Faculty Policy Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2010

Present: Norman, Brooks, Grasse, Miller

Norman called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

The first discussion was about the Provost’s RTP proposal. Norman went over the Provosts proposal. It includes a 3 year contract for new faculty hires. There is some concern that the reviewer won’t take the process as seriously as new hires are given more time before their contract expires and thus would fail to provide important feedback. There is concern about how new faculty will be counseled to complete that plan. Grasse felt that every stage of the tenure process offers potential glitches. Each stage needs to be examined for potential issues. It is possible that the RTP policy changes will be implemented by fall of 2011, but additional faculty feedback is needed. Grasse said that there are glitches in the plan and that it needs to be more clearly worded. It was discussed to possibly have college based meetings or forums to gather feedback.

RTP Standards—There was a discussion about RTP Standards. Norman said that we need to look at unusually meritorious along with minimum standards for the key phases of this proposal for the 3rd year review and tenure review in particular. A separate policy could be created to require that each department have clear standards for teaching, scholarship and service. It would be helpful for the provost to give us an example of a current department standard he recommends that we follow as an or share with our committee and example for a similar institution. Norman is in the process of putting together a letter soliciting faculty input on the RTP proposals and a copy to will be sent to all faculty.

Online PTE’s—There was a discussion about online PTE’s. Grasse said that his report was a basic fact finding. Gus Martin says that online PTE’s are inevitable. Norman asked Grasse to write a one page proposal of policy to introduce in draft form. In a previous meeting Esposito spoke of our campus being special and that there might be reluctance on student’s part to participate in the process. Sneed spoke in a previous meeting of the impropriety of assuming this was inevitable. Grasse said that Martin will have a report on what other CSU campuses are doing by the end of the semester. We are awaiting data on the experience of the pilot from Martin. We had been under the impression the full time professors involved with online were volunteers, but some discussions suggest that is not the case. This is not a system wide effort to the best of our knowledge. Miller asked whether Gus will be providing any data regarding the success of the use of online PTEs (completion rates compared to traditional pencil and paper PTEs) in the report he is planning on providing about other CSU campuses.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:00 a.m.