<div align="center">

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes

Thursday, November 10, 2022
10:00 –11:30 AM

</div>

Attending: Mandy Rees (chair), Andrea Anderson (alternate), Debbie Boschini, John Deal, Rhonda Dugan, David Gove, Anna Jacobsen, Brian Street, Zach Zenko

I. Call to order

II. Volunteer to Take Minutes
   Rhonda will take minutes this meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes
    Brian first, David second. Minutes approved.

IV.   Announcements
   1. 2021-22 Referral #02: Department Formation Criteria Revision—voted on by the Senate and has moved on for review by President Zelezny.
   2. Meeting schedule: We will meet for two weeks in a row before the Thanksgiving break.

V. Approval of Agenda
   Anna moved first, Brian second. Agenda approved.

VI. Old Business

1. 2021-22 Referral #39: The Personnel Action File (PAF) and the Working
            Personnel Action File (WPAF) - Handbook Change

First read in Senate meeting last week (11-4-2022). Mandy and Brian took notes at the meeting. Feedback, questions, and suggestions regarding handbook language from Senators included:
- Include language on how to organize PAFs
- Whether "signature" should be used since files are all electronic
- Is "WPAF" mentioned in the PTR section? Should the timing of the PAF be included so that information can be communicated in a timely manner?
- Should the PAF be digitized?
- What happens with the PAF when a faculty member changes Schools?
- Can faculty review their own PAF?
- Should student workers be allowed to file documents in the PAF or should it be staff only?
- Should Deans get training about the PAF, its contents, how to manage the PAF and how to add files.
- With Box used the system for the WPAF, how do all review letters get placed in to the PAF?

- Need to address the steps for unit review committee

Discussion about Senator feedback and revisions WPAF handbook language
- Digitized files is a separate referral issue
- From Article 11.6 of CBA: PAF housed by relevant office; shall be designated a "custodian" of the PAF files and the processes outlined when files can be added
    - Response: Deans are the official custodians of PAFs. Deans ask their staff to correspond with faculty regarding the insertion of materials. Deans will receive training/
    - Suggestion: To catch anything missing in the PAF, the custodian (i.e., Dean) should review all materials in the PAF.
    - The Library currently completes this process of making sure all materials are in the PAF.
    - Suggestion: Add language about the timing of the review of the PAF. Say something like "prior to the admission of the letter".
    - There is a concern about "policy" versus "implementation of the policy"
- Question: What is mean by a "negative vote" in 305.6.3c; how is abstention a negative vote?
    - Suggestion: Should we say if the vote is "unanimous" or "majority of the committee"?
    - Suggestion: All committee members sign the cover page regardless of vote; the dissenting members have the option to submit a minority report
    - Question: what does "negative" imply here?
    - Suggestion: All committee members sign the recommendation
    - Question: How does an "abstention" mean "no" in the language?
    - Discussion regarding the distinction between the terms
    - Question: Does the committee need to have consensus for evaluation and recommendation?
    - Comment: The idea of a committee member abstaining is problematic; if they do the work, then compose a minority report. A suggestion made to remove the word "abstention".

Discussion shifted to language for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) process

- Question: Referring to Article 11.8 of the CBA, can we add handbook language if not explicitly listed in the CBA?
    - Response: Information about what can go (and not go) in file; medical files, police records should not be in the PAF. Other campuses typically refer to CBA. Example from Cal Poly Pomona's list of requirements for PAF shared with the committee. There is a need for training for School deans and staff.

- Question: Are there just appointment letters, SOCI summaries and previous levels of evaluation letters in PAF?
  - Response: Yes. Also the faculty member's CV and Master Index
  - Response: Based on Article 18 of the CBA, file can also include reprimand letters.
- Questions: What is the duration of SOCIs with summaries kept in the PAF? What is the faculty member's to maintain storage of materials?
  - Response: Need to review Article 11.7 of CBA on this matter.
- Question: Should there be an appendix similar to Pomona to list the minimum files that should be include in the file?
  - Response: With the move to a permanent electronic system, there will be additional questions to address. We will have to develop a process as we switch to the new system. Perhaps add the minimum list in the Handbook for now: CV, appointment letters, levels of evaluation, rebuttals, letters of reprimand, Master Index.
  - Response: We will need to have a designated person to maintain the PAF
  - Response: This will be the PAF custodian (Deans)

Comment: In our next meeting, need to develop an appendix

Potential changes in Handbook Language (newer revisions noted in italicized red font with "11-10-22")

305.6.3 *Evaluation and Recommendation by the Unit Committee*
While faculty and students may contribute to the deliberations concerning a faculty, only unit RTP committee members shall participate in forming the written performance evaluation and recommendation.
  a. *The views expressed by individual members of the unit RTP committee during the committee's deliberations shall be confidential.*
  b. *The unit RTP committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation based ~~primarily~~ on information in the RTP file__,__ __which includes information from both the WPAF (submitted by the faculty under review) and the PAF (maintained by and located in the respective dean's office). All unit committee members must review the contents of the WPAF and sign the WPAF access sheet. At least one unit committee member must review the contents of the PAF and sign the PAF access sheet.__*
  __c.__ *The evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the* red *full* *committee. ~~An abstention counts as a negative vote. (added on 11-10-22). c.~~ All committee members shall sign the unit RTP committee evaluation and recommendation* red *indicating their participation in the evaluation process (added 11-10-22). Any member of the unit committee may submit a minority report. If any minority reports are submitted, a cover sheet signed by all committee members shall be included to indicate that they have reviewed the minority report(s).*

d. *The RTP file, including evaluations and recommendations from the unit committee and from the unit chair (if provided), shall be forwarded to the dean.*

306.3 Post-Tenure Review

f. The probationary and tenured members of the unit shall elect a post-tenure review committee to carry out the periodic review. The committee shall consist of no fewer than three (3) full-time tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the individual being evaluated. The committee shall elect its own chair. ~~*, who participates in the discussion.*~~ *(added 11-10-22) The unit RTP committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation based* ~~*primarily*~~ *on information in the RTP file. The evaluation and recommendation process shall be based on information from both the WPAF which includes information from both the WPAF (submitted by the faculty under review) and the PAF (maintained by and located in the respective dean's office). All unit committee members must review the contents of the WPAF and sign the WPAF access sheet. At least one unit committee member must review the contents of the PAF and sign the PAF access sheet. (added 11-10-22)* The committee evaluation and file shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean.

g. The department/unit *(added 11-10-22)* *chair may submit an evaluation as part of the post-tenure review, but then shall be ineligible to serve on the unit committee.*

VII. Adjourn: 11:30AM