

2019-2020 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee: Professional Standards

Chair: Kenneth Peter

Chair-Elect for 2020-2021:

Kenneth Peter

45562

Number of Meeting held: 19

0119

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

Items of Business Completed 2019/2020

1. Revised Late-Add Guidelines
2. Studied RTP Implementation and issued major report on improving it
3. Research and reissued the archaic but still valid "Banked Time" policy
4. Passed a temporary SOTE exclusion amendment for use during the COVID pandemic.
5. Assisted the Provost in crafting a memo to guide Faculty Evaluation during COVID
6. Passed a policy recommendation to enable title changes related to the Faculty Affairs reorganization.
7. Rescinded an obsolete policy on evaluation of Unit 4 faculty
8. Revised and passed a SOTE exclusion amendment clarifying which SOTEs may be regularly excluded from evaluations.

Unfinished Business Items from 2019/2020

1. Revision of Lecturer Policy
- 2.
- 3.

New Business Items for 2020/2021

- 1.

2.

3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by June 16, 2020.

Meeting 18: May 6, 2019

ADM 223A

2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat J: Raman

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

Call to Order – 2:02 PM

1. Approval of minutes of April 29 (Cargill) - approved
2. Late Add Guidelines (Discussion continued from last meeting)
 - Discussion resumed with importance of candidates making a case for their late-add materials, such that the late-add committee is not “burdened” with trying to figure out importance or significance of the material. As such, the onus is on the candidate to explain the importance of the material to the dossier.
 - The justification need not be onerous; a candidate can simply (and in short) explain (a) why the material is late, and (b) why is it relevant to the candidate’s case.
 - This would be helpful to both candidate as well as late-add committee members. Ken mentioned that committee members could use “face-validity” to judge the appropriateness/quality of the material via the candidate statement rather than the actual materials themselves.
 - Additional discussion: One way to have “fair” reviews is to compress all three layers of review into one semester. Alternatively, have the “final” RTP review in the 7th year – this would give candidates 6 full years to develop their profiles and cases.
 - Alternatively, candidates could add late-add information to the *rebuttal* letter(s) up the chain.
3. Vote on statement from memo (Pertinence, last sentence) per email revisions
 - Keep the statement, 6-3
 - Discussion on modifications with respect to “significant achievement”. Split on whether “significant” is an appropriate word to use. Ditto with “pattern” Alternatives proposed were “noteworthy”, “notable”. James suggested that the arrangement of Teaching, Research and Service in the memo be looked at.

4. Sarah had to leave at 2:42 pm

- Kudos to Sarah for being an excellent committee member.

5. Vote: Committee votes to endorse this memo as an advice to the Administration on Revisions to the 2001 guidelines

- Passed unanimously, 8-0-3

6. Range Elevation policy discussion

- Continuing members of the PS committee will keep working on the rough draft of the policy.
- Reviewed edits made on sections 1.1 through 1.4
- Paid particular attention to senate resolution language
- 1.2 in particular referenced the CBA and a large part was struck down
- James will continue to work on section 1.2.1
- Lecturer orientations are important and are needed to convey this information [range elevation policy] to them directly
- Discussion of what terms may be deemed appropriate for inclusion as Department “asks” – e.g. use “strongly encouraged” rather than “need[ing]”
- Suggestion that lecturer titles should be moved to an appendix
 - Question on how many of these titles are current, and who should oversee? Joanna or UP? Ken to investigate
 - e.g 1.3.10.1 Adjunct Professor – is this in line with CSU and CBA guidelines?
- 1.4 Discussion on confidentiality
 - Procedures and criteria need to be consistent across
 - Appointment
 - Evaluations
 - Range Elevation
- III: Official offers of employment must be made in writing. Lecture appointment letter needs to be explicit and must relate directly to evaluation.
 - Shelley stressed that all aspects of the assignment (teaching AND others) should be reflected in both letter of appointment and evaluation criteria.
 - Evaluation criteria needs to be as clear as possible
 - Discussion on whether range elevation should be automatic post evaluations or whether lecturers need to apply for it

- Conversation on case that struck down terminal degrees for range elevation
- James to find information on CSU policies re “tenured lecturers.”

7. Future action items

- Ken is running again for PS Chair
- He requests people to come back to the committee as they are able
- Has two “big” goals/projects for next year
 - 1/2 Wants to see the Academic Freedom Policy go through
 - BAFR riddled with lots of “Admin” bits. Clarity on Provost, VP, James roles on committee
 - 2/2 Need for training Faculty and Administrators on RTP policy

8. 4:00 p.m. Ken thanked committee; committee thanked Ken for an excellent semester. Thanks to James for joining us. Meeting was adjourned.

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 1: August 26, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Kemnitz

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of May 6 (Raman)
3. Updates:
 - a. President will (has?) signed Late Add amendment. The committee's suggestions have been forwarded to the Provost who is now responsible for issuing the late add guidelines.
 - b. SOTE Exclusion amendment not signed Returned for consultation with Joanne Wright and Carl Kemnitz.
 - c. Training of RTP Committees?
 - d. Charging statement for RTP committees?
4. Ongoing projects
 - a. BAFPR. Alternate strategy?
 - b. Lecturer Policy
5. New issues
 - a. Editing references to AVPFA in policy.
 - b. Collecting data on RTP old/new implementation
 - c. Issue with policy language on SOTE "norms"
6. Member suggestions
7. Adjourn.

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

Meeting 1: August 26, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Kemnitz

Present: Zachary Birrer, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nidhi Mahendra, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley

1. Call to Order 2:00
2. Approval of minutes; May 6 (Raman) – approved with no dissent
3. Updates:
 - a. President has signed Late Add amendment. The committee's suggestions have been forwarded to the Provost who is now responsible for issuing the late add guidelines.
 - Chair Peter reviewed the major changes and those were discussed with the committee for feedback to the provost
 - Teaching = Academic Assignment
 - First “may” = “should”
 - Plausible vs. possible vs. “noteworthy improvement”
 - “ratings” = “levels of achievement”
 - When the late-add committee judges that the statement makes a plausible case that ...
 - “several” = “many”, “typically” = “often” ?
 - Two extremes under RSCA.
 - Service: “might plausibly shift” is better than current
 - Duplicate last sentence suggestion for RSCA/Service
 - Examples seem to be more challenging to avoid what might be viewed as restrictive language.
 - b. SOTE Exclusion amendment not signed Returned for consultation with Joanne Wright and Carl Kemnitz.
 - Article 40 of the CBA is at odds with proposed policy
 - SOTEs cannot be the sole means of evaluation
 - Long discussion about special sessions
 - Question: should we divide out the two issues? (quick fix in the amendment and then address special session evaluations)

- c. Training of RTP Committees
 - Training for committees coming
 - James Lee could share presentation w/ PS
 - d. Charging statement for RTP committees
 - Policy requires both confidentiality and charging statement
4. Ongoing projects
- a. BAFPR. Alternate strategy
 - Staff BAFPR with policies as they currently exist
5. Adjourned at 4:01

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 1: Sept 9, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Chin

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Aug 26 (Kemnitz)
3. Updates:
 - a. The Provost has issues Late Add guidelines (attached.) The guidelines reflected our advice, with some beneficial simplification. Many thanks to Carl for shepherding these through!
 - b. Following our last meeting, CFA pointed out that the newly revised RTP calendar had moved the final deadline for late add materials up to December 20. This would have excluded all Fall Sotes as well as the “pulse” of articles that gain acceptance in January after reviewers return from their breaks. This was pointed out to James, who has restored the January late add date. Many thanks to James!
4. SOTE Exclusion amendment. Decide next step.

I had a productive conversation with Joanne, who indicated that the issue was the concern that SOTES not ever be the sole basis of evaluation—which could lead to grievances. Solution: amend the teaching evaluation policy to make it clear that ALL courses—regular as well as special sessions—will be SOTEd (subject to the usual exceptions), and also that ALL evaluations of t/tt faculty, lecturers, and special sessions faculty will be holistic. Holistic: relying not only on SOTES but also on direct observations and teaching materials like syllabi.

5. BAFPR. Shall we end this referral?

It seems unlikely that any major reform effort of this important committee will be productive. Restrict ourselves to title changes regarding the AVPFA as per all other policies?

6. AVPFA to SDFA-UP (Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs to Senior Director for Faculty Affairs—University Personnel). Resolving nomenclature in our policies.

Professional Standards is responsible for numerous policies that cite the AVPFA as having various roles in implementation. In most cases (most implementation issues), the

S DFA-UP should take over this role. In a few cases (related to policy formulation or interpretation), the Provost or the Provost's designee should take over a role.

Solution: a policy empowering the Senate office to editorially change all instances of the AVPFA to S DFA-UP with a list of exceptions that we identify in the policy as "Provost or designee."

7. Reviewing the RTP policies

The RTP policy specifically requires us to periodically review the policy. To do so, I suggest we gather data while we still have the results of the old RTP policy available. We get instant feedback on process problems, but no feedback at all on outcomes. We need to assess our outcomes.

Specifically, it would be good to know information such as the following:

- a. Old vs new; rates for all outcomes including early, tenure, promotion, special reviews, etc.
- b. Three categories of achievement: ratings at all levels (Department, Dean, College, University, Provost, President for each of the three areas of achievement

How can we obtain this information (anonymously, of course)?

8. Format Guide

James has requested input on the current "What goes where" guide (attached.) This guide is referred to in policy as the "format guide."

S15-7 (5.4.5.1)The AVP for Faculty Affairs in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee shall produce and maintain a format guide for the dossier. Before implementation, the format guide must be approved by the AVP for Faculty Affairs, the Professional Standards Committee, and by the University RTP Committee. The guide will specify the organizational structure of the dossier, will summarize all required materials, will specify its format, the length and types of appropriate documentation, required statements or narratives by the candidate, and any other required characteristics.

Before the RTP policies were approved, Professional Standards included many specific dossier requirements in draft policy, such as a 2000 word limit on narrative statements. Prior to passage these specific requirements were removed from policy and placed in the format guide as a more suitable venue for such specifics.

9. Training of RTP Committees

Feedback for James on what RTP Committees need to learn in their training sessions.

- a. Training of RTP Committees?
- b. Charging statement for RTP committees?

10. Issue with policy language on SOTE “norms.”

We are reaching the point where some faculty are falling below the “norm” with SOTE scores above 4.0. The instrument uses a different scale on the “overall” question than it does on any others. This is the scale:

(5, very effective; 4, effective; 3, somewhat effective; 2, ineffective; 1, very ineffective)

What this means is that faculty who are rated as overall “effective” teachers by their students could in some instances be denied tenure or promotion on the basis of their teaching falling below the “norm.”

Solution: Should be amend the “Criteria and Standards” policy to supplement the descriptor of baseline teaching to indicate something like “falls within the norms or is judged effective by students”?

