

## 2013-2014 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:**

Professional Standards

**Chair:** Kenneth Peter**Chair-Elect for 2014-2015:**

Kenneth Peter

45562

0119

kenneth.peter@sjsu.

edu

**Number of Meeting held:**

15

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

### Items of Business Completed 2013/2014

S14-8 Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

1. S14-1 Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty, Excluding courses of small size from teaching evaluations

SS-S14-1 Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty at San Jose State University

SS-F13-8 Endorsing a Proposal to Reform the SJSU Policy on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion by Adopting the "Flexible Achievement" Plan

2. Continuing consultations with SERB and IEA on SOTES implementation.

Approval of Library RTP Guidelines

3. Review of Canvas "policy"

Consultation with C&amp;R on Intellectual Property issues included with F13-2 Technology Intensive Courses....

### Unfinished Business Items from 2013/2014

1. RTP policy redraft. Draft completed, consultation, modification, and approval desired in AY 2012-15

- 2.

- 3.

### New Business Items for 2014/2015

1. Referral on Lecturer status re: Emeritus faculty

Referral on updating policies concerning email privacy

- 2.

- 3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by July 18, 2014.

## Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes

2:00-4:00 pm, April 21, 2014,  
117B Industrial Studies Building

**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Attendees:** Shannon Bros, Elizabeth Cara, Winncy Du, Elna Green, Jeff Kallis, Elba  
Maldonado-Colon, Kenneth Peter

**Absent:** Karin Brown, Paul Kauppila, Nathan Gottheil,

**Notetaker:** Winncy Du (Seat E)

### Meeting Discussions:

1. Meeting was called at 2:00 pm by Kenneth.
2. 3/17/14 meeting minutes was approved with adding Winncy's name in the attendees.
3. Discussed the policy recommendation: Replacing S99-9 "Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility". Peter would make changes based on suggestions from the committee and then send to Senate as the first reading on April 28 senate meeting for feedback. All present members approved (7-0-0) for the first reading.
4. Discussed the policy recommendation: Replacing F10-4 "Selection and Review of Department Chairs." Approved this as a first reading item for April 28 Senate meeting. Contents include: vote right of FERB faculty, proportion of part-time faculty votes, voting policy located at the beginning of the chair policy, salary/workload/compensation for acting and interim chairs, chair recruit committee's the final decision right with majority faculty votes, how and when to start/request external search (some comments on external search – expensive).
5. RTP policy. Key decision items:
  - (1) Addition of 3.6 – sources and scholarly, artistic or professional achievements: One suggestion was to change 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> review to Fall semester. With consideration of contract, working load of department/College RTP committees, the PS committee recommended to maintain the current arrangement (Spring semester). For ASA, 3<sup>rd</sup> year is mandatory, 4<sup>th</sup> year is mandatory unless the department/college RTP committees thought the candidate is outstanding and no need for the fourth/fifth year review.
  - (2) Faculty search committee: tenured only or all faculty members should be in the search committee. At least three tenured full time faculty members should be in the committee. Since the faculty union contract was changed in 2005-2006, if there is not enough faculty in the department, one can have a probationary faculty to be in the committee (98-8). Some committee member did not recommend have a probation faculty be on the search committee. In this case, outside department faculty member(s) can serve on the committee and reach a three- or five-member committee.
  - (3) Appointment policy: an appointment decision may not be made solely by the search committee. Other discussions and changes were made and recorded by Ken to submit to 4/28 Senate meeting.
6. Adjourn at 4:00 pm.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes May 5, 2014

Karin Brown

Present: Kenneth Peter, Elisabeth Cara, Elna Green, Jeff Kallis, Winncy Du, Nathan Gottheil, Karin Brown.

Absent: Paul Kauppila, Elba-Maldonado-Colon, Shannon Bros-Seemann.

The minutes from April 7 and April 21 (with two abstentions) were approved.

1. The committee heard a report from senator Gottheil regarding conflicts of interest in faculty assigning course readers and textbooks. The committee determined that this presumed conflict and its specific applications need to be further investigated, and postponed further action to the fall.
2. A motion to withdraw AS 1544 - the BAFPR from the final reading planned for the May 12, 2014 senate meeting was passed unanimously. The committee will look into comparable policies in other institutions with the aim of simplifying the process.
3. After reviewing the changes following the first reading of AS 1543 – Selection and Review of Departments Chairs and Directors; the committee voted to advance the policy for a final reading in the May 12, 2014 senate meeting with a unanimous vote.
4. The committee discussed the RTP policy, but no specific amendments were made.

Adjourned.

Professional Standards Minutes  
4.7.2014

Present: Bros-Seemann, Brown, Cara, Du, Gottheil, Green, Kauppila, Maldonado-Colon, Peter  
Absent: Kallis

Minutes approval: Pending

Chair Peter provided an update on work in progress related to RTP revisions. Provost Feinstein visited to share his thoughts on expectations related to RTP revisions, and to commend the committee on its work.

Comments: Enjoyable opportunity to learn about faculty on campus and their work.

Suggestions on ways to fine tune—

- Would like to separate the 3 sections—Academic, Service, Scholarship
- In relation to rating scores – He wonders about rating system and the challenge it could pose as it is implemented.
- Binders antiquated. Electronic would be more flexible and accessible.
- SOTES sb electronic.
- Inconsistencies—CVs. For example—
  - On publications—
    - Conference papers vs refereed vs submitted to journal or magazine.
    - What is considered peer review ought to be clarified.
    - Issues related to differences of opinion: department vs college committee vs dean
    - Abstain should come with reasons as to why. Should state grounds for abstention.
    - Elna the # of abstentions has gone up through the years.
- Provost wants more guidance from faculty on these issues and challenges.

