2018-2019 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee: Professional Standards

Chair: Kenneth Peter	**Chair-Elect for 2019-2020**: Kenneth Peter 924-55562 0119 Kenneth.peter@sjsu.edu (Please include phone/zip/email if available)
Number of Meeting held: 18	

Items of Business Completed 2018/2019

1. SSR and Policy Proposal (Vetoed) on Information Privacy

2. Anti-Bullying Resolution.

3.Revised policy on Direct Instructional Obligations

4. Amendment clarifying provenance of RTP Late Add Guidelines and prepared new guidelines

5. Disposed of numerous official referrals, several inquiries about RTP, and several sets of department guidelines.

Unfinished Business Items from 2018/2019

1. Revision of Lecturer's Policy

2. Revision of BAFPR policy

New Business Items for 2019/2020

1. Pursue oversight over "training" of RTP committees.

2.

3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by June 4, 2019.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for May 7th, 2018

Meeting 19: May 7, 2018
Clark Hall 445, 2:00-3:00 PM

Present: Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, Stephen He, Michael Kimbarow, Roxana Marachi Alison McKee, Kenneth Peter, Brandon White

1. Meeting was call to order at 2:00pm and minutes of April 23rd were approved

2. Updates: All three Professional Standards policies passed the Senate (GRIF, modification of period for the "mini" reviews, and Awards policies. These three join the Academic Freedom policy awaiting the President's review. In total, there are four policies awaiting approval.

3. Review of Teacher Education Guidelines
   Recommended revisions are as follows:
   a. The final version needs to have the date and vote on the front page.

   b. Service section is brief and written with general language that does not add specificity intended for supplemental guidelines (especially compared to the earlier two sections for Teaching/Scholarship). This section would be improved if described in more detail- or the department may consider not including at all if it doesn't add more substantively to the current Service guidelines. If revised, department may want to indicate that because of the nature of its mission, deep service to community and profession is highly valued and/or to highlight more specifically the various *kinds* of community and/or professional service that should be acknowledged. What would constitute excellent, good, or baseline service, in ways that are otherwise not measurable?

   c. Additional detail in the following areas would strengthen the guidelines.
      i. It would be helpful to have an example of what is meant by "curricular product" (line 11 of Section II). If reviewers are unfamiliar with the work you do to understand standards for scholarship that would warrant a "baseline", "good" or "excellent" designation, what specific information can the department communicate to the next level of review about the *quality* of those accomplishments (in reference to bulleted list on page 3)?
      ii. Clarify what is meant by "the work" (p. 2, 2nd paragraph and throughout document where it may benefit from specificity).
      iii. Consider stratifying bullet point section into baseline, good, and excellent for greater communication about their relative weight in consideration for outside reviewers. While it may be clear to teacher educators what "curricular products" or other work being described are, it may not be apparent to reviewers so the more specificity that could be provided, the better.

d. External peer-review. If bulk of scholarly work is not externally peer-reviewed, faculty may request for this to be done. If faculty member does not request, then consider allowing committee be able to request external peer review. Independent, external review of non-peer reviewed work would strengthen the guidelines and be helpful to both candidates and reviewers.

A motion was made, seconded, and voted on (unanimously) to approve the Teacher Education guidelines with the following contingencies that
a) the recommended revisions described above be voted on and approved by Department Faculty and
b) the Department-approved revisions would then be approved at the discretion of the AVP for Faculty Affairs (Dr. Michael Kimbarow) by the end of the June, 2018.

4. Updates were provided to the committee on previous conversations related to Data Ethics and to the continuing work on a Sense of the Senate resolution on bullying/prevention that would be drafted by the committee for Fall 2018.

5. The meeting was adjourned early (3:00pm) for Provost Feinstein's farewell reception.

The minutes above were provided by Roxana Marachi.

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 1: August 27, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Chin

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of members
    a. Continuing members: Jessica Chin, HHS; Steven He, Business; Alison McKee, H&A; Kenneth Peter, COSS
    b. New members: Anil Kumar, Engineering; Nyle Monday, General Unit; Shelley Cargill, Science; Tabitha Hart, COSS (2); Sarah Rodriguez, Associated Students.
    c. Vacancies: College of Education, AVP for Faculty Affairs.
3. Approval of minutes
    a. of May 7 (Marachi) (Only continuing members vote on approval)
4. Carry over business from AY 2017-18
    a. The revised Academic Freedom policy, which also created an academic freedom committee, was passed unanimously by the Academic Senate on April 9, 2009. It still awaits Presidential action. It has neither been signed nor returned (vetoed.) We had planned a reform of the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility but this cannot begin until we know the fate of the Academic Freedom Policy, which was an integral part of the reform.
    b. An Information privacy policy was passed to replace the obsolete F97-7 by the Senate on April 10, 2017 with no dissent. It was returned with a veto message on April 20, 2018. The veto message, the policy that was vetoed, and a revised policy recommendation which would conform to the veto message are attached. We need to decide on the next step to take given the impasse.
    c. Faculty bullying. The committee last year began research on the problem of faculty bullying, with a consensus that the first step in dealing with this problem is to raise campus awareness through a thoughtful, well researched Sense of the Senate resolution. Alison McKee led the subcommittee doing the research.
    d. Bernier referral. A respected faculty remember has proposed (see memo) that we reform College RTP committees by requiring that the department representative be recused from participating or voting on that department's candidates. We need to respond one way or the other.
5. New referrals for AY 2018-19
    a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
    b. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
    c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.

    d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy.
6. Possible new business for AY 2018-19
    a. Possible response to elimination of the AVP and the Office of Faculty Affairs.
    b. Data ethics policy.
    c. Issues with peer evaluations. A group of Lecturers met with Alison and me last spring and described a pattern of violations of the teaching evaluation policy (F12-6) against Lecturers in particular (though not exclusively.) Complaints included failure to schedule peer observations in advance, failure of the observer to stay for the full session, conflicts of interest, etc.
7. Department Guidelines
    a. Who approves in the absence of an AVP? Suggestion: send our recommendations to Deputy Provost for now.
    b. Political Science Guidelines (note, Chair Peter will recuse himself from voting or leading this discussion, but will be happy to answer questions.)
    c. Teacher Education? Approved pending revisions and AVP's approval.
    d. Child and Adolescent Development? Approved pending revisions and AVP's approval.
8. Proposals from members for future agenda.
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 1: August 27, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Chin
Present: Chin, He, McKee, Peter (chair), Kumar, Monday, Cargill, Hart, Rodriguez

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of members
    a. Continuing members: Jessica Chin, CHaHS; Steven He, Business; Alison McKee, H&A; Kenneth Peter, COSS
    b. New members: Anil Kumar, Engineering; Nyle Monday, General Unit; Shelley Cargill, Science; Tabitha Hart, COSS (2); Sarah Rodriguez, Associated Students.
    c. Vacancies: College of Education, AVP for Faculty Affairs.
3. Approval of minutes
    a. of May 7 (Marachi) (Only continuing members vote on approval): 4 approve, 5 abstain (new members), 0 against. Minutes approved.
4. Carry over business from AY 2017-18
    a. The revised Academic Freedom policy, which also created an academic freedom committee, was passed unanimously by the Academic Senate on April 9, 2018.
        i. Waiting for response from President. (It has neither been signed nor vetoed).
        ii. We had planned a reform of the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) (creating 2 separate committees-- BAF and PR-- from the existing BAFPR committee), but this cannot begin until we know the fate of the Academic Freedom Policy, which was an integral part of the reform.
    b. An Information Privacy Policy was passed to replace the obsolete F97-7 by the Senate on April 10, 2017 with no dissent. It was returned with a veto message on April 20, 2018. The veto message, the policy that was vetoed, and a revised policy recommendation which would conform to the veto message were shared with PS. PS discussed possible next steps.
        i. Option 1: Take no further action; let old policy stand
        ii. Option 2: Pass the document with all suggestions from President, which includes a presidential directive (nonconfrontational)
        iii. Option 3: Pass the document with all suggestions from President and bring forward together with a proposed Sense of the Senate (to go on record) that includes points of emphasis on information privacy important to faculty (i.e., related to presidential directive)
            1. Support for option 3 to advance policy while also voicing important stance of faculty

a. Peter will draft a Sense of the Senate resolution

c. Faculty bullying. The committee last year began research on the problem of faculty bullying (faculty-on-faculty).
    i. Alison McKee is the head of subcommittee to research this issue.
        1. McKee shared some background information on the issue and possible steps forward.
        2. Working on draft of White Paper
    ii. Possible first step is to raise campus awareness through publication and distribution of a well- researched white paper and Sense of the Senate resolution.
    iii. Discussion about tools to help faculty, i.e., basic counseling and advice to faculty
    iv. Need to be clear about definitions and consider various viewpoints and experiences
d. College RTP revision referral (memo).
    i. Memo expressed concern regarding "lack of clarity distinguishing roles performed by different levels of review (especially between departmental and college-level)". Proposed that College level RTP be revised and suggested, for example, that the department representative be recused from participating or voting on that department's candidates.
        1. Most of his suggestions are already existing policy and practice (i.e., distinguishing roles between levels of RTP).
        2. Department representative recusal from decisions on RTP is not supported by PS; input from dept rep at College RTP is important to the conversation and to the RTP decision process at the college level
        3. PS does not recommend taking further action on this referral
        4. Peter will send response from PS to memo author

5. New referrals for AY 2018-19--Peter summarized details of each referral
    a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
    b. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
    c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.
    d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy (question of allowance for exclusion from dossier)
6. Possible new business for AY 2018-19
    a. Possible response to elimination of the AVP and the Office of Faculty Affairs
    b. Data ethics policy
    c. Issues with peer evaluations. A group of Lecturers met with Alison and me last spring and described a pattern of violations of the teaching evaluation policy (F12-6) against Lecturers in particular (though not exclusively.) Complaints included failure to schedule peer observations in advance, failure of the observer to stay for the full session, conflicts of interest, e.g.

i. Peter drafted a "Policies and Best Practices for Direct Observations (Peer Observations) of Teaching" to remind campus of policy and to follow the policy
    1. PS members to provide feedback on draft to Peter

7. RTP Department Guidelines
    a. In the absence of an AVP, we will send recommendations and guidelines to Deputy Provost (Carl Kemnitz) for now.
    b. Political Science Guidelines
        i. Dept vote was 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
        ii. Suggestions include reorganizing numbered bullets; remove good from baseline guidelines; consider rethinking "definitions"
        iii. Vote to approve with consideration of revisions: 8 approve, 0 against, 1 abstain (Peter). Unanimous approval.
            1. McKee will write memo and Peter will send to Carl Kemnitz for review.
    c. Teacher Education guidelines: Approved pending revisions and AVP's approval.
    d. Child and Adolescent Development guidelines: Approved over summer, not posted on website yet
8. Proposals from members for future agenda
    a. Send to Peter
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 2: September 10, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of August 27 (Chin)
3. Consideration of reminder memo on peer evaluations
4. Consideration of Policy Recommendation on Information Privacy
5. Consideration of Sense of Senate Resolution on Information Privacy
6. Questions on new RSCA plan
7. Questions on new cyber-security requirements (Spirion)
8. Consideration of memo response to Bernier
9. Revision of Library RTP Guidelines
10. Updates
11. New referrals for AY 2018-19; Prioritizing
    a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
    b. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
    c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.
    d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy.
12. Proposals from members for future agenda.
13. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 2: September 10, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order at 2 pm.