11. Adjourn.

Professional Standards (PS) Committee

Minutes

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

Minutes taken by Seat B: Chin

Present: Zachary Birrer, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, James Lee (joined at 3 pm), Nidhi Mahendra, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley

1. Call to Order 2 pm
2. Approval of minutes
 - A. of Aug 26 (Kemnitz)—approved
3. Updates
 - A. The Provost has issued Late Add guidelines which reflected the advice and suggestions from PS, with some beneficial simplification. Thanks to Kemnitz for shepherding these through.
 - B. Following our last meeting, CFA pointed out that the newly revised RTP calendar had moved the final deadline for late add materials up to December 20. This would have excluded all Fall Sotes as well as the “pulse” of articles that gain acceptance in January after reviewers return from their breaks. This was pointed out to James Lee, who has restored the January late add date. Many thanks to Lee for addressing this issue.
4. SOTE Exclusion amendment. Decide next step.
 - A. Peter had a productive conversation with Joanne Wright. He indicated that the issue was the concern that SOTEs not ever be the sole basis of evaluation—which could lead to grievances.
 - B. Solution proposed: amend the teaching evaluation policy to make it clear that ALL courses—regular as well as special sessions—will be SOTEd (subject to the usual exceptions), and also that ALL evaluations of T/TT faculty, lecturers, and special sessions faculty will be holistic. Holistic: relying not only on SOTEs but also on direct observations and teaching materials like syllabi.
 - C. Peter presented policy recommendation for amendment of F12-6 (SOTE exclusion policy)
 - i. Riley: questioned whether direct observation is the sole means of peer observations by policy (F12-6); could possibly include a review of curriculum, for example
 - ii. Departments should have their own direct observation guidelines

- iii. Peter invites feedback from PS and J. Wright to proposed amendment
- 5. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR)
 - A. Discussion of whether to end this referral or continue to work to improve policy
 - i. Board now has 4 members (from 1)
 - ii. Due to recent vetoes of proposed BAPFR policy amendments, it seems unlikely that any major reform effort of this important committee will be productive
 - B. Motion to close referral (Riley); Second (Cargill). Motion carries 10-0 unanimous** (Lee absent for vote)
- 6. Need to resolve issue of nomenclature in existing university policies since there has been a change in university positions-- removing Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs (AVPFA) and installing Senior Director for Faculty Affairs—University Personnel (SDFA-UP).
 - A. Professional Standards is responsible for numerous policies that cite the AVPFA as having various roles in implementation.
 - i. In most cases (most *implementation* issues), the SDFA-UP should take over this role.
 - ii. In a few cases (related to *policy formulation or interpretation*), the Provost or the Provost’s designee should take over a role.
 - iii. A significant issue that arises is that it is sometimes unclear to whom the task in question should be appropriated, but it is important that faculty issues be kept on academic side of the house (Academic Affairs side, not UP)
 - B. Recommended solution:** a policy empowering the Senate office to editorially change all instances of the AVPFA to SDFA-UP with a list of exceptions that we identify in the policy as “Provost or designee”
 - i. Start with listing out specific policies where AVPFA is mentioned, then make decision of whether to change
 - ii. Peter will start process for next meeting
- 7. Reviewing the RTP policies
 - A. The RTP policy specifically requires PS to periodically review the policy. The review needs to start within a year.
 - i. For the review, we need different data (in addition to process issues which make up the bulk of the feedback currently collected/received by PS), especially related to RTP outcomes, but question is how to collect data.
 - ii. Outcome data that could be useful in the review include: how many special reviews were completed; how many 4th and 5th reviews are being done; rates for all outcomes including early tenure, tenure and promotion; how do faculty do across three categories of achievement?; what are the ratings at all levels (Department, Dean, College, University, Provost, President) for each of the three areas of achievement; comparison of promotion rates comparing old to new RTP policy.
 - iii. PS will continue to identify and address procedural issues

- B. How can we obtain this information (anonymously)? Not just this year, but looking back multiple years (longitudinal data)
 - C. *Lee requested brief proposal for type and amount of data needed for review as he will need to figure out administrative needs for collecting such data*
 - D. Concern was raised about difficulty in divorcing recent outcome data from effects of leadership changes, RTP changes, moving to electronic dossier and other overarching issues that affect process
8. Format Guide (RTP Dossier)
- A. Lee provided “What goes where” guide. This guide is referred to in policy as the “format guide.”
 - B. *SI5-7 (5.4.5.1)The AVP for Faculty Affairs in consultation with the Professional Standards Committee shall produce and maintain a format guide for the dossier. Before implementation, the format guide must be approved by the AVP for Faculty Affairs, the Professional Standards Committee, and by the University RTP Committee. The guide will specify the organizational structure of the dossier, will summarize all required materials, will specify its format, the length and types of appropriate documentation, required statements or narratives by the candidate, and any other required characteristics.*
 - C. Discussion about “2000 word limit on narrative statements”.
 - i. There is often misunderstanding/misinterpretation about this 2000 word limit
 - 1. Statements and other contextualizing information can be added throughout the dossier, in addition to the 2000 word narrative
 - ii. Question was raised whether we should be more or less stringent with the 2000 word count.
 - 1. Allowing longer statements presents workload issues for reviewers
 - 2. 2000 words seems to be a reasonable length to allow for an effective and succinct statement
 - iii. *PS agreed that there should be more clarity in the instructions, stating that a 2000 word limit is suggested/recommended and including a brief description of the purpose of the statement/narrative to give the reader some direction*
 - iv. *Also, add a reminder that more explanations and contextualization can be added in other areas of the dossier*
9. Training of RTP Committees
- A. Lee presented draft of PPT presentation on preparing/training RTP (training required by policy). Topics included:
 - i. Timeline
 - ii. Different levels of review and options to respond to different levels of review (flowchart)
 - iii. Creating fair and equitable committees
 - iv. Ethics, conflicts of interest, recusals
 - v. Standards: different policies (old vs. new); principles of evaluation
 - vi. Guidelines; criteria (with descriptors)
 - vii. Teaching: SOTE/SOLATEs (CBA and University Policy F12-6)

- B. PS provided feedback on slide content
 - i. Change SOTE exclusion slide to include “15 units per semester” not per year
 - ii. Add clarification on symbols on charts (baseline, good, excellent chart)
 - iii. Adjust visual levels of “good” “baseline” “excellent” for clarity
- C. Concern raised over lack of information/invitation to sign up for RTP training
 - i. Lee will follow up and send email
- D. Concern raised over receiving content of training if cannot physically attend
 - i. Lee will look into other options such as virtual presence and/or recording
- 10. Issue with policy language on SOTE “norms”
 - A. We are reaching the point where some faculty are falling below the “norm” with SOTE scores above 4.0.
 - B. What does it mean to fall within the norm?
 - i. Averages are often above norm
 - ii. Confusion in the phrase norm, where some faculty interpret the norm as the average/mean and report it as such, but this is incorrect. Norm is not the average.
 - 1. Discussion of whether/how to clarify language in policy
 - 2. How to report items with different scores in different ranges
 - a. Difficult to report in summary statements (written by committee chairs, for example)
 - iii. Issue: The instrument uses a different scale on the “overall” question than it does on any others. This is the scale: 5, very effective; 4, effective; 3, somewhat effective; 2, ineffective; 1, very ineffective
 - iv. In this instance, faculty who are rated as overall “effective” teachers by their students could in some instances be denied tenure or promotion on the basis of their teaching falling below the “norm.”
 - C. Recommendations/possible paths forward**
 - i. Reintroducing SOTES visuals with the norms
 - ii. Ask SERB to produce a wider range of more effective norms to better contextualize teaching instead of lumping all classes together for ‘norming’
 - 1. Inclusion of more norms needed to consider differences in teaching between, for example, graduate/undergraduate; large lecture/small seminar; lower division/upper division
 - iii. Change language of policy for clarity, amending the “Criteria and Standards” policy to supplement the descriptor of baseline teaching to indicate something like “falls within the norms” or “is judged effective by students”
 - iv. Need more and better training of RTP committees to implement current policy and SERB guide
 - 1. *Suggest that SERB put clear definition of norm at top of guidelines*
 - D. Peter will invite chair of SERB to meet with PS

11. Adjourn 4:10 pm

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 1: Sept 23, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Sep 9 (Chin)
3. Updates:
 - a. President Papazian raised two faculty related issues with Chair Mathur. One was the President's desire to consider a new category of faculty "faculty of practice." The second was the possibility of hiring a substantial number of full time Lecturers with three year contracts after national searches. It was noted that policy changes might be needed.
 - b. I have conferred with Mary Currin-Percival, Chair of Serb, about our concerns regarding the frequent misinterpretation of the SOTEs. She will attend a future meeting of PS, but wishes to have a chance to meet with SERB first to initiate their agenda before reporting back to us.
 - c. Training of RTP committees is proceeding apace thanks to James Lee.
 - d. Summary of this year's complaints coming to me about dossier submission. Interface issues with eFaculty, continued concerns over confidentiality of materials in eFaculty, last minute instructions on front matter, etc.
 - e. The issue of faculty in the College of Professional and Graduate Education and RTP. University and College and Department level reviews?
4. SOTE Exclusion amendment.

The amendment has been revised with the input of the two officers indicated in the veto message. (attached).

5. Reviewing the RTP policies

A number of faculty who were denied tenure and/or promotion have approached me with concerns about enforcement of provisions of the RTP policy. I have replied that all individual cases are handled by CFA with the grievance process. PS does, however, have an interest in overall policy concerns that might transcend individual cases. I will summarize what I know and open it up to discussion as to how to proceed.

In addition, we should discuss what specific information we would like Faculty Affairs to compile regarding the RTP process to assist with our review of RTP outcomes. What would be especially helpful, and what not? Could this information be presented in the annual report that Faculty Affairs makes to the Senate?

6. AVPFA to SDFa-UP (Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs to Senior Director for Faculty Affairs—University Personnel). Resolving nomenclature in our policies.

I have gone through the entire policy list on the Senate website (twice) and downloaded all those policies that are known to have originated with Professional Standards. I combined all the pdfs into a single document and converted that document to Word format. I have arranged them chronologically.

The result is a single searchable document, although some of the earliest files gave the optical converter problems and did not convert well. While this document is not good enough to produce finished copies of policies, it is good enough to search for various key words.

There are 125 instances of "Faculty Affairs." Perhaps not all of them will need to be changed. Some refer to the office, some to the title.

There are 74 instances of "AVP" and 9 of "AAVP."

The policy file is 247 pages long

Suggestion: Examine the policies for possibly rescissions first, and draft an omnibus policy that rescinds the obsolete policies and authorizes changes in the names of office in the remaining as appropriate-- in one swoop.

7. Adjourn.

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

Meeting 3: Sept 23, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order at 2:00pm

Presents: Zachary Birrer, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley

Absents: Nidhi Mahendra

2. Approval of minutes

- a. of Sep 9 (Chin) – approved.

3. Updates:

- a. President Papazian raised two faculty related issues with Chair Mathur. One was the President's desire to consider a new category of faculty, "faculty of practice." The second was the possibility of hiring a substantial number of full time lecturers with three year contracts after national searches. It was noted that policy changes may be needed. Those are the positions for which the degree and the time commitment it takes to maintain the professional practice makes it difficult or unlikely to pursue RSCA. However, under the current RTP policy, those departments, such as nursing, can create a guideline to declare their professional activities to be considered as a part of the RSCA. Unfortunately we haven't received the resubmission of the nursing department guidelines since we provided them comments last year. It has to be negotiated in a very careful way so that we can improve the commitment of our lecturers without undermining the need to continue to improve our faculty ratio and support our full time tenured and tenure track faculty.
- b. Ken has conferred with Mary Currin-Percival, Chair of Serb, about our concerns regarding the frequent misinterpretation of the SOTEs. She will attend a future meeting of PS, but wishes to have a chance to meet with SERB first to initiate their agenda before reporting back to us.
- c. Training of RTP committees is proceeding apace thanks to James Lee. Hopefully, the training will be good for three years.