Chair Peter—Stating why could help (baseline vs higher levels)'

- Early tenure and promotion issues--- This year there were 8 of 46 requests for early tenure.
  - Criteria: Performance should be excellent compared to all university faculty and in all three categories.

Chair Peter indicated that we have been working on this. Read from new guidelines being developed.

- Provost—Concern: Candidates who come with many years of service credit without sufficient data points while being here.

Chair Peter related with issue on 2-4-6 pattern—

3<sup>rd</sup> year is a critical year. Concern-- Feedback that goes to faculty requires that faculty have more time to improve before final review.

Chair Peter: We are considering a major review before 6<sup>th</sup> year. It would have to be on 4<sup>th</sup> not the 5<sup>th</sup> yr. This is important because publications take more than a year.

Provost agrees.

Peer evaluation forms—Some are helpful and some are worthless.

Chair Peter—Faculty Development should be able to handle with suggestions from us.

Concerning rating system—Necessary.

Bros-Seemann—Major problem in campus-- There is a disconnect between expectations and resources. Can the department be required to develop promotion criteria?

Provost—Guidelines help. Blueprints help. Faculty need to know what to expect clearly. Thais, what must be met. Help them understand.

Cara—Provide guidelines that can help RTP Committees.

Provost—On removal of Chairs-- Process must be clear. Formal consultation with departments is essential.

Agenda Item #4--Voting for candidate for Chairs (external reviews)—

Chair Peter—Committee reminded us, that in the selection process, the rest of the faculty (other than the selection committee) does not have access to confidential information that might affect endorsement.

Information that might impact on votes and recommendations.

Bros-Seemann—Solution is that the Department becomes a committee of the whole.

Chair Peter—Doesn't work because neither probationary nor part-time faculty can serve in the committee.

Bros-Seemann—Suggested having a Committee of the Whole.

Provost—Intent of the Department should be made available to President.

Chair Peter—Faculty needs to understand that they are delegating the authority to select to the Search Committee.

Provost—Consider the option-- Nominating representatives to the committee.

Chair Peter—He added that into revisions

Trend— Units are not having

Andy—Usurps colleges faculty needs. Chair searches require tenure. If they do not work, we have to live with them.

Closing thoughts from Provost--What is the role of the Provost in review process?

He has to rely on department/college peers. What is the true role of the Provost in making the final decision?

Agenda Item # 3—Approval of Library RTP guidelines—

Chair Peter— Two issues:

What is position description?

Kauppila—Position description has been eliminated

Dean with input (Section V.A revised)

Chair Peter—( To AVP Green) Do revisions meet your approval?

AVP Green—Yes

Motion to approve RTP Library guidelines-- msa: Sh/Li (App: 8 Abst: 1  
Absent Jeff)

Kauppila-- Issue to explore in future—Library Faculty doesn't have a Chair.

Agenda Item #4--Selection of Department Chairs- Discussion resumes--

Chair Peter—Of concern. Must work on it. The goal is to have something  
ready for Senate approval by Fall.

Dean of H & A asked for advise concerning issue with School of Music  
and Dance.

Green—Department will collect votes from whole and  
recommendation will be forwarded to Department Recruitment  
Committee, and to Dean, and to Provost/President.

Bros-Seemann—Why not have the department share their vote with  
the Committee?

Chair Peter—Committee should take feedback as an advisory vote.

Green—Doesn't know of factions in departments.

Chair Peter—What do you want to do with this policy this year?  
Senate was split on this issue.

Bros-Seeman---Suggestions--

Modify F 02-04, which already needs modification.

Next year? Start talking to Departments about RTP.

Start having conversation w UCCD about proposed changes  
and suggestions to Chair selection process.

Chair Peter—Will bring a draft to UCCD for feedback/suggestions on  
pending issues related to RTP before we present them to the  
Senate.

Bros-Seemann -- Start conversation on Chair selection

Chair Peter—Vote on modifications to proposed Policy Recomm on  
Selection and Review of Dept Chairs

Bros-Seemann —Get department's feedback on how proposed

Chair Peter— Issue: Removal of Department Chair—Must be  
investigated further. Should a petition be necessary? From  
whom? If so, should the vote be 2/3 votes vs majority of  
faculty? Needed: A process. It will be on agenda next time.

Cara—Should we consult with CFA? Chairs are part of contract.

Chair Peter— Will send to UCCD and CFA for feedback on the next  
draft.

Agenda Item--Board of Academic Freedom— continued--  
Ng provided suggestions this morning. Chair Peter will bring back next time.

Agenda Item--RTP Policy-- Link between contract and what we propose.

Review 5.0

5.2 Change in years to submit-- Are we supporting the 3<sup>rd</sup> year dossier with the Annual Summary of Achievements reviews in-between?

5.2.3 Chair Peter--Third year review can trigger a 4<sup>th</sup> year review. Do you want just 1 performance review before tenure review or more than one?

Kauppila—2-4-6 vs 1-3-6 confusing.

Bros-Seemann —Do 3-4-6

Chair Peter—4<sup>th</sup> yr toughest, most explicit

Bros-Seemann —Consider that 3<sup>rd</sup> yr helps organize, follow ups are to add to the dossier.

Maldonado-Colon—What about faculty coming in w credit?

Chair Peter—Do it in 3 + as need? Do as 3 and 4?

Bros-Seemann —Do as 3 and 4.

Brown—Weren't we to reduce the number of dossier submissions?

Bros-Seemann —Why not ask UCCD?

Green-- Contract mandates 2<sup>nd</sup> year recommendation.

Chair Peter-- This takes away ability of university to review someone too quickly.

Bros-Seemann —Take to UCCD

5.3 Standard for retention—Performance in academic assignment—

Bros-Seemann —add academic assignment and service

Chair Peter- Why not scholarship too?

