PROESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Minutes May 5, 2014
Karin Brown

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

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

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

1. The committee heard a report from senator Gottheil regarding conflicts of interest in faculty assigning course readers and textbooks. The committee determined that this presumed conflict and its specific applications need to be further investigated, and postponed further action to the fall.

2. A motion to withdrew AS 1544 - the BAFPR from the final reading planned for the May 12, 2014 senate meeting was passed unanimously. The committee will look into comparable policies in other institutions with the aim of simplifying the process.

3. After reviewing the changes following the first reading of AS 1543 – Selection and Review of Departments Chairs and Directors; the committee voted to advance the policy for a final reading in the May 12, 2014 senate meeting with a unanimous vote.

4. The committee discussed the RTP policy, but no specific amendments were made.

Adjourned.

**Professional Standards Committee**

**Minutes 25 August 2014**

1. Called to order at 2:00 pm

   *Present:* Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter, Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White

   *Absent:* Kell Fujimoto, Cole Niblett [College of Education is not represented yet]

2. Minutes for May 5, 2014 approved (2 yes, 4 abstain, 3 absent at time of vote)

3. Introductions of committee members

4. Overview of work of committee and pending referrals
   - BFR reform. Continued from last AY. Professional Standards will wait to hear from the Board itself on its recommendations for reform.
   - Referral on electronic communications and privacy. We may be out of compliance with CSU policies.
   - Emeritus status. A lecturer has requested emeritus status and policy is unclear on lecturer eligibility, so we have to review. We will need to check other campuses for their policies too.
   - Other subjects of interest. Professional Standards can take up any subject we want, if it's in our area. We don't have to wait for a referral. We have some others that came to us last year that we can continue to review now [post-tenure review].

5. Major project for the year: ARTP policy reform.
   a. Back ground of ARTP reform. Before 1998, the policy was revised frequently. Since 1998, we've had only 1 major attempt to revise and it failed [2006] after 6 years of work. President never gave a veto message, so reason not clear. Consensus at the time was that problems were the "professional development plans" for each individual faculty, and the change to the URT committee's mandate.
   b. We began to review again 2 years ago. PS met with broad range of constituencies. Conducted survey of faculty. Studied other campuses. Got Senate approval for basic concepts, through a sense of senate resolution.
   c. Now we need to finish the draft. Next step would be having hearings open to the whole campus. Only then would we take it to the Senate for approval. We are not really ready to share the draft with others until the committee reaches consensus on content. But then it will be widely circulated.
   d. The Committee discussed electronic dossiers. Issues of security. Funding source.
   e. Homework for next time: section 6.2 and on. Also look at 3.3.3.2

6. Adjourned at 3:55 pm

*Minutes submitted by Elna Green (Seat A)*

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**September 8, 2014**
**ADM 114**
**Chair: Kenneth Peter (As corrected September 22)**

**1. Call to order at 2:14pm** (The meeting location has been changed from IS117B to ADM114 because Aviation office, which holds the key to IS117B, was closed at the time.)

*Present*: Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee (minutes), Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White, Kell Fujimoto

*Absent*: Cole Niblett (College of Education is not represented yet)

**2. Minutes of August 25 approved by consensus**

**3. Member suggested referrals for AY 2014-15**

A. Review a list of current items
- ARTP policy: Third year of looking at the policy. The committee hopes to come to agreement so we can move this forward to public hearing.
- Privacy of electronic communication
- Post tenure review policy: Ken clarified that it is separate from ARTP policy.

B. Committee members need to bring an item ASAP if they wish the committee to undertake a reform (usually around the beginning of AY) as it usually takes at least one academic year to look at it.

**4. Emeritus Faculty redraft**

A. Ken provided background and summary of the policy including privileges attached to emeritus status.
- Currently the status is applicable to all retired "tenured" faculty. They need to apply to obtain the status though.
- Late last year emeritus status to lecturers was brought up. Under the current policy, it is up to the President's discretion.
- Last year Statewide Academic Senate passed a resolution which recommended that campuses review existing policies and consider whether lecturers be granted emeritus status.

B. Discussion and Suggestions
- Do we want to revise the old policy?: Should lecturers be allowed to emeritus standing? If yes, in what way?
- Changing the emeritus titles and making them associated with the last title – e.g., Emeritus Associate Professor, Emeritus Professor, etc.