- d. Summary of this year's complaints coming to Ken about dossier submission. Interface issues with eFaculty, continued concerns over confidentiality of materials in eFaculty, last minute instructions on front matter, etc. The confidentiality should be emphasized in the future training of RTP committees.
- e. The issue of faculty in the College of Professional and Global Education and RTP. University, College, and Department level reviews? Are we able to conduct both level reviews (College and Department) internally? Do we give this college its own representative on the university RTP committee or should this group become part of the General Unit together with librarians and counselors? James will discuss with them and report back to PS for further discussion.

4. SOTE Exclusion amendment.

The amendment has been revised with the input of the two officers indicated in the veto message. Faculty teaching must be evaluated holistically. On line 73 after sources of information, "such as direct observations, SOTES, syllabi, and other teaching materials" will be added to avoid the misinterpretation that direct observations is the only alternative to SOTES. On line 115, we add "the remaining SOTES shall be representative of the teaching assignment" to emphasis that the classes for which SOTES are given out have to be representative of the breadth of teaching assignments. Ken will implement an online vote to allow all members to participate.

5. Reviewing the RTP policies

A number of faculty who were denied tenure and/or promotion have approached Ken with concerns about enforcement of provisions of the RTP policy. Ken has replied that all individual cases are handled by CFA with the grievance process. PS does, however, have an interest in overall policy concerns that might transcend individual cases. Ken summarized what he knows and opens it up to discussion as to how to proceed. Some issues should be referred to Faculty Diversity Committee. Ken will ask those faculty to provide more evidence for PS to discuss further.

6. AVPFA to SDFP-UP (Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs to Senior Director for Faculty Affairs—University Personnel). Resolving nomenclature in our policies.

Ken has gone through the entire policy list on the Senate website (twice) and downloaded all those policies that are known to have originated with Professional Standards. He combined all the pdfs into a single document and converted that document to Word format. He has arranged them chronologically.

The result is a single searchable document, although some of the earliest files gave the optical converter problems and did not convert well. While this document is not good enough to produce finished copies of policies, it is good enough to search for various key words.

There are 125 instances of "Faculty Affairs." Perhaps not all of them will need to be changed. Some refer to the office, some to the title.

There are 74 instances of "AVP" and 9 of "AAVP."

The policy file is 247 pages long

Suggestion: Examine the policies for possible rescissions first, and draft an omnibus policy that rescinds the obsolete policies and authorizes changes in the names of office in the remaining as appropriate-- in one swoop. Committee members will examine those pre1990 policies for rescissions. Carl will create a shared google doc to organize it more efficiently.

7. Adjourn at 4:05pm.

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 4: Oct 14, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat D: Mahendra

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Sep 9 (He)
3. Updates:
 - a. The Provost has agreed to come to Professional Standards for our October 21 meeting to discuss his ideas concerning the Lecturer policy.
 - b. Is there information regarding consultation with: College of Professional and Graduate Education and RTP?
 - c. The SOTE Exclusion Amendment passed the Senate unanimously and is on the way to the President for the second time.
4. Rescinding S73-19. (Attached)
5. Status of F70-5 “Banked Time.” This policy was abstruse without the memo to which it referred. We have located the memo. The policy may still have utility. Next steps?
6. Status of F85-8 “PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR EMPLOYEES IN UNIT 4 - ACADEMIC SUPPORT”. This policy concerns Student Service Professionals III and IV staff. Rescind or update?
7. Status of S92-3 “APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION POLICY FOR LIBRARY FACULTY WITH TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS.” What next?
8. Beginning Inquiry into AY 2018-19 RTP policy implementation. (See big attached packet.)
9. AVPFA to SDFa-UP (Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs to Senior Director for Faculty Affairs—University Personnel). Resolving nomenclature in our policies. Continue to rescind and update policies before initiating editorial changes?
10. Adjourn.

1. Meeting called to order 2:02 pm

Present: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Anil Kumar, Shelley Cargill, Nyle Monday, Steven He, Jessica Chin, Shannon Rose Riley, Nidhi Mahendra, Zachary Birrer (student representative), Carl Kemnitz (Sr. VP AA), James Lee (Sr. Director, AA)

Absent: None

2. Approval of Minutes – approved unanimously with no abstention.

3. PS Updates

- a) Ken shared that Provost del Casino will be visiting PS at next week's meeting (time certain: 2:00 pm) and he is interested in discussing the lecturer policy and has some ideas for better integrating lecturers into the campus environment.
- b) Regarding RTP policies and the new CPGE, Ken asked the committee to consider whether we should reach out to them and raised the topic of whether CPGE would be considered a 'typical' college and have multiple levels of review in RTP process given their small number of faculty (estimated at 28). Would small number of faculty available allow for the same diversity in review process, as in other colleges? It appears CPGE's process could be similar to librarians and counselors, who are permitted to use a different college's RTP committee, and send a representative to that committee.
- c) Ken reported that the SOTE exclusion amendment, following addressing Carl's and Joanne Wright's comments, passed the Senate unanimously and is being considered a second time by President Papazian.

4. Rescinding S 73-19

Ken explained that S73-19 (*Faculty Personnel Records: Confidentiality, Access*) needs to be rescinded. S12-2 indeed updated this old 1973 policy (at the request of the Chancellor's office) and should have not just 'amended' S 73-19 but should have rescinded and replaced it. In his research, Ken discussed S 73-19 with Joanne Wright, and former SJSU faculty, Wendy Ng (now Dean, CLASS at CSUEB) to confirm his understanding. PS is unanimous in favor of rescinding S73-19.

5. Status of F70-5 Banked Time

F70-5 is the policy on the accumulation and withdrawal of banked time for faculty, established at then San Jose State College. This is an interesting discovery as there are varied trends across departments and colleges at SJSU, currently. For example, Shannon shared that the Humanities and Arts do not permit faculty to bank time while Shelley shared that in her college, banked time

is permitted. James added that the banked time policy is a helpful one, and is now referred to as “load balancing” and is decided between deans and department chairs. Carl agreed that the policy has value, and banking is occurring in multiple departments across the university (also confirmed by James). Carl added that banked time should be used when it makes sense and is often based on what deserves workload allocation. Ken suggests that F70-5 be rescinded and replaced (and eliminate gendered language) and to attach the original Bunzel policy recommendation (removing Clause 2) and Burns memo and send out to campus with an accompanying memo. Discussion had about whether memo is helpful in its current form, needs modification (e.g., to include language on load balancing), and should be distributed to deans and to UCCD. Sense among PS members is to send it out since “banking” is occurring among some departments, and documenting it carefully is necessary as it has impact on other campus programs like the RSCA Assigned Time Awards (ATA).

6. **F85-8 Performance Evaluation Procedures and Criteria for Employees in Unit 4 (Academic Support)** Ken brought up the issue of how Unit 4 employees are evaluated, and on the criteria for these evaluations. This policy needs to be modified and brought in line with other policies, and to be consistent with what is happening with evaluations of current academic support and student services professionals. It is not clear that the current 120 student services professionals are aware of the existence of this policy. Ken’s question to PS is whether we should rescind or revise this policy, and whether realistically we will be able to, given existing work on PS agenda. If we revise this policy, we would need a subcommittee of Unit 4 stakeholders to participate in the process since Unit 4 constituents are not represented on PS committee. After discussion, Carl and Ken advise that details of Unit 4 employee evaluation are highly ingrained in their CBA and we cannot contradict their CBA by any action we take. At the same time, there is hesitation to rescind the policy in case there are concerns about such action. Therefore, further action is not possible without outreach to or feedback from Unit 4 representatives. Ken clarifies that line indicating “Document dated September 15, 1996” likely is a typo and should be **1985**, based on information available on the CSU website.

7. **S92-3 (Appointment and Evaluation Policy for Library Faculty with Temporary Appointments)** – Researching this had been delegated to Nyle. He reports that this policy is obsolete and library no longer has FT temporary appointments or “lecturer” titles. Also, there is no longer an Associate Director position, but a Dean position and Nyle thinks these evaluations would fall under Associate Dean, Emily Chan. Carl advises we should follow the same steps of action as we decided for Unit 4 employees because this 1992 policy likely passes for a reason, despite the existence of CBA. This policy might be related to the one on GRIFs (grant-related instructional faculty). Ken recommends a small focus group be conducted to decide further course of action.

8. AY 2018-2019 RTP Policy Implementation

PS identifies this as our most important issue. Ken requests PS to offer input, about thoughts on next steps for us as a committee, given the types and number of concerns from faculty. He reminds PS that our conversation is not to be about individual candidates and the merits of their cases, rather we should be thinking broadly about issues of policy. He cautions that the information provided by CFA on this issue should be considered sensitive and not be further distributed. He also reminded PS that we are the stewards of this policy and that an important reason for examining alleged violations of policy is to discover whether the policy needs to be revised for clarity. For example, one such issue involves whether the policy is clear how to handle the different situations when the President chooses to delegate the final decision to the Provost vs. when the President decides not to do so, since the timeline and nature of the letters written would need to change accordingly. Carl shared that the policy may have been written with the Provost in mind; however, CBA gives President the right to make a final decision on the retention, tenure and promotion of a faculty member. Ken stated that multiple faculty constituents are looking to the academic senate to help shed light on concerns about whether RTP policies were implemented appropriately. Other constituents have expressed concern about the rates of denial, and whether denials fell disproportionately on women and faculty of color. PS discussed whether we could obtain data from UPFA about the last several years about the number and demographics of RTP candidates, and outcomes so we could be evidence-based or evidence-guided in our deliberations. We will decide at our next meeting how to proceed forward on these issues pertaining to RTP policy implementation.

9. Referral PS-F19-1 from the SJSU Academic Senate

This referral comes via the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR; active now), requesting to modify University Policy S14-3 i.e., the Student Fairness Dispute Resolution policy. This original dispute resolution policy is from Instruction and Student Affairs, however, we are only deciding on a part of the policy pertaining to BAFPR (under PS aegis). The Chair of BAFPR suggests that this board should function like an appellate board. Given there is no student member on BAFPR, their job would be not to review a decision per se', rather to review whether due process was followed in a fairness dispute. Therefore, BAFPR wishes for clear acknowledgment that they may or may not wish to interview faculty or students to determine if there has been any procedural violation.

Meeting adjourned: 4:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted

Nidhi Mahendra

Professional Standards Committee

Agenda

Meeting 4: Oct 21, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat E: Kumar

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Oct 14 (Mahendra)
3. Time certain 2:00 visit of the Provost to discuss the Lecturer Policy revision.
4. Updates:
 - a. The inquiry regarding F70-5 “Banked Time” has been send and comments are dribbling in, so far favorable.
 - b. The inquiry regarding F85-8 was not sent, reasons explained below in the repeal recommendations.
 - c. An inquiry has been sent outlining several options for RTP structure for the College of Professional and Graduate Education and asking for advice from those faculty by the end of the semester.
5. Rescinding S73-19. (Attached) We voted to rescind this, but we need to approve a slightly different implementation clause. Also attached is Wendy’s old markup clearly showing what was intended at the time of the 2012 revision.
6. Rescinding F85-8 “PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR EMPLOYEES IN UNIT 4 - ACADEMIC SUPPORT”. This policy concerns Student Service Professionals III and IV staff. We have been informed that it would be a violation of the Unit IV contract to consult these staff about performance evaluation, so no outreach was conducted.
7. Inquiry into AY 2018-19 RTP policy implementation. We shall discuss what the next steps for Professional Standards in this matter should be, and (if necessary) begin the discussion of possible recommendations.
8. Adjourn.