Bros-Seemann —It takes time to develop scholarship

Chair Peter—In cases of academically poor performance, we one must consider that they are harming students.

Bros-Seemann —Failure to teach and to serve students should not be in this section (?)

Du—Is there anything in the contract that requires service?

Cara—Not apparently.

Chair Peter—Is it possible to retain without scholarship?

Brown—Won't know until 4<sup>th</sup> year.

Du—There are cases where department does not support this.

Bros-Seemann —We should advance argument that it takes time to develop scholarship but not service. Thus, academic and service should be primary criteria to advance.

Green—What happens if they do not develop scholarship?

Chair Peter—Keep for 6 years.

Cara—Expectations for scholarship sometimes supersede Teaching and Service

Bros-Seemann --- Focus should be on not hurting our students academically and on providing service to students and colleagues.

5.4 Not clear on professional development plan.

Chair Peter—Shall I dispense with it?

Bros-Seemann —Check drop box for feedback. Only chance we have to insist that resources need to be allocated to support process.

Resource levels for achievement (?).

Du—Post-tenure review—Need to have the Committee Chair signature.

4:00 Adjourned



Minutes Of The Professional Standards Committee

March 17, 2014

Attendees: Peter, K.; Greene, E.; Kallis, J.; Gottheil, N.; Maldonado, E.; Cara, E.; Kauppila, P.; Bros, S.; Brown, K.

The meeting was commenced at 2 PM.

The minutes of the February 24, 2014, meeting were approved with a modification that Elizabeth Cara was not listed as present but she was present and the minutes were corrected.

The committee dealt with the referral on the assignment of textbooks written, or put together, by professors and required for the course. The question as to a conflict of interest was raised and S 98 – 9 was referenced. It was reiterated that it was not a violation or conflict of interest if the book was published. It was also noted that if the profits from a textbook were donated that would not be a conflict. The discussion included issues on transparency of pricing and profits generated; the evaluation of the books by a faculty committee and the relative price of the book as compared to other similar material. The committee suggested a survey be done to determine the percentage of faculty that used self-published material that was required in their course and generated income. A question was raised as to whether self-published material that was then assigned was an abuse of the faculty members position.

The RTP revision was reviewed. Shannon agreed to provide new language for 3.5.4.4.2. The language will deal with resources that need to be provided to meet the level of achievement that is required in the RTP process.

Section 3.5.4.1 was discussed with respect to the approval of department guidelines by the department and then Faculty Affairs.

Section 3.5.4.3 was discussed with respect to the use of accreditation in personnel evaluations. The committee then looked at timing for tenure and promotion to associate and to Prof. The issue of early tenure and promotion were reviewed. Section 4.1.1.1 was referenced and Faculty Affairs indicated the contract language would start the next academic year.

Section 5.0 was then discussed. Shannon provided a history on multi-cycle reviews. She pointed out that there was insufficient time to do a proper review in the second year. There was additional discussion about a second year Department review to assist tenure-track faculty in putting together their dossier for the third year. The committee discussed third and sixth year reviews with the requirements that faculty goals be included. The committee discussed annual reviews and felt that they were of questionable value for most faculty.

A vote was taken for requiring a second year departmental review and was passed 6 to 1. An additional vote was taken on a third-year full dossier review with the ability to recommend a fourth and fifth year review. A third year dossier review with fourth and fifth year reviews being able to be requested by the 3<sup>rd</sup> year committee was approved by an 8 to 0 vote.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted M. Jeffrey Kallis

Minutes

2/24/14

Industrial Studies 117B

Meeting called to order at 2:10 adjourned 4:03

Chair Kenneth Peter

Present: Peter, Brown, Du, Green, Maldonado-Colon, Gottheil, Bros-Seemann.

1. Minutes approved unanimously.

BAFPR- send back to board and ask them to: 1. Remove vetoable phrases like "on consent", 2. Settle jurisdictional confusion (**faculty on faculty complaints vs. faculty on administration complaints**) about what the board does. Unanimous vote to send back to the board.

2. Electronic Dossiers- - provost sent copy of UNLV RTP policy that is similar to the one we are proposing that also includes electronic dossiers. Suggestion to review the policy and decide if electronic dossiers should be included in the RTP policy that we draft in a general way and then leave details of the policy to faculty affairs and the senate to implement.

Options:

1. Informal consultation with faculty affairs
2. Get senate endorsement via sense of senate resolution
3. Faculty affairs announces possibility of electronic dossiers.

Consensus that electronic dossiers would be discussed in a "resolve" clause of the RTP policy- professional standards will consult with faculty affairs to implement electronic dossiers.

3. **RTP Policy**- UNLV policy is very close to the one we are proposing with criteria, minimum in each category, language etc. Suggested that committee review this specific policy.

3.5.1.3- guidelines should be used when appropriate

3.5. 2.2- deleted exclusively

3.5.2.3- Changed may to should

3.5. 2. 6- jurisdiction= chair's description?

(Need to revise the policy on appointment letter)

"...faculty must be advised to the interdigitation among appointment letter, chair's description and specialized guidelines"

3.4.5.1 add "College and" or nothing that stops a department or several departments from adopting the college or same guidelines.

3.5.4.2 can consult with departments and colleges (take out leader).

3.5. 4. 3 Guidelines should be reviewed as part of the program planning process and if modified resubmitted for approval.

3.5.4.4 Department guidelines should meet these conditions.

4.1.1 , 4.2 will move into 5.0

4.2 and 4.3 lay out the information putting, "typical" first then atypical. Keep these parallel throughout.

Standards sound good- clear and fair- committee each voiced agreement.

Future:

1. Give thought to 5.0 probationary reviews- what do we do to help faculty move through the process.
2. Think about when the BIG year reviews should occur. Beef up third year review so as to get reasonable feedback or feedback in a reasonable amount of time to address it?

