Faculty Policy Committee
Minutes
January 26, 2011

Present: Norman, Sneed, Faraji, White, Grasse, Esposito, and Brooks

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

Approval of Agenda    MSP

RTP process Resolution-Norman said that what we had been asked to do was give a final look over to what would be called FPC 11-01. Changes to Academic Affairs policy to the RTP process. This document is not intended to get to the next level which is departmental guidelines minimums and things that are next on the agenda. Hopefully everyone has looked through this carefully to see where the changes are. No levels of review are eliminated. One thing that Norman did want to call to attention is the timing or the ordering of the college level review that will now precede the dean’s level of review. That’s a change. The other change the provost suggested we incorporate into this document have to do with the increase in time for these probationary appointments, which have been viewed by CFA as very positive. There biggest concern of the final copy of this voted on at the senate would be that peer review remain at the same level, and that the administrations hand is not strengthened.

Mike said that they are not seeing that the hand is strengthened but they are looking to see whether or not this does that. Norman said yes, because it has been modified and copies were sent to the president as well as the whole executive committee to comment on by today. Mike asked if the document of issued by Ron or his office? Norman said the request, and White should know how much it has been modified, and Norman thanked White for his role in the senate of reviewing these.

Sneed said that in the 3rd year you can get …………. Decisions and I know that a lot of people are in favor of that. The reason I am against 2 decisions is that 1 year versus 3 year appointment that once someone gets a 1 year appointment it’s hard to get past that. Sneed would say that people start to view that as a negative. White said “in the 4th and 5th year you mean.” Sneed said yes and it will impact their decisions towards tenure that could really hurt them. Another reason is that there are no guidelines as to gets a 1 year versus a 3 year appointment. Every decision that these committees make throughout the process is subject to a grievance. We are going to be creating more problems for people who get one year.

White said that you will notice at the end of the 4th probation year that there can be an award of 1, or 2 years. Sneed said that was his concern that we may have these decisions that at least in the document that are in fact arbitrary. It’s not like I’m saying that I trust the right decision will be made for 1 year
versus the 3 year. They are arbitrary because they are not officially defined. White asked if that was the purpose of department guidelines. This is setting up a skeleton of the process and this process employs as standards whatever the departments within the colleges establish as their guidelines, so the question would be whether or not at the end of the 3rd year a person is evaluated with consistent departmental guidelines.

Sneed said that this documents does not make that decision at all. Grasse asked if Sneed was suggesting it should. White read section A on page 1. Sneed said that it does not define whether the department recommends a 1 year or a 3 year appointment. Sneed said that is important and it cannot be left out. If the department is not to make any recommendations either way it becomes less arbitrary. Hopefully it will be main based on how much they adhere to departmental guidelines. But what percentage of department guidelines? 80%? 90%? How many publications? 1, 2, 3? White said that this document does not address that issue. White said that the further problem is that the departments don’t follow the guidelines. What is the purpose of there being the committees and the deans’ reviews and recommendations if they are not going to make a recommendation, and just simply do a review without a recommendation? The provost would be acting arbitrarily. Assuming there is a series of recommendations from the various committees and dean levels to the provost then the question is whether he follows them. Sneed said the recommendations currently do not state 1 versus 3 so are we saying that they are now going to state that? This document does not specify. White said okay. Sneed said the current language is recommend and highly recommend your letters can’t say (this is a really great person). There is not language in the current process where we say highly recommend or a one year appointment. Highly recommend or a 3 year appointment. White said correct, and so wherever that standard is established we need to look at that, and amend it consistent with this. White said that it must be a PM or another Academic Policy. Norman said that he was trying to figure out how to draft some language and make a fix here. White urged him not to consider doing it here, because what you are doing here is creating the skeleton, the process and what Sneed is suggesting and rightly so is that the guideline needs to be addressed in terms of the various recommendations that each of the committees are going to deal with. Sneed asked if the provost meant that he would be making the decision? Do we really want that in his ballpark? Does he want to have recommendations from prior levels of review? White said that this might be where the CFA is concerned because the provost would be acquiring some additional control.

White asked who would be an expert on the RTP guidelines and Sneed said Gus Martin. White said that there is concern about folks adding in collegiality of a faculty member. Norman said that there is interest in the committee coming up with some proposals for the senate to weigh in on, establishing department guidelines, that they are reviewed and revised. Making very clear what the minimums are. It becomes a 3 or 4 pronged set of recommendations. To not reappointment is also a decision. And then it becomes 1 or 3 years and then in the 4th year it becomes 2 or 3 or 0. Who has the final say?