**Professional Standards Committee
Meeting Minutes**

Meeting 4: Oct 21, 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, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer , James Lee (Sr. Director, Faculty Affairs)

ABSENT: Carl Kemnitz (Sr. VP AA), Shannon Rose Riley

Special Guests: Provost Vincent Del Casino, Ravisha Mathur and Joanne Wright

1. Call to Order at 2:04 p.m.
2. Approval of minutes of Oct 14 (taken by Mahendra)
3. Time Certain 2:00 pm visit of the Provost Vincent (Vin) Del Casino
Vin was invited to discuss his ideas concerning the Lecturer policy. He started by mentioning his 11 year Cal State Long Beach association with Geography department as well as serving as chair of dept. He added that as a chair, he never did a three-year appointment. He mentioned that during his time, there were some 1.0 appointments with 80/20 assignments. Here at SJSU, we have very few full time lecturers and a huge number of part time lecturers with varying teaching/service commitment levels (accurate data currently not available). He also noted that some worked more than 2 jobs to support themselves. This from his perspective was not intellectually viable in the long run. He is mulling over the appointment of searches for 3 year, full time appoints for some future lecturers. If we are thinking about pursuing this option, we need to think about the mix and develop the right structure including a rigorous evaluation. Questions came up around terminal degree requirements, the CBA, and how a policy needs to be flexible. Some questions were asked after his remarks concluded:
 - a) What can we do? How could we require a terminal degree for a 3-year appointment?
Answer- think of order or work. We could do an international search but need to be careful about displacing current lecturers. If implemented right, then this would also create more individuals dedicated to the community. Another point noted was the need to think about higher standards for appointment.
 - b) Is this 80/20 for all?
Answer- one size does not fit all – hence need to think of different models. Need is to create local flexibility for different kind of faculty needed such as some 80/20 and some process for those with clinical expertise.
 - c) Do we need change in nomenclature?
Answer – Deans asked to provide 3 year hiring plans

Additional points mentioned by Vin

- a. Set a bar. e.g. ABD which introduces some flexibility but this needs to be managed with the dean/chairs
- b. Think about language to be used during the time of appointment.
- c. Need a clear evaluation procedure. Range elevation occurs very infrequently, the normal evaluation process needs to be significant.

Discussion ended at 2:49 pm.

d) Updates

- a) *The inquiry regarding F70-5 "Banked Time" was sent and comments were dribbling in, so far favorable.*
- b) *The inquiry regarding F85-8 was not sent since the policy was covered by CBA (Joanne Wright indicated that it was violation of the CBA). The information on the website does not apply.*
- c) *An inquiry has been sent outlining several options for RTP structure for the College of Professional and Graduate Education and asking for advice from those faculty by the end of the semester.*

e) Rescinding S73-19.

Committee had previously voted to rescind but Ken asked for revote to approve a slightly different implementation clause. There was no opposition to new language (Votes 8-0)

f) Rescinding F85-8 "PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR EMPLOYEES IN UNIT 4 - ACADEMIC SUPPORT".

Joanne Wright mentioned that this was a violation of their CBA to consult with these staff about performance evaluation. Voted that it be rescinded – no opposition (votes 8-0)

g) Inquiry into AY 2018-19 RTP policy implementation.

Joanne Wright was invited at 3:00 pm to answer questions about her memo. AS Chair Mathur was in attendance for this time. Ken mentioned that he had received a confidential letter which might be interpreted to make allegations of discrimination in the RTP process. Vice President Wright's memo advised him that there was a "duty to report" discrimination and so he and Chair Mathur had turned over the memo as instructed.

Vice President Wright mentioned that the grievances are moving along per policies and procedures outlined in CFA and CSU. If they are seeking judgment or resolution, then it would be a circumvention of CBA for Professional Standards to examine these cases. She also noted that if committee makes policy reforms and gathers information for this purpose, then the information collected would not be complete since she cannot provide any information. Ken emphasized that our intent is to review if the policy is working the way it is intended.

At this time, an inquiry was made if there would be any concern with the committee using the documents after the grievances were concluded (settlement or arbitration). Joanne mentioned that in this situation, it would be permissible. It was also noted that it would be inaccurate to make inferences based on selection of specific statements outlined in the documents submitted to the committee.

Ken pointed out that CFA legal team reviewed the memo and also clarified that they had not transferred jurisdiction. Joanne enquired if CFA wanted a written statement or report. Ken asked if Joanne had reviewed the HEERA policy wherein a specific statement was made possible by David Elliot.

“CBA language should not inhibit or restrict academic senate role”

It appears that the main issue is that cases are live and we should also be mindful of conflicts in the committee.

Before Joanne left at 3:45pm, the committee discussed 3 options with her

1. Wait till the grievance is concluded (needs more discussion)
2. Use a research pool analogy – i.e. open it up for all people to provide input
3. Write a white paper with recommendations

Wright – collaboration is welcome but these recommendations should not be based on specific cases. Committee could get preclearance with Joanne. After she left, the committee decided that the timing of publication would be crucial. Ken would initiate a draft of the white paper on improving the RTP process.

Meeting adjourned 4:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted
Anil Kumar

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 4: Nov 41, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F: Monday

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Oct 21 (Kumar)
3. Amending/Reissuing F70-5 “Banked Time.” (Attached) Should Professional Standards send this to the Senate as a 1st reading?
4. Amending S15-8 “Teaching Descriptors.” (Attached.) Note two different alternative amendments in the document. Should Professional Standards send one of these to the Senate as a 1st reading?
5. Policy Recommendation “Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs (Attached). Should Professional Standards send this to the Senate as a final reading?
6. White Paper: Improving Implementation Of San Jose State University’s Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policies.
 - a. Should Professional Standards draft a white paper of this nature for advising the Senate, its committees, and the administration on ways to improve the implementation of our RTP policies?
 - b. If “yes,” then discussion of the text, the recommendations, and the process for such a white paper, possibly based on the draft provided.
7. Adjourn.

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 5: 4 Nov 2019

Clark Hall 445

2:00-4:00 pm

Minutes recorded by Seat F: Nyle Monday

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter, Shelley Cargill, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz

ABSENT: Shannon Rose Riley, Jessica Chin

1. **Called to order at 2:02**
2. **Approval of minutes:** meeting of 21 Oct 2019.
3. **Amending/Reissuing F70-5 "Banked Time."**

Discussion brought out that some departments, such as English and World Languages, actually do make use of "banked time" of a sorts, but not necessarily as delineated in this policy. As it currently stands, the policy contains gender language which would need to be standardized, and there is some confusion over aspects such as the ability of faculty to transfer their banked time to someone else. The latter would need to be removed before moving this forward.

It was then questioned whether this should actually be amended or left as it is. If it is to be amended, some things should be deleted, such as under-load or getting paid for banked time. These would need to be more fully explained. Also, some departments "load balance" within a year or even within two years. If this is brought to the Senate, these and other inconsistencies in practice are sure to come up. The Committee could choose to simply post the memo and the policy and leave it, do a minimal amount of amending, or redo the policy completely. After further discussion, the Committee decided to completely rewrite the policy. A subcommittee consisting of Shannon, Shelley, Nidhi and Carl will look at this further and bring their findings back to the Committee.

4. **Amending S15-8 "Teaching Descriptors."**

The Committee became aware that, in some cases, a SOTE evaluation of 4.0 was being adjudged as "below the norm" even though, by definition, that score indicated an instructor was "effective." To correct this situation, Ken offered two potential modifications of the wording of the policy to counteract that possibility. Discussion ensued, and the decision was made to use

the second version, changing the final sentence in the Baseline (3.3..1.3.2) definition to read, " Student evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are either generally within the norms by the end of the review period or indicate effective teaching in various survey components, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter." There was unanimous consent to move this forward.

5. Policy Recommendation "Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs."

Due to recent changes in organization structure, many of the titles of individuals and offices found in current policies are no longer correct. These need to be updated in the most efficient manner possible. The Committee is making a policy recommendation to the Senate, suggesting that bylaw 15a should be invoked to remove references to Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (AVPFA), the Office of Faculty Affairs, and other obsolete nomenclature, in favor of the current terminology. It was questioned whether similar references to the Provost or the Provost's designee could also be altered under this bylaw, and the consensus was that it could. The Committee unanimously agreed that such a recommendation should be made, and discussion and fine tuning of the proposed text took place. Subsequent to the meeting, it was also resolved that the policy would expire immediately after the title changes were completed.

6. White Paper: Improving Implementation of San Jose State University's Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policies.

Discussion continued over the draft of a White Paper dealing with the RTP process here at San Jose State. Ken clarified that a White Paper does not carry the same weight as a Senate resolution, but is rather the Committee's way to offer advice on a particular subject. The manner in which this issue came to the Committee was atypical and the paper Ken drafted, and which other Committee members have revised, was based on the concerns voiced to Ken. The Committee needs to serve our constituents, but at the same time must present both sides of any possible dispute in order to find a middle path forward.

In discussion, it was expressed that the Paper, as it now stands, could be perceived as an accusation of racism directed toward the President, and that it presents only one side of the argument. Other members did not believe that was the intent, and intensive discussion took place. Several members pointed out that although this issue was being brought up now, it reflected a larger situation that has been part of the SJSU landscape for a number of years. The question was how the Senate could best fix the situation. Before such a "fix" can be found, however, most members felt it will be necessary to have a clearer statistical picture of RTP results at SJSU, and James was tasked with providing this information as soon as possible.

An additional issue was raised in the memo sent to Revisha and Ken by Joanne which basically took this policy issue out of the hands of the Senate because of the CBA. It is felt by the majority of the Committee that this is an incorrect interpretation based on past practice and that it requires some response.

After extensive discussion it was decided that the Committee will rewrite the White Paper once additional statistical information is received, so that a more complete and accurate picture of the RTP process at the university can be assembled. It was also decided that a separate response to the memo shall be written to clarify the rights and responsibilities of the Senate regarding policy and the CBA.

7. Adjourned at 4:03

Respectfully submitted,

Nyle C. Monday

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 7: Nov 25, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Riley

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Nov 5 (Monday)
3. Updates
 - a. Amending S15-8 “Teaching Descriptors.” Review Senate comments
 - b. Policy Recommendation “Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs. No Senate comments. Change “Academic Vice President” to “Associate Vice President.”
 - c. Visit to UCCD Dec 11. Planning for feedback?
4. Amending/Reissuing F70-5 “Banked Time.” Report from subcommittee
5. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment (Attached)
6. Lecturer Policy (Restarting the drafting process)
7. Draft Memo: response to Wright
8. Information RE: RTP implementation?
9. Adjourn.