## **Professional Standards Committee**

### **Minutes 17 February 2014**

*Members in attendance: Peter, Bros-Seeman Brown, Cara, Du, Gottheil, Green, Kallis, Kaupilla Maldonado-Colon*

1. Called to order 2:05. All members present by 2:25
2. Minutes for 3 February 2014 approved without revision
3. Library RTP Guidelines reviewed. The Committee agreed that the Library had satisfactorily resolved nearly all our earlier questions/issues. However, a couple of new questions now arose. The Committee agreed to send the Guidelines back to the Library for additional questions to be answered: what is "position description"? what is meaning of the "person to whom candidate reports"? In addition, the TOC should be updated to reflect changes in text. The Committee agreed that we will try to complete this approval process by the end of the term, so that the Library will be able to apply its new guidelines this coming fall.
4. Referral of F10-4, Department chair review policy. A couple of recent department chair removals has raised questions about the details of the policy. Interim Provost Feinstein willing to come to talk to us about the problems in the policy. Discussion points: how high a priority is this? It's a relatively rare event. But appears to have become more frequent recently. Faculty need to be consulted, even if president doesn't take the advice. Results of reviews are not transparent. Summaries are too vague. Policy is only 4 years old. This is a symptom of current governance climate. Suggestion to table until next fall, after RTP finished and maybe BFR as well. Committee agreed. We will take up F10-4 next year.
5. Referral of Canvas "policy" for our review. Discussion points: this is not a policy, so shouldn't be called policy. To make it a policy would make it relatively inflexible, by requiring senate review and presidential approval each time Academic Technology wanted to change anything. Suggestion that the document should reference current actual policies. Chair Peter will send a memo to Academic Technology summarizing our conclusions, and we'll be done with this referral.

6. Continued discussion of RTP policy revision, sections 1.0 through 3.4. Discussion points:  
Possible accreditation problems in Business. Requirement for departments to create "guidelines" or "expectations." Nature of review for departmental "guidelines" or "expectations." Required narrative statement from candidates.

Will pick up next time with section 4. Also we need to give attention to "retention" [probationary developmental section].

7. Adjourned at 3:45 pm.

*Minutes reported by Seat A: Green*

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS  
COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – February 3, 2:00PM-4:00PM

IS 117B

Chair: Kenneth Peter

1. Present: Bros-Seemann, Brown, Cara, Gottheil, Green, Kauppila, Maldonado-Colon, Peter

Absent: Kallis, Du

2. Approved the minutes of January 27th

3. Action Item: Amendment to F12-6 “Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty”  
Excluding courses of small size from teaching evaluations (from SERB.)

The Committee discussed whether teachers who have between 5 to 9 students should be automatically enrolled for SOTES or have to opt in. The Committee agreed that faculty should have to opt out of SOTES and not in.

**M)** Cara **S)** Maldonado- Colon to change the language to make teachers have to opt out for SOTES as compared to opt in.

Vote: 8-0-0

Motion Carried

4. Action Item: Redraft of the Resolution on faculty hiring. Discussion of Fall 2013 Faculty stats.

The Committee discussed the statistics that are being used to measure how many teachers are currently employed. Mr. Peter said that the “instructional faculty” statistic is completely different from previous years and so this year cannot be compared to the others in terms of hiring. The “all faculty” statistics were accurate, and so all the charts in the resolution were changed to the “all faculty” stats. Mr. Peter showed the Committee data on the tenure density of San Jose State. The data showed that less than half of the instructional faculty are tenure/tenure track. However in terms of total faculty it increased by 4 headcount for Fall 2013.

The Committee agreed that the previous rationale for keeping low teacher to student ratio and then replacing tenure/tenure track faculty with lecturers is unwise, that there needs to be more permanent faculty, and a good hiring pool would be the part time faculty currently working here. The Committee agreed that they would like to reach the CSU average of at least 62% for tenure/tenure track faculty. Mr. Peters said that they could add new language about realigning strategic priorities to hire permanent faculty and would look into further revising the language.

Ms. Bros added "permanent faculty" in bullet point 2.

**M) Ms. Bros S) Ms. Green** to approve the resolution as amended.

Vote: 8-0-0

Motion Carried

#### 5. Discussion Item: Discussion of draft of RTP policy.

The Committee discussed how to get rid of the numeric description and instead do it through a more abstract way.

Ms. Bros stressed that you need a matrix of some kind in the policy because if there is no numbers then you need a matrix to show all the different combinations. She also changed the word "minimum" to "baseline" in the policy.

Mr. Peters added that there needs to be guidelines for each category for comparisons as well. The Committee also discussed early tenure promotion. The Committee agreed that there needs to be a clear and defined criteria for it.

#### New Business

##### 1. Discussion Item: Electronic Dossiers

The Committee discussed whether to survey faculty to see if they want electronic dossiers. They also thought to do a sense of the senate to get a feeling for how Professional Standards could further pursue this, perhaps appointing a task force for implementation.

##### 2. Discussion Item: Canvas

The Committee discussed whether or not the contracts with Canvas are also policy. Ms. Maldonado-Colon said that it is more of a handbook than policy. Mr. Peters said for them to get back to him with any feedback.

Mr. Peters adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

Note Taker,

Nathan Gottheil



PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
Minutes January 27, 2014  
Karin Brown

Present: Kenneth Peter, Elisabeth Cara, Elba-Maldonado-Colon, Elna Green, Jeff Kallis, Shannon Bros-Seemann.

Absent: Winncy Du, Paul Kauppila, Nathan Gottheil.

The minutes from November 25, and December 2, 2013 were approved.

