

Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

January 22nd, 2026
10:00 to 11:30 am

Education Building, Room 123

I. Call to order

II. Volunteer to Take Minutes (Zoom/AI)

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. Announcements

- The Chair announced he will not attend Academic Senate next week and requested an alternate.
- Najmeh agreed to serve as the Chair's alternate for Academic Senate (Thursday, 10:00–11:30).
- Amber, as Vice Chair, will lead any FAC discussion items brought forward at Academic Senate if needed.

V. Approval of Agenda

- Old Business: Unit RTP committee formation / clarification (substantial discussion).
- New Business: Nine (9) referrals were received; the committee anticipated addressing 2–3 due to time constraints.
- A time-certain was set to prevent Unit RTP committee discussion from consuming the entire meeting.

VI. Old Business

- a. Referral 2025-2026 05: Unit RTP Committees
 - a. Referral 2025-26 25 – Inconsistency with previous handbook changes
 - b. [See RES252610_Unit RTP and PTR Composition_Jan 19 2026 v3 on Box](#)
 - c. FAC reviewed revisions intended to clarify Unit RTP (and PTR) committee formation, reduce administrative burden (especially in larger units with many lecturers), and align with CBA requirements while preserving meaningful faculty input.
 - d. Key points reviewed/discussed:
 - i. Concept introduced/emphasized for consideration: a Unit RTP Committee “pool” elected once per review cycle, from which candidate-specific RTP committees would be assigned.

- ii. The committee discussed that this tiered approach could reduce repeated elections (“election, election, election...”) while allowing candidate-level specificity.
- e. Eligibility and CBA alignment:
 - i. Discussion of FERP participation and the CBA language indicating presidential approval may be required for FERP faculty to run for election (as interpreted in discussion).
- f. Discussion of rank requirements, including keeping campus “historic practice” (higher rank than candidate) rather than opening contractual complexity (e.g., retention-only reviews).
- g. Discussion referencing CBA Article 15.35 regarding PTR evaluation for FERP participants only if requested by participant or appropriate administrator (as discussed).
- h. Ballot approach:
 - i. Proposed approach: All eligible tenured faculty appear on the ballot unless they opt out; probationary and tenured faculty are expected to participate in voting.
 - ii. Discussion included the “opt-out” mechanism as a way to reduce burden and potentially avoid reputational harm, balanced against transparency and the reality of elections.
 - iii. Assignment process from the pool (candidate committees):
 - 1. Proposed assignment considerations included: rank/eligibility, conflicts of interest and independence, disciplinary expertise, and workload equity.
 - 2. A recurring concern: whether a pool approach could reduce meaningful candidate input, particularly if “everyone is in the pool” and the pool assigns committees internally.
 - 3. Candidate influence:
 - a. Candidate may recommend a candidate committee chair (noted that some feedback opposed a candidate choosing the chair due to perceived bias).
 - b. Candidate ability to appoint/request an outside member was discussed as an existing/important safeguard.
- i. Big vs. small department realities:
 - i. Larger units with many lecturers raised concerns that per-candidate elections are administratively burdensome.
 - ii. Small departments described situations where the pool is necessarily small and members effectively review everyone.
 - iii. The committee discussed whether policy should assume good-faith departmental processes rather than attempting to legislate every unique case or circumstance.
- j. Outcome / Next steps:

- i. The Chair indicated they are leaning against bringing the Unit RTP item forward next week to allow more time for committee digestion and refinement.
- ii. FAC members were asked to send ideas and feedback to the Chair by next Thursday (approximately one week) focusing on:
 1. Which concerns from feedback must be addressed,
 2. Which concerns can reasonably be set aside,
 3. A defensible rationale balancing large and small department needs.

VII. New Business (Time Certain: 10:45)

- a. Referral 2025-2026 28 – Term limits for department chairs and program directors
 - i. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed a proposal clarifying term limits for department chairs and program directors, specifying that individuals are ordinarily expected to serve no more than two consecutive three-year terms in the same role in order to promote shared governance, leadership development, and equitable distribution of service. After two consecutive terms, a break in service is expected before an individual may serve again in the same role, with the proposal explicitly noting that this is not a lifetime limit and that eligibility resumes following a break. The proposal allows for exceptions in cases where no other qualified and willing candidates are available, provided departments document their recruitment efforts and rationale, with such exceptions requiring approval from both the Dean and the Provost. Discussion also reaffirmed that departmental votes constitute recommendations and that final appointment authority rests with the Provost. The committee briefly discussed whether FERP faculty could serve and whether the length of a break in service should be specified, concluding that eligibility issues could be handled administratively and that additional specification was unnecessary. The FAC voted to forward the proposal to Academic Senate for First Reading, with Vice Chair Amber designated to support and lead discussion as needed.
- b. Referral 2025-2026 35: SOCI Modality
 - i. The Faculty Affairs Committee discussed proposed revisions to SOCI modality in response to concerns about the increasing cost and impracticality of paper-based evaluations and the challenges associated with online SOCIs, including lower response rates and cases in which faculty may not receive reports when there are zero responses. The committee reviewed changes intended to better align handbook language with current reporting practices, including removing references to measures not currently provided, ensuring that faculty receive SOCI reports even when no student responses are submitted, and clarifying that reports should be

available for all academic terms and distributed to instructors, department chairs, and college deans for recordkeeping and access. Additional discussion addressed implementation practices for face-to-face courses, including providing dedicated class time for SOCI completion and requiring instructors to leave the room to protect student privacy and reduce response bias, as well as the need for clear institutional guidance and technical support. The committee also considered how the language should apply to instructional faculty and courses, while recognizing that other faculty categories (e.g., librarians, counselors, athletics) may meet evaluation requirements through unit-level procedures. The FAC voted to forward the SOCI modality revisions to Academic Senate for First Reading, and the Chair will finalize minor wording and formatting edits prior to submission.

- c. Referral 2025-2026 19: Teaching Modality (FAC and AAC joint referral)
 - i. The Faculty Affairs Committee discussed a referral addressing the determination of teaching modality, particularly in cases where disagreements arise among faculty, departments, deans, and administration, as well as concerns related to the Distributed Learning Committee's (DLC) limited activity since the COVID-19 period and uncertainty regarding oversight and certification for online and hybrid instruction. Proposed policy direction emphasized that course modality should primarily be determined at the departmental or program level through established curricular and scheduling processes grounded in pedagogical appropriateness, disciplinary standards, and student learning outcomes, while recognizing a coordinating role for deans to ensure alignment with institutional mission, student access needs, and resource constraints, including the expectation that face-to-face instruction remains the primary mode. The committee discussed strengthening guidance for the DLC, including expectations that it meet at least annually, issue certification guidance when applicable, and be subject to Academic Senate review if it fails to convene. The proposal also outlined a process for resolving modality disagreements through good-faith consultation, with unresolved issues referred to the Provost (or designee) and any departures from departmental recommendations documented in writing. Existing practice requiring dean approval for modality changes after student registration was noted as an area for clarification. The FAC voted to forward the teaching modality referral to the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) for joint consideration, and the Chair will transmit the item and incorporate suggested clarifications before further review.

X. Adjourn