Meeting 7: Nov 25, 2019

CLARK 445

2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, , Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz

ABSENT: Nidhi Mahendra, Shannon Rose Riley

1. Called to order at 2:02 PM

2. Approval of minutes: meeting of 4 Nov 2019.

3. Updates

a. Amending S15-8 "Teaching Descriptors." Review Senate comments

Two comments on Senate floor were similar:

Rationale including 4.0 being effective is not in policy, would like to see this in the text of the amendment

Should we modify this further for next go around with the Senate?

Discussion on adjusting the wording so that it is not misinterpreted as the rationale will not be incorporated into the amended policy

There is a bit of a problem with "norms" as it puts an emphasis on numerical value

Discussion of below and above norm – to qualify "excellent" majority of SOTES should be above norm. This is not realistic with current "norms" to be above the norm. SERB determined that norms would be 20th – 80th percentile, but concern would be you can't lower bottom without raising the top. Perhaps norms need to shrink to 30th – 70th.

What if we dropped talk of "norms" for baseline, but keep the "norms" in the good and excellent category?

Discussion of how people find "norms" an issue overall. Reason includes that the definitions are problematic.

Problem with measuring effectiveness of teaching is that it is subjective, and we want an objective measurement. However, eliminating this measure would result in people drifting away from paying attention to good teaching.

Discussion returned to proposed language in policy – previous version included a clarifying sentence which may work to solve the confusion raised on Senate floor

Ken will bring this back next meeting with all language options so alternatives can be considered

b. Policy Recommendation “Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs. No Senate comments. Change “Academic Vice President” to “Associate Vice President.”

No comments at Senate

c. Visit to UCCD Dec 11. Planning for feedback

Ravisha visited UCCD and was asked many questions about RTP

Committee should discuss what would be the most appropriate way to structure the discussion, focused around chairs and their needs

Peter shared three questions:

1. Clarification on greater emphasis on RSCA? Is service being weighted correctly?
2. Candidates being consistently reviewed throughout levels, dept / chair should know candidate best and that should be weighted appropriately
3. How RTP is interpreted and implemented and how it effects recruitment and retention

Discussion of how this meeting/conversation at UCCD could be framed

Discussion of different transparency at different levels – how can chairs help / guide candidates – numbers could help, but reasons are important for chair mentorship

Discussion of all RTP committee members having access to decisions of all levels – it is in the system, this is valuable for education of RTP committees, it is much more transparent if they see what all the other committees said, allows committees to see “wild” disagreement if it does happen

James indicated that under S98-8 there isn't a “easy” way to get information out, so this will take longer to get the data out

d. Communications with Spartan Daily

Reporter contacted Ken regarding RTP “investigation”

Discussion of questions posed to Ken and responses

4. Amending/Reissuing F70-5 “Banked Time.” Report from subcommittee

Shelley made first attempt at editing with some suggestions

Carl discussed with the provost who said if we have gone 50 years without needing this policy, do we really need it. Would we be better to rescind and talk about implementation and practices that allow us to do what is in the policy? Perhaps there is a need to regularize this practice.

Discussion of current views by administration regarding policy that is management in nature.

Does this old policy apply to FERP faculty? Discussion of how this possibly influences faculty across campus.

Discussion of posting as is so that it can be utilized by the university as a current policy – Agreement on discontinuing our work to S70-5, and asking the senate office to append the memo to the existing policy

5. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment (Attached)

Discussion of the minor amendments in section VI – see track changes on document

Discussion of BAFPR and the changes the board has proposed

Discussion of BAFPR perhaps needing a student member

6. Lecturer Policy (Restarting the drafting process)

Chair circulated the lecturer policy with current edits

Suggestion by chair is to rescind and replace entire policy, starting with what was updated last year; this must include the level of appointment differences Joanne shared with committee.

Discussion of how / if we would incorporate the provost's ideas of a full-time lecturer line

Discussion of using term "professor" in any lecturer line name – discussion of naming could be for future

Investigation of titles across different campuses should be conducted so we have some consistency

7. Draft Memo: response to Wright

Discussion of memo – minor editing changes made, discussion of timing to second bullet point

Discussion of distribution of memo – sent to Joanne but it could become public

Do we want to hold it over for a week to consider it more carefully? Yes, members can edit

8. Information RE: RTP implementation?

James – no real patterns so far other than perhaps women are less likely to get what they ask for than men, overwhelmingly people get what they are going for, women may tend to not get early tenure and promotion as much as men

May have numbers in a week or two

A generic tenure rate and generic promotion rate would be helpful

Race and demography data isn't ready yet – Hispanic women more likely to have problems for full, tenure and promotion – black women have more of a problem but numbers are very low

9. Adjourn at 4:10 PM

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 8: Dec 2, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Riley

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Nov 25 (Cargill)
3. Report on RTP outcomes (Lee)
4. Teacher Education Guidelines Review (2nd Round)
5. Language for Teaching Descriptor
6. Language for campus update on “banked time”
7. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment (Kemnitz report?)
8. Lecturer Policy (Restarting the drafting process)
9. Adjourn 3:45
10. Informal discussion of draft Memo: response to Wright

Notes from Professional Standards Meeting
December 2, 2019
Shannon Rose Riley

Meeting 8: Dec 2, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM
Minutes to be taken by Riley

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, , Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz, Nidhi Mahendra, Shannon Rose Riley

ABSENT: None

Teacher Ed guidelines review

TED guidelines were submitted in SP18 to PS and some revisions were suggested. A deadline given to implement the changes. Their revision was submitted after that deadline, therefore Carl thinks it's a good idea for PS to review again.

Some discussion of guidelines and case study examples in terms of the original intent of the new criteria and standards vs. implementation. There is agreement that while the case studies are ideal, the Committee does not want to reject otherwise good guidelines that don't include them.

Unanimous vote to approve with a few changes re defining term "creative" and also regarding candidate calling for external review rather than putting the work on higher levels of review.

James D. Lee presentation on RTP decisions

More people going up for RTP given increase in hires under Provost Feinstein
Discussion of data related to RTP decisions over last 5 years.
Discussion of role of Faculty Diversity Committee

Senator He brings up potential issues with gender (for tenure) and with Asian groups (for promotion to full) in regards to decisions. Can this be further assessed? Not statistically significant but perhaps "abnormal." He asks for additional years data from James.

FDC should be involved in more work related to qualitative research about RTP. Perhaps not of groups who have already had decisions but of people in the pipeline.

Memo from PS re RTP

Carl and James left the room for this part. Unanimous decision to respond to Joanne's memo.

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 8: Dec 9, 2019
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Riley

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Nov 25 (Cargill)
 - b. of Dec 3 (Riley)
3. Updates
 - a. A memo responding to the Wright memo of October 18, on behalf of the Chair of the Senate, the Chair of Professional Standards and the faculty and student members of the committee, was delivered.
 - b. Acknowledgement of the Dec. 3 Spartan Daily article (not for discussion until later in the meeting.)
 - c. Chair's meeting with Faculty Diversity Committee
 - d. Upcoming meeting with UCCD
4. Language for Teaching Descriptor amendment and possible final reading.
5. Language for campus update on "banked time" rediscovery
6. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment (Kemnitz report on student membership during appeal?)
7. RTP outcomes data from James Lee and Joanne Wright; next steps?
8. Lecturer Policy (Restarting the drafting process) (subcommittee to draft in January?)
9. Adjourn

Minutes to be taken by Birrer

Present: Kenneth Peter, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Nyle

Monday, Zachary Birrer, Carl Kemnitz, Nidhi Mahendra, Anil Kumar, Shannon Rose Riley, James Lee

1. Call to Order at 3:02
2. Approval of the Minutes: Meeting of 25 November 2019, Meeting of 2 December 2019
 - Correction on last meeting minutes Meeting 9, added role call onto last meeting minutes
3. Updates
 - Spoke to Joanne Wright about the returned memo from the Professional Standard Committee.
 - Spartan Daily printed on the memo that we had read off in one of the prior meetings. There were misquotes and dates that were wrong in the printing.
 - There was nothing resolved in the Faculty Diversity Committee, but they want to make steps to help.
 - There is an upcoming UCCD meeting. Kenneth Peters, Shelley Cargill, Nidhi Mahendra are attending and Shannon Rose Riley might be able to attend.
 - College of Professional and Global education. There were 3 options for this college, but they requested that they have their own college as well as they want to have representation in the university committee. We will come back to this in February with the three ways to approach the policy.
4. Language for the Teaching Descriptor amendment
 - Discussed the options listed to bring to the Senate. The committee chose to pick at option number 5.
 - Kenneth added “Assigned courses are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description, as shown in course syllabi and other teaching materials” in all of the options. There will be a change in the rationale to fit the change of the policy. We will move it to a final reading at the next Senate meeting.
 - Discussed the lack of students participating in the SOTEs and how it would make a difference in the quantitative
5. Language for campus update on “banked time” rediscover
 - The Banked time Policy is posted with the rationale attached. Discussed how to reintroduce the policy back into the system.
 - Changed some of the formatting of the memo before turning over to Rivisha. Made specific points to help department chairs to balancing WTUs of faculty for their convenience.
6. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment
 - Carl pointed out a problem in the grade dispute appeal, Kenneth pointed out that he brought it up to the executive committee and they are open to the issues within the policy.
 - Discussed the purpose of the committee in regards to faculty and the lack of students sitting on the committee.
 - James suggested a possibility change to professional faculty conduct process review rather than appeal of a specific grade. BAFPR would review the final grade of the student and the professional responsibility of the faculty.
7. RTP outcomes from James Lee and Joanne Wright; next steps?
 - About the Spartan Daily article, brought up whether there was any substance to what was written. As well as the Spartan Daily’s misrepresentation of the facts might prove to be harmful for the recruitment of faculty of color and even within current faculty

- Discussed the hardship of retention with faculty of color and/or not being able to get through the RTP process.
 - Looked at data from the RTP process between 2016-2019 after the change in policy. Based on the experiences that faculty have throughout their performance reviews. Talked about the data over the course of the past years combined versus the 2018-2019 RTP decisions.
 - Discussed the judgement of different levels of review (Department and University level). There has been discussion that the feedback from the department committee should be weighted heavier than the university committee because they work closer with the individual.
 - Since the article for the Spartan Daily is out we feel like we need to find and craft a response that addresses this. We were noted in the article so we would like to have a uniformed response. We want to bring up possible thing that we are being proactive about such as staff training and other RTP policies. We would like to have a response for the university by the first meeting of the Spring 2020 semester.
 - The white paper is being split into the 2 issues that Professional Standards faces: The institutional racism and everything else.
8. Lecture Policy
- These types of policies are typically are created in subcommittees, mixture of administrators (Carl and James) as well as other members.
 - Members of the PSC can make changes and recommendations online to get started on a draft to have in January.
9. Meeting adjourned at 4:01pm

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meetings 10 and 11: January 27 and February 3
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat A: Kemnitz

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Dec 9 (Birrer)
3. Updates
 - a. The Senate and SERB have feedback on the Teaching Descriptor amendment
 - b. Review of meeting with UCCD on RTP matters.
 - c. Communication with
4. Language for Teaching Descriptor amendment and possible final reading.
5. Language for College of Professional and Graduate Education to integrate them into RTP policy
6. BAFPR Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment
7. Lecturer Policy Rewrite
8. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

February 3, 2020

Meeting #11

CLARK 445

2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Kenneth Peter (chair), Carl Kemnitz, Anil Kumar, Jessica Chin, Nidhi Mahendra, Shelley Cargill, Steven He, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee

Regrets: Shannon Rose Riley

Minutes taken by Seat B: Jessica Chin

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Jan 27 (Kemnitz): approved by consent
3. Language for College of Professional and Global Education to integrate them into RTP policy
 - a. Policy Recommendation Amending S15-7: "Procedures concerning small colleges"
 - b. Require that all RTP committees have representatives from 3 departments/schools on college committee; if fewer than 3 departments/schools, can elect a rep from a related department/school
 - c. Any department has right to elect someone to university RTP committee, but each college is *not required* to send rep to university committee
 - i. What are practical implications of this? (Kemnitz)
 - d. Motion: move recommendation as first reading to Senate. Moved, seconded, Approved 9-0.
4. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) Grade Dispute Appeal Amendment (S14-3)
 - a. Student Fairness Dispute Appeals Committee (SFDAC) will consist of the entire membership of the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility,

joined by one faculty member *and one student member* of the SFC subcommittee that initially reviewed the case.