1. In order to preserve students anonymity, the Student Evaluations Review Board (SERB) requested to amend the policy and specify that SOTES shall not be administered in classes with less than five students.

The committee will propose the following amendment for the Senate approval:

“SOTES shall be administered in all classes with enrollments of 10 or more students and shall not be administered in classes with enrollments of less than 5 students. In courses with enrollments of 5-9 students, evaluation shall be at faculty request.”

2. The percentage of permanent faculty at SJSU is low and is on the decline. The percentage of permanent faculty decreased from 55% in 2012 to 52% in 2013. The Committee will draft a state of the senate resolution on faculty hiring.
3. Guest: Wendy Ng, chair of Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR).

Currently the referrals to the BAFPR are inconsistent and the charge of the committee is not clear. The BAFPR requests clarity regarding to the scope of its responsibility, particularly pertaining to disputes among faculty.

4. Due to concerns of rigidity in the Retention, Tenure and Promotion policy (RTP), the committee will replace the number scale in faculty evaluations with language.

Adjourned.

# Professional Standards Committee

## Minutes

### December 2, 2013

---

Present: Peter, Green, Maldonado-Colon, Du, Bros-Seemann (Note taker), Gottheill  
Absent: Brown, Kallis, Cara, Kauppila

Meeting came to order at 2:20 when a quorum was available.

- 1) BAFPR
  - a) Green
    - i) The impetus for this policy is a single case but it is a major revision
    - ii) The policy takes ultimate decision away from admin
    - iii) Not clear what problem to be resolved. Suggestion – go back to committee
  - b) Group – discussed ideas
  - c) Ken
    - i) Suggested that we table the policy for now and bring in Wendy Ng to talk to us
  - d) Elba
    - i) Major problem that she noticed was the lack of an appeal process in current policy
  - e) Shannon – asked Elna if she had any issues with the present policy
  - f) Elna
    - i) Concern that faculty vs faculty was always referred to FA and not referred to BFR  
(1) Ken pointed out that the policy did not really state that.
  - g) Ken
    - i) Need to have a conversation with all involved
  - h) Shannon – suggest that we start with a list of things that appear to be broken
    - i) Worried about too much detail on procedure.

**Action item: Tabled to next meeting**

- 2) RTP
  - a) Ken
    - i) Went through changes
    - ii) Explained minimum levels
  - b) Debate on categories

**Action item: Decided on needs improvement, minimum, good, excellent & truly outstanding**

- c) Discussion on possible pushback for departmental expectations
  - i) Elba - Item 7 – always a choice between university and departments. In the past, there was concern from the Provost and FA that guidelines from each department would not be manageable.
  - ii) Elna - Current admin does not share that position and the dossiers already incorporate guidelines
  - iii) Ken – other campuses actually have more onerous documentation (e.g. guidelines) that were proposed by admin. Problem will come from faculty and chairs who resist dept level guidelines
- d) Shannon – need to have a statement in 8 about needing more than minimum.

---

**Action item:** Add a statement about needing more than the minimum as 8d

- e) .
  - f) Elba
    - i) 7b. Scholarship. 7c. Service and teaching put together. Why?
  - g) Debate on numbers
    - i) Ken - Asked about keeping the numbers
    - ii) General consensus was that we should leave it as is
    - iii) Shannon – Perhaps put examples of possibilities as an appendix
  - h) Ken
    - i) What is the point of having a category 5 if 8 is the minimum total?
    - ii) Answer: this provides a mechanism for getting early decision.
  - i) Elna
    - i) 8a needs to remove “good” as it implies needing a level 3 for teaching.
  - j) Had a general discussion about student perspective on important characteristics for faculty.
- 3) Adjourned 3:47

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS  
COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – November 25, 2:00PM-4:00PM

IS 117B

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Bros-Seeman, Brown, Cara, Du, Gottheil, Green, Kallis, Kauppila, Maldonado-Colon,  
Peter

Absent: none

1. Minutes of the 10-7-2013 and 10-28-2013 meetings were approved after minor corrections.
2. Discussion item: **Flexible Achievement Plan**

Senators' questions about the plan indicated a concern that the Flexible Achievement Plan, in spite of its name, would be more restrictive than what is currently in place. Specificity of expectations remains a difficult issue, as does different standards across disciplines.

Kallis: Departmental guidelines can't be separated from individual expectations.

Cara: How to encourage departments without their own RTP guidelines to create them?

Bros-Seeman: Is the appointment letter specific enough? How would departments deal with unexpected changes in the faculty member's research priorities?

Green: Faculty can get new appointment letters as their academic assignment and/or research priorities change.

Aviation was mentioned as a program substantially different from other disciplines.

Committee members asked which documents would "trump" others if there are inconsistencies. Green answered: CFA contract > Academic Senate policy > letter of appointment.

Bros-Seeman: Interdisciplinary faculty must be taken into account ("cluster hires").

Peter pointed out that the original intent of the plan was to increase flexibility even though some senators did not see it that way.

A discussion followed of the pros and cons of the numerical scale proposed as part of the plan. Some committee members argued for more use of quantitative methods like the scale while others argued for less.

Bros-Seeman: Teaching and service expectations should be set by the university but research expectations should be set by individual departments. Several committee members agreed.

Kauppila: Does not support the use of the numerical scale (lengthy explanation followed.)

Bros-Seeman: Pointed out that we judge students' academic performance using quantitative methods – why should faculty be any different?

Discussion followed on the numerical scale itself and how many levels it should have. An informal vote was taken and more committee members favored the 3-level scale. After more discussion an informal vote was taken again and this time the 4-level scale was favored.

The committee then considered what language should be used in the descriptions of the four levels of achievement and how many points would be necessary for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

Peter: Some senators will be against mandatory departmental guidelines.