        - This can be too complicated
    - Requiring lecturers a minimum of 10 years of employment to be eligible for emeritus status. They should successfully receive at least one range of elevation (this needs to be checked with Faculty Affairs).
    - Adding that lecturers have to have a terminal degree to apply for the emeritus status?
    - We need to research what other CSU campuses provide benefits associated with the emeritus title Or they just award the title.
    - Consult with ERFA (Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association) about existing and potential benefits
    - Clarification about what "retired" in the policy means.
    - We would need to develop criteria and application process rather than discussion of allowing lecturers emeritus status or not.
    - Philosophical questions: What's the context of including lectures in emeritus standing in other CSU campuses?
    - Does the committee want to make it easier for lectures to obtain emeritus status or keep the existing policy? The statewide Senate asked each campus to review the existing policy.
    - The group of lectures we are concerned about is those who have been at SJSU for decades and invested in SJSU. Then the question is how we can draw a line between them and other lecturers.
    - We need to be careful about terminology. We may use "faculty" rather than lecturers so as to include all Unit 3faculty.

C. Summary
    - We are not ready to decide anything today.
    - We need more information from ERFA, CFA and other CSU campuses
        - Shannon will craft questions for ERFA regarding benefits and context of including lecturers in emeritus faculty
        - Elna will ask other CSU campus about what benefits they provide to emeritus faculty.
        - Kell will bring this issue up to CFA.
    - This topic will continue to be discussed.

**5. Member suggested redrafting of ARTP policy.**

A. Lines 384-435: Requirement of obtaining grants for tenure and promotion
    a. Discussion
        - The current policy does not allow requiring grants for tenure. Candidates can get credits for doing that though.
        - Do we want to make it restrictive or less restrictive?
            - Should Deans be allowed to require grants for tenure and promotion and include it in the offer letter? We cannot write a letter like that under the current policy.
            - Due to variance in different disciplines, we need generic guidelines for research grant.
        - Ken will draft a revision:

- Stick to old policy (3.3.3.2), a blanket prohibition with certain exception
- Strike out 3.3.3.2.1
- Clarify “exception” language in 3.3.3.2.2.: delete “in one case” and add “infrastructure resources” after “appropriate assigned time.”

B. Line 578: conflicts about guidelines in interdisciplinary or more than one disciplinary departments or departments with many sub-disciplines
   a. Discussion
      - A case from COB is shared: Having conflict due to separate guidelines between department and college.
      - An examples of multidisciplinary department was shared – e.g., School of Music and Dance
      - Suggestion: departmental guidelines not updated or approved within certain time frame is invalidated.

C. Summary
   - Members commented in two places in the Dropbox folders: Ken will merge those two documents.
   - Ken will review all the comments provided: Simple comments will be just incorporated and complicated/controversial ones will brought up for discussion to the committee.

**6. Adjourn 4:03pm**

*Minutes submitted by Sang Lee (Seat B)*

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**September 22, 2014**
**IS 117B**
**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

Approved by consent September 29 as corrected.

## Call to order at 2:00pm

*Present*: Rocio Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White, Kell Fujimoto

Rocio Dresser from College of Education was introduced onto the committee. No student representative yet.

## Approval of Minutes

Kell and Rod made minor corrections to Emeritus Faculty redraft section of the minutes. Sang found a typo. Changes were made by Ken.

A vote to approve was taken: 7 approved 1 abstention and 1 absence (Brandon came after minutes approved).

Minutes approved.

## Emeritus Policy Discussion

Shannon's ERFA survey received 12 responses, which had been circulated. Gail Fullerton's views from her email were shared and considered. Her message: process should be selective; lecturers sometimes are deserving.

Shannon summarized findings of the ERFA survey: Electronic services were useful. Parking was not that useful. Value perceived was the status of the title. Most people felt that if non-tenured faculty had put in time and deserved it, they should get it.

Elna presented findings from review of CSU policies: Tracking of use of emeritus privileges from across CSUs is not accessible.

Discussion around the question of "Should we revise the 1998 policy or leave as it?" Agreement was:
(1) Keep current policy as is for tenured faculty.
(2) Establish a process and criteria for non-tenured faculty who have contributed and should be included in emeritus status.

Suggestion for criteria and process: Under normal circumstances other faculty can be granted emeritus status if they have 10 years of at least half-time teaching at SJSU and recommendation of appropriate department personnel committee with justification. Departments are free to establish their own guidelines. Ken to write this up and try for consensus for next meeting.

**ARTP Policy Discussion**

Ken's most recent draft with all comments and responses was reviewed to identify comments that need to be discussed further for Ken to address. Brandon, Gita, Sang, Shannon, Kell, Rod, and Elna identified their comments that need further discussion.

Ken mentioned that additional comments, including Rod's missing comments can be introduced after today, but will be prioritized after today's identified comments are addressed.

**Adjourn 4:00pm**

*Minutes submitted by Gita Mathur (Seat C)*

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**September 29, 2014**
**IS 117B**
**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Call to order at 2:00pm**

*Present*: Rocio Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White, Kell Fujimoto

**Approval of Minutes**

A correction to the minutes by Ken.