- b. When are appeals justified? Peter proposed the following conditions which were discussed and agreed upon by the PS comm.
 - i. Procedural violations
 - ii. New information becomes available after decision of student affairs committee has been delivered
 - 1. Change to “relevant new” evidence for clarity, not just any “new” evidence
 - iii. Evidence of demonstrable bias
 - c. Add that students may not participate in decision of grades, following EO.
 - d. Peter will incorporate changes to amendment to prepare for Senate.
5. Lecturer Policy Rewrite: PS committee reviewed draft
- a. 1.1 Purpose
 - i. Worked to include equitable language for lecturers and tenure/TT faculty
 - ii. 1.1.3 Meet student demand (delete unanticipated); use “cover” classes instead of “replace”; should we delete list of possibilities?
 - 1. Cargill will review binder for lecturers to see what other campus policies include
 - iii. 1.1.4 discussed usefulness in keeping language to promote positive culture around lecturers
 - b. 1.2 Discussion about which elements should be included in “guide” and not in policy?
 - i. Who is responsible for preparing and providing the lecturers’ guide (that used to be given by Faculty Affairs)? Probably a dual effort of Faculty Development, Faculty Affairs and UP
 - ii. Need to put lecturers’ guide and other pertinent information for lecturers on website; e.g., lecturers’ page with Lecturers’ Guide
 - iii. Lee suggested delete “shall”; instead, “...university provides...”

- c. 1.2.2 delete “or equivalent person for their unit”; just say chair, as chair definition includes directors
 - i. Direct lecturers to seek information from chair and Lecturers’ reference guide; strike ‘items of clarification’ from policy and put in guide
- d. 1.3.1 what is a peer review committee?
 - i. Tenured-only faculty as included in CBA article 15
 - ii. Personnel committee (not peer-review committee)
 - iii. Changed language relating to committees who have access to confidential materials, referencing CBA (15.10 and 15.11) and applicable law
- e. 2.10 New titles for categories for lecturers
 - i. Added for flexibility
 - ii. Discussion of whether to include language about “professor” as reserved for tenure and probationary faculty.
 - 1. Kemnitz: Could have long-term committed faculty hired as ‘professor of practice’, not hired on as tenure-track and not hired to do RSCA. Would the reservation of the title professor for tenure-track faculty be appropriate in this instance?
 - 2. Mahendra: this is very common in the instances of clinical practice, such as “professor of clinical practice” which are not tenure-track
 - 3. Lee: could create a perception of devaluing
- f. 2.1-2.9
 - i. What to do with all the titles?
 - ii. Some correspond to CBA titles
 - iii. Lee: if not appointed, should not be in policy
 - iv. Cargill: will consult other CSU lecturer titles

6. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation

- a. Lee will give presentation to Senate on Monday, including information about hiring

- b. PS would like to include some data from Lee's report in the white paper
- c. PS will produce a report and publish a summary statement of steps that have been taken; also respond to article in Spartan Daily

7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 12: February 17
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat He

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Feb 7 (Chin)
3. Updates
 - a. CFA has filed an Unfair Labor Practices charge regarding our investigation into RTP matters
 - b. Teaching Descriptor amendment passed and on the way for signature
 - c. Small College RTP amendment did not make it to the floor for 1st reading
4. Updated language and distribution for Small College RTP amendment
5. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation.
6. Lecturer Policy Rewrite continued
7. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

Meeting 12: February 17
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by seat C: He

1. Call to Order at 2:00pm.

Presents: Zachary Birrer, Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Nidhi Mahendra

Absents: Carl Kemnitz

2. Approval of minutes

- a. of Feb 7 (Chin) – approved.

3. Updates

- a. CFA has filed an Unfair Labor Practices charge regarding the intervention of Joanne's Memo into our investigation on RTP matters. The actual filing closely parallels our memo. We have no idea how long these things will take.
- b. Teaching Descriptor amendment passed and on the way for signature. The previous policy recommendation (Amendment C to University Policy F12-6) was vetoed by the President last spring and we responded to the issues in the fall. Recently the President has signed the policy.
- c. Small College RTP amendment did not make it to the floor for 1st reading. Ken suggests sending it out as a final reading, so that after the recommendation passes in the March meeting, it will have enough time to be signed and become policy before the next RTP cycle starts.

4. Updated language and distribution for Small College RTP amendment

- Some small changes: new college change to rename college / restore the phrase of “and shall be elected” / not to list the entire name of the policy (S15-7)
- Vote to approve the policy recommendation for final reading at Senate (Vote: 9-0-0).

5. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation.

- Change the title to “report to the senate” to make it a little less confrontational.
- Add the analysis from the spreadsheet Joanne provided of data from the last five years on the tenure and promotion rates among various categories.

- The report will provide a roadmap to identify all of the issues that the PS needs to address.
- Keeping silent will damage the credibility of the PS.
- The annual statistics on tenure and promotion rates should be published while protecting confidentiality of individual cases.
- We do not have enough data yet to assess the impact of the new policy on the rates.
- CFD should work with the Faculty Diversity Committee, the Office of Diversity, and the Provost.
- The revisions of the RTP guidelines for Counseling and the RTP guidelines for Library should begin now and be done in consultation with the PS and the Provost.
- RTP training should be bigger than the SOTEs and include more, such as how to write the letter.
- We should simply recommend that the PS re-examines the policy about the rules of the President and Provost in writing those final letters.
- The PS would recommend moving FA back to academic side.
- The guidance or the model of recommendation letters are needed.
- Anil will double-check the statistics and the rest of the members will edit the report.

6. Lecturer Policy Rewrite continued

Postponed.

7. Adjourn at 4:02pm

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 13: February 24
CLARK 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 7 (He)
3. Updates
 - a. A resolution from UCCD on RTP matters has arrived
 - b. I asked for data on SOTE response rates and that information has arrived
4. Small College RTP amendment has been circulated electronically to the Senate list for comments; review any comments.
5. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation. This document and all supporting documents that will accompany it are in a Professional Standards shared drive.
6. Lecturer Policy Rewrite continued
7. Adjourn

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Meeting 13: February 24, 2020

CLARK Hall 445

2:00-4:00

Minutes taken by seat F: N. Monday

1. Called to Order at 2:08 pm

Present: Zachary Birrer, Shelly Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Carl Kemnitz, Nyle Monday, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley (via Zoom)

Absent: Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nidhi Mahendra

2. Approval of Minutes of Feb. 17 with modification of second sentence in section 3a: delete and replace with "Filing uses the same HEERA quote as our memo."

3. Update

- a. A resolution from UCCD on RTP matters has arrived and is available for viewing on the shared drive.
- b. A request had been made by the Committee for data regarding SOTES response rates. This information is now on the shared drive and indicates that there has been a drop in responses since the initial conversion to an electronic format. This may be due to the fact the grade-hold which had been used to motivate students was dropped 1 ½ year ago. Since that time the number of responses has plummeted. It was suggested that the grade-hold incentive be reinstated.

4. The Small College RTP amendment has been circulated electronically to the Senate list for comments, after a few small changes. Only two responses were forthcoming, both approving of it with no changes. The amendment was not taken up in the Senate at its last meeting due to lack of time. Due to the President's veto of some other related policies, it was felt that it was important that the Committee move this forward for a final reading in the Senate next week.

5. The revised White Paper on RTP implementation is now on the Committee's shared drive. It does not appear that, prior to the year in question, there has been a historical bias in RTP evaluations. There remains some confusion over the interpretation of the numbers, and these will be reexamined to further clarify the findings. Committee members will aggregate and simplify the statistics to make them more meaningful to readers. One result of accurate statistics on successful candidates would be the identification of typical profiles. These would help both candidates and reviewers in negotiating their way through the RTP process. Considerable discussion took place.
Chair Peter will rewrite some portions of the document and send it to Joanne Wright for review. If the response is positive, it will then be sent on to the CFA, UCCD, and the Faculty Diversity Committee for their feedback. The Committee would like to present the finalized version to the Senate at its April meeting.

6. Lecturer Policy

The rewrite of the Lecturer policy continues.

- A. The list of titles which appeared in Section 2 have been moved to Appendix B.
- B. The title "Senior Director of Faculty Affairs" should be removed from Section 3.1.1.
- C. Section 3.2 was discussed and will be rewritten
- D. Wording of sections 3.3.1 through 3.3.4 to be changed to "LA: Appointment at this range is for an entry-level..." or something similar.
- E. It was discussed whether section 3.4 dealing with salaries should be entirely dropped, and Section 1.1 reworded to say that salary is covered in the contract.
- F. It was noted that the section on "Evaluation" was numbered incorrectly: it should be changed from "3" to "4." This requires changes to all subsequent numbers.
- G. In Section 5.2.6 it was noted that the document uses the term "excellent" while the evaluation form uses the term "commendable." This should be made consistent. Discussion took place over the use of the word "sustained" and whether should be a limited, set time period to be considered during a review.

7. Meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 14: March 9
CLARK 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 24 (Monday)
3. Updates
 - a. The Senate passed the Small Colleges RTP amendment
 - b. I had a useful 30 minute discussion with the Provost about our draft RTP report
 - c. At the time of the distribution of the agenda am expecting feedback on the draft report from Joanne Wright, SAVP University Personnel.
4. Revised White Paper on RTP implementation. What changes should we make based on feedback?
5. Lecturer Policy Rewrite continued. Focus: Section 4 “Evaluation.”
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 14: March 9
CLARK 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Attendees: Shelley Cargill, Zachary Birrer, Jessica Chin, Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nyle Monday, Shannon Rose Riley, Kenneth Peter

Not in attendance: Carl Kemnitz, Steven He

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of Feb 24 (Monday). Approved by consent.