   Presents: Chin, He, McKee, Peter (chair), Monday (late), Cargill, Hart, Rodriguez
   Absents: Kumar
   Guest: Carl Kemnitz, the Deputy Provost (replacing the AVP of Faculty Affairs on the Professional Standards committee)

2. Approval of minutes of August 27 (Chin)

3. Consideration of reminder memo on peer evaluations

   - Group of lecturers met with Ken and Alison late last spring and complained about the way peer observations are conducting. The existing policy (F12-6) can take care of those problems. Ken prepared a draft of a memo to remind the people of the existing policy provisions. This is the oversight function of the committee.
   - Almost all of the questions can be answered by reading section C of F12-6.
   - The observations can serve both an evaluation purpose and a formative purpose.
   - The committee agreed on the memo with minor changes.

4. Consideration of Policy Recommendation on Information Privacy

   - A policy recommendation prepared by PS passed by the senate in April 2017 to modernize the 1997 policy on privacy of electronic information. The President returned it with veto memo a year later. PS discussed it last time and agreed to prepare a revised policy recommendation that conforms to the President's memo.
   - The policy recommendation is slightly better than the 1997 version and we are better off sending it forward.
   - The Professional Standards Committee approved a first reading of the proposed policy at the next senate meeting. (vote: 7-0-0)

5. Consideration of Sense of Senate Resolution on Information Privacy

   - The PS last meeting agreed to prepare the Sense of Senate Resolution on Information Privacy expressing our continuing support for those portions of the

original policy recommendation that we deleted to make signable by the President.
- The Sense of Senate Resolution is prepared based on the assumption that the Senate passes the policy recommendation and the President signs it.
- By adopting the SOS we will document this dispute, so that the future senate can see the record and may return to the issue in some constructive way.
- The Professional Standards Committee approved a first reading of the proposed SOS at the next senate meeting. (vote: 8-0-0)

6. Questions on new RSCA plan

- We have all received the email from the Provost announcing the new program and some of the faculty have also received an email from Deans.
- The legislature permitted the word "research" to appear in the mission of CSU in 1988, but it was not supported. The faculty has had their work load expanded by adding research but nothing else has been subtracted. We are expected to do research without any reduction in our other responsibilities up until now.
- Q: What is the budgetary protection for it? A (Carl): We are implementing a three-year budget and this is the budgeted base at increasing rates throughout the current three year period. We won't be able to promise anything for the long term. But it doesn't say 12 WTU every semester workload anywhere in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. In fact, the current contract states that the workload should be assigned consistent with historical precedent and that is the long term protection.
- Existing RTP policy is quite flexible about different kinds of the career path people can choose. If we were ramping up research it would be only collectively because we expect more people to take advantage of the program, but not individually. The fact that some faculty are moving to this model shouldn't jeopardize the alternative career path that others may pick.

7. Questions on new cyber-security requirements (Spirion)
(Postponed)

8. Consideration of memo response to Bernier

- The memo is written based on the conversation of last meeting.

9. Revision of Library RTP Guidelines

- The RTP policy allows departments or academic units to create RTP guidelines. It is optional for all academic units except for the library and counseling. It is required for those two units. It took quite a while to produce the guidelines and the library guidelines got approved just about a year ago.
- Nyle explained that besides the normal work, more and more librarians are taking additional roles especially these recent years and they no longer fit in the

traditional guideline. This revision was meant to try to address the roles and show how some of these functions could fit into the RTP requirements.

- It doesn't clearly outline the difference between the types of things can be done and the frequency and quality with which they have to be done at the different levels.
- A lot of policy criteria seem to be just the basic work expectations.
- We will invite the chair of the RTP committee to come to join the conversation.

10. Updates
    (Skipped)

11. New referrals for AY 2018-19; Prioritizing
    a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
    b. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
    c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.
    d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy.

    - We will work on b first. C and d are just minor clarifications. All should be taken care of before the end of the year.

12. Proposals from members for future agenda.

13. Adjourn at 4:00pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 3: September 24, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: McKee

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Sept 10 (He)
3. 2:00 Time Certain Library Guidelines Discussion
4. Consideration of Policy Recommendation on Information Privacy for Final Reading
5. Consideration of Sense of Senate Resolution on Information Privacy for Final Reading: Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability?
6. Discussion of Bullying report (McKee)
7. How is Faculty 180 implementation going?
8. Outstanding referrals for AY 2018-19 (bolded as priorities?)
    a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
    b. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
    c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.
    d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy.
    e. **PS F18-5 S10-7 Appointment and Evaluation of Temporary Faculty has sections that are obsolete under the new contract**.
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

Meeting 3: September 24, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Jessica Chin, CHaHS; Steven He, Business; Alison McKee, H&A; Kenneth Peter, COSS; Anil Kumar, Engineering; Nyle Monday, General Unit; Shelley Cargill, Science; Tabitha Hart, COSS; Sarah Rodriguez, Associated Students; Carl Kemnitz, Deputy Provost; Nidhi Mahendra, Education

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes of Sept 10 (He).

3. Library Guidelines Discussion with two guest representatives from the Library
    a. Suggestions: look at range of existing examples of other RTP Guidelines (in particular, English and Political Science) available online. They are now written for external reference under new RTP policies to inform those not within a given discipline how to assess a candidate's work.
    b. Discussion of new functional roles of librarians in addition to their more traditional liaison duties: changing librarian roles have added to the difficulty of articulating standards for assessing myriad aspects of librarians' work → perhaps this could be part of a more robust description at the start of the document.
    c. Indicate methods of assessment and evaluation of professional work cited to justify different rankings.
    d. Discussion of the possibility of providing hypothetical profiles to illustrate Baseline, Good, Excellent as a way of organizing RTP information.
    e. Representatives will return to the Library and consult with others to determine if they want to revise RTP guidelines now or wait until a later deadline.

4. Consideration of Policy Recommendation on Information Privacy for Final Reading

a. Issue of data ethics: where should it be inserted? Perhaps best incorporated in the Sense of the Senate resolution (SOS) as a strategic choice.

5. Consideration of Sense of Senate Resolution on Information Privacy for Final Reading: Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability?
    a. Two additional clauses on Information on information privacy in response to Senate feedback.
    b. Ken Peter will send forward for final reading at next Senate meeting.

6. Discussion of McKee's bullying document and possible next steps (in no particular order)
    a. Consider the need to balance the needs of academic freedom with the problem of bullying
    b. Clear definition of bullying required (even as bullying itself blurs boundaries)
        i. Existing language and definitions are present in some policies already adopted by other higher ed institutions.
    c. A Sense of the Senate resolution (SOS) that might call for any number of things:
        i. Study of best practices around bullying in higher ed
        ii. Resources to address bullying
        iii. Antibullying training
        iv. Conflict resolution training
        v. A study of bullying on campus (to what end, however?)
    d. Perhaps we need to revise aspects of Professional Responsibility policy in light of greater awareness of bullying?
    e. Revised board of Professional Responsibility might take on the issue of bullying, help figure out what role University Personnel might play.
    f. Ken Peter will contact Stefan Frazier to send out general campus call for any existing resources units and individuals may have to address issues of bullying.
    g. Ken Peter and Alison McKee will work on early draft of SOS.

7. How is Faculty 180 implementation going? (Interfolio bought it out)
    a. System isn't open most of the time.
    b. Send Shelley Cargill any issue with Faculty 180.

8. Unfinished Business: Outstanding referrals for AY 2018-19 (bolded as priorities?)

a. PS F18-1 regarding S12-2 that makes the AVPFA the custodian of personnel records, now that there is no AVPFA
b. **PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.**
c. PS F18-3 regarding F81-12 that requires faculty attendance at commencement.
d. PS F18-4 regarding clarification of F12-6 where it refers to double sized sections in the teaching evaluation policy.
e. **PS F18-5 S10-7 Appointment and Evaluation of Temporary Faculty has sections that are obsolete under the new contract**.