A vote to approve was taken: 7 approved 0 abstention and 2 absence (Shannon & Sandy came after minutes approved).

*Minutes approved.*

**Emeritus Policy Discussion**

Kell offered amendment: 1.2.1 employed a minimum of ten years full –time equivalent service.
*Amendment approved*

Ken asked if the ten year requirement should apply to tenured faculty as well.
*Nobody requested that.*

Ken asked if we can strike out 1.4.
*1.4 is back and undeleted.*

Elna asked about the catalog mentioned in 2.1
There was a discussion about how to access names of emeritus as well as regular faculty online

Policy Vote: 8 in favor, 1 against, 0 abstention, 0 absence

Ken will submit the policy for the senate meeting on Oct. 13 for the first reading.

**ARTP Policy Discussion**

Line numbering in this section is based on RTP Draft 928, dated 9/29/2014.

a) Line 56: Should the line read “may be credited” or “will be credited” (referring to achievements that overlap two categories.)
*Motion defeated. Vote: 8 to keep the current text, 1 to change*

b) Line 213 – 222: Should the inserted material be accepted as stated or modified? (Referring to the requirement to obtain external funding.)
*Text revised to exclude Assistant Prof.*

c) Line 338 – 347: Should the inserted material be accepted as stated or modified? (Referring to the requirement to obtain external funding.)
*3.3.1.2 inserted*

d) Line 361- 363: Should this insertion be made to clarify the intent that baseline teaching involved improvements in response to earlier performance reviews?
*Lines inserted*

e) Line 602 - 608: Should these insertions be made to clarify how guidelines must be kept current?
*Revised to five year*

f) Line 765: Should we state “if committees and administrators” rather than “if committees or administrators” to specify that the imposition of additional full (performance) reviews require both faculty and administrative authorization?
*Keeping the language “if committees or administrators”*

g) Line 904 - 921: Shall we accept this section as sufficient to deal with controversies about “rank ordering” of candidates for appointment?
*Text revised*

**Adjourn 4:05pm**

*Minutes submitted by Rod Fatoohi (Seat E)*

**Professional Standards Committee**

**Minutes**

**October 20, 2014**

**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Call to order at 2:00pm**

*Present*: Rod F, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Brandon White and Rocío Dresser. Absent were Kell Fujimoto and Shannon Rose Riley. Joining the committee part way through for the first time was student representative Joshua Romero.

**Approval of Minutes**

A vote to approve was taken: 7 approved 0 abstention and 2 absence

*Minutes approved.*

**I. Emeritus Policy Discussion**

1.2. Brandon had a concern about giving emeritus to just anyone and in particular reducing the time as suggested by one Senator to six years. If reduced, then temporary faculty should be held to same standards as tenure faculty (service, scholarship and service).

There was a discussion to revise the length of time to be simply 10 years rather than 10 years equivalent full time service, but to add the requirement that nominees should be judged to have made significant contributions.

1.2. Ken will change this section to include: significant contributions.

Some questions were posed:

a. 6 years is part-time or full time?
b. Are there many full-time lecturers? Elna responded that that is not the case. About 10% of lecturers are full time.
c. Ken, What about music and similar departments? In some departments lecturers teach only a single specialize course but are part of the department for decades. Should it be left to the department to decide?
d. What about if the faculty member is an administrator?

Brandon suggested that nominees should have been employed a minimum of 10 years and have made significant contributions to the university.

Ken, will make revision for October 27 meeting.

**II. Gendered language "emeritus/emerita" vs. proper Latin**

After the discussion, the consensus was that we would change the language in the policy to the plural emeriti to be inclusive of both genders. Ken will also check with our Latin professor to get her viewpoint.

**III. Adding email access to the list of privileges**

After the discussion, the consensus was to allow faculty to continue with the email privileges. Ken will add a statement adding email privileges for Emeriti faculty

**IV. Adding Chair/Dean consult on resource provision**

2.4 Senator Michael Kimbarow made a recommendation that some type of provisions should be in place so that Deans consult with the department Chair when assigning space to faculty. The committee considered this, but felt that the existing language allows for such consultation to take place.

2.4. No changes were made.

**IV. Where to publish the list**

The committee discussed the problem that the existing policy requires the publication of the names of emeriti faculty in our catalog, but this has not been done for 4 years since the catalog became electronic. Ken will bring back a revision that requires the publication of the names in a position of honor but that does not specify the catalog.

**ARTP Policy**

Line 890. We will vote on this issue next time

Lines 948 – 958 Prior to making a recommendation, there should be one office responsible to make the Chair aware of the financial consequences of retreat rights.

Line 982-989 Shall we change "the letter may indicate" to "the letter shall indicate" to require that appointment letters become more specific about individual faculty responsibilities? Skipped because Shannon was not there.