3. *Updates*

- a. The Senate passed the Small Colleges RTP amendment
Stef asked Provost if this would be recommended to President; Vin responded affirmatively and endorsed it.
- b. Ken had a productive 30 minute discussion with the Provost about our draft RTP report
Per Ken, the Provost had read the whole report carefully and did not have problems with any of our recommendations. He had a suggestion –he would prefer that UPFA recommendation be built into asking for a study of which aspects of UPFA belong with the Provost’s office. He asked if we would soften this recommendation – and not have it be as emphatic as it sound. He said that most of what we said in our report, he had already communicated to the senate. He wondered about the two cases with extended probationary time – are these truly negative decisions? Ken was agreeable and explained that we avoided term denial. KP shared with PS members being pleasantly surprised that Provost was quite in agreement with our report.
- c. At the time of the distribution of the agenda, Ken reports having received some feedback on the draft report from Joanne Wright, SAVP University Personnel. Joanne raised some good points, and there may be parts of our document (RTP report) that we may need to clarify. Joanne has had limited time with our document and Ken only received this feedback late last night. Ken advises that Joanne’s reaction may be a reasonable barometer of President Papazian’s responses to our report.

4. *Revised White Paper on RTP implementation. What changes should we make based on feedback?*

Joanne sent edits. Committee now reviewing and acting upon white paper on RTP implementation. Discussion about whether or not to mention loss of pivotal person in the

late Dr. Amy Strage- what impact might this have had on faculty support during the RTP process? Shannon and other PS members discussed that we need to be explicit that this white paper was in response to faculty concerns via memo, direct report from constituents, and much thoughtful deliberation among PS members.

Our committee considers it a problem that we have Provost's Office and HR in a tussle over departmental RTP guidelines. Legitimate concern by Joanne Wright that training on RTP guidelines has been provided before; yet we note that this training is much more systematic now with James Lee's office. James shared that it is his understanding that President prefers oversight of UPFA in evaluating RTP decisions. Perhaps this is not intended to undermine the provost, yet have checks and balances on the Provost's decision-making about RTP matters.

Issues raised:

- One suggestion is that Vin, Joanne, and Carl can work on this together and suggest revisions to our recommendations.
- Another issues is about Provost and University RTP letters – can these be issued at the same time to candidates? Is this kosher?
- There is ongoing debate/discussion, per Ken about whether FA should function akin to HR? Provost has asked why James' position cannot be as a manager/leader of FA?
- Request from faculty that James Lee be evaluated by faculty, given importance of that role for faculty, or when future search conducted, could members of search committee be mostly faculty? This was vetoed by President Papazian. Provost would prefer we not make the recommendation to move UPFA- yet make a direct recommendation to study this - then Vinn/Joanne/Lisa would discuss this or divvy up responsibilities.
- Do we know if moving things back (despite clear doubt that office would move back anyways) would help matters?
- In the past, Elna (AVP for AA) and Amy Strage (extremely close; collaborated on everything)- do James and Deanna get to collaborate similarly?
- What if we have an external evaluator to examine whether placement of FA is beneficial in HR or faculty affairs?

5. Lecturer Policy Rewrite continued. Focus: Section 4 "Evaluation."

Ken shared that Carl was called in to emergency session this afternoon (due to unfolding COVID 19 situation). So committee will not address this particular topic today

6. Meeting adjourned 3:45 pm

Respectfully submitted
Nidhi Mahendra

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 15: March 16
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat E Kumar

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra)
3. Updates
 - a. The President has signed the S2020 SOTE optional policy
 - b. The RTP report has been edited and sent back out for comments.
4. Policy on Covid 19 cancelled conferences and RTP
5. Discussion of Covid 19 cancelled peer observations (Lee)
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 15: March 16
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Nidhi Mahendra, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz, Shannon Rose Riley

1. Meeting called to order at 2:02 pm
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra) – not available
3. Ken updated committee
 - a. The President has signed the S2020 SOTE optional policy
 - b. The RTP report has been edited and sent back out for comments.
 - c. Ken met Provost who raised the issue of clock stoppage for probationary faculty whose research is substantially affected.
4. Policy on Covid 19 cancelled conferences and RTP
Provost suggested calling it a Sense of Senate resolution. The current policy was discussed by the committee. Sense of Senate resolution does not need to be precise in language. CBA section should be removed from the policy. Modifications made to the written policy.
5. Discussion of Covid 19 cancelled peer observations by James Lee.
Memo drafted by Lee to be used as tool for cases where direct observations are not possible. The committee discussions who has to be reviewed. James pointed out that there were small number of lecturers who need to be reviewed for the first time (i.e. those with initial appointments). Memo was welcomed by the chairs in the committee.
6. Meeting adjourned 3:38 pm

Respectfully submitted
Anil Kumar

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 16: April
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat F

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra)
 - b. of March 16 (Kumar)
3. Disposition of RTP Report
 - a. Some comments have been received, a few confidential. Many comments on recommendation 8 (Faculty Affairs and the Academic Division).

Stef Frazier suggests this alternative language for the recommendation:

The University should, ideally, restore Faculty Affairs to the Academic Division. If there are potential gains to administrative efficiency to be made by the placement of some of Faculty Affairs' duties and tasks within University Personnel, the University should undertake a study of organizational structures, possibly by requesting an independent review, with an eye toward granting as much control as possible over substantive faculty matters to the Academic Division.

One respondent asked (confidentially) that recommendation 3 be shifted from a focus on the Faculty Diversity Committee to an independent review.

- b. Faculty members of ExCom asks that PS bring this to the April 20 Senate with a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing the report and its recommendations. Discussion.
4. Question: some faculty have lobbied for an extension of S98-8, particularly for Associates going up for full, similar to (but not as extreme as) a clock stoppage. Discussion.
5. Disposition of Lecturer Policy
 - a. Continue our work updating this policy.
6. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Meeting Minutes

Meeting 16: April 6
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz, Shannon Rose Riley

ABSENT: Nidhi Mahendra

1. Meeting called to order at 2:04 pm
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra) – not available
 - b. of March 16 (Kumar) – approved with some modification to #5 (suggested by Chin)
3. Ken updated committee
 - a. The RTP report has been returned to the Committee with various comments and suggestions.
 - i. Discussion of the two recommendations that received substantive feedback (items #3 and #7). The Committee reviewed the suggestions.
 - ii. The Committee discussed several options for bringing the Sense of the Senate to the Senate. The Committee will bring a slightly revised SoS to the Senate that endorses the report and its recommendations.
 - iii. The Committee members will review the revisions before next Monday.
 - b. Ken met Provost who raised the issue of clock stoppage for probationary faculty whose research is substantially affected. Some faculty have lobbied for an extension of S98-8, particularly for Associates going up for full, similar to (but not as extreme as) a clock stoppage. The Committee discussed this in detail, deciding that a clock stoppage is not recommended as there is one more year of S98-8.
4. Disposition of Lecturer Policy
 - a. Some discussion of the issues with S10-7, which predates the current CBA.
 - b. Some discussion of department level criteria for evaluating lecturers (e.g. Humanities)
 - c. The Committee will continue its work updating this policy
5. Meeting adjourned 4:01 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon Rose Riley

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 18: April 27
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat H: Cargill

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra)
 - b. of April 13 (Cargill)
3. Continued work on Lecturer Policy
4. Adjourn

Meeting 18: April 27, 2020
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat I: Birrer

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz, Shannon Rose Riley, Nidhi Mahendra

ABSENT:

1. Meeting called to order at 2:04 pm
2. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. Of March 9 - not available
 - b. Of April 13th - Approved
3. Update
 - a. Interfolio people - they are going to test some dossier to see what the system looks like for test readers.
 - b. Provost will be joining us next week
4. Continuing on Lecture Policy
 - a. 4.3.4. - Ken added this as a suggestion to fill the previous discussion we had on currency requirements
 - i. Addition: "Such requirements must be delineated in an initial or a revised appointment letter, and then may be evaluated as part of the teaching assignment".
 - b. 4.3.5. Scale used for evaluation as part of teaching assignment
 - i. Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, and Needs improvement are binary and clear
 - ii. Tougher Scale factors to evaluate: Good and Excellent/Outstanding
 1. In Excellence explanation: Replacing "significantly beyond the minimum" to "notably above good". Felt that the wording fit better because "significant" seemed to refer to a statistical comparison.
 - a. Addition in Excellence: "fully met and completed with distinction"
 - c. Range Elevation
 - i. Tackles some problems that Joanne raised earlier in the year and prompted this review of the Lecturer policy.
 - ii. 5.1.3. May not be needed because it seems pointless of reminding lecturers that they are temporary
 - iii. Members of the committee who were chairs were sent lists of people who were eligible for process of range elevation. Faculty are also notified by UPFA if they are eligible. Some would like to see the processes in the policy that enables them to turn to.

- iv. 5.2.4.1. The amount of material beyond 6 years makes it very difficult for the lecturers to dig up, as well as it is a workload issue for the reviewers of those candidates. The ambiguity in the last sentence does not place a limit on how many materials may be submitted.
 - v. 5.2.4.2. Current Vitae discussion - They are more detailed and longer than a resume. Disadvantage is that for people that do not have CV's it might dissuade individual from applying for range elevation, or for persons that have never needed them due to no need of CV's in outside careers.
 - vi. 5.2.4.3. Discussed the impact of the verbiage situated around "2000 words" to make sure that there is an understand that the material should be concise including example and evidence of professional growth and development
 - 1. There are two schools of thought either keep it explicit with allowing the 2000 word limit to stay and the other is to remove the 2000 word limit. The addition of "concise" was added to avoid the explicit expectation of 2000 words.
 - vii. 5.2.5 To make the section more clear removed "during the period... of the current request" to move to the period of review section. If a lecturer starts off really good how is this going to impact growth and development. There is an idea that growing could be maintained by staying current throughout their time as a lecturer.
 - 1. Professional growth and development ought to go into what their initial assignment.
 - viii. 5.2.7. & 5.2.8. Shift these because they seem to fit better under Process
 - ix. 5.2.10. - CBA language
 - x. 5.2.11. Why are FERP faculty excluded?
 - 1. FERP faculty might not be involved in that much service. There might be some FERP faculty that have met the requirement.
 - 2. Possibly you would want the most experienced people to sit on such a panel.
 - xi. 5.3.1. Why is there a Range Elevation Amount in policy?
 - 1. It might be assumed that there is a 5% amount for ever raise
 - 2. 5.3 - Deleted from the policy
- d. Meeting Adjournment time: 4:00 pm

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 17: April 13
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Cargill

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra)
 - b. of April 6 (Riley)
3. SSR Endorsing RTP Report
4. Continued work on Lecturer Policy
 - a. Review section 4 Evaluations edits
 - b. Examine section 5 Range Elevation
5. Adjourn

Meeting 17: April 13, 2020
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat G: Cargill

PRESENT: Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shelley Cargill, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Anil Kumar, Nyle Monday, Zachary Birrer, James Lee, Carl Kemnitz, Shannon Rose Riley, Nidhi Mahendra