9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 3: October 8, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Kemnitz

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Sept 24 (McKee)
3. Updates:
    a. Passage of Information Privacy resolutions
    b. Receipt of veto message on early tenure
    c. Receipt of veto message on academic freedom
    d. Issue: contractual prohibition of promotion candidates serving on tenure and promotion (but not retention) committees. See CBA 15.43 *In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.*
4. How is eFaculty issues implementation going? See email thread. Please keep adding to it.
5. Bullying: 3:00 time certain, conversation with Nicole Dubus, PhD, MSW, LCSW Assistant Professor, Social Work. Nicole has professional (clinical) experience with bullying in higher education.
6. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 4: October 8, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Jessica Chin, CHHS; Steven He, Business; Alison McKee, H&A; Kenneth Peter, COSS; Anil Kumar, Engineering; Nyle Monday, General Unit; Shelley Cargill, Science; Sarah Rodriguez, Associated Students; Carl Kemnitz, Deputy Provost;

Absent: Tabitha Hart, COSS; Nidhi Mahendra, Education

Guest: Nicole Dubus, Social Work

1. Call to Order 2:00
2. Minutes of Sept 24 Approved
3. Updates:
    a. Passage of Information Privacy resolutions
    b. Receipt of veto message on early tenure
        i. CBA does not allow more than two years of service credit
        ii. Should we encourage the CSU to allow 3-4 years of service credit with a Sense of the Senate?
        iii. Action: Committee decided to drop the issue
    c. Receipt of veto message on academic freedom
        i. Proposal had two parts (1) splitting BAFPR (2) Academic Freedom
        ii. Current board membership too restrictive to have many eligible participants and terms are too long
        iii. Options: Liberalize membership and keep mission and structure of BAFPR or address specific concerns
        iv. Committee opted to try to return this to the senate after having addressed the president's specific concerns
    d. Issue: contractual prohibition of promotion candidates serving on tenure and promotion (but not retention) committees. See CBA 15.43 *In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees.*
        i. No one could offer any rationale for this prohibition
4. How is eFaculty issues implementation going? See email thread. Please keep adding to it.

    a. The current input will be shared with Joanne Wright and any additional questions/suggestions will be shared later
5. Bullying: 3:00 time certain, conversation with Nicole Dubus, PhD, MSW, LCSW Assistant Professor, Social Work. Nicole has professional (clinical) experience with bullying in higher education.
    a. Part of a continuum from "unsupported" to "severely harassed/persecuted"
    b. If based on particular behavior then you have to prove that behavior happened
    c. Barring specific behaviors may create secretive behavior
    d. If based around intent then it's easier to address need
    e. Is it a supportive work environment? (voice needs to be heard)
    f. Culture: to be successful we need the right environment and feeling of safety.
    g. Unmet need should be addressed (effort made to understand situation)
    h. Emphasis should be on healthy, developmental culture. Focus on the positive (what does it mean to be a supportive environment?). Are there structures with a safe place to be heard/arbitrated?
    i. Can we define a "supportive environment" instead?
    j. Bullying is a subjective experience that is defined by the person feeling bullied. If the individual cannot change behavior then there needs to be corrective action.
    k. Corrective action: committee or mentor should have the power to make corrective action
    l. Zero tolerance for offending behavior. Low bar required to bring it to the committee.
    m. Suggestion, first step is committee created to discuss w/ admin
    n. We may need a two-pronged approach: (1) immediate short-term solution for those who are clearly crossing the bullying line, (2) long-term solution that establishes an enduring supportive environment.

6. Unfinished business: PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
7. Adjourned at 4:01

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 5: October 22, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Nihendra

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Sept 24 (Kemnitz)
3. Updates:
    a. Issue: contractual prohibition of promotion candidates serving on tenure and promotion (but not retention) committees. See CBA 15.43 *In promotion considerations, peer review committee members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. Faculty unit employees being considered for promotion are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees. We have reached out to experts in CSU and CFA and have not yet received a definitive answer regarding the purpose of this provision.*
    b. *Advisory memo on Peer evaluation procedures.*
4. Bullying: Updates on San Francisco State's progress; draft Sense of the Senate (McKee)
5. Academic Freedom Policy Revisions
6. How is eFaculty issues implementation going? See email thread. Please keep adding to it.
7. PS F18-2 regarding whether S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) needs revision in light of contract language that may have chance since 1996.
8. Adjourn

October 22nd, 2005
Professional Standards Meeting

Meeting 5: October 22, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 pm

Meeting called to order: 2:02 p.m.

Present: Jessica Chin, Steve He, Alison McKee, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Anil Kumar, Shelley Cargill, Sarah Rodriguez, Carl Kemnitz (Deputy Provost)

Absent: ?

1. Call to order 2:02 p.m.
2. Minutes of October 8 approved
3. Updates:

a. CBA 15.43
Seeking clarification on promotion candidates who may serve on Tenure-Promotion but not Retention committees – Ken revealed no response was received from CSU or CFA. He suggests getting red of this prohibition, given its archaic origin and discussed its relationship to potential conflict of interest.

b. Advisory memo on Peer Evaluation Procedures – Ken acknowledged that several lecturers have expressed thanks.

c. Bullying – Sense of Senate resolution
Ken updated group that new Title IX officer, ____ (name here), is a national expert on bullying and endorsed our work on this topic. She and CDO, Kathy Wong-Lau were reluctant to take on the topic under ODEI but are in support of our committee working on this.

Allison updated the group that she spoke with Christina Sabie at SFSU (Sabie has a background in conflict resolution. Allison updated group on SFSU approach and activities (includes workshops on bullying for faculty, staff and students; activity closely tied to Title IX activities and SFSU president is enthusiastically in support).

Seems necessary to finalize a definition of bullying for our work- group discussed what SJSU President Papazian's opinion is of our work – information presented by Ken that President Papazian will not be at senate meetings until February 2019. Ken shared that ExCom liked the idea of task force on bullying, coming out of PS efforts rather than our committee continuing to do much more work. This discussion preceded our group's review of the first reading of the Sense-of-Senate resolution.

Discussion was had about more explicitly addressing relationship of bullying to create a diversity-friendly environment for minority faculty. Discussion led by Ken on whether document needed both whereas statements and rationale. Items discussed included Student Union bullying policy, Tabitha's suggestion to move up the definition of bullying so reader is clear on what we are discussing. Ken reminded group to discuss who will be reading this document, and reminded committee that President is reluctant to sign off on policies emerging from Academic Senate that affect stakeholders who are not represented on senate. Group discussed that we start small with a task force that included President, Interim Provost, Kathy, and faculty experts on bullying.

Ken suggested that we make recommendations for how this task force may be composed as part of our work. Jessica updated the group that there is whole CSU taskforce on a Professional and Healthy Workforce. Ken suggestes that our next steps are to proceed through Jaye Bailey or Joan Wright. Carl suggests that we send forward to Jaye and copy to Zainah (spelling?), President's executive assistant.

Jessica suggested that we should move quickly on what could a person do right now, if they were experiencing bullying? Possibilities include EAP (Life Matters), am ombudsperson (SJSU does not have one).

d. Academic freedom policy and President's veto

- Her suggestion to keep an advisory role and strike out the term "monitoring" in the document.
- Ken confirms we should strike 2.1.2 (3rd bullet in President's veto)
- Ken agrees with 4th bullet in president's veto that we not be prescriptive with regards to detailing academic freedom
- Ken sought feedback from PS committee on who could serve on this committee, recommended restrictions be eased on who can serve on this academic freedom committee
- Discussion had on how we get provost's input on this—Ken suggests we clean up this report, send it to Provost, who can then get input from President and get back to our committee. No formal vote taken since we are not recommending that senate take any specific action.

e. ONG referred policy on Direct Instructional Obligations to us S 96-2 and discussion had about 20 days (18 hours in CBA) of substitute instructional obligations. Some discussion had about how to address/consider issues pertaining to online instruction. Steven (Business) discussed how 20 days poses particular challenges in the College of Business since some classes only last 10 days. Ken discussed that our options are:
i) Write a memo and decline to act
ii) Amend it- proposing a minor amendment
iii) Carry out a substantial reform of document
iv) Rescind this policy if it is not needed.

Jessica questions whether current faculty contract supercedes this policy. Agreement to carry this discussion over to next meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 4:01 pm.

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 6: October 29, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat E: Kumar

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of October 22 (Nihendra)
3. Updates:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost
4. Bullying: Redraft of resolution (McKee/Peter)
5. S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) Amendments
6. S97-5 (Post Tenure Review) Amendments?
7. Adjourn

Meeting 17: April 29, 2019
ADM 223A
2:00-4:00 PM
Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

Present: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Alison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman, Sarah Rodriguez

Call to Order – 2:04 PM

1. Approval of minutes of April 15 (McKee) - approved

2. Bullying issue – numerous inquiries, issue assigned to new chief of staff, out to new chief diversity officer, put together a working group, met a week ago, Kathy Lau reported working on campus climate survey which will include issues related to bullying, campus climate survey will be a 3 semester process,

3. Guidelines for Late Add (Discuss attached memo)

CBA doesn't allow for differentiated restarts, any late add material must go back and be restarted at department level

This means that what constitutes late add material must be more clearly differentiated

Once process of RTP starts in fall, then it can't be changed. Any guidelines need to be in place before dossiers are submitted

Procedural material not in question

We suggest this language be replaced with the following:

Material shall be accepted for late admission into the dossier only for candidates undergoing performance reviews or seeking promotion.
The submission must provide clear evidence that the information became accessible only after the date of the closing of the dossier and that it is pertinent. When justifying a submission, candidates should keep the following points in mind:
1) "After the date of the closing of the dossier." This means that the actual achievement occurred after the closing date—not merely that documentation of an earlier achievement became available after the closing date. For example, the final acceptance of a publication occurs after the deadline, or an art show or musical performance occurs after the deadline, or a candidate is elected to an important professional or service leadership role after the deadline.
Committee members felt examples are good
2) "…and that it is pertinent." Late items that indicate a significantly improved pattern of achievement are pertinent. Late items that fit a pattern documented elsewhere in the dossier are not.

Question: what if it is a new course. Then yes, include b/c new course even with same SOTES

Pertinent discussion below

3) Fall SOTES and other teaching materials. Normally, these materials should not be added late since they are unlikely to shift a pattern established through many earlier semesters, but should instead be saved for use in any subsequent reviews. If, however, a department or college level review recommends a negative decision based at least partly on teaching, then such materials become "pertinent" and may be included if the case is made that they show significant improvement over a prior pattern

Committee: Do they know that you can include a letter/personal statement to justify need? Discussion of being more explicit on writing a justification for late add. They should think of this as instructions to both the candidate and the committee.

What about "other teaching materials"? When would this be appropriate? Things they did in class after deadline. If first time teaching, might want to submit materials like handout that happened half way through semester, or simulation or group project. If planned at start of semester, then why allow? Because it may have been more profound or had a greater outcome/effect than thought.

What does everyone think of "if negative decision"? Perhaps frame as negative votes? This errs very far on faculty rights side, but at same time there will be lots of re-evaluation of dossiers. Discussion of 6-year probation but evaluated on 5 years of work. Distinguish between rebuttal and including additional information to support your argument. This should not be an entire new dossier, but an appropriate level of info for clarity for moving forward. Discussion of rebuttal inequity, some are strictly concise, and others include new info. Future discussion of rebuttals needed. Alternate wording for negative decision wording: "An improved pattern in a previously perceived weakness"

Be explicit about pertinent but leave that up to the late add committee to judge whether it meets that requirement. Late add committee only refers to justification, not entire dossier. Does the committee have enough information to say "no." Would need more guidance for what is pertinent and what is not pertinent. Could provide a list of items that are pertinent and what are not pertinent.

