **Welcome/Introductions:** Some quick introductions for people not in attendance last week.
2. **Handbook Available:** A word file of the handbook has been made available to us for easy edits. Need to make sure to download a copy of word file; don’t edit the copy in the FAC Box file.

**V. Approval of Agenda:** Unanimous approval.

**VI. Old Business**

1. **2024-2025 07 – Evaluation of Academic Administrators**
   1. **See Box**

There were very minor edits suggested by the Senate and Executive Committee. We discussed some suggested edits by the group and went over changes made by the committee chair.

We discussed some possible issues with requiring reviews of the President’s Cabinet. These reviews would be an entirely new review procedure for Cabinet members. Administrator reviews are led by the ED code. We need to review that language. The President may not be able to sign off on reviewing cabinet members even if he agrees with the FAC and Academic Senate.

This issue will likely require some additional research before taking the resolution back to the Senate.

The Resolution will be discussed later. An invitation to Lori Blodorn will be extended.

**VII. New Business**

1. **Proposed Referrals**
   1. **Clarification regarding election to Unit RTP Committees**

This was brought to FAC by faculty who are concerned about not participating in the RTP process. The handbook allows for very different voting procedures across campus. We discussed briefly what election procedures to Unit RTP Committees each of our departments use. We all do it differently, though within the guidelines of the handbook.

Other possible methods and procedures were briefly discussed. It was suggested that it may be difficult to make a blanket policy for all departments as we all vary dramatically. For example, some departments have very few eligible faculty (tenured or full), and some have many.

Not yet clear if we want to address this topic, and it was paused for further discussion later.

1. **2024-2025 15 – Timeline of SOCI Administration**
   1. **With Academic Affairs Committee**
   2. **Memo to Executive Committee**
      1. **See Box**

Academic Affairs Committee will not be able to address this immediately and have said that FAC can draft a resolution first.

We looked at the memos on Box. The previous AAC recommended timelines for SOCIs that are the same for all SOCIs regardless of SOCI modality (online, in person). This would limit the period that students have access to online SOCIs to two weeks, to match the schedule for in-person SOCIs. This could impact SOCI timelines this semester. Data show that SOCI response rates for online SOCIs don’t increase after two weeks.

Amber moved to approve, Elijah Seconded.

1. **2024-2025 14 – SOCI Process** 
   1. **With Academic Affairs Committee** 
      1. **See Box**

This issue is suggesting edits that may help relieve bias in the SOCI process. Reviewed suggested edits. These edits include the ability for faculty to request additional course specific questions be added to their SOCIs. We need to check with IT to find out if this is possible.

One of the suggestions was to allow faculty to choose whether they submit the written SOCI responses (qualitative) with the quantitative data. We discussed that bias is sometimes exposed through open ended questions, and by removing the written questions the bias may not be obvious. This would also result in Unit Committees and others in the review process missing some of the important information from students. There are issues on occasion, however, where the qualitative and quantitative responses from students don’t match. Overall, the qualitative comments are often important for those evaluating RTP/PTR files and can show where faculty have improved.

It was suggested that there are some issues with the current SOCI questions. We discussed re-evaluating the questions and how to better deal with bias. Could we determine if bias is a significant issue on our campus? Are data available? They are, but it would be unlikely that we could connect those data with how biases get transferred into tenure/promotion decisions.

One suggestion for dealing with biased SOCIs was that faculty may be able to request that certain comments be redacted from the SOCI file, but that the other comments would still be submitted for evaluation during the RTP/PTR process.

Homework: Think about and investigate processes to eliminate problematic comments and eliminate bias- go beyond what CSUB does. Comments may be sent to the FAC chair ahead of our next meeting, or just bring them to the next meeting.

Planned discussion next time.

1. **2024-2025 06 – Sixth-Year Lecturer Review**
   1. **Taskforce recommendations**
   2. **See Box**This issue has been addressed by FAC in the past, and a taskforce was recommended. However, the composition of the members of the taskforce were not defined. The Executive Committee asked us to determine the committee composition for this taskforce.

Many possible options were suggested. We settled on the following:

* One lecturer
* 2 full-time lecturers with 3-year appointments
* 2 tenured faculty including one department chair.
* CFA representative
* AVP Faculty Affairs – ex officio

Unanimously approved. Will be sent to the Executive Committee.

1. **2024-2025 05 – Faculty Director Performance Review**
2. **2024-2025 08 – Faculty Hiring Prioritization-Position Control**
3. **2024-2025 13 – Reconsideration of the Role and Structure for CPR**

**VIII. Tabled**

**IX. Adjourn:** 11:30 AM