Norman asked it is okay to move forward. Sneed said that he sees this as a problem and White said that he would support that. It’s a major concern that needs to be addressed. Grasse asked if the
recommendation of this committee would guarantee that it is debated. Sneed said that we should make recommendation but if a document leaves here it does not mean that we fully buy into it. Grasse asked if a document could be accompanied by a recommendation. Sneed said that it could.

Kate Esposito and Salim Faraji joined the group.

Norman said that our intent would be to issue this as a first reading item at the next senate meeting.

Esposito asked if right now the committee just makes a 1 year recommendation and White said it’s a recommendation for another year or not. Espositio asked if the provost had the discretion to say a 1 year reappointment or a 3 year reappointment. White said that is what we are going to look at and ultimately he thinks the answer is yes. It probably guarantees a grievance. Let’s assume you have recommendations throughout for another appointment and the provost decides not ... that is a grievance.

Norman asked Esposito and Faraji if there were any concerns from the colleges that they come from with the RTP process? Esposito asked if the faculty has the right to request the URTP? White said that he thought it was automatic if there was a disagreement. Esposito said that just recent there was someone who was declined, declined and declined and then overturned by the provost. White said that in this case it does not guarantee the URTP. Espositio was not talking about RTP but rather going from associate professor to professor.

White said that in the 5 or 6th year a person could request a URTP review. White asked who appoints the URTP and the answer was that it was a college election for representation. White said that he would put the resolution together for our senate meeting next week.

Faraji asked how long this draft was based on. It was proposed by the provost during the last semester. It seemed suspicious because it seemed like it wasn’t a bad idea. We have done some revisions to try and clarify. Faraji said that after the 3rd year he did not remember that for himself. White said that was the new part. Norman said what faculty are happy about is that you don’t have that stress at the end of your first or second year. Norman said that currently you don’t earn the right to a terminal year until after the completion of your second year. Under the first policy if you do poorly your first year you can be gone. Esposito asked if this addresses lecturers and it does not. This is only for tenure track. Lecturers go through a reappointment.

Department Standards for Tenure Minimum (Report Norman)-Norman discussed how the next objective would be to write a document on how to develop standards for tenure at the minimum. It might be a decision of 3 year versus 1 year of appointment. We will look at tenure and steps for qualification for early tenure. Norman has gathered a lot of wide ranging things and faculty members that he has spoken
to say don’t do anything because right now the system is ambiguous enough and that protects faculty. And there are other folks who think we need departments to develop clear, easily defendable standards that people know where they are standing. Norman is interested in hearing from everyone how that would work for your college. We need to create these and come up with a timeline to revisit these. The discussion we had at exec is that we should have it at 3 years or maybe longer periods of time.

Esposito said that her department just quantified there’s for satisfactory and then meritorious. They have been given to the provost. This is the college of Education and Teacher Education. Norman said that we may want to draft a resolution asking the administration for a date they can respond to all of the revisions. Sneed said that in his department their revisions were submitted about 2 years ago but have not heard back. But they were supposed to be approved by the provost. Sneed felt there was a PM or and AM with a date…but it was never done.

When Esposito was acquainted she came in as graduate faculty and then they were reorganized. The guidelines for graduate education are dramatically different for teacher education. Do you write to the guidelines you were initially hired under or the guidelines of the department you were moved to? One of her colleagues has a grievance of some sort filed on this saying that she wants to go back to her original department. White said that it was his understanding that it would be the guidelines that applied when you were hired regardless of reorganization. You are initially hired under a contract. Grasse asked if we would want David Bradfield’s insight on that.

Grasse said that when we are talking about guidelines we are talking about various disciplines within a department and in humanities and music we are not just musicians. We are very collegially but the thought of departmental guidelines for these steps is highly problematic. It involves very specific language that is disciplined based. We have the map of departments but within those departments there are people with degrees and careers in very different areas sometimes. How deep do we go? How do we interpret the problem of establishing guidelines or suggesting minimum standards when we are really looking at the careers of many different people, and disciplines that happen to be in departments? The nature of the language has to be generalized it has to safeguard faculty, yet promoting the power of the department. Grasse says that he can see many loopholes and problems.

White said that he understands better where the provost is coming from and it seems that it is consistent with the thinking of the philosophy of no child left behind which is let’s just get the scores and make the decisions that way. We take out the humanity and the judgment. When you think of the language you would have to come up with to have cross discipline guidelines it is an absurdity. It takes away from the committees and the deans who review this stuff. The deans are the ones to make these judgments because administrators want things to be simplified. White shares Grasse’s view and thinks it is something to stay away from. We should respect the fact that those who will be appointed to these committees will make intelligent judgments.