Discussion of "pattern" – late add should indicate support of or breaking of a pattern

Add examples for research and service (in addition to SOTES, teaching examples) – this could all be a subheading for #2 with examples for teaching, research and service

4. BAFPR Amendment

Section 4.2 – five items sent to Joanne and Kathy, Joanne responded with general reservations UP may handle some complaints, UPFA may handle a Title IX, it may be easy to state things this BPR is not responsible for, personnel items can't be shared

Carl indicated that a lot of these things are handled by grievance. That process is not handled by the process in this policy. Section 4.3 is also a concern b/c dictates method for UPFA to follow, some of these things happen differently than outlined. Perhaps James can take a role in this.

This policy is the one that enforces the things that no one else enforces.

Discussion of rewording of 4.2 to fulfill what BFR is doing and refer to UPFA. Really need to rescind and replace some of this material

No point bringing as a first reading this year as not just an edit but more a rescind and replace, need to remove procedural stuff that falls under UPFA now. Problem points 4.2 & 4.3

Committee wonders if James would take this on as a project in summer working with Joanne, Ken will inquire if he is willing

5. Range Elevation policy revisions

Could bring it as a first reading to publicize that we are working on it, needs consultation process. Discussion of the amount of revision this needs and that it isn't time to prematurely bring it forward

Discussion of changes that have been made

Discussion of Section 1.B – does this section contain relevant information? Relevant info can be incorporated into appropriate sections

Discussion of Section 1.C and 1.D – perhaps a more general preface could be incorporated into the preface, some of 1.D can be moved to another area

Discussion of Section III.C

6. Adjourn – 3:55 PM

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 7: November 26, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Monday

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of October 22 (Nihendra)
    b. of October 29 (Kumar)
3. Updates:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)
    b. Information Privacy resolution to President (Peter)
    c. Assigned Time for Exception Service to Students S15-1 (Peter)
4. Bullying: Redraft of resolution following first reading (McKee/Peter)
5. S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) Redraft following first reading (Peter)
6. Referrals:
    a. PS F18-5 Appointment and Evaluation of Temporary Faculty
    b. PS F18-6 Staff Awards
    c. PS F18-7 Range Elevation Criteria
    d. Library Board unofficial referral: The Library Board would like Professional Standards' advice on recommending that department RTP guidelines include the following sentence:

        We encourage RTP committees to consider faculty work published in open access venues, while using discipline-specific criteria to evaluate quality, value, and impact.

        For comparison, this is what Political Science inserted in their guidelines:

        We encourage our faculty to retain publication rights so their scholarly work can be republished in SJSU Scholarworks, an open access repository. Open access journals are also acceptable to the department provided they meet all the same standards for peer review and ethics as traditional journals.

7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting 7: November 26, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting called to order at

Present: Jessica Chin, Tabitha Hart, Steve He, Nidhi Mahendra, Allison McKee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Anil Kumar, Shelley Cargill, Sarah Rodriguez, Carl Kemnitz (Deputy Provost).

Absent: None

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00.
2. Minutes of October 22nd approved. Minutes of October 29th approved with minor changes.

3. Updates:
   a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)
      As of yet, no feedback has yet been received.

   b. Information Privacy resolution to President (Peter)
      - Steph has spoken to the President, but there seems to be some reluctance to issuing a Presidential Directive.
      - It is felt by some that it is not so much the content of the resolution that is the problem, but that it is felt that this should be the prerogative of the President rather than something initiated by the Senate.
      - Steph will pursue this further with the President

   c. Assigned Time for Exception Service to Students S15-1 (Peter)
      - Funding for Assigned Time will continue until the current contract is changed, however the current deadline has been missed.
      - The Chancellor's office has not announced how much money will be available or what the new timeline will be.
      - The new deadline is expected to be the first week of next semester.

4. Bullying: Redraft of resolution following first reading (McKee/Peter)
   - Corrections and other modifications of the resolution were made by the Senate.

- At the recent Executive Committee meeting, it became apparent that the President was unaware of the work done on this and she expressed concerns.
- The suggestion was made that this be changed from a Senate Management Resolution to a Sense of the Senate resolution, as this puts the impetus for it back in the hands of the President, as was apparently the case at San Francisco State.
- Work was done to reword the document to make it into more of a request for the President to act
- Carl noted that the list of suggestions made by Senators which were added to the document should be regarded as examples and suggestions rather than as mandates.
- Discussion took place about removing this list from the body of the document and adding it as an addendum or a footnote.
- Ken will work on how this list might be introduced within the document.
- Allison and Ken will rework the resolution in light of the discussion and re-present it at the next meeting.

5. S96-2 (Direct Instructional Obligations) Redraft following first reading (Peter)
    - Minor corrections were made, including changing "his/her" to "their" in line 64.
    - Committee voted 9-0 to send the document to the Senate for a final reading.

6. Referrals:
    a. PS F18-5 Appointment and Evaluation of Temporary Faculty and (c.) PS F18-7 Range Elevation Criteria
        - It was explained that when Lecturers top out at their salary range, they have the opportunity to apply to shift into another range where their pay rate can be increased.
        - In the past this was sometimes explained to be mirroring what happens in the tenure-track RTP regime, however this is inaccurate.
        - Imposing RTP style requirements on Lecturers could be unfair as their assignments are different, they are not required to do research, etc.
        - Some Lecturers are not aware this is possible, and it is not clear how much service is required to qualify for this sort of increase.
        - The Committee agreed that more clarity needs to be brought into the procedure, and so Jonathan Karpf and Camille Johnson will be invited in (separately) in Spring to speak to the Committee on this topic.

- In the meantime, Ken will work on the minor changes suggested in Sharmin Khan's referral.

b. PS F18-6 Staff Awards
    - At present there is no University-level award for outstanding staff members.
    - This has been brought up previously, but some in administration have indicated that this is outside the responsibility of the Senate, as it deals with staff rather than faculty, and must come from the President's office.
    - Since the Senate cannot craft this policy, it was suggested that a Sense of the Senate resolution be created to request that the President create such an award.
    - In the past, there has been discussion of the creation of a Staff Council, but this entity has never materialized.
    - As this was brought up with the President a year ago without any action being taken, Ken will send a friendly reminder to Jaye Bailey to see if this provokes action.
    - If not, the Committee will look into alternative routes.

c. PS F18-7 Range Elevation Criteria
    - See "a." above.

d. Library Board unofficial referral: The Library Board would like Professional Standards' advice on recommending that department RTP guidelines include the following sentence:

    We encourage RTP committees to consider faculty work published in open access venues, while using discipline-specific criteria to evaluate quality, value, and impact.

    For comparison, this is what Political Science inserted in their guidelines:

    We encourage our faculty to retain publication rights so their scholarly work can be republished in SJSU Scholarworks, an open access repository. Open access journals are also acceptable to the department provided they meet all the same standards for peer review and ethics as traditional journals.

    - Clarification was sought by Committee members as to what the purpose of this "unofficial" referral was.
    - Ken explained the source of this request.
    - Nyle further explained that this in response to the perception of some in the Library that peer-reviewed online journals might not

be given their due weight when being reviewed by RTP committees in the various departments on campus. This was a suggestion that this be codified into RTP guidelines to insure that faculty received proper credit for their work.

- Discussion took place regarding how this impacted or was otherwise concerned with Affordable Learning Solutions, the Scholarworks repository, and the like.
- It was expressed that this perception on the part of the Library might not be correct, and many departments do respect online publications.
- The suggestion was made that perhaps an educational campaign might be more appropriate than merely adding such a statement to RTP guidelines, and that perhaps the Library should conduct a survey for the various Departments to ascertain the actual state of awareness on campus.
- Ken will send a summary of this feedback to the University Library Board for their consideration.

7. Meeting adjourned at 4:01

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 7: December 3, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-3:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of November 26 (Monday)
3. Updates:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)
    b. Cami Johnson and Jonathan Karpf are scheduled to visit PS to discuss the Range Elevation referral on February 4, the 2nd meeting of spring semester.
    c. I have conveyed the substance of our conversation about the Library Board's suggested language on open access journals back to the Library Board.
    d. I have contacted the VP for Organizational Development and Chief of Staff to inquire about the creation of staff awards.
4. Bullying: Redraft of resolution for final reading (McKee/Peter)
5. Consideration of F12-6 language on exclusion of SOTES. See the last sentence of E4 and referral F18-4
6. Current Disposition of this semester's referrals:
    a. PS-F18-1 concerning the AVPFA as custodian for personnel records; dealt with by Senate Bylaw permitting title changes
    b. PS-F18-2 concerning the Direct Instructional Obligations policy's obsolescence; final reading amendments on the way to Senate
    c. PS-F18-3 concerning archaic F81-4 on attendance at commencement; PS recommends waiting two years to see how SJSU's new commencement activities work out to determine an appropriate policy update.
    d. PS-F18-4 a request to consider clarification of a phrase in F12-6 concerning the exclusion of certain SOTEs from the evaluation process. Taken up today.
    e. PS-F18-5 a request to modernize F10-7 (Appointment, Review, and Range Elevations for Lecturers) to bring its language in line with changes in the CBA. Will produce amendments to consider at the January 28 meeting
    f. PS-F18-6 a follow up on the establishment of university-wide staff awards. Have inquired with the administration about progress.
    g. PS-F18-7 a request to create clearer criteria for the award of range elevations for lecturers in F10-7. Speakers scheduled to come discuss with PS at the February 4 meeting.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting 8: December 3, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting called to order at 2:00

Present: Jessica Chin, Tabitha Hart, Steve He, Nidhi Mahendra, Allison McKee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Anil Kumar, Shelley Cargill, Sarah Rodriguez, Carl Kemnitz (Deputy Provost).

Absent: Carl Kemnitz entered meeting at 2:50 PM

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00.
2. Minutes of November 26 approved.

3. Updates:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)
        No new information available
    b. Cami Johnson and Jonathan Karpf are scheduled to visit PS to discuss the Range Elevation referral on February 4, the 2nd meeting of spring semester.
    c. K Peter conveyed the substance of our conversation about the Library Board's suggested language on open access journals back to the Library Board.
    d. K Peter contacted the VP for Organizational Development and Chief of Staff to inquire about the creation of staff awards.