Line 1039-1078 Ken, will comeback with alternative language to accomplish better participation.

Line 1089-1098  Ken, You want all arguments represented clearly. A secret electronic voting may not be used for now until made secured.
Elna is going to investigate and get back to the group.
Ken will work on this section.

Adjured  4:02 PM

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**October 27, 2014**

**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Call to order at 1:59pm**

*Present*: Rocío Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Kell Fujimoto, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, and Brandon White.

*Absent:* Joshua Romero.

**Approval of Minutes for October 20, 2017**

No corrections or additions
A vote to approve was taken: 9 approved 0 abstention and 1 absence

*Minutes approved.*

**I. Emeritus Policy: Examination and approval for final reading**

Ken talked about the change to use Emeritae, Emeriti, and Emerita and had consulted with Latin Professor Olcott and the Chicago Manual of Style. He had attempted to apply it through the policy, but there may be areas which he might have missed and still need to be modified. 2.1 is added which identifies the use of emerita or emeritus with a faculty's highest title.

3.2: Ken edited the section to make it gender neutral, but highlighted that the association (ERFA), not the policy, will determine its own name.

Rod brought up a question regarding the use of a faculty's highest title. This brought out the discussion and concern of how non-instructional faculty will use the designation emeritus/emerita (i.e., counselors whose classification is Student Service Professional - Academic Related [SSPAR]). Additionally, Ron pointed out that Lecturers also face the same issue (Lecturer A, B, C, D). It was agreed that Lecturers would use Lecturer Emeritus/a and Counselor would use Counselor Emeritus/a.

1.4: Kell made a motion to amend 1.4 - that "other" be removed. Shannon second. Discussion: Kell explained that the current wording allows the President to confer emeriti status only to those faculty who do not meet the criteria for 1.1 & 1.2. Removing "other" allows the President to confer emeriti status to all faculty, even those that were denied emeriti status by their department. Brandon questioned 1.2.2., which states that the

department personnel committee will provide a justification for its recommendation. Who is the recommendation going to? The President? Brandon/Shannon pointed out that having other also allows the President to confer emeriti status to those who were denied and that it was a matter of interpretation of the policy. Shannon called the question.

- 4 approved, 4 against, 1 abstained, 1 absent motion failed

2.7: Rod brought up a question about emeriti faculty getting free parking and if it can be denied. Ken stated that theoretically it can be denied, but has never been. Rod made a motion to amend 2.7 that emeriti faculty pay for parking at current faculty rates.

- Motion had no second. Motion fails.

Elna brought up a question to 1.1 & 1.2 – if the policy should state that the President is the one conferring the emeriti status. No motion to amend 1.1 &1.2 made.

Rod suggested that we indicate in "Workload" that departments may have to create criteria for recommending emeriti status. "Some departments may create criteria to evaluate applicants" will be added.

The committee voted to bring the policy to the Academic Senate for a Final Reading

- 8 approved, 1 against, 1 absent

**II. ARTP Policy**

Line 982-989 Shall we change "the letter may indicate" to "the letter shall indicate" to require that appointment letters become more specific about individual faculty responsibilities?

- Brandon brought up the question if "shall" will lock the appointment letter such that there is little flexibility for changes later on (giving an example of teaching certain courses)
- Shannon stated that the appointment letter should identify what your responsibilities and requirements are.
- Kell stated that both "shall" and "may" can protect faculty from workload issues.
- Brandon suggested a change to 6.2.6.4 to "shall" instead of "may" which would address issue brought up by Shannon. The committee agreed. Thus, 6.2.6.5, 6.2.6.6, and 6.2.6.7 is no longer needed.

Line 990-998: Rod stated that the original appointment letter comes from the Dean. Why would a revision of the appointment letter need to be approved by the department personnel committee?

- Ken stated that the article is there to protect faculty from administration who may revise appointment letters without faculty input.
- Elna disclosed that current practice is for the initial appointment letters to be discussed with the department and chair, submitted to FA for review, and presented to the faculty member. Elna suggested that revisions should follow the

process of initial appointment letter.

- The following change was suggested: 6.2.6.8 Any subsequent change in the particular character of a faculty member's assignment shall be made in writing and signed and approved by the faculty member, the department chair, and the college dean. A revised appointment letter must then be included in subsequent dossiers and the PAF in Faculty Affairs.

Line 1100-1122 Shall we accept this section as sufficient to deal with overuse of abstentions?

