**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Minutes**

Thursday, October 5, 2023

10:00 –11:30 AM

**Mathematics Department Library Room**

**Sci III Room 235**

**Attendance:** Kristen Gallant, Debbie Moschini, Anna Jacobsen, Maureen Rush, Tracey Salisbury, J.T. Chen, Pratigya Sigdyal (substituting for Sumita Sarma), Monica Ayuso, Zachary Zenko

**I. Call to order**

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes 🡪 Zack**

**III. Approval of Minutes from September 21, 2023 🡪 Zack, seconded by Tracey**

**IV. Announcements**

**V. Approval of Agenda (Consider moving New Business)**

**🡪** Does digitizing fall under our purview?

* Maybe the Senate accepts the report, and the executive committee creates a resolution to adopt the recommendations?
	+ Currently tabled and will be brought back to executive committee for a resolution by the task force to go directly to the Senate
* Moving Option to Retreat from new business to #4 for next meeting
* Agenda approved

**VI. Old Business (new referral numbers)**

1. 2023-24 Referral #10: Standing Committee — Bylaws Change Section IV – draft resolution to the Senate attached.
	1. Discussed whether a statement of interest should be explicitly required or naturally emerge at the organizational meeting
	2. Discussed whether nominations should be allowed from the floor
		1. Comments that they should be allowed to ensure no position is vacant.
		2. Added an additional statement about candidates speaking to interest and qualifications.
		3. Added some clarity about duration of service
		4. Motion to approve; seconded; committee passed
		5. Updated resolution to be passed onto Academic Senate
2. 2023-24 Referral #03: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - **Handbook Change** – 306 document attached.
	1. Discussed edits, bullet point by bullet point and tried to improve clarity
	2. Bullet points E and F presented a lot of confusion
	3. Discussed “one or more members selected from…” and realized that a secondary committee could outweigh the primary committee, and made suggestions for changes
	4. Discussed whether Unit committee members *shall* serve or are *expected to* serve; lean toward are expected to serve because there are instances where unit members are not professional or are not meeting their professional obligations and expectations as a committee member
		1. “are expected” provides a safe “out” for the faculty members to recuse themselves from the committee
	5. Discussed new additions to PTR and mirrored language above
	6. Discussed whether the Handbook should clarify that the Chair of the Unit must be a higher rank if writing a recommendation; the CBA appears fairly silent or confusing on this issue because they mention that faculty reviewing must be above rank, but also that unit chairs may write a letter.
		1. It is an eligibility question. Should Department Chairs be able to make recommendations and evaluations of a faculty member of a higher rank (e.g., Assistant Professor evaluating an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor)?
		2. CBA Article 15.21 says "Department chairs may make separate recommendations as a part of the periodic evaluation process".
		3. Article 15.43 says "In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion".
		4. Our CSU Bakersfield Handbook also says
			1. The department chair of the unit may submit a separate evaluation and recommendation, using the same timeline as the unit review committee. Department chairs choosing to submit a separate evaluation and recommendation shall not participate in the deliberations of the unit committee. (305.4.3.a.2)
			2. A chair submitting a separate evaluation and recommendation shall not serve on the unit RTP committee. (305.6.1.k)
			3. Except in cases of probationary faculty already at the top rank (professor or equivalent), in promotion and tenure considerations, members of the unit RTP committee must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion or tenure. (305.6.1.h)
		5. The question is whether we can adjust the Handbook to indicate that Chairs may submit a separate evaluation and recommendation if they are of a higher rank.
		6. The Faculty Rights Representative (Zachary Zenko) will consult with statewide CFA to get additional information and perspective
			1. As of October 9th, no comment received but Zenko will continue to keep committee and Senate updated
	7. Extended meeting by 5 minutes; noticed that several handbook guidelines are not consistently done in practice
	8. FAC approved document
	9. Meeting adjourned at 11:35
3. 2023-24 Referral #12: Three-Year Lecturers and PTR Committee - **Handbook Change –** draft PTR portion attached.
4. 2023-24 Referral #09: Effect of Sabbatical on Assigned Time and Release Time
5. 2023-24 Referral #08: General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) Review and Appointments

**VIII. New Business**

1. 2023-24 Referral #17: Option to Retreat Policy – Handbook Change?

**IX. Tabled**

1. 2023-24 Referral #02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process.

Note: Wait for report from University Task force.

**X. Adjourn**