4. Bullying: Redraft of resolution for final reading (McKee/Peter)
    - Distributed draft widely, Mary Papazian responded almost immediately with "will get back to you"
    - Changed to sense of the senate resolution requesting president appoint a task force
    - The office of diversity has contracted for a campus climate survey to begin in spring 2019 and finish in fall 2019, there will be questions on bullying. This would dovetail nicely with the task force. Kathy has indicated that results are going to be transparent.
    - Discussion of putting resolution forward at next Senate meeting, the positive reception by Senate, forthcoming campus climate survey coupled with potential Presidential input all support putting this sense of senate forward
    - Document revisions discussed
    - Discussion of administrative steps that will be taken under the Resolved clause. Discussion of role of University Personnel. Decided that the task force will need to address these items.
    - Discussion of wording of current "services available"

- Motion to approve sense of senate resolution as modified on line 112, moved and seconded, 10-0-0 vote in favor, Kemnitz absent

5. Consideration of F12-6 language on exclusion of SOTES. See the last sentence of E4 and referral F18-4
    - Background of universal SOTES provided by K Peter
    - Discussion of removal of SOTES from one course per year dependent on stipulations in policy, discussion of last sentence of section regarding "double sized courses" where person is teaching the required number of WTUs but not the required number of units, discussion of using WTUs instead of units
    - Decided to amend policy by striking the last sentence of E4 and changing third sentence from "at least fifteen units" to "at least fifteen WTUs (equivalent of five 3 unit courses)". K Peter will prepare an amendment for January meeting.
    - Should formulate a way to notify colleagues of contents of this policy, also need a mechanism by which content can be removed from electronic dossier as per policy. This is a task that we could ask SERB to take on, communicating policies concerning teaching evaluation
    - Discussion of what constitutes double sized course. C Kemnitz offered: system definition 75 students gives GA/TA support, 120 students entitles you to double size

6. Current Disposition of this semester's referrals:
    a. PS-F18-1 concerning the AVPFA as custodian for personnel records; dealt with by Senate Bylaw permitting title changes
    b. PS-F18-2 concerning the Direct Instructional Obligations policy's obsolescence; final reading amendments on the way to Senate
    c. PS-F18-3 concerning archaic F81-4 on attendance at commencement; PS recommends waiting two years to see how SJSU's new commencement activities work out to determine an appropriate policy update.
    d. PS-F18-4 a request to consider clarification of a phrase in F12-6 concerning the exclusion of certain SOTEs from the evaluation process. Taken up today. Decided to amend policy as above in item 5.
    e. PS-F18-5 a request to modernize F10-7 (Appointment, Review, and Range Elevations for Lecturers) to bring its language in line with changes in the CBA. Will produce amendments to consider at the January 28 meeting
    f. PS-F18-6 a follow up on the establishment of university-wide staff awards. Have inquired with the administration about progress.
        - If no response received, what would be the next step? If no response is received, then can take subtle measures to encourage creation of staff awards.
    g. PS-F18-7 a request to create clearer criteria for the award of range elevations for lecturers in F10-7. Speakers scheduled to come discuss with PS at the February 4 meeting.

- Everyone is encourage to become well informed about our policy and policies shared by Cami before the meeting.

7. Meeting adjourned at 3:12 PM

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 9: January 28, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat I: Rodriguez (Backup seat A Kemnitz)

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Dec 3 (Cargill)
3. Reports:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)?
    b. I have heard nothing more about the Information Privacy policy that is before the President.
    c. I have not heard more about the Staff award suggestion since I conveyed our suggestion to Jaye Bailey in December, who said she favored the concept.
    d. The President thanked me at the Holiday party for the Bullying Resolution. When I followed up at the January Excom she indicated it would be a project handled by her new Chief of Staff, who arrives at the end of the month. She indicated a willingness to receive suggest names for the task force.
4. Range Elevation Discussion. Cami Johnson and Jonathan Karpf are scheduled to visit PS to discuss the Range Elevation referral on February 4. Discussion to familiarize ourselves with S10-7, particularly section "V. Range Elevations.
5. Amendment to F12-6 language on exclusion of SOTES.
6. RTP referral: clarifying the descriptors in S15-8.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

January 27, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting called to order at 2:00

Present: Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steve He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Allison McKee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Sarah Rodriguez

Absent: Nidhi Mahendra

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00.
2. Minutes of December 3, 2018 approved
3. Updates:
    a. Academic Freedom resolution to Provost for feedback (Kemnitz)
        No new information available
    b. K Peter discussed names to suggest names for the Bullying Task Force. He will send suggestions to the president's
4. Amendment to F12-6 language on exclusion of SOTES.
    a. Questions about the use of Academic Year were addressed with specific bold language to replace "Academic Year":
    "Per **year (beginning in fall and including special sessions)** … during **that period**."
    b. 9-0 approval
5. Range elevation
    a. LL range needs to be eliminated to conform to current contract
    b. Two pathways to get range elevation
        i. Top step in schedule
        ii. 0.8 for six-year period
    c. Guidelines are lacking (CSUMB and Fullerton were suggested as better models); committee will evaluate
    d. Discussion of terminal degree were raised regarding range elevation
6. Brandon's Referral
    a. Overalapping descriptors of quality in RTP criteria levels (baseline/good/excellent). Do all four baseline criteria need to be met? "Common Sense" clause.
    b. Revise policy or role for training? Should we have mandatory/optional training for committees? …for committee chairs? …for new chairs?
    c. Education and new interpretation guide for SOTES were deemed to be essential to combat the issues raised.
    d. There was reluctance to revisit the policy at this time.
    e. PS Chair will draft a response.
7. Adjourned at 3:56

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 10: February 4, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat I: Rodriguez

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Jan 28 (Kemnitz)
3. Review of S10-7, particularly with regard to Lecturer Range Elevation
    a. Visitor 2:00 : Cami Johnson, Acting Director, School of Management
    b. Visitor 3:00 : Jonathan Karpf, Lecturer Representative, SJSU CFA
    c. Documents: S10-7, referrals F18-5, F18-7, Letter from James Lee
4. Time permitting: discussion of BAFPR.
5. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

February 4, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting called to order at 2:00

Present: Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steve He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Allison McKee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Sarah Rodriguez, Nidhi Mahendra

Absent: None

1. Meeting called to order at 2:00.
2. Minutes of January 27, 2019 approved
3. Updates: Review of S10-7, particularly with regard to Lecturer Range Elevation
    a. Visitor Cami Johnson, Acting Director, School of Management: Johnson expressed her concerns about the lack of guidance and mentoring given to lecturers, such that there is no support for how to apply for the range elevation. Johnson also expressed concern towards different eligibility requirements for each department. Some that lecturers teach in more than one department and submit materials for a range elevation derived from both departments to a single department when they apply. Is there a conflict? Other concerns pertain to the period of review and the clarity of it, to what kind of documents are needed, and timing of notification.
    b. Visitor Jonathan Karpf, Lecturer Representative, SJSU CFA: Karpf assisted when S10-7 was originally drafted. He noted that he provides range elevation workshops to prepare lecturers to apply, and noted that there could be a Chair workshop to assist Chairs, if there was demand. He emphasized the difference between RTP and range elevation—RTP grants vastly more significant benefits, with lifetime tenure, etc. He agreed that there are some places wehre the old policy could be updated to conform to the contract and to clarify a couple of ambiguous spots, but the policy has generally been working.
4. Adjourned at 3:56pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 11: February 18, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Chin

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Feb 4 (Rodriguez)
3. Review of S10-7, particularly with regard to Lecturer Range Elevation
    a. Visitor 2:00 : Joanne Wright, Senior Associate VP University Peronnel
    b. Documents: S10-7, referrals F18-5, F18-7, Letter from James Lee (all same as lat time)
    c. Decisions: what to revise in S10-7
4. Revision F12-6 SOTE exclusion amendment for final reading
5. BAFPR membership change. (One idea: leaves BAFPR policy unchanged for now except for its membership, which has always been solely faculty and thus controllable with an SMR.)
6. Late Add criteria? I've received an inquiry as to whether policy or contract offers any guidance on the criteria for what may be late-added to a dossier.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 11: February 18, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes recorded by Seat B: Chin

Present: Kenneth Peter (chair), Jessica Chin, Sarah Rodriguez, Nyle Monday, Alison McKee, Shelley Cargill, Steven He, Nidhi Mahendra, Anil Kumar, Priya Raman (new)
Regrets: Carl Kemnitz
Guest: Joanne Wright

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Feb 4 (Rodriguez): approved
3. Review of S10-7, particularly with regard to Lecturer Range Elevation
    a. Discussion with Joanne Wright, Senior Associate VP University Personnel
        i. Peter summarized concerns raised by referrals (C. Johnson and S. Kahn) and info presented at the last meeting by Jonathan Karpf
            1. Documents: S10-7, referrals F18-5, F18-7, Letter from James Lee (all same as last time)
        ii. Wright discussion and information: **Range Elevation**
            1. To be eligible, 5 years in rank plus SSI max (terminal degree requirements <u>not</u> included)
                a. Terminal degree document only applies to appointment, NOT range elevation
                    i. Ref: SLO precedent
                b. **<u>Recommendation</u>**: To reduce confusion, put terminal degree language only in terminal degree section of policy; remove from range elevation section
            2. Last year new calculations/methodology enacted to determine eligibility based on FTAS: 12-year, 9-year, 6-year
            3. UP sends eligibility list to colleges every year
                a. The question remains, how do colleges disseminate the eligibility information to lecturers? Is this done consistently or in a timely manner?
            4. Special calendars are made for those lecturers who did not receive eligibility information in time to meet original submission deadline
            5. **Appendix A** is a mix of duties. Though most are hired to teach, not all; so the criteria should be organized by primary responsibilities: i.e., teaching, research, service, other? Optional?

a. **Recommendation**: split criteria and examples based on type of responsibility/assignment
b. Discussion about which criteria to include in Appendix A. Need to be clear that the main evaluation criteria will be what is in the appointment letter.
    i. Unresolved questions/issues:
        1. Which appointment letter?
        2. Vague lecturer appointment letter language
        3. Which criteria to include in the policy?