- Ken explained that there has been an increase in abstentions and a decrease in against votes which might indicate that faculty are struggling to make a decision or afraid to do so.
- Rocio questioned how someone who abstains can do so in secrecy and as required in 7.1.6.2.3, as voting is done by secret ballot.
- Brandon indicated that the policy should address when voting occurs as abstentions should not be involved in the evaluation – voting should be done prior.
- Ken stated that abstentions is not a vote and occurs prior to voting where the faculty who abstains will then need to justify why they are abstaining. Those who abstain are then not allowed in the discussion.
- Gita expressed some concerns of faculty who become absent to abstain.
- Rocio discussed that for recruitment, members cannot be absent in the interviewing process, therefore, can we require faculty members to attend committee meetings?
- General consensus was to revise to indicate that Abstentions are not votes, that the decision to abstain should be made prior to voting, that abstaining members should not be present for discussion, that abstentions should not be explained in a committee decision, that abstentions should be justified outside the process to Faculty Affairs. Ken will draft accordingly and bring language back to the committee.

Shannon brought up a concern about teaching lecturers losing their status when change the departments in which they teach. Is this something for Professional Standards Committee?

Meeting adjourned: 3:59 PM

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**November 17, 2014**

**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Call to order at 2:00pm**

*Present*: Rocío Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Kell Fujimoto, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, and, Joshua Romero

*Absent:* Brandon White

I. Approval of minutes (from Kell): approved unanimously

II. Discussion of Item 3 on agenda: **emeritus policy**:
Ken summarizes concerns from President:

1. In our ten-year definition we don't require it to be continuous. But there are problems with saying continuous service would include maternity leave, etc. According to Collective Bargaining Agreement, there are legitimate kinds of leaves.
2. Wants something more specific about "significant contributions"
3. Another question is about departmental committee recommending—but the question then is to whom? Who approves? We didn't intend to suggest approval.
4. President wants criteria.

- Discussion of 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 to address above.
- Discussion of 1.3 regarding "approval" by Provost.
- Discussion of 2.5 regarding resources for emeriti faculty.

- Elna raises question about Board of Academic Freedom in 1.3—would the BAF be the deciding board or committee in the way it's currently phrased? Discussion to include BAF into consultative process.

- Discussion to fix 1.3.

- Kell raises question about 1.2 – regarding service component as a problem area. Ken notes that the President doesn't want to award emeriti status to non-tenure faculty at all and we want to convince him that they contribute, often, in an equivalent manner.
- Short of making a kind of dossier requirement, this is something of a compromise.

- Rod brings up question of "equivalency"—that seems to be the issue.
- Ken responds that the point is to give departments some flexibility in this regard.
- Elna points out that the phrase with "equivalency" has nothing to do with time served but with contribution.
- Rod brings up question of fairness.
- Question is raised whether we want to make emeritus policy like an RTP policy in degree of specificity.
- Rocio brings up question of time and service again regarding non-tenure faculty's ability to make a substantial contribution.
- Discussion of next step: to submit for a final reading this semester.
- 1.2.2 is the remaining controversial part—the question
- Kell proposes a change.
- Seconded by Elna.
- Vote: 7 for, 2 against (Rod and student member)

- Elna asks that we consider the "resolved" section of the policy and consider adding examples, e.g. Lecturer serving as Chair of Senate, etc. in the Rationale section.
- Ken requests examples from the Committee to add to rationale section.

- Sang brings up concern about setting bar too high with mention of Senate Chair/Lecturers, etc.

- More debate over final approval. Legal issues are raised—do you really want a committee to be sued for denial? (Rod).

- Gita raises concern over tenure vetting, which goes beyond the department vs. politics of departmental committee making decision.
- Rocio counters that departmental committee knows the lecturer under consideration.
- Ongoing debate on whether President or departmental committee would decide.

- Vote: final approval with committee: 6; final approval with President: 3 (Elna, Rod, ?)
- Kell notes that President still can grant in 1.4.
- Agree to take a final vote in one week.

III. Ken introduces new work for Committee: Re release time allocation policy. Over winter break we hope to get more information. We have a model for how to do it from 15 years ago.

IV. Return to ARTP policy:
- 6.2.4.2 – accepted

- 6.2.6.5 – discussion of Chair's Description vs. Appointment Letter
- Gita asks when a change takes place when does it get revised? Discussion between Gita and Elna about process in case where departments are divided.
- Ken notes that Chair's Description is written at time when dossier moves ahead.
- The academic assignment should not be changed until the letter has been changed.
- Rod brings up 6.2.6.4 re appointment letters—makes case that appointment letters aren't reissued because you are not reappointed.
- Ken tries to summarize debate: if appointment letters were just boilerplate they would never need to be revised. But in previous policy, we expanded it to include information about academic assignment. If it does so, then it would need to be revised.
- Gita: can we say addendum to the appointment letter instead of "revised appointment letter" in 6.2.6.5 – agreed
- Discussion of 7.1.4.4 – on departments with fewer than 4 active Professors—the section is expanded to give small departments more choices.
- Ken proposes to put debate of "abstentions" on hold until Brandon returns next meeting.
- Committee moves on to 7.2.5. Debate for final 30 minutes – discussion about Associate level chairs producing Chair's letters (8.4). Ken is going to go back through the policy to determine the role of Chairs and their letters.
- Rocio questions candidate going up for full when the Chair cannot write the Chair's description for the person… Elna clarifies they can write the description, but not the evaluative letter. Ken notes that the evaluative letter is written by the Chair of the Committee, not the department.
- Take a vote on 7.2.5: 8 vote to have higher rank votes only; 1 vote to maintain language as is.

