**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**MINUTES**

Thursday, March 14, 2024, 10:00 –11:30 AM

**Attending:** Maureen Rush (chair), Anna Jacobsen, J.T. Chen, Sumita Sarma, Zachary Zenko, Kristen Gallant, Debbie Boschini, Mandy Rees

**I. Call to order**

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes** – Anna volunteered.

**III. Approval of Minutes from Feb 29, 2024 –** Zack first, Kristen second. Approved.

**IV. Announcements**

Referral on SOCI administration was sent to AAC and FAC.

Brief introduction of the issues:

Paper SOCI completed in one day whereas electronic are completed over a longer period.

Flagging of student comments that are discriminatory or otherwise inappropriate.

Request for referral regarding credit toward tenure is still in progress.

Background on the push to move forward a RES on electronic performance review files was presented. This will be our primary agenda item for today.

**V. Approval of Agenda** — Approved**.**

**VI. Old Business**

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

The Task Force report and findings were reviewed. The Task Force reviewed and ranked the following 7 platforms. Each platform was compared to BOX: Interfolio (44.5), OnBase (37.5), Box (34), Live Binders (33.1), Faculty Success (32.0), Adobe Binder, Mahara, and Scholarly Software. Each platform was evaluated according to 4 Required Capabilities: Secure, tracks access and changes, aids in ease of organization, and easily reviewed by all levels of review. Cost was not included among these criteria nor was ease of use for practitioners.

The FAC is against the recommendation by the Task Force and the current resolution for the following reasons:

1. The costs were a major issue during the first reading, and in light of the current, dire financial situation of the campus (faculty lines put on hold), the FAC believes that cost needs to be a factor, particularly when there are other platforms that meet the required capabilities with lower, or no costs. The cost for Interfolio begins at $28k and increases each year (5-15% depending on inflation and number of users).
2. Costs are not just the cost of the software, but also the time of faculty who may need to be trained in a new system.
3. We also foresee workload issues with a pilot program. Even though a faculty member undergoing review could opt for the pilot program, all other levels of review would have to access two platforms, regardless.
4. It is not clear that the full capabilities of BOX were considered (in comparison to other platforms), or if the early and unexamined implementation of BOX, as currently used, formed the basis of comparisons in the report. There are additional capabilities of BOX that are not currently used, including the use of templates to organize folders, the blocking of downloads to increase file security, etc.
5. In addition to BOX, which is already used on campus, CANVAS was not evaluated by the Task Force. It is widely used on the campus by faculty, is of no additional cost, and does meet the 4 required capabilities (degree to be determined).
6. Interfolio, recommended by the Task Force, permits the downloading of files and thus does not fix one of the primary concerns about file security.
7. Additional concerns are with the long-term filing and maintaining of files. When do faculty “get their files back” and have control of their files, versus what needs to be stored for longer term access.
8. An argument made in favor of adopting Interfolio is that many CSU campuses already use this platform and seem to find it adequate for their needs, but this does not indicate what options they considered before making the decision to implement Interfolio as their selected platform.

In light of all of these comments and concerns, FAC votes to unanimously to withdraw our committee support for the currently considered resolution to move forward with a pilot of Interfolio.

As a second point, the committee expressed deep thanks and gratitude to the Task Force for their thorough and thoughtful evaluation of different potential platforms.

An emerging consensus is that the continued use of BOX, with the implementation of some of the features of this platform is a better short-term option. While continuing to use this platform, we could continue to evaluate other potential platforms such Canvas.

FAC explored a pilot project of use of Canvas as an alternative platform that uses software that faculty are familiar with. Canvas has serious security issues including the downloading of files and the ability of external entities to view files on the platform.

Pros of BOX include familiarity with use, flexibility, ability to block downloads of files, template of folders could be developed and easily used for file organization, and there are settings for BOX use that have not yet been fully used but could be valuable in addressing some of the past concerns with BOX. Faculty training could also be expanded to increase ease of use, such as the use of Box Drive.

It was generally agreed that the rush to adopt BOX under dire circumstances during the pandemic led to many complaints with its implementation for the RTP process. Since some years have gone by, we believe a more considered and thoughtful implementation is possible.

FAC will propose a competing resolution as an alternative to the Interfolio resolution.

The committee drafted a new resolution recommending the use of Box as our platform for faculty performance review. This will be submitted to the Academic Senate as a new resolution to present at the next meeting.

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

BPC would like to meet with us jointly on April 4th.

BPC has shared a new edited document that we reviewed.

**VII. Adjourn** – 11:30 am