Kallis: Make the creation of departmental guidelines opt-in instead of opt-out.

Peter: Some departments devalue service – this policy will establish minimum levels of service and teaching.

The committee continued to discuss differing standards among disciplines, appointment letters, and other aspects of the Flexible Achievement Plan.

3. Discussion item: Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility.

Kallis explained the proposed changes to be made to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility policy. Bros-Seeman suggested a change to section 1-6. A general “softening” of the language was encouraged.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 4:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Kauppila

=====  
=====10-28-13 Meeting Minutes =====

Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes

2:00-4:00 pm, October 28, 2013, Industrial Studies Building 117B

Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker: Seat E (Winncy Du)

Attendees: Karin Brown, Elizabeth Cara, Winncy Du, Nathan Gottheil, Elna Green, Jeff Kallis, Paul Kauppila, Elba Maldonado-Colon, Kenneth Peter

Invited Guests: Mohammad Qayoumi (President), Andrew Hale Feinstein (Deputy Provost), Lynda Heiden (Senate Chair)

Absent: Shannon Bros

Meeting was called at 2:03 pm by Kenneth.

1. No previous (10/7/13) meeting minutes was approved (the minutes are not received yet);
2. Discussion on Faculty's *Intellectual Property* (IP) for online teaching/e-lecture/distance learning materials. Shall the Committee make any recommendations to the C&R regarding its draft policy? Related IP in the CFA bargaining and the Udacity contract were reviewed and discussed:

-- Current Udacity contract does not align with the bargaining agreement.

-- If the University (or a company like Udacity) extraordinarily supports the faculty, for the online courses, is the IP still owned by the faculty, or by the University, or jointly own by the University and the faculty member.

Jeff made a motion to allow the faculty who developed the materials can have the copyright and can take the materials with them to other institutions without approval of the U. The motion was approved (9:0).

3. Discussion of possible revisions to AS 1523 "Sense of the Senate Resolution Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty at SJSU."

Ken shared some data that he collected based on several suggestions from the last Senate meeting.

President Qayoumi is invited regarding the resolution and to discuss the problem more generally. Key comments on T/TT faculty hiring from the President:

-- T/TT is very important to the U. In the last 10 years or so, due to the budget went down, SJSU didn't replace TT position, but more lectures – current 50%.

-- We don't see new \$ coming, what we can do?

(1) Teach 5 course vs. 4 course (e.g., load is 1.2 instead of 1.0).

(2) Increasing TT number would also improve Student/Faculty (S/F) ratio.

(3) Financial reality to increase S/F ratio (with an assumption that no improvement on financial situation expected to see in next 7 years).

In addition:

-- Increase enrolment or increase courses taught by part-time faculty;

-- Increase non-resident students.

Ken: we have more/largest MS programs, this could affect the ratio due to the nature of MS? We are low F/S ratio. Other campus hire more, what is model campus?

Mo: retention and F/S ratio are the lowest on SJSU campus among the CSU. CSU-fullerton has the highest F/S ratio.

Jeff: how meet 16.9% goal, change the size of capstone course (~35 students per class). Class time could be changed (e.g., allow the most critical contents to be taught in classroom, rest contents could be taught online or learned by students themselves. Would like to see which solution works.

4. Amending S99-9 "Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility"



Jeff gave the rational of issue and mentioned that these suggestions came from last year's Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BFR).

Ken gave the brief history about the BAFPR (the board started 1991, consisting of all full-professors).

Elna suggested to revise Item 2 in the amendment, and the committee decided to look at the paragraph 2 before the next meeting (?).

5. "Flexible Achievement Resolution." Shall the Committee adopt this resolution to present to the Academic Senate for a first reading at the November 18 meeting?

Jeff suggested that "Expectation" should be departmentalized. The committee will continue discussion on the RTP issue.

6. Tenure-track position application from part-time faculty or lecturer. Elba talked about the issue. One suggestion is to add "encourage" retention.

7. Senate chair, Lynda Hyden, said hello and "thank you" to every PS committee member.

Meeting adjourn at 4:08 pm.

After the meeting, the PS student member (Nathan) invited the PS committee members to stay for a conversation on his ideas about increasing student involvement in the Academic Senate.

Tentative Timeline:

Oct. 28	BAFPR	FlexAchieve	T/TT Proportion
No.4	Revise	Revise	Revise
Nov. 18 (senate)	1 <sup>st</sup> Read	1 <sup>st</sup> Read	Final
Nov. 25	Revise	Revise	
Dec. 2	Revise	Revise	
Dec. 9	Final	Final	

Meeting Minutes (Jeff kalis)

October 7, 2013 Meeting Started at 14:02

Present Peters; King; Kaupilla; Gottheil; Maldemado-Colon, Kallis; Cara; Brown, Du and Bros

Minutes amended /per Kaupilla observation that the Library had some pre-existing policies corrected Item # 5, Minutes then approved

Joined by: Suta Sujilparapitaya re: SOTES

New SOTE system will be fully on line by 5-2013

Norming will be based on a 5 year average

Currently the norm is based on a 6 semester average.

Prior paper SOTES were higher than the new electronic SOTES

For now the electronic norms will be based on the electronic SOTES in hand

Reason for Norm change: paper use some classes, electronic uses all

There is also an increase in students responding

SOTE security will be developed via My.SJSU in the CMS system,

The fall back is PDF copies

There is a desire to make SOTES a positive influence rather than a source of complaint This means that there will have to be resources to help train faculty based on SOTE issues

E-DOSSIER Liz Cara

There are currently 11 Universities using e-dossiers including Channel Islands

Two views emerged: 1] find an existing system to modify; 2] build our own and then sell it.