6. If work assignment is teaching, is it useful to include other accomplishments such as RSCA or service? JW: yes, useful to show they are 'good citizens'; also, we want to encourage participation in dept, college, university and community (service)
7. JW provided a binder with collection of all university policies that include info on range elevation
8. **Recommendation**: standardize notification process to ensure lecturers are receiving the information
9. **Recommendation**: remove obsolete lecturer categories such as LL

b. Decisions: what to revise in S10-7
    i. Option A: work with existing structure of policy, make minor revisions for clarity
    ii. Option B: rewrite policy from ground up after having reviewed policies from other campuses
    iii. Option C: include option to add service activities accompanied by a narrative contextualizing service/other activities as it applies to instructional mission/assignment
        1. Could create categories in line with lecturer categories to show growth of teacher up the ranks

4. Revision of F12-6 SOTE exclusion amendment for final reading
    a. The amendment clarifies language on when one may exclude SOTES (based on class size and calendar year)
    b. Lecture calendar is different than T/TT; so, removed 'academic year' and redefined timeframe
    c. JW: no evaluations for Article 40 classes (non stateside typically, extension classes); 40-17 can be evaluated by request, following Article 15
    d. University policy requires all classes to collect SOTES with few exceptions related to technical or ethical grounds (E5). SERB is currently evaluating SOTES collection requirements in special sessions. Currently, SOTES should be collected in all classes, including special sessions, and placed in personnel file (as stated in current policy)
    e. Peter presented for discussion current version of amendment that included changes based on feedback from first reading at Senate.
    f. VOTE to send forward current amended version as final reading to Senate: approved 10-0

5. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) membership change.
    a. Peter reviewed history of BAFPR and proposals put forward by Senate in the recent past related to separating Board into 1) academic freedom and 2) professional responsibilities. Proposals were vetoed by President
    b. Current Board is understaffed and only has 2 people, so need to find a way to gain more members
    c. Discussion of options moving forward. One idea: leave BAFPR policy unchanged for now except for its membership, which has always been solely faculty and thus controllable with a Senate Management Resolution (SMR)
        i. Peter proposed membership changes in policy
        ii. Though changes through SMRs are done within Senate, the current policy has been signed by prior president, presenting a conflict with what we can or cannot do with membership criteria (because technically, the proposed SMR would change in practice how membership is determined in current policy)
6. Late Add criteria. Peter received an inquiry as to whether policy or contract offers any guidance on the criteria for what may be late-added to a dossier
    a. There are no criteria about what to include in the RTP policy
    b. Will need to address questions: Should we provide criteria? How to incorporate guidelines in policy?
    c. Criteria is located on UP website under calendar—guidelines
    d. Currently, the guidelines state the following:
        i. • Unless there has been a termination recommendation, new material shall be accepted for admission into the dossier **only for candidates undergoing performance reviews in 3rd or 6th years, candidates undergoing 4th or 5th year performance review of a complete dossier, and candidates who are tenured and seeking promotion.** Please note that tenure-track faculty members should place Fall semester Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) ratings in the dossier during subsequent review cycles.
    e. According to these guidelines, Fall SOTES should be eligible for consideration for a tenured candidate seeking promotion.
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 12: February 25, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Feb 18 (Chin)

3. Draft amendments, S10-7, related to Lecturer range elevation

4. Draft SMR, BAFPR membership change

5. S15-7 (RTP Procedures) amendment: clarifying late add criteria.

6. Presidential debrief issue. I have received a complaint that the President has not met with the University RTP Committee as required by policy S15-7:

    > 3.6.4 When the presidential action is not consistent with the recommendation of the university committee, the President shall meet with the committee to discuss the reasons for the action.

    Investigate?

7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 12: February 25, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order at 2 pm.

Presents: Kemnitz, Chin, He, Mahendra, Kumar, Monday, McKee, Cargill, Peter (chair), Raman, Rodriguez

2. Approval of minutes of February 18 (Chin)

3. Draft amendments, S10-7, related to Lecturer range elevation

- It was mentioned at the executive committee that we are working on this issue. The Provost is interested in it and would like to come to a PS meeting in the future.
- The draft replaces the term "temporary faculty" with "lecturer".
- The full description about the different levels of lecturers has been moved from the 'range elevation' section to the 'initial and subsequent appointment' section. The LL category has been deleted because it no longer exists.
- The eligibility for range elevation should be adjusted to generally meet the requirements stipulated in contractual agreements to consider the current second way to become eligible and their changes in the future. Lecturers shall be informed of their eligibility.
- Evidence of professional growth and development should support the evaluation of the assignment of the lecturer.
- Regarding the levels of achievement, we need to have some criteria for progressing from A to B to C to D, but we shouldn't make it as elaborate as RTP.
- Appendix A should be reorganized and revised.

4. Draft SMR, BAFPR membership change

- The board currently only has two members.
- As an all-faculty committee, it falls under the senate management resolution rules which allow the senate to select its own committee. However, the old policy was signed by President Caret and the old policy contains membership in it. The question is whether this should be done as a senate management resolution or as a policy recommendation.

- The Professional Standards Committee decided to bring this as a first reading of the proposed senate management resolution to the next senate meeting, have an open discussion and wait for feedback (vote: 9-0-1)

5. S15-7 (RTP Procedures) amendment: clarifying 'late add' criteria

- Late add is hard to judge because on one hand we don't want it become routine and create chaos with the review process. On the other hand, the bureaucratic year-long review system should not prevent them from allowing important accomplishments the faculty have made along the way during that year to be considered.
- We need clear guidelines for what can and can't be added under certain circumstances.
- The amendment will establish a policy mandate for the Provost and the PS to devise the guideline.
- The Professional Standards Committee approved a first reading of the proposed policy recommendation at the next senate meeting. (vote: 10-0-0)

6. Presidential debrief issue. Peter has received a complaint that the President has not met with the University RTP Committee as required by policy S15-7:

> 3.6.4 When the presidential action is not consistent with the recommendation of the university committee, the President shall meet with the committee to discuss the reason for the action.

- Peter will contact the University RTP committee chair to find out.

7. Adjourn at 4:02pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 13: March 11, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Mahendra

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Feb 25 (He)

3. Updates
    a. Senate passed SOTE exclusion amendment, with changes.
    b. The Provost will visit with Professional Standards to discuss Range Elevation issues.
    c. Senate generally supported BAFPR Senate Management Resolution. However, Senate Chair Frazier has had conversations with the President and advises to proceed cautiously. I have asked the Provost to come prepared to discuss this issue when she visits on March 18.
    d. Senate generally supported the first reading of the Late Add amendment but had one suggestion.
    e. Presidential debrief issue. I have confirmed that the President did meet with the University RTP committee in the fall. The Chair of the committee was unwilling to answer questions about what was discussed nor to offer an opinion about the utility of the meeting. Question: is the policy provision to require a meeting working as intended?

4. Late Add amendment. Revised as per Senate feedback to clarify that the late add committee is to apply the guidelines. (Attached)

5. BAFPR Amendment. Discussion in advance of Provost's visit.

6. Range Elevation Amendment. Discussion in advance of Provost's visit.

7. New referrals. S19-1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
    a. S19-1 Concerns the Exceptional Assigned Time Committee and its temporary status. The referral neglects to consider that Amendment A eliminated the time-dependent language and substituted this:

        This policy shall remain in effect as long as Article 20, section 37 entitled "Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students" of the Collective Bargaining Agreement remains in effect…

b. S19-2, 3, 4, and 5 all concern name changes related to the office of Faculty Affairs and the AVP for Faculty Affairs. While editorial changes are possible, the various policies need to be reviewed since the successor office and successor officer are not always obvious. Do the functions identified in policy transfer to the Provost or designee, or do they transfer to University Personnel?

8. Framing next year's work: a suggestion.
    a. There is a very great need for the training of RTP committees. Training of RTP committees is required by policy and yet it is seldom accomplished. Should Professional Standards prepare to shift its focus from policy formulation and toward constructing a system of RTP training?

9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Meeting Minutes

Meeting 13: Monday, March 11, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 pm

Minutes recorded by Seat D: Mahendra

Call to order at 2:04 pm.

PRESENT: Kenenth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Allison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman, Sarah Rodriguez

ABSENT: None

1. Call to Order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Approval of minutes of Feb 25 (taken by He)

3. **Updates**

a) *SOTE Exclusion Amendment:* Passed by senate with some changes
b) *Provost visiting PS committee* meeting on March 18th to discuss Range Elevation, BAFPR and other relevant issues.
c) *BAFPR Senate Management Resolution* - Ken shared that at first reading, Senate was in support to proceed with BAFPR Senate Management Resolution. President wants us to abide by the previous policy, which has been sent to Provost Ficke to review.
d) *Late-Add Amendment* – Senate generally in support of first reading of Late Add Amendment; offered a suggestion to change language in 5.4.3. (see below for details)
e) *Debriefing between President and Chair of the University RTP Committee* – Based on a referral requesting PS to obtain information on whether such a debriefing takes place between President and Chair of University RTP Committee, Ken confirms such a meeting did occur in Fall of this academic year (Fall 2018). Per the Chair of the University RTP Committee, no details of said meeting or topics discussed are available, due to confidentiality of these discussions. With no details available, it remains difficult to establish the purpose of such meeting or whether it is serving the expected purpose.

4. **Late Add Amendment –** Now revised per senate feedback; added language indicating that Criteria for Late-Add materials state that …"*the provost or designee, in consultation with PS committee, shall issue guidelines for determining which materials may be inserted after the dossier has been officially closed" and that "late materials must have the approval of a committee, which will apply guidelines and limit materials"….*

Senate asked to connect the committee responsible to this amendment, in the document. Priya asked a question about whether we have defined what is meant by Late-Add. Carl advised the committee that these changes to Late-Add materials are not likely to go into effect for this very next RTP review cycle.

5. BAFPR Senate Management Resolution

Ken shared that at the first reading, the senate was in support to proceed with BAFPR Senate Management Resolution. President wants us to abide by the previous policy, which also has been sent to Provost Ficke to review. Provost indicated that she has strong feelings about academic freedom policy. Ken shared with the committee that PS committee will have an opportunity to discuss this topic with the Provost during her visit on March 18th.

6. Lecturer Range Elevation Policy – Proposed Amendment

a) Ken shared that he received Allison's and Nidhi's edits and questions about the policy document. Carl said he reviewed document carefully and also made edits in Google docs. Ken suggests not making further changes to this policy until after we hear from Provost. Ken also shared that Joanne provided the committee a binder containing range elevation policies compiled from other CSU campuses. This binder is available for review by PS committee members. One question facing PS is whether we would wish to consider a rubric that makes explicit the incremental difference expected in going up for each subsequent level (A, B, C, D) in the range elevation policy. The topic of the lecturer range elevation policy will be discussed with Provost Ficke during her visit to PS on March 18th.

