**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Minutes**

Thursday, February 1, 2024

10:00 –11:30 AM

**Mathematics Department Library Room**

**Sci III Room 235**

**Present:** Maureen Rush, Zachary Zenko, Kristen Gallant, Mandy Rees, Tracey Salisbury, Anna Jacobsen, J.T. Chen, Sumita Sarma, Debbie Boschini

**I. Call to order:** 10:04am

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes:** Mandy Rees

**III. Approval of Minutes from Nov 30, 2023**

Moved: Zach

 Seconded: Anna

 Minutes approved.

**IV. Announcements and Discussion**

1. Resolutions for referrals #19 (HSIRB and IACUC Policy Updates) and #21 (Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee) were put before Senate last fall but did not have first reading.
2. The Committee has two new referrals and that have now been placed in Box:

#26 New Department Proposal—Public Health

#27: Faculty Director Performance Reviews

1. Discussion of RTP/PTR/Periodic Review criteria and concerns committee members had.

 • FAC members ask for a referral to clarify service credits for those coming into

tenure-track positions with a shortened timeline. Specifically, do you count

service/scholarship at other institutions? Also, do you count scholarship that was initiated at other institutions but completed at CSUB?

 •Debbie Boschini explained that this information is not in the handbook or

contract, so departments interpret it differently.

 • Is there a policy if a department doesn’t have appropriate criteria? How do

Deans evaluate criteria before approving it? Should there be a summer project when all of the RTP criteria are gathered to be reviewed to determine differences to see the scope of the problem? Should Deans review the criteria for consistencies? Every five years criteria are supposed to be reviewed.

**V. Approval of Agenda**

Moved Mandy

Second Anna

Approved

**VI. Old Business**

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

Round 1: Canvas experiment

We all worked with Canvas in the fall and will share our perspectives in a future meeting.

1. 2023-2024 #19 HSIRB and IACUC Policy Updates – Handbook change – ready? This is completed and has been sent to Senate.
2. 2023-2024 #21 Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee – Handbook change – ready?

This is completed and has been sent to Senate.

1. 2023-24 Referral #03: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - **Handbook Change** – 306 document attached.

We need to work on this before the end of semester.

1. 2023-24 Referral #09: Effect of Sabbatical on Assigned Time and Release Time

We did not address during the meeting.

1. 2023-24 Referral #08: General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) Review and Appointments

We did not address during the meeting.

**VII. New Business**

1. 2023-2024 #11 Academic Administrators Search and Screening – Handbook change.

This is a joint referral with BPC. BPC has requested to have a joint meeting with FAC. We were given handbook language with edits. Did BPC make these edits?

Discussion ensued over potential problems that arise when working with search firms.

• Should the search committee members be able to call references if they prefer? Or does the search firm always do this. Sometimes there are subtleties you can pick up from a reference’s answers.

• We questioned whether appointing officers should be a part of the screening activities when they make the final appointment.

• If the search firm or Provost has requested to be present during deliberations, do we want them to participate through chair’s approval? Or should they be present only when invited to do so by the committee? BPC has added new language about this into **309.4 Confidentiality of Search and Screening Committee Activities**. Suggested by BPC: “Exceptions can be made to include the appointing officer and/or one member of a search firm with written approval of the chair.” This could mean the chair is pressured to include them during deliberations. FAC suggests instead that the chair initiates an invitation: “The chair of the committee may, through a written invitation, invite the appointing officer or member of the search firm to their deliberations at their discretion.”

• The search firm often gets instructions from the Provost and communicates with the Provost, leaving the committee out of the loop. This gives the Provost more power and can undermine the committee’s work. The committee needs a statement of the search firm’s role to ensure the firm is not making decisions that should be made by the committee and isn’t keeping information away from the committee. The agreement with the firm needs to be made in consultation with the committee so everyone’s role is clear.

1. **2023-24 #26: New Department Proposal—Public Health**

Committee members are asked to review the Formation Request documents and the associated documents that relate to Faculty Affairs and we will discuss this proposal at the next meeting. Folders we should look at: Administrative Support, Faculty Review and RTP, and Faculty Affiliates Support.

1. **2023-24 #27: Faculty Director Performance Reviews—Handbook Change**

Currently people may be cherry picking from the handbook since there isn’t a designated section on Faculty Directors, so we need to provide some specifics.

Points to consider:

• Who fits under this category? Should we define what is meant by “faculty director.” Is it up to FAC define categories and give guidelines? Categories can include: Grant Directors, Program Directors (like Graduate Directors), Faculty Directors (like FTLC Director.)

• Do faculty directors have set terms? Term limits? Are there positions that can be hired and fired at will?

• Who is in charge of them? Who do directors report to?

• Are directors reviewed? How frequently are they reviewed? Do criteria exist for these reviews?

• Who writes the job description and policies? Is this done by boards, faculty committees, or others? Certain centers have outside boards (Kegley) or answer to the Chancellor’s Office and might be out of our purview.

• Should we just focus on work on campus-wide directors? There are directors appointed by departments (the Liberal Studies Director for instance would not be a campus-wide director.)

• We need to make sure each Director position has the following specified:

Clear job description with compensation or amount of reassigned time

Length of term

Term limits

Review criteria in place, determine who writes it

Frequency of review

Who conducts the review?

If there is a board in place, would every board member be qualified to

conduct the review?

**VIII. Adjourned** at 11:26am