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes**

**November 24, 2014**

**Chair: Kenneth Peter**

**Call to order at 2:05pm**

Present: Elna Green, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Joshua Romero, and Brandon White

Absent: Rocio Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Kell Fujimoto, and Sang Lee

**Approval of Minutes for November 17, 2014**

No corrections or additions
Minutes passed by consensus

1. Discussion of Emeritus policy in particular to questions and comments made by the Provost on the draft. Reviewed all of the provost's concerns and corrections were made and are indicated in the current draft of the policy.
    a. 2.5, question about giving space/resources to part-time/lecturer for research endeavors when they never did research at the university and the implications. Discussion was that two safe guards are in the policy for safe-guarding this.
    b. Motion to move and accept all changes. 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstention
    c. Change email address to email accounts.
    d. Additional changes? Discussion of whether or not policy should include section on revoking emeritus status. Agree to leave this alone and let administration decide.
    e. Unanimous vote (6-0-0) in favor to send policy as it is to the Senate for final reading.
2. Continued Discussion of RTP Policy
    a. Discussion of abstentions. Do you count them for quorum? Will it be evident that if you have a commit of X number and then the vote is revealed and is X-1, wouldn't that clearly show the abstention.
    b. Maybe it is okay to count abstentions but not allow them part of discussion. Will the policy as it is worded encourage absenteeism because abstaining will no longer have an influence on the vote? Decided that abstentions will be recorded but person will be asked to leave the room during deliberations and vote.
    c. 7.1.6.2.1 change 'should not abstain' to 'shall not abstain'
    d. Discussion of whether or not 7.1.6.2.3 should be kept or not as it may not serve a purpose. Decided to strike this and removed.
    e. 7.2.5 and 7.2.10. Discussion of whether chair should write a separate recommendation or be allowed to serve on the committee if the person who is being reviewed is going up for a higher rank than the current chair. i.e. chair of department is associate professor and person going up for full professor. Is this

appropriate? There is a reason for ranks and the goal is to produce objectivity in your evaluations without a unethical situation arising. Long discussion over the merits and consequences. 5-1 vote to keep language as it is in the policy as opposed to re-writing.

f. 7.3.2. This was established to prevent Dean's who just want to come in and sit in on the college committee. What is the Dean or designee's roll when sitting in on this meeting? Is it just for policy clarification or missing documents in dossier? Should they be present in the room when this happens or can the chair of the committee step out and ask these questions? It was decided that changes should be made to this section to include language that dean's or representative may not intervene or interfere with committee's deliberations.
g. 7.1.3. Adding language to restrict or regulate materials placed in dossier by someone besides the person who is being evaluated. CBA 15.8 indicates that it might be able to allow someone to submit anything they please. CBA 11.3 any material identified by source may be placed in the PAF. CBA 11.4 Faculty unit shall be notified of anything placed in the file. Discussed, provision to include when material is inserted without consent form candidate, that faculty affairs would have to vet the material and determine if it is germane. It was indicated that this would be need to reviewed by appropriate campus counsel. Question on who would handle this and discussed that it would be faculty affairs that might be the group to coordinate this since they also have the ability to stop the dossier clock for review. Language will be drafted and committee will review prior to submitting to university counsel to see if the language is appropriate for CBA.
h. Case load for University RTP. Section 7.4.4 discusses what URTP committee would review. Question becomes would the committee review dossiers for a rebuttal. There should be a difference between a rebuttal and a point of clarification. Unanimous to take out 7.4.4. Discussion on full professor being evaluated by URTP as opposed to just college and it is because URTP will make evaluation for university service as opposed to just college or department levels.

3. Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

**Professional Standards Committee**

Minutes 26 January 2015

*Present:* Chair Peter, and members Dresser, Fatoohi, Fujimoto, Green, Lee, Mathur, Riley, Romero, and White

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm with a quorum of 8 members.