PSC needs to create a policy and then get a SOS on it.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY Joined by Cathy Cheal issue re: Udacity

Udacity mentors are not TA's; their name needs to be changed to Tech Support

If technical problems raised by students faculty needs to refer to help desk and not try to solve them themselves

The ownership of IP is still unclear. Faculty owns unless University provides some undefined level of support that is extraordinary. (see CFA/CSU contract Article 39).

Request a joint committee meeting with CR to iron out language.

RTP

Agreement to ask for a SOS on proposed RTP changes

Standards need to be different for performance art based department. Important that they have the necessary financial resources and have appropriate time lines for RTP purposes.

Some question as to expectations and how the term is used. Expectations are not individual, but group based.

Discussion of catalog rights and their impact.

General consensus on use of point system. Concerns raised as how point system is developed and how it is implemented. Suggestion that it be more of an "accounting" system than an evaluative system.

Meeting adjourned at 16:04

Professional Standards Committee Minutes  
September 30, 2013

Present: Peter, Maldonado-Colon, Cara (notetaker), Green, Brown, Gottheil, Kallis,  
Bros-Seaman, Kaupilla

Called to order: 1:59 pm.

1. Minutes approved with minor revisions.
2. Guests- Stuart Ho, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics,
3. Rachel French, (Dept. of Biology Chair, Student Evaluation Review Board
4. James Lee, past Chair, Student Evaluation Review Board - operating committee with members who are experts on evaluation and statistics to answer question.

*How to deal with threats made by students in anonymous SOTES?*

Contract specifies that they have to be anonymous.

Brainstormed ideas of how to handle- student needs counseling, will always have aberrant behavior, court could potentially demand records and if they are on the computer then they are traceable, though programmer states that it cannot be done. Has not gone unnoticed and an investigation continues. University has duty to protect students and faculty, university legal counsel should be consulted. Peters could address a letter to President, CFA President asking for advice.

*Have norms changed on electronic SOTES?*

Lee suggested that each individual compare their own. Peters suggested that IEA develop norms for electronic SOTES and compare with written ones. Ho can compare the norms. Create a more expanded list of norms by class size, class topic, average, expected grades or other relevant differentiation, etc.

*Can results be provided electronically?* Faculty would log into mysjsu, and deans and department chairs would have log in rights to a secure shell. Controlled by faculty affairs. Faculty affairs has not yet received data so cannot evaluate if data is safe or secure. What about hackers?

*Courses not on usual AY schedule and off-campus courses are planned*

*When can we expect G.5 to be implemented?*

Is almost finished.

*D.4, shared qualitative question is being implemented.*

*How to deal with E.9 the exclusion of WU students from the SOTES?*

Faculty need to know that they need to give a WU early if they want to exclude them from the SOTES. Cannot stop them once the SOTES have been filled out.

*Should there be a policy that excludes certain classes, supervision, few students, etc.?*

Should there be a number of students in a class that excludes SOTES.

*What have SERB learned from first go-round of electronic SOTES?. Any problematic areas?*

Difficult communication with the administrative departments.

“People generally do not like change”.

Center for Faculty Development collaboration is problematic.

but There are instructions on how to interpret the SOTES available to all few seem to read them.

5. Library RTP Guidelines- unique circumstances

Two level committees- first level-and assoc. and full prof-similar to dept committee - second level only full- replicates college comm.

Library leadership committee in 2013 revised the 2004 RTP guidelines, eg, librarians may have two masters so do not have to publish in library information science but publish in other disciplines.

Change in language and also relies more on letters of evaluation from other faculty in departments librarians work with. Recommended guidelines for the letters.

Also have letters of evaluation that come from in the library – coordinators.

Closer to developing an assessment instrument for “one shot” teaching sessions (contentious concept for last 15 years).

Included standards in the appendices.

Suggestions for change came from the committee

**Action Item:** Motion made to send to faculty affairs withdrawn

Motion by Peters, second by Bros-Seaman to faculty affairs that the library guidelines be returned to library with suggestions for improvements- clearer distinction between mpp and faculty evaluation, frequency of dept evaluations needs to be clarified- what is a review period, sections that are not relevant to the use of university committee be removed- FERP, Post tenure review, appendices.

Suggestion that policy return to Prof Stan Comm with revisions. Unanimous 9- 0.

6. Sense of Senate Resolution- “Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty”- revisions delineated by Peter

Action Item: Motion to Accept by Bros-Seaman, second by Brown. Motion approved 6 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstained.

Next time: Report on RTP Status

Professional Standards Committee  
Minutes September 9, 2013

Attending: Peter, Bross-Seeman, Brown, Cara, Du, Gottheil, Green, Kallis, Kaupilla, Maldonado-Colon,

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00pm.
2. Minutes of August 26, 2013 were approved.
3. Chair Peter provided updates on subject and guests for next meetings—
  - a. Sutee will visit us on September 30 to address issues related to the electronic implementation of SOTES.
  - b. A representative of the School of Library will share with us their new RTP guidelines. Chair Peter mentioned that the School of Library Sciences had their own guidelines first. However with changes in policy and practices, they have made revisions.
  - c. Visitors will join us later in the semester to discuss “mentor” and intellectual property issues associated with our Udacity experiments.
4. Resolution from us to Senate on SJSU’s shortage of tenured and tenure track faculty. To connect with previous discussion on August 26<sup>th</sup>, Chair Peter referred us to the CSU Chancellor’s data report and to OIR’s data and information. From ample discussion the committee decided to—
  - a. Chair Peter will draft a resolution for our consideration. The resolution should help strengthen the Provost’s position on fairness, efficiency, and meaningful professional growth.
  - b. The resolution should be related to retention and graduation and the role of faculty in facilitating these goals; and must also take into consideration also the characteristics of the new generation entering our campus.
  - c. The committee will like to review the proposed policy drafted in 2002, thus it will be sent to us.
  - d. Committee members should also review-- *Response to ACR 73 (Strom-Martin) --A plan to increase the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the California State University*
5. Planning for RTP reform. The committee brainstormed about organization of our RTP reform. In discussions, we must clarify and distinguishing between –
  - a. Drafting overall criteria and department specific criteria.
  - b. Must keep in mind that the goal would be to encourage departments to develop specific criteria related to their field.
  - c. Consider creating universal criteria and ask departments to align with and develop their own.

