

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes**

Thursday, October 13, 2022
10:00 –11:30 AM

University Advancement Conference Room

- I. Call to order**
 - a. Meeting started at about 10:01 am
 - b. In attendance: Mandy, Rhonda, John, Debbie, Anna, Ying Zhong (alternate for Kristine), David, Zack, Brian
- II. Volunteer to Take Minutes**
 - a. Brian
- III. Approval of Minutes**
 - a. John moves to approve, Anna Seconds. Approved unanimously.
- IV. Announcements**
 - a. Item number eight, under New Business, Academic Integrity campaign with Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility. There is a question on how this is related to academic integrity. This referral was sent to several subcommittees. The referral has been put on hold. EC will work on this, provide further guidance. Item will be removed from FAC agenda until further notice.
- V. Approval of Agenda**
 - a. John moves to approve, Brian Seconds. Approved unanimously.
- VI. Old Business**
 1. 2021-22 Referral #02: Department Formation Criteria Revision
 - a. Resolution is sitting, there is movement occurring to bring the resolution to the Senate floor for 1st reading at next general Senate meeting. FAC's work has been compiled and included, along with the work from AAC and BPC.
- VII. New Business**
 2. 2019-20 Referral #08: Honorary Doctorate - Handbook Change
 3. 2021-22 Referral #20: Accessibility of Instructional Materials
 4. 2021-22 Referral #23: Faculty Hall of Fame Selection Process Change
 - a. Questions, do we want to continue the Hall of Fame awards and is their wish/desire to move the selection process over to the Faculty Honors and Award committee?
 - b. FAC reviewed the Hall of Fame current resources through the library website.
 - c. An initial question posed – is the Faculty Hall of Fame award duplicating the emeritus award? How are the awards different?
 - i. Awards selection criteria differ. Eligible for Faculty Hall of Fame award is a faculty member with contribution in the three areas of service, scholarship and teaching. Whereas the emeritus award is outstanding contribution in at least one of the

areas and the home departments are consulted in the selection process.

- ii. There was agreement within the committee that there was enough need to keep the award, as that the Faculty Hall of Fame award was considered a distinct level above emeritus. It was noted that it is important to recognize faculty, as there are few ways the campus formally does this and to capture important institutional memory.
 - d. Should the Faculty Hall of Fame go to the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee?
 - i. Currently, the library is where the selection process is housed, and there is an interest from the library to move it out of their control.
 - ii. Should the selection criteria be move to the Faculty Honors and Award Committee (FHAC)?
 - iii. There was consensus among the committee that this was the logical location.
 - iv. There was expressed concern of the overload of FHAC, and adding this item to their charge.
 - 1. It was noted that this may be a separate issue, and that if the Committee is overworked that this should be addressed more broadly.
 - 2. For example, expanding the committee membership.
 - v. It was suggested that the timing of the Faculty Hall of Fame application submission and selection dates could be organized to better spread FHAC's work.
 - e. FAC is in agreement, we think the Faculty Hall of Fame should continue and that the selection process should move to FHAC.
 - f. The current selection cycle has already commenced. FAC will next work on developing the new process for the award in preparation of the next awards cycle.
5. 2021-22 Referral #39: The Personnel Action File (PAF) and the Working
6. 2021-22 Referral #40: Digitizing the Performance Review Process
7. 2021-22 Referral #41: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - Handbook Change
- a. Review of working chart, that was developed from current handbook language.
 - i. Significant inconsistencies and errors are currently in the handbook for faculty review guidelines.
 - b. There was a discussion of streamlining some of the groups in the chart, as there was overlap
 - i. There was a concern of creating conflict with some other campus or union policy when trying to combine faculty "groups".
 - c. One way the committee considered to improve the grouping was to look at length of contract – i.e., semester-by-semester v. one-year v. multi-year contracts.

- d. A concern was that faculty only teaching in the Spring, is often not reviewed.
 - i. Review in this situation is at the discretion of the dept. chair.
 - ii. The scope of this process of identifying temporary faculty needing review is currently not manageable by the Provost's office.
 - e. The committee is in agreement that a chart is a good way to help those involved understand who and when there should be a review of a faculty and the handbook should be updated to include this.
 - f. The committee worked to correct and improve the chart.
 - g. There is a concern that those not on contract for consecutive semesters, will be missed, unless the dept. Chairs catch it.
 - h. The table should be presented in a hierarchical structure – 6-year faculty, then 3-year faculty, and so on.
 - i. For our semester-by-semester faculty, could language be included to simplify it, stating if you're teaching at least once in a calendar year, a faculty member would submit a file, for either fall cycle or the spring cycle.
 - j. The committee discussed the possibility of separating out various lecture types on the Faculty Affairs website to help create further clarity.
 - i. Including the temporary faculty on 1 or more year contracts. Debbie was going to confirm, but felt it was possible.
 - k. The committee will plan to review what other campuses (CSUs) have done to help develop CSUB's material.
8. 2022-23 Referral #02: Academic Integrity Campaign- Ombudsperson and
- i. Committee on Professional Responsibility- ON HOLD
9. 2022-23 Referral #03: Holding Exams on Last Day of Class

VIII. Adjourn

Meeting ended at 11:29 am