

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Agenda**

Thursday, February 23, 2023
10:00 –11:30 AM

Humanities Office Building Conference Room

- I. Call to order → 10:01 (present: Mandy, Zack, Rhonda, David, Anna, John, Kristine, Debbie). Guest: Dean Bozarth**
- II. Volunteer to Take Minutes → Zack**
- III. Approval of Minutes → Zack motioned; Rhonda seconded. All in support.**
- IV. Announcements → Exchange of handbooks with San Bernardino (Mandy)**
- V. Approval of Agenda → There are several referrals in waiting, and hopefully executive committee will have more referrals. Anna moved, Kristine seconded (John withdrew second). All in support.**
- VI. Old Business**
 - Faculty Hall of Fame → Dean Bozarth suggests flexibility with dates on the Faculty Hall of Fame selection process.**
 - Committee follows criteria that are sent to them**
 - Suggestion – Faculty Hall of Fame added to Handbook. Language drafted by Mandy to show handbook changes.**
 - Language notes the President although this is managed by the Provost (e.g., President or Designee)**
 - Edit to remove the meeting in the Albin Room of the library and language specific to the library.**
 - Could we add this to the process to add to the nomination process for emeritus (so that you could be emeritus, or hall of fame at the same time with the same process, just one at a time). This would be 308.2.6.**
 - Could this be broadened to include faculty that are currently working? On the other hand, there are other opportunities for that (e.g., annual awards).**
 - Could be merged with the Emeritus sections**
 - Which should be higher status? Emeritus, or Hall of Fame?**
 - Emeritus is treated as the elite, and Hall of Fame “for other people”
 - Perception is that Hall of Fame is higher than Emeritus
 - Emeritus should be primarily based on length of service to the university?
 - Should there be demonstrated need to continue accessing library for Emeritus?
 - Should Emeritus be treated as “lower standard”?
 - Setting a minimum length would be an issue if someone passes away tragically.

- If there was a minimum length, it would be for Emeritus.
- It is possible that Faculty Hall of Fame is perceived as higher because it is newer than Emeritus.

→ **Should we merge sections and timelines?**

- If so, which should be higher?
- Should they require excelling in multiple areas?
- Faculty Hall of Fame was created by the library for recordkeeping and historical documentation. The intention was never to merge these.
- How do we make Faculty Hall of Fame separate? There might be more room to adapt those processes because Faculty Hall of Fame is newer.
- Faculty Hall of Fame and Emeritus should not be a subset of one or another.
- Merging would allow streamlining.
- It is important to acknowledge people who have worked for years and have never quite reached Emeritus status.
- There are expectations for the Emeritus process, and so changing this would be problematic and a bad idea.
- Faculty Hall of Fame → Suggestion for “significant lasting contribution to the University or to their Discipline” that would transform/positively impact the University/Discipline in a meaningful way. This would remove the length of time requirement, ranking requirement.
 - Fully separated from University
 - Does not pay attention to different areas (teaching, scholarship, service)
- Suggestion: Rename 308.2 to “Awards for Faculty separated or retired from university”
 - Emeritus is a career award
 - Faculty Hall of Fame is an award to a person for a specific thing (e.g., founding a program).

Joined by BPC to discuss RTP Calendar Review

1. Concern on 28 calendar days would impact later timelines
2. BPC examined calendars of all other CSUs. Most CSUS seem to have about 3-4 weeks for the Unit Committee to review 2nd year TT faculty.
3. Some campuses have a College level review and the URC is only for appeals.
4. If we stick with the structure we have, then there is not really any “standard” to follow.
5. Comment from FAC → Unit level of review is the most important and most impactful and requires the most thorough and thoughtful comments. This is a critical window for faculty for faculty development.
 - a. Higher levels of review are much less detailed, and so there is less concern for burden on administrator’s time.

- b. **If the President wants to change her approach, then we can re-examine. But currently, this is not a problem that exists.**
 - c. **FAC is comfortable with requiring TT candidates to write rebuttal to URC (few do this: BPC “not more than 3 in a given year”).**
- 6. **Mandy will work with Charles Lam from BPC to refine language and create proposal to go forward with Senate**
- 7. **BPC → This will also affect PTR**
 - a. **FAC → But that only goes to Unit and Dean**

2022-23 Referral #22: General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo)
Review and Appointments

1. **Were the directors so far appointed by the Senate? Who made the appointment originally?**
2. **Three faculty directors: GE, TLC, and Kegley**
 - a. **It would make sense to focus on both GE and TLC director so that it does not seem like we are micromanaging one and ignoring the other**
 - b. **Whether it should be about TLC was discussed at executive senate, but referral only mentions GE director**
3. **There should be a broader call for these types of positions (GE and TLC Director). Perhaps directors not tied to units could be added.**
4. **Is there a difference between appointed vs. elected directors/chairs?**
5. **There should be a call for nominations and a review process, whether the position is elected or appointed**
 - a. **There should also be a review process to evaluate ongoing performance and make suggestions for ongoing improvement**
6. **There is interest in seeing what other CSUs have done**
7. **There should be a review process for all of these positions**
 - a. **Who participates in the review process? GECCO is like the “department”, but GE affects more people than just GECCO or even instructors of GE courses.**
8. **Comment: Seems like an administrative/Dean-type of position where people at the same level would be in charge of review and include others (faculty, students) to participate.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. Zack moved to adjourn. Mandy seconded.

VII New Business

1. 2019-20 Referral #08: Honorary Doctorate - Handbook Change
2. 2021-22 Referral #20: Accessibility of Instructional Materials
3. 2021-22 Referral #23: Faculty Hall of Fame Selection Process Change
4. 2021-22 Referral #40: Digitizing the Performance Review Process

5. 2021-22 Referral #41: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - Handbook Change
6. 2022-23 Referral #02: Academic Integrity Campaign- Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility- ON HOLD
7. 2022-23 Referral #03: Holding Exams on Last Day of Class
8. 2022-23 Referral #16: GST Instructor Classroom Observations
9. 2022-23 Referral #20: RTP Review Calendar Timeline (**10:30am** joint meeting with BPC)
10. 2022-23 Referral #22: General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) Review and Appointments

VIII. Adjourn