Esposito said that they are so ambiguous, she said that you know you need to do research and that you need to have 80% or higher on your PTE's. At least in our department it’s an unwritten rule.
specificity is nice and it might serve to protect some junior faculty. Sneed said that the issue of which guideline you go under the one you were hired under or the one you have now due to reorganization. Sneed said that this is an issue for CFA and FPC. We need to let CFA deal with that.

Norman said that unusually meritorious should be less than 10% of the population. We need to know what the minimums are because unusually meritorious has to be greater than that. It’s the harder of the two and it creates a greater amount of conflict between administration and faculty.

Faraji said that his department is being asked to develop language broad enough for departments to use as a template. Norman said that each department needs to create these standards. They need to be posted so that faculty can easily and readily see them. Departments are required to revisit those. Should it just stop at the level of the department? Or should there be a super level, college level? The provost doesn’t think that the department can always be trusted in some instances. Norman said that the provost said at the last senate exec meeting that departments came up with crazy guidelines that were no peer professional. It isn’t common but it has occurred. Grasse said that there is a danger there, there is always going to be an exception to these complicated processes. It could be chasing after language that we end up shooting ourselves in the foot with.

Sneed said that we have to develop early tenure requirements and the process of which that goes. In the policy it states that departments go up to deans, colleges, or to the dean and the dean goes to the provost makes the final decision on whether those guidelines are either good or bad. One process we can develop for tenure minimum. The provost last year recommended revising that policy and state that the department develop the guidelines and have them approved by an outside department at another university. You could do the same with a tenure minimum develop a policy that states that departments have to develop these policies. It would be approved by the department, the dean, the provost and then would go to Gus Martin’s office. There are no college standards in this process at all.

White said that we have about 60 departments on the campus.

Grasse asked what the chances of the provost’s office going to other provost’s office? For just feedback? Sneed said that he has friends that teach in psychology in other departments. Grasse said that he has friends that teach worldwide. Sneed said that is a better connection than the provost.

Esposito said that we might look to accreditation bodies. Rather than look to another department who may not have our advising load or workload or who may not have large class size that may be functioning with a limited amount of resources. We are a very different campus as opposed to Cal Poly or Cal State LA, or Long Beach. They are not dealing with the same issues and depending on the program they may not be impacted. We might look to accreditation bodies. Maybe there are some guidelines there as opposed to asking a department at CSU Long Beach.

Faraji said that in Africana Studies they used San Diego State as external reviewer and National Organization and National Council of Black Studies. Maybe a combination of the two. Sneed said that not everyone has an accreditation for a department. Sneed said that you would still end up with a faculty member doing your review. The president of APA is a faculty member at a university. Sneed said
that many organizations don’t have anything in place to review departments. The president of APA probably would not sign off on a psychology department because that is not their charge. Sneed said that it is common for departments to review other departments within the same discipline at other universities. To get an accreditation body to review a department ... you would have to look into that.

Grasse said that the National Association of Schools of Music has accredited our department. He is not sure if they would be able to review a department.

Sneed said that we could put in our policy one size does not fit all. We could say that external review could be and/or an accreditation body.

White asked if we were charged with establishing a requirement of departments to establish the standards, is that what we wish to do. Norman said that the administration is asking the senate to come up with a recommendation for policy rather than just the provost going through the process of what he wants. That will require departments to establish standard to review these standards. Norman said that he has not heard the provost for the minimum say there is a requirement of the outside department or accreditation but we can have that in there. We could have it mandatory for the unusually meritorious. It seems like it’s more important to get an external evaluation. We maybe know better what the expectations are given our unique mission.

How frequently the review is and what level of specificity do we want to impose upon the department and how they do this? Have an elected body of X number of people who review this? Is this full department? Any guidelines on how these are created. Who gets to vote and who gets to decide which department? Do we just leave it to the department? Sneed said yes we leave it to the department.

Norman went through language on the computer. PM 82; PM 90-05; and PM 84-02.

A meeting will be scheduled in 2 weeks if everyone is okay with that. All were in favor.

Norman said that within the next 2 weeks he will come with a draft to consider with respect to the unusually meritorious.

Norman recommended that there be a clear distinction between the form used to request online PTEs and paper PTEs at the start of the semester and that Dr. Martin’s office send an email reminder during the first two weeks explaining the new process bringing attention to this change.