**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Minutes**

Thursday, November 16, 2023, 10:00 –11:30 AM

**Attending:** Mónica Ayuso, Anna Jacobsen, Maureen Rush, Sumita Sarma, Zachary Zenko, Ying Zhong (alternate for Kristen Gallant), Ankita Agarwal (alternate for J.T. Chen)

**Guest:** Alex Slabey (10 - 10:45 am)

**I. Call to order**

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes**

Anna volunteered.

**III. Approval of Minutes from Nov 2, 2023**

Zack first; Mónica second, approved.

**IV. Approval of Agenda**

Sumita first, Zack second, approved.

**V. Announcements**

RTP/PTR committee resolution (Referral #12) sent to senate, but we have not yet addressed the second part of the that referral. This will be addressed as we continue to work on Referral #03.

**VI. Old Business**

1.2023-24 Referral #02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process. (Time certain 10 am)

Alex Slabey joined us to discuss the possible use of Canvas in the RTP/PTR/PEF process, and the functionality of Canvas compared to Box.

Canvas cannot stop the downloading of content, but Box permits the loading of view only files that prevent downloading.

The changing of access as files move through the review process requires lots of manual activity within Box. In the Canvas environment, this would also be the case and access would still have to be managed for who has access to the file. If reviews are submitted as “assignments” they can’t be later removed because then their assignments are removed, so access would have to be “deactivated” but not removed. Each file for review would require the creation of a new “course” from a standard template. Alex would be the position that would currently be responsible for creating a default canvas “shell” that could be copied to create new courses for each faculty review.

Courses could stay “indefinitely” within Canvas; there is no policy that limits the period of retention. Future reviews could be added to the same course and this could be a way of retaining past reviews.

A major concern with any new system would be the automation of the system as much as possible.

Canvas does have a feature that logs a record of who access files, but this is not accessible to standard course teachers. This could be exported by those with access to these records.

Canvas has the benefit of being a familiar program for faculty, but there would need to be a process in place for assistance with the software-side of potential problems.

There may need to be some limits on total file size to prohibit exceptionally large file sizes.

The FAC will run an internal trial for what a “course” for faculty review might look like within Canvas and how the workflow process may work. Alex will work with us to put this together so that we can all see how it will function. This will be an initial trial so that we can continue this discussion in greater depth moving forward. Some features will need to be limited and access by different levels will need to be carefully regulated so that “discussion” items in the course are not visible to other levels of review.

**VIII. New Business**

1. 2023-2024 #19 HSIRB and IACUC Policy Updates – Handbook change

FAC reviewed the proposed/requested changes to the handbook language for the related policies. The changes maintain faculty representation, balancing burden on faculty time while ensuring that we continue to meet regulations.

2. 2023-2024 #21 Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee – Handbook change

Can we refer to the checklist in the resolution and include the checklist as a proposed appendix to the University Handbook?

Proposed section would be adding language to section 308.7. First section includes language and policy that is already in place and exists on campus, but hasn’t previously been included in the handbook. Second and third sections would create new policies.

Should the school dean be involved in the process of reviewing graduate faculty criteria? Or some other level of review prior to criteria being sent to a school-wide position? The committee discussed different options for the review of criteria. We should add a sentence to empower the GSC to consult with other CSU campuses and/or discipline specific experts. Language should be changed to “The AD-GUS and AVP AA shall state why approval was not granted, and this information will be forwarded to the Graduate Studies Committee.

**IX. Adjourn** (11:30 am)