ABSENT: Nidhi Mahendra

1. Meeting called to order at 2:04 pm
2. Approval of minutes
 - a. of March 9 (Mahendra) – not available
 - b. of April 6 (Riley) – approved
3. SSR Endorsing RTP Report
 - a. Discussion of RTP report – discussion of edits since last week
 - b. Committee vote to approve report with all edits –
 - i. Motion to approve made by Riley, seconded by Kumar – 9-0-1 vote
 - c. Committee vote on sense of senate resolution expressing support for RTP report
 - i. Motion to approve made by Chin, seconded by Monday – 9-0-1 vote
4. Continued work on Lecturer Policy
 - a. Revisit of document shared by Riley and history of that document
 - b. Review section 4 Evaluations edits
 - i. Notification (section 4.1.1) – Ken couldn't find this in the contract, Carl indicated maybe under workload rather than evaluation criteria, James indicated it is 15.3 evaluation criteria and procedures in contract. This can be simplified now with this knowledge
General process all grouped with rebuttal added 4.1.6
 - ii. Review process – merge of several sections in old policy with no language change
 - iii. Role of chairs and committees – new heading, can have evaluations for things other than teaching if part of their appointment, another date to remove in submission of ASA deadline
 - iv. Documentation for evaluation – new heading, beginning of a section on criteria for evaluation, can the date by which evaluation must be done be removed?
 - v. Criteria for evaluation – discussion including: new language to clarify assessment on appointment and how to incorporate other non-appointed scholarship, language on holistic evaluation included, clear appointment letters especially regarding service and scholarship would be valuable, evaluation for qualifications for specific curriculum relevant to currency, currency worked into area of appointment in appointment letter, discussion of maintaining currency through reading literature and other

methods, this aspect of currency needs to be two pronged both in the appointment letter and in the evaluation, discussion of language paralleling the RTP policy, excellent, good, satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory these terms may need to be defined in evaluation section, discussion of another word for excellent perhaps “outstanding” or “exceptional”, perhaps these terms don’t need to be defined here

5. Adjourn at 3:56 PM

Professional Standards Committee Agenda

Meeting 19: May 4
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by the Chair

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes deferred to email vote so as to include final meeting minutes
 - a. March 9 Mahendra
 - b. April 27 Birrer
 - c. May 4 Peter
3. Announcements
 - a. The RTP Report and its recommendations were endorsed by the Senate with no negative votes and 3 abstentions.
 - b. Senior Director Lee requests that Professional Standards craft policy clarifying how RTP committees are constructed for joint appointments.
 - c. SERB has expressed concern that even though the President signed the policy permitting S20 SOTES to be excluded from future reviews, that RTP committees will nonetheless look at removal in a negative light. Solutions: policy? SOTE interpretation guide? Training?
4. Visit with Provost Del Casino regarding RTP report and follow up. The Provost's comments are viewable on the attached report. In addition, the Provost suggests three additional recommendations at the end of the report which we may wish to discuss with him today:
 - a. Recommendation: Professional Standards should provide clear policy outlining the use of external reviews, which have been shown to limit local and institutional bias. While it cannot be mandated, the calendar and process for RTP should be changed to include a standard period and approach to external review.
 - b. Recommendation: Professional Standards should re-assess the use of "baseline" as a satisfactory category in relation to the larger strategic mission of the institution, which is to generate outstanding teacher-scholars.
 - c. Recommendation: Professional Standards should consider how to create a more robust standard for Academic Assignment that includes service to students - a required component that could enhance overall ratings in this area for those who provide extraordinary support to students. This could reduce the reliance on

SOTES and provide a more robust Academic Assignment review that focuses on faculty contributions to student success.

5. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

Meeting 19: May 4
Electronic ZOOM meeting
2:00-4:00 PM

Members in attendance: Shelley Cargill, Zachary Birrer, Jessica Chin, Anil Kumar, James Lee, Nyle Monday, Shannon Rose Riley, Kenneth Peter, Carl Kemnitz, Steven He

Absent: none

Guests: Senior Director James Lee, Provost Vincent Del Casino, Senate Chair Ravisha Mathur

Minutes were taken by Kenneth Peter, Chair

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes was deferred to email vote so as to include final meeting minutes
 - a. March 9 Mahendra
 - b. April 27 Birrer
 - c. May 4 Peter
3. The following announcements were made in writing:
 - a. The RTP Report and its recommendations were endorsed by the Senate with no negative votes and 3 abstentions.
 - b. Senior Director Lee requests that Professional Standards craft policy clarifying how RTP committees are constructed for joint appointments.
 - c. SERB has expressed concern that even though the President signed the policy permitting S20 SOTES to be excluded from future reviews, that RTP committees will nonetheless look at removal in a negative light. Solutions: policy? SOTE interpretation guide? Training?
 - d. It was also announced that this morning, the President signed all of the pending policies coming from Professional Standards this year, including several minor ones but also the Small Colleges RTP amendment and the revision in the teaching descriptor.
4. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a conversation with the Provost about the 15 recommendations in our RTP Report and three of his own recommendations. The three recommendations he provided were as follows:
 - a. *Recommendation: Professional Standards should provide clear policy outlining the use of external reviews, which have been shown to limit local and institutional*

bias. While it cannot be mandated, the calendar and process for RTP should be changed to include a standard period and approach to external review.

- b. Recommendation: Professional Standards should re-assess the use of "baseline" as a satisfactory category in relation to the larger strategic mission of the institution, which is to generate outstanding teacher-scholars.*
- c. Recommendation: Professional Standards should consider how to create a more robust standard for Academic Assignment that includes service to students - a required component that could enhance overall ratings in this area for those who provide extraordinary support to students. This could reduce the reliance on SOTES and provide a more robust Academic Assignment review that focuses on faculty contributions to student success.*

The committee spent considerable time discussing external review, and the possibility of creating in policy a standardized process for seeking and administering such reviews, while leaving these reviews optional for both cultural and contract reasons.

Much attention on recommendations b and c centered on ways to be sure that anyone achieving tenure at SJSU demonstrate that they are doing a good job supporting student success. Was the configuration of the three buckets, or the levels of achievement for baseline, sufficient to guarantee that?

The committee then turned to discuss the 15 recommendations in the report. Those recommendations are listed below, and notes from the meeting pertaining to them follow as appropriate:

- 1. Recommendation: Faculty Affairs should keep and annually publish statistics on tenure and promotion rates, broken down demographically, so far as is possible while maintaining the confidentiality of faculty. Trends should be noted and monitored over time.*
- 2. Recommendation: As S15-8 becomes fully implemented, annualized data should be gathered on candidate levels of achievement by area and by level of evaluation, so that patterns among those who are successful and those who are unsuccessful can be discerned and tracked over time.*

With regard to recommendations 1 and 2, the committee explain the reasons for continuing to gather data on the RTP process, and thanked the administration for beginning this task. There was general agreement on the utility of the effort, but a five year moving average of outcomes could be used to make it easier to protect confidentiality of particular cases.

- 3. Recommendation: The University should undertake an in-depth study of retention and advancement for SJSU faculty of color. To assure that the report is credible, research should be carried out by experts, adequate resources should be provided, and the Faculty Diversity Committee should be consulted.*

4. *Recommendation: The Center for Faculty Development should work closely with the Faculty Affairs, the Faculty Diversity Committee, the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, and the Provost to understand the needs of faculty of color from appointment to promotion to Professor, and should develop additional support mechanisms--such as additional mentoring for RTP candidates--as appropriate. This effort should be a high priority for the allocation of any necessary resources.*

With regard to recommendations 3 and 4, the Provost indicated general agreement with the need to undertake these efforts, but also indicated that the Covid crisis had interfered with progress so far.

5. *Recommendation: The Counseling and Library faculty should begin the revision of their RTP guidelines, consulting with the Provost early in the process. The goal should be to craft clear and transparent expectations for probationary faculty that can be endorsed by both the faculty, the Professional Standards Committee, and the Provost by Spring 2021. As with all revisions of guidelines, faculty hired before the revision should be grandfathered under the old guidelines, but every effort should be made to craft documents which current probationary faculty will wish to adopt immediately so as to provide clear guidance during the evaluation of their dossiers.*

With regard to recommendation 5, the Provost indicated that he had already spoken with Counseling about the need to improve their guidelines. The Library guidelines seem to be in better shape, currently, although both Counseling and the Library are coming due for reapproval.

6. *Recommendation: Faculty Affairs should consult with Professional Standards, UCCD, the Faculty Diversity Committee, and other relevant groups to continue to refine the RTP training program with the goal of achieving a more fair and transparent application of policies and standards. The possibility of specialized training for RTP evaluators in different roles or at different levels should be explored.*

The committee expressed its support for RTP training and thanked for Director Lee for initiating it. There will be additional training this fall required, and it will focus on other subjects than a year ago. The Chief Diversity Officer will likely be involved and one area of focus can be implicit bias training. Senate Chair Mathur, for example, highlighted an article that showed that recent journal submissions for women during the Covid epidemic were very significantly down, while submissions from men are up.

7. *Recommendation: The Professional Standards Committee should consult with the President and Provost and propose recommendations that would clarify the culmination of the RTP process in S15-7 and S15-8.*

The committee and our guests discussed the problems alluded to by recommendations 7 and 10, and noted that the timeline and the calendar have been fixed, and a repetition of the issues encounters are unlikely in the near term. Revising the policy for greater clarity might help prevent timelines problems from occurring in the future for some future administration.

8. *Recommendation: The University should undertake a study of the organizational placement of Faculty Affairs, possibly by requesting an independent review, with an eye on retaining administrative efficiencies associated with University Personnel while restoring a more formal connection to the Academic Division and faculty more generally.*

Recommendation 8 was extensively discussed, and the committee reinforced the broad support on campus for returning Faculty Affairs to the Academic Division. Those views were heard, although no commitment for a change was forthcoming.

9. *Recommendation: Administration of the SOTEs should be improved with a focus on enhancing the response rate, controlling SOTEs for the influence of grades, and visually presenting the results (and their limitations) in a manner that non-experts can readily and quickly understand.*

Chair Peter indicated that he had spoken with SERB Chair Currin-Percival, and these matters appear to be on the way to resolution, with a display by grades being restored, and a restoration of measures to increase the response rates expected after the Covid situation eases.

10. *Recommendation: After any associated grievances are concluded, the University should offer a public explanation for the apparent discrepancy in timing between the President's decision letters and the Provost's recommendations for the 2018-2019 RTP process.*

Discussed earlier under recommendation 7

11. *Recommendation: The University should use software that makes it impossible for evaluators to inadvertently download dossier materials to their computers.*
12. *Recommendation: The University should have a legal specialist examine the multiple privacy policies associated with eFaculty and its parent companies and, if accurate, issue a written assurance to the campus that dossier materials cannot be subject to data mining by any party.*
13. *Recommendation: Until dossier confidentiality is completely assured, faculty should be permitted to submit materials in a paper format or another secure means identified by the university.*

14. Recommendation: Faculty Affairs, Professional Standards, Faculty Development and other interested users of the eFaculty dossier system should review the dossier preparation guide to see if it can be adjusted to help with organizational strategies specific to the online dossier format.

Recommendations 11-14 were discussed collectively. Director Lee indicated progress with the software vendor on fixing a number of the problems referenced, although he cautioned about the history of slow progress with the eFaculty system. He indicated that the privacy agreements had been checked and found to be secure, Chair Peter requested that a written statement to the campus be made to that effect to increase confidence. Alternate methods of submissions such as using Adobe were discussed, as was the need to find ways of improving the general organization of the dossiers.

15. Recommendation: The Center for Faculty Development, in consultation with Professional Standards and other interested faculty and administrators, should solicit or create “model” letters that may help improve the quality of information communicated as part of the RTP process.

The Provost remains skeptical of template letters, but agreed that a statement of what belongs and doesn't belong in the letters might provide better guidance, particular for inexperienced letter-writers.

5. Adjourn