2. Approval of minutes of November 24. The minutes were approved with 4 votes in the affirmative, 4 abstentions, and 2 absences at the time of approval vote

3. Emeritus policy update. Policy was approved by the Senate and signed by the President.

4. Assigned time policy in new Collective Bargaining Agreement. The new contract includes a provision for assigned time for exceptional service. The campus Senates are each charged with creating an implementation policy. Timeliness is an issue. Need to approve a draft by next week, so can make it to the senate in February.

   The Chair provided a draft of the policy under consider at Fullerton. The Committee discussed several shortcomings of the Fullerton document. The main concerns were the process for selecting committee members, the weighting assigned to criteria, the calendar for the process, and the role of chairs and/or deans in approval of applications.

   The Chair will bring a draft policy to the next meeting.

5. ARTP policy. The Committee reviewed changes discussed on November 24. We did not cover section 8.
   a. 7.1.3. Discussion of guidelines for inserting materials into a dossier without the candidate's permission. The major question is how to determine what is "germane." Will return to this discussion next week.
   b. 7.1.5. Committee approved language on quorums and abstentions.
   c. 7.3.2. Committee approved language on college committees consulting with their deans.
   d. 7.4.5. Committee approved language on university level reviews of cases with unanimous recommendations at the lower levels of review.

6. No new business.

7. Adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by Elna Green, Seat A

# Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

February 2, 2015
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

**1. Call to order at 2pm.**

*Present*: Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Kenneth Peter, Brandon White, Rocío Dresser, Kell Fujimoto
*Absent*: Shannon Rose Riley and Joshua Romero

**2. Minutes of January 26 approved by consensus.**

**3. Assigned Time policy in light of recent CBA**
*Shall the Committee adopt the attached policy for presentation to the Senate as a Final Reading on February 9?*

Discussion about number of slots for SJSU
About $90,000/year for 3 years. The contract says it is based on the minimum salary of assistant professor. Is it same as our vacant rate ($5,000-$5,500)?

Estimation by the Chancellor's office: 17 3-unit courses for SJSU. That means 2 courses (10%) need to be set aside for appeal.

Review of revisions, discussion and decisions
4.2. Clarification: Assigned time can only be used during the academic year. Not summer session.

6. Application materials. This section is substantially revised: (1) include "assigned time can be implemented in a manner that will not create undue hardship for scheduling or staffing critical curricula"; and (2) add statements and signature page to be signed by the chair and the Dean. Signature page will be devised by the Faculty Affairs.

> **Changes to be made**: (1) Reorder three application materials for clarity; (2) replace "requirements" with "criteria" (as outlined in 7.1).

7.1. It is the language from the contract.

7.2. Added: "Demonstrate or hypothesized" in consideration for activities to be implemented.

7.2.2. Added: "or the continuation of excessive workload" so those who already overwork can also apply and it does not imply that one should work more than what s/he does.

**Change to be made**: Reverse order between 7.2.1 and 7.2.2.

4.1.1. “All unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal….” Discussion about eligibility: Is “faculty employee" not same as Unit 3 faculty OR teaching faculty only? Language is confusing because the Contract says "all faculty unit can apply.”

Decision: The committee decides to broadly interpret this.

8.1 Added: “The EATC shall establish its own procedures to systematically evaluate the proposals and prioritize them for funding prior to beginning the review process.” This addition is for efficiency of the process.

8.2. **Change to be made**: Strike out "final." It won't be final decision as there will be appeal process.

Clarification: Department is getting paid to hire part time lecturers. It will not affect salary of faculty who will receive the assigned time.

9. No change.

10. Revised based on the agreement the committee made last time.

5.1. Timeline. It does not suggest specific dates.

5.2. **Change to be made**: Add "2015" after December.

11. It confirms inclusion of sunset clause.

Question: What if the senate rejects the proposed policy in February meeting and there will be delay in implementing the policy? Money will be rolled over to the next year and eventually goes back to CSU if not used at all. If the policy is not approved this academic year by senate, it will happen next year.

Discussion: 3-3 teaching model in other CSU campuses. (1) 4 unit model (Sonoma) and (2) oversized class model (San Diego). Neither of them is not real workload reduction and they just shift workload.

**Approval of the policy with revisions: Unanimous amongst members present. 8-0-0**

**4. ARTP policy**

*Review of section 8: The Dossier, Narrative Statements, accumulated record of review,*

*etc.*

Review of revisions, discussion and decisions

8.1.3. & 8.1.4. Are they necessary? Do we need two sections? Are these sections about AFTER closing or not?

8.1.2. The section becomes late add.

> **Changes to be made**: Strike 8.1.3 except the last sentence- “Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the initial personnel committee for review, evaluation and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review.” This sentence will be moved to 8.1.2.
>
> Then, the current 8.1.4 will become 8.1.3. Also, add timeline such as "prior to the closing date."
>
> The entire 8.1 will be rewritten and brought back to the committee.

