

Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

February 5th, 2026
10:00 to 11:30 am

Education Building, Room 123

I. Call to order at 10:06 am

II. Volunteer to Take Minutes (Zoom/AI)

III. Approval of Minutes

1. January 22 minutes: announcements/minutes were deferred.

IV. Announcements

V. Approval of Agenda

1. Unanimously approved

VI. Old Business

- a. Referral 2025-2026 05: Unit RTP Committees
 - a. Referral 2025-26 25 – Inconsistency with previous handbook changes
 - b. The committee reviewed continued revisions to the Unit RTP/PTR committee elections language and noted that no additional feedback had been received since the prior meeting. Members agreed that earlier confusion created by the “candidate-specific committees/unit pool” framing could be reduced by reframing the concept as candidate-specific reviews—meaning each candidate receives a distinct review, and committee participation may vary by candidate due to eligibility rules and recusals. The committee discussed several eligibility clarifications to strengthen the draft, including rank requirements for promotion reviews (e.g., professors reviewing associate professors for promotion, with broader eligibility for assistant and temporary faculty reviews), ineligibility of faculty currently under consideration for promotion to participate in tenure/promotion peer reviews, restrictions on unit chairs serving when they submit a separate chair evaluation for a given candidate, and the requirement that FERP faculty obtain presidential permission before running for peer review committee service. The group also reinforced the role of elected alternates, who would be chosen once per cycle and activated automatically when an elected member is ineligible for a specific candidate’s review, with random selection if multiple alternates are needed, and reaffirmed the goal of a single election per review cycle rather than per-candidate elections.

A new issue was identified regarding sabbatical status; to avoid potential challenges to committee constitution, the committee agreed to add explicit language that faculty on sabbatical are ineligible to serve during the term of their sabbatical (with attention to one-term sabbaticals).

The committee then approved a motion to forward the revised resolution to Academic Senate and noted follow-up edits to ensure sabbatical ineligibility language is included consistently in both RTP and PTR eligibility sections, including the clean handbook version.

- b. Referral 2025-2026 28 – Term limits for department chairs and program directors
 - a. The committee reviewed feedback received on the proposed chair and program director term limits resolution, including comments from Senator Dugan and discussion at Academic Senate. Members discussed the timeline for forwarding departmental recommendations and how early deadlines interact with scheduling and reassigned time decisions. While a February 1 deadline was considered, the committee noted practical constraints at the start of the semester and the need to align the timeline with the completion of chair reviews. As a result, the committee agreed that a March 1 deadline represented a more feasible compromise that still supports effective planning. The discussion also clarified break-in-service language, with the intent to require a minimum break of at least one semester and to specify that interim or completion service should not automatically count as a full term. Confidentiality expectations for chair and program director reviews were reaffirmed, emphasizing alignment with RTP practices in which results are not shared broadly and the individual under review receives the evaluation and an opportunity to respond. The committee approved a motion to forward the updated resolution, including the March 1 timeline, to Academic Senate. The Chair additionally noted a potential future need for a referral addressing chair recall or removal procedures and serious performance concerns, acknowledging that while chairs are appointed rather than elected, departments would benefit from greater procedural clarity.
- c. Referral 2025-2026 35: SOCI Modality
 - a. The committee reviewed feedback on proposed suggestions related to Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) administration, focusing on clarifying timelines and procedures. Members discussed defining SOCI timing in terms of class meeting days rather than weekdays to better account for holidays, specifying that the SOCI completion window should begin between 14 and 21 days before the end of the term, and ensuring that students are provided sufficient in-class time to complete evaluations, with approximately 20 minutes discussed as a reasonable standard. Process and access concerns were also raised, including that students may receive links allowing them to select among multiple courses, which can result in comments being submitted for the wrong class. Faculty expressed a need for clearer

guidance on what students see in Canvas and email and how best to direct them, with suggestions including ITS-provided screenshots and the use of faculty-specific links or QR codes.

- b. The committee further discussed maintaining careful language around bias, generally supporting phrasing such as “bias may be present” rather than assuming bias is always present. With respect to courses enrolling fewer than six students, members noted that ITS practice is to exclude such courses from SOCI administration by default unless an approved exception exists, with nursing cited as having a standing exception. The committee agreed the draft language should reflect this default practice and clarify that exceptions may be requested for compelling reasons, such as accreditation requirements or the need for evaluation opportunities, while recognizing anonymity concerns in very small sections. Finally, the committee considered who should review waiver or exception requests in sensitive cases and reached consensus that such requests should be considered by the AVP for Faculty Affairs to ensure neutrality and consistency. The revised draft was approved by the FAC for second reading.
- d. Referral 2025-2026 19: Teaching Modality:
 - a. On Hold until further feedback from DLC and AAC)

VII. New Business

The committee discussed broader concerns related to faculty workload and service equity, emphasizing the need for clearer post-tenure review (PTR) criteria that support accountability for service expectations, particularly for post-tenure and full professors. In this context, the Chair highlighted several forthcoming referrals and work items for the committee, including clarification of unit-level criteria for faculty review and periodic evaluation, with attention to defining “exceptional” performance and identifying required elements or checklists. The Chair also noted the need to strengthen handbook guidance on required RTP file components, such as ensuring consistent placement of peer teaching observations, and to consider a more platform-ambivalent organizational structure.

X. Adjourn