- d. To capture the expectations consider suggesting a comprehensive handbook that could be developed at college or department level.
- e. Decision related to revisions to the RTP process – Possible way to approach it is by dividing it into 3 major tasks--
  - 1. Focus on criteria—Pull criteria out of existing doc and look for ways to clarify and/or improvement. Consider that at least 40% of the colleges must engage in some form of program accreditation.
  - 2. Develop procedures---Bulk of the document. Could be done after criteria are elaborated.
  - 3. Identify potential standard operating procedures/ documentation-e.g. dossier, dividers, electronic format. Such changes might not require major policy modifications. To explore—Portability, security, flexibility, evaluation, storage, and existing models and challenges they face. For comparability consider CSU's of equal profile as ours as well as other universities out of state, and effective business models.
- c. Committee membership—
  - 1. Criteria/procedures—Bros-Seeman, Green, Peter, Brown, Maldonado-Colon
  - 2. Potential standard operating procedures/documentation Electronic dossier—Finding out what is possible and doable. Kauppila, Kara, Du, and Kallis, Gottheil To consider-- How are they used? Privacy concerns? Protected? Implemented? Evaluated? Is there any value in having the sub-committee identify some sources to develop the software?
- d. Timeline-- Initial draft--Both sub-committees would have a report or draft on **October 7**

- 5. New business—Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility Requests that we review the documents they have developed before they are brought to the Senate. Kallis reported-- The committee met with Provost last year. Provost Junn encouraged re-writing procedures. The committee worked on them. However, they never came to Professional Standards, thus, they would like to submit them to us for review. The document intends to clarify areas where there were issues related to division of responsibilities, and procedures.
  - a. What were main issues?
    - 1. The old policy was conflicting on what to investigate and the process to follow, particularly during the meet and confer stage. Hence, the need to eliminate ambiguity and to clarify.
    - 2. There was contention with Faculty Affairs.



The committee was supposed to investigate issues impinging on academic freedom, however we could not write any recommendations to the parties. The Board had to turn their draft to Faculty Affairs, not to the parties involved. The Board felt that if they investigate, they should be the ones making recommendations and distribute them. The suggestions provided were intended to improve relations.

- b. Chair Peter reviewed—The function of Board of Academic Freedom and Responsibility has a historical perspective. Professor Roy Young brought the issues to the Senate and suggested options— He proposed an ethics board added. The proposal was amended several times. When there are disputes related to academic freedom or conduct, the Board serves as an advisory body to try to resolve the problem. Faculty would like CFA to be involved, not just to let Faculty Affairs be the decision-maker.
- c. Kallis clarified issues--We found that for years complaints to the Office of Faculty Affairs never got to the Board. Hence, process was usurped.
- d. Chair Peter suggested that we would review the proposed amendments clarifying roles of both the Board and the Office of FA.

Meeting adjourned 3:25.

Minutes taker: Maldonado-Colon

## Professional Standards Committee

### Minutes for 26 August 2013

*Members in attendance: Peter, Brown, Cara, Du, Gottheil, Green, Maldonado-Colon*

*Members absent: Bros-Seeman, Kallis, Kaupilla*

1. Called to order at 2:05 pm. Seven members present by 2:20 pm.
2. Minutes for 29 April 2013 read and amended [Brown was present]. Approved as amended 4 ayes, 2 abstentions, 4 absences.
3. Introductions and quick orientation to the Committee's business.
4. Update on implementation of SOTEs. Some successes and some failures. Higher response rates than paper versions. Some other requirements not implemented as we wanted. Results weren't reported back with breakdown by expected grades. We will request that SERB and Sutee come give us an update on 1<sup>st</sup> round at a future meeting.

5. MOOC issues. Questions for Professional Standards:

Should we have some kind of guidelines or rules for the "mentors"? They aren't hired by us, the faculty don't have any say in what they do. Contract with Udacity leaked out, but has very little detail and doesn't include the answers to the questions we are asking.

Do these new technologies need new policy to protect faculty—their pedagogies, their lecture content? Where do the lectures get saved? Can students copy materials they have access to? How do we record, and not discourage free discussion?

The Committee agreed that we must learn more before undertaking the creation of any policies. We planned to invite faculty who have taught in Udacity courses [perhaps Ron Rogers], Cathy Cheal [from Academic Technology], and maybe others to give us information on these technologies.

6. Status of tenure track faculty. What can we do as a senate to support the effort to improve ratio of tenure/tenure track? How to encourage the president to support? A sense of the senate resolution? The Committee discussed focusing the message on advising, which the president seems to value. Another emphasis could be a focus on the role of the permanent faculty in the improvement of graduation and retention rates. Another focus could be on research productivity—tenured faculty are going to do that kind of work, and have the ability to bring in the grants.

The Committee will continue to work on this question.

7. Organizing the RTP agenda for the year. For the benefit of the new members, the Committee reviewed briefly the activities from last year (surveys of the faculty, etc). The Committee discussed some of the major concerns that the campus has expressed about the current RTP policy (such as lack of clarity at points), as well as some of the difficulties we face in revising it. At the hour of adjournment, the Committee had not laid firm plans for approaching this major project.
8. There was no other business.
9. Adjournment at 4:00 pm.

*Minutes reported by Seat A: Green*