New Referrals –

One new referral (S-19 1) pertained to the Exceptional Assigned Time Committee and whether it's status was temporary. On checking, this referral overlooks Amendment A which eliminated time-dependency and declared that EATC policy remains in effect as long as CBA does. Ken reported that 4 additional referrals (S19-2, 3, 4, 5) had to do with requesting name changes in documents referring to the nomenclature of faculty affairs and the prior position of AVP of Faculty Affairs. Depending on document, discussion needed about in which cases does review get assigned to University Personnel vs. the Provost or their designee. Carl advised the committee that currently there is a split in that Joanne's role is to ensure that policy is followed and that process adheres to rules and regulations, whereas substantive academic decisions about candidates will be handled by AVP for Faculty Affairs. After some discussion, PS Committee agreed that these referrals are best deferred until after SJSU's new Provost arrives.

8. Framing next year's work for PS Committee – Ken believes this to be a game changer discussion. Ken shares his perspective that most referrals and complaints are not about lack of policies per se', but concern about the appropriate implementation of existing policies. He asked the committee members whether it PS should refocus our energy on an thorough educational and outreach campaign of RTP criteria.
Some concerns discussed by PS members were that:

- RTP committee members are unclear about how to evaluate specific faculty accomplishments –should they be using their own academic judgment or reinforce stated criteria?
- Are faculty on RTP committees knowledgeable about the latest SOTE interpretation guide generated by SERB) so that they are using this information for fairly evaluating teaching accomplishments
- Another example was discussion of considering impact factors of journals in which faculty publish their work – this is very relevant in some disciplines, but not in others
- What happens when a "departmental" RTP committee is entirely comprised of members not from the department (due to lack of tenured/senior faculty in a department)?
- There is a need for educating all RTP committee members, and chairs of committees
- Shared consensus among committee members that it is unacceptable and unethical to conduct sloppy reviews of our colleagues'/peers' dossiers
- Discussion points raised by Steve and Carl that all committee members should sign a certification statement *"I certify that I have read the policy S 15-8"*
- Consider proposing content and format of workshops to support RTP process for committee members – one type of workshop would offer a general introduction on reviewing faculty dossiers and a second type of workshop would have a case-study based approach using de-identified dossiers in which problems were exposed.
- Point raised by Allison that whereas RTP issues are a priority for PS, perhaps the committee should not devote itself solely to RTP issues.
- Committee members discuss that CFD representative should have a standing invitation to assist PS or serve on our committee during this work around the RTP standards. Members in agreement that we should identify the CFD person before we dive too much into this process.
- Recommendation to all members to consult RTP committees in their respective departments and colleges to determine points of contention and problems encountered during RTP reviews, as committee continues to deliberate and make decisions on how PS will proceed on this issue.

Adjourned 4:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted
Nidhi Mahendra

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 14: March 18, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat E: Kumar

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of Feb 11 (Mahendra)

3. Visit with Provost Joan Ficke
    a. Discussion of Range Elevation issues and policy
    b. Discussion of members of Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR)
    c. Discussion of Referrals S19- 2, 3, 4, and 5 regarding changes to the Appointment and RTP policies references to "AVP for Faculty Affairs" and "Office of Faculty Affairs."

4. Late Add amendment. Revised for final reading. (Attached)

5. Range Elevation policy revisions (Attached)

6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Meeting Minutes

Meeting 14: Monday, March 18, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 pm

Minutes recorded by Seat E: Kumar

Call to order at 2:02 pm.

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Alison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman

ABSENT: Sarah Rodriguez

1. Call to Order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Approval of minutes of Feb 11 (taken by Nidhi)
   - 1 correction noted (Alison instead of Allison)

3. Visit with Provost Joan Ficke

After initial introductions, three topics were discussed. The key items are noted below

a. **Discussion of Range Elevation issues and policy**

Ken started the discussion by posing two questions:

1. It appears that terminal degree is used as qualification and the policy does not talk about other criteria. Vague details about how to establish the criteria.
2. What to do if lecturer is a scholar but this is not part of the actual assignment?

Joan replied that it is a difficult situation for the lecturers without clarity in the evaluation criteria. She shared a model proposed at Mount Clair where they implemented as RSCA like program where a different title for such faculty was created (e.g. faculty instructional specialist and clinical specialist. They were hired to teach for a calendar year (not academic year). These were documented in the appointment letter. The instructional specialist was rooted in the department. Another aspect was security for which either 1, 2 or 3 years' contracts were provided (case in point was for clinical specialists).

The discussion moved to the details to be provided in the appointment letter. The specifics in the letter could be changed such that it reflects the reason for hiring and the duration. The lecturers should know what they have been hired for and the signature affirms that they agreed to do so. If need be, it should be also noted that research is the circumstance of the position.

Key takeaways
Overall: Tidy up the process to make better academic process
The intent is to protect the individual and provide a framework.

I.e. process should be clear for lecturers to understand that if they are moving from A to B, they have to show the work of B.
Recommendation

1. *Expand appointment letter*
   - It should reflect the reason for hiring and the duration. Include other duties if relevant.
2. *Role of individual*
   - They should understand
     a. *What were you hired to do, and*
     b. *Did they do it?*
3. *Evaluation form*
   - Current form may not be appropriate since there appears to be a disconnect between form contents and evaluation criteria.

b. **Discussion of members of Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR)**

There are two issues – academic freedom and professional responsibility (ethics).
Joan enquired as to intent of formation of group and the actual duties to be performed – i.e. educational mission and ethics board. From a set up perspective, it is the principal disciplinary committee.

Staffing the committee was brought up as a concern. It was noted that there is a feeling that not enough faculty know what academic freedom really means. An idea to develop programs for new tenure track faculty to make them understand and get settled into the culture of SJSU was presented. The intent should be to involve the faculty, the college level and the university level administrators in this loop.
A second question asked was "how to select the group of people?". It was also mentioned that the selection process was the AS call and the executive committee is charged with the selection. There should be some screening (thereby some criteria) required in this selection process and might be a role here for the Chief Diversity Officer. The policy should articulate where this function resides. The key takeaway was everyone should be made aware of the true meaning of academic freedom. This could be a message delivered from the Provost's office with support from academic support board.

After Joan left (3:15 pm), the committee debriefed and deliberated on the BAFPR future steps. In response to how to staff the committee, it was noted that the members should feel secure while performing the tasks and therefore an associate professor may not be the best candidate. The members also need a certain level of expectation such as negotiating skills along with judgment. Hence, we need to be careful in how the qualifications of membership are set up. An idea to run the elections through the dean's office was also floated, which might be more work since this would be an extra layer added on to the process. The committee also talked about the term of membership (2 year vs. 4 year terms). 4 years may be unattractive but it could be set up as 2-year term with an option of renewal.

c. **Discussion of Referrals S19- 2, 3, 4, and 5 regarding changes to the Appointment and RTP policies references to "AVP for Faculty Affairs" and "Office of Faculty Affairs."**

The concern is that this is a decision beyond the senate. Joan's advice was to identify the nature of the duty. If interpretive in nature, then this should be Senior Director of Faculty Affairs. If it is academic judgement, then this should be the Office of the Provost (i.e. Provost designee).
In the debriefing, the committee decided to change all the titles.

4. Late Add amendment. Revised for final reading.
Voted and approved 10-0-0

5. Range Elevation policy revisions
Consensus was to do a full revision. Many felt that it was our obligation and a piece meal change was not possible. Discussions will continue at the next PS committee meeting.

Adjourned 4:04 pm.

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 15: April 8, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Monday

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of March 18 (Kumar)

3. BAFPR Amendment (Attached)

4. Range Elevation policy revisions (Attached)

5. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 15: April 8, 2019

Clark Hall 445

2:00-4:00 pm

Minutes recorded by Nyle Monday (seat F)

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Alison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman, Sarah Rodriguez

ABSENT: Carl Kemnitz, Nidhi Mahendra

1. **Called to order at 2:03 pm.**

2. **Approval of minutes of March 18th meeting (taken by Anil Kumar)**

3. **Discussion of BAFPR Amendment**

Based on conversations with various members of administration, and the past record of the current President in approving policies and revisions sent forward from this committee and others, it was felt that an amendment of the BAFPR policy would be unlikely to be approved. Objections would likely be centered more on the original policy, rather than on the current revisions, as it is faculty-centered and might be seen as a threat to Presidential prerogatives.

The suggestion was made that this might be mitigated by the inclusion of a non-voting Senior Director for Faculty Affairs to provide logistical support, and a designee from the Provost's office to serve as a liaison to the Provost and the President. Discussion took place of the relative importance of confidentiality as opposed to administrative buy-in. It was questioned if the presence of administrators might serve to deter faculty and others from seeking the assistance of BAFPR. Conversely, the presence of administrative representatives might give BAPFR some "teeth," as academic freedom is covered under University policy rather than the Union contract. In the past, policy has been inconsistently enforced.

Some discussion was made of nature of collective bargaining in the State of California. Unlike the regions where many of our administrators are from, not everything is covered in our contract and the Faculty Senate controls academic governance. This creates a struggle between the two sides and leaves organizations like BAPFR with little or no enforcement capability, relying on administration to act on its recommendations. Having administrators on the board

might help to insure that that would actually take place. The question was then asked if the Professional Standards Committee should develop the best possible policy, or one which is most likely to be acceptable to the current administration.

It was suggested that RTP might provide a model for the activities of BAPFR. A statement might be included in the policy that requires the Board to meet with the Provost to advise them of the findings of the Board. There might also be an amendment that calls for a formal answering mechanism to insure that a response from administration is forthcoming. The concern that some faculty have had over confidentiality might also be at least partially addressed by having Board members sign non-disclosure agreements, as is the practice for RTP committees.

The use of the word "monitor" seems to be problematic for the current President, so new terminology will be found. Provision for logistical support should be written into the policy, as well as a requirement for a meeting of the Board with the Provost to advise them of the case findings. It was also suggested that BAPFR produce an annual report, so that there will be a public record of the number and types of cases which have occurred, but without case specifics. Other modifications, as shown in the current draft, were approved. Ken will further revise the new policy in light of this discussion and present it to the Committee at its next meeting.

4. Discussion of revisions of Range Elevation policy

It was felt that there must be a great deal of consultation with stakeholders in refining and clarifying this policy, and this will no doubt take a significant period of time. Most Lecturers are not familiar with this policy, and once they become aware of it, there will be questions even if the policy is unchanged. The current policy is somewhat ambiguous about when Lecturers can apply for elevation and does not provide a rigid structure for promotion. This is seen as a positive thing to some, as they want to provide some "wiggle room" for specific cases. Others would rather see something more clearly defined, more on the lines of the RTP process. Extensive discussion took place on the relative merits of the two visions. At present, range elevations for Lecturers are primarily seniority-based and somewhat rare. Not all Lecturers are even aware of this possibility.

Based on this discussion, Committee members seem to feel that there needed to be more clarity regarding the expectations for Lecturers. What level of achievement must be achieved to advance to the next level? Expectations would have to be tied to the individual Lecturer's appointment letter as not all Lecturers have the same assignment. It was suggested that although clarity is needed, it might be advisable to maintain a degree of "strategic ambiguity" to allow for the diversity of activities a Lecturer might be involved in. Flexibility should be built into the policy and it should err on the side of the Lecturers.

Discussion took place regarding some specifics of the evaluation. It was suggested that the narrative should be restricted to 2000 words to avoid overly long applications. It was also discussed whether the material included should be restricted to the past six years rather than

since the last promotion, as some Lecturers may have served in their present classification for a decade or even longer. Similarly, how many years of SOTES should be included? Should previous ASA's be included? The goal is to provide the Lecturers with the opportunity to fully present their achievements but without overdoing their review materials.

Further discussion will take place at the next meeting.

5. **Meeting adjourned at 4:01 pm.**

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 16: April15, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: McKee

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of April 8 (Monday)

3. BAFPR Amendment (Attached)

4. Range Elevation policy revisions (Attached)

5. Guidelines for Late Add (begin discussion)

6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 16: April 15, 2019
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by McKee

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Alison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman, Sarah Rodriguez

1. **Call to Order** at 2 p.m.

2. **Approval of minutes of April 8** (Monday)

3. **BAFPR Amendment**
   - Overview and discussion of proposed changes
   - Mission:
     - "Provide advice" (rather than "monitor") the state of AF and PR at the University.
     - Titles and office names changed to update and reflect current administrative and organizational structure at the University.
     - The Board will report directly to the Provost (or his/her designee), as favored by Provosts Feinstein and Ficke.
     - An annual report will go to Provost/designee, Academic Senate, and University community.
     - Replaced specific references to S99-8 with general reference to AF- and PR-related policies.
   - Membership, Reporting, and Support
     - Issues: confidentiality and sensitive materials; the possible need to report Board recommendations in person to the Provost re: specific cases to maintain privacy.
   - Procedures for Addressing Alleged Infringements of Academic Freedom
     - Disposition of various complaints: e.g., Personnel issues to UPFA, system and structural issues to Provost?
     - Sensitive issues of oversight might occur when a faculty member alleges that AF has been violated by an administrator v. when a faculty member complains about another faculty member.
   - Discussion of Professional Misconduct half of the policy → especially directing people where to go on campus to file certain kinds of complaints → the importance of vectoring certain issues away from the Board to appropriate channels/offices (e.g., Title Ix, civil rights, etc.)
     - Action Item: Ken Peter will reach out to Kathy Wong (Lau) and Joanne Wright for their respective input about Section 2, parts a, b, c, d, and e, and the offices that currently handle complaints referred to in those sections.

- Discussion: "[Members of the BFR] shall act under the authority of the President" (the phrase is from the old policy but it may invite scrutiny from current administration). Should it be the Provost? Either? Should it be struck? But how, then, do we indicate the seriousness of purpose of the Board, its functions, and its recommendations?
- Action Item: Ken Peter will draft a Preamble to address these issues.
- Consensus: The BAFPR Amendment will not go to the next full Senate meeting for a first reading.

4. Lecturer Range Elevation policy revisions

- Recurring topics pf discussion
  - Importance of letters of appointment that specify lecturer assignments to teaching, research, and or/scholarship, as these will determine the terms by which they will be evaluated (most, but not all, lecturers are assigned to teach)
  - Collection of SOTEs: 6 years? (check with Joanne Wright to see if there is any CBA language that contradicts this period)
  - Length of narrative: limit/don't limit to 2,000 words. Or set 2,000 words as an expectation of length rather than a hard and fast rule?
- Real policy revision will be time-consuming and require input from many stakeholders.

5. Guidelines for Late Add

- Due to miscommunication, the President initially received only the first two (of three) pages and did not get the full file until 1:58 p.m. today.
- Critical issues: what's allowed in and when? What can/cannot be considered?
- Observation: this year there were 17 requests for late adds and only 2 resulted in changed vote outcomes.
- At the same time, faculty have the right to to present the strongest case possible in favor of RTP and to insist on due process, no matter how onerous Late Adds can make that process for committees.
- One option: split the procedural pathway → if the RTP vote is favorable (i.e., retain and/or promote), then include the accepted late-added material into the file but don't send the dossier back to previous levels of review → it will be seen by the higher levels as the file proceeds forward → i.e., URTP and Provost will see the late adds. If the vote has not been favorable at any of the previous levels, however, then the accepted late-adds need to go back to committees at previous levels of review.
- Issue of Fall SOTEs: if submitting fall SOTES for consideration for late add, candidates must indicate in their justification how they demonstrate new information (e.g., needed improvement or greater teaching experience) and therefore make a material difference in their RTP case.

6. Adjourn at 3:57 p.m.

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 17: April 29, 2019
ADM 223A
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of April 15 (McKee)

3. Guidelines for Late Add (Discuss attached memo)

4. BAFPR Amendment (Attached)

5. Range Elevation policy revisions (Attached)

6. Adjourn

Meeting 17: April 29, 2019
ADM 223A
2:00-4:00 PM
Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

Present: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Alison McKee, Nyle Monday, Priya Raman, Sarah Rodriguez

Call to Order – 2:04 PM

1. Approval of minutes of April 15 (McKee) - approved

2. Bullying issue – numerous inquiries, issue assigned to new chief of staff, out to new chief diversity officer, put together a working group, met a week ago, Kathy Lau reported working on campus climate survey which will include issues related to bullying, campus climate survey will be a 3 semester process,

3. Guidelines for Late Add (Discuss attached memo)

CBA doesn't allow for differentiated restarts, any late add material must go back and be restarted at department level

This means that what constitutes late add material must be more clearly differentiated

Once process of RTP starts in fall, then it can't be changed. Any guidelines need to be in place before dossiers are submitted

Procedural material not in question

We suggest this language be replaced with the following:

Material shall be accepted for late admission into the dossier only for candidates undergoing performance reviews or seeking promotion.
The submission must provide clear evidence that the information became accessible only after the date of the closing of the dossier and that it is pertinent. When justifying a submission, candidates should keep the following points in mind:
1) "After the date of the closing of the dossier." This means that the actual achievement occurred after the closing date—not merely that documentation of an earlier achievement became available after the closing date. For example, the final acceptance of a publication occurs after the deadline, or an art show or musical performance occurs after the deadline, or a candidate is elected to an important professional or service leadership role after the deadline.
Committee members felt examples are good
2) "…and that it is pertinent." Late items that indicate a significantly improved pattern of achievement are pertinent. Late items that fit a pattern documented elsewhere in the dossier are not.

Question: what if it is a new course. Then yes, include b/c new course even with same SOTES

Pertinent discussion below

3) Fall SOTES and other teaching materials. Normally, these materials should not be added late since they are unlikely to shift a pattern established through many earlier semesters, but should instead be saved for use in any subsequent reviews. If, however, a department or college level review recommends a negative decision based at least partly on teaching, then such materials become "pertinent" and may be included if the case is made that they show significant improvement over a prior pattern

Committee: Do they know that you can include a letter/personal statement to justify need? Discussion of being more explicit on writing a justification for late add. They should think of this as instructions to both the candidate and the committee.

What about "other teaching materials"? When would this be appropriate? Things they did in class after deadline. If first time teaching, might want to submit materials like handout that happened half way through semester, or simulation or group project. If planned at start of semester, then why allow? Because it may have been more profound or had a greater outcome/effect than thought.

What does everyone think of "if negative decision"? Perhaps frame as negative votes? This errs very far on faculty rights side, but at same time there will be lots of re-evaluation of dossiers. Discussion of 6-year probation but evaluated on 5 years of work. Distinguish between rebuttal and including additional information to support your argument. This should not be an entire new dossier, but an appropriate level of info for clarity for moving forward. Discussion of rebuttal inequity, some are strictly concise, and others include new info. Future discussion of rebuttals needed. Alternate wording for negative decision wording: "An improved pattern in a previously perceived weakness"

Be explicit about pertinent but leave that up to the late add committee to judge whether it meets that requirement. Late add committee only refers to justification, not entire dossier. Does the committee have enough information to say "no." Would need more guidance for what is pertinent and what is not pertinent. Could provide a list of items that are pertinent and what are not pertinent.

Discussion of "pattern" – late add should indicate support of or breaking of a pattern

Add examples for research and service (in addition to SOTES, teaching examples) – this could all be a subheading for #2 with examples for teaching, research and service

4. BAFPR Amendment

Section 4.2 – five items sent to Joanne and Kathy, Joanne responded with general reservations UP may handle some complaints, UPFA may handle a Title IX, it may be easy to state things this BPR is not responsible for, personnel items can't be shared

Carl indicated that a lot of these things are handled by grievance. That process is not handled by the process in this policy. Section 4.3 is also a concern b/c dictates method for UPFA to follow, some of these things happen differently than outlined. Perhaps James can take a role in this.

This policy is the one that enforces the things that no one else enforces.

Discussion of rewording of 4.2 to fulfill what BFR is doing and refer to UPFA. Really need to rescind and replace some of this material

No point bringing as a first reading this year as not just an edit but more a rescind and replace, need to remove procedural stuff that falls under UPFA now. Problem points 4.2 & 4.3

Committee wonders if James would take this on as a project in summer working with Joanne, Ken will inquire if he is willing

5. Range Elevation policy revisions

Could bring it as a first reading to publicize that we are working on it, needs consultation process. Discussion of the amount of revision this needs and that it isn't time to prematurely bring it forward

Discussion of changes that have been made

Discussion of Section 1.B – does this section contain relevant information? Relevant info can be incorporated into appropriate sections

Discussion of Section 1.C and 1.D – perhaps a more general preface could be incorporated into the preface, some of 1.D can be moved to another area

Discussion of Section III.C

6. Adjourn – 3:55 PM

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 18: May 6, 2019
ADM 223A
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat J: Raman

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of minutes
    a. of April 15 (Cargill)

3. Guidelines for Late Add (Discuss attached memo, as per email revisions)

4. Range Elevation policy revisions (Attached)

5. BAFPR Amendment (Attached) Suggestion: work with James Lee over the summer to redraft.

6. Adjourn for the Year.