Contract 15.12.a. is applicable to involuntary insertion. We need a deeper review and research of the Contract.

Discussion: Is reviewing late add materials only without the whole dossier okay? Currently the whole dossiers are not circulated for review of late add materials. What materials should the committee re- vote? Just the late add materials or the whole dossier? Committee can ask the whole dossier if needed. Electronic dossier can help the problem.

8.2. Electronic dossier. The language is permissive without mandate.

> **Change to be made**: "Must" needs to be replaced with “shall.”

8.2.1 & 8.2.2. Intention- Choice of format is for fairness and minimizing workload. Faculty Affairs needs funding and time to search the right platform with security if going with electronic format.

8.3. It is the old language.

8.4. New and endorsed by the prior committee – asking for one holistic narrative statement. Background: Unevenness about narrative statements. The current policy does not require narrative statements. Evaluation is supposed to be holistic but requiring three separate narrative statements may not be helpful for that.

8.4.3. Ask to cite evidence to support its argument by referring to specific documents included elsewhere in the dossier. This would be easier if electronic format is used.

Discussion: Educating RTP committee members about the policy – not so much has been done. The committee members need to have good understanding about the policy including its spirit.

**5. New Business- None**

**6. Adjourn @ 4pm.**

Minutes submitted by Sang Lee (Seat B)

# Professional Standards Committee
# Minutes 2/16/15

Notetaker: Joshua Romero

1. **Call to order at 2:02pm**
   a. Present: Kenneth Peter, Kell Fujimoto, Shannon Rose Riley, Elna Green, Rocio Dresser, Rod Fatoohi, Gita Mathur, Joshua Romero, Sang Lee, Brandon White
   b. Absent: none
2. **Minutes of February 2 approved by consensus**
3. **Academic Senate update:**
   a. Assigned time was passed by the senate
      i. Talked about many professors will be going after the 17 units of assigned time

4. **ARTP Policy**

   a. 1st Resolved Clause (Section B)
      i. If this is passed, it will affect those professors starting in the Fall
      ii. Section 2 information on how
      iii. How will this affect hybrid situation. Professors should not have the choice if they have no significant time at the university. (1st and 2nd years)
         1. Associate professors going up for full professor?
         2. Need to define what policies people are choosing to have (between the old and new one, on criteria and standards)

   b. 2nd Resolved Clause
      i. Professional Standards shall help in training staff for the new policy
      ii. Conversation on how this will be possible. (brandon's concern with how much time the trainings will have to be and if so, released time will be needed)
      iii. Consulting purposes?
      iv. Issue of having everything happen in a month
      v. Educational training after certain committees are over.
      vi. What should be limited? Harder for 4th year review (even 5th year) because of what specifics need to be done
      vii. The changes of what professors want in their careers and have professors teaching "to the test" rather than teach what can be as equally as credible but not recognized by the RTP committee
      viii. Talking about the three categories can be chosen but scaled with the standards of the RTP committee
      ix. Talked about how people are going to be educated about the new policies and how closely this committee will work with the university.
      x. The sessions were difficult because of the differences of college policies

rather than the university

xi. How should the committee give their time to adjusting the campus to the new RTP policies

c. 3rd Resolved Clause

i. Talked about the history of RTP on campus and how they got revised every few years through amendments to the policies

ii. It was then changed to in 1998-2006 that it would be updated in one big new policy

iii. The 6 year cycle was in accordance with most of the committee about how

d. Section 8:

i. 8.3.4

1. 8.3.4 "Unsolicited materials. In addition to materials required by policy and/or provided by the candidate, the Agreement (Section 15.8) permits the inclusion of additional information provided by faculty unit employees, students, external reviewers, and academic administrators. For such materials to be inserted into the dossier without the consent of the candidate, they must be submitted to the Department Chair or Dean before the closing date, and they must subsequently be inspected by the AVP for Faculty Affairs to determine a) if the insertion is allowed under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and b) that the insertion is both germane to the criteria of this policy and neither prejudicial nor defamatory. If the insertion is allowed, then the candidate must be afforded at least seven days to insert a response to the material."
    a. Looked over CB 15.8 to see if it followed that policy
2. Suggesting to abolish unsolicited materials
3. Good as written until after Elna gets back to us about if we can rid the unsolicited material

ii. 8.4.1

1. The talk about conversion of the dossier to an electronic version
2. Accommodations for those with disabilities
3. What we can do is to make it permissive for those who want it, having a president who would sign it by a certain time.

iii. 8.5.1

1. How people would have their publications count for the dossier during their "lost year."
2. The issue would be the time and work that a person would use before the appointment

iv. 8.6.3.4

1. Concern by the use of language of "using" students
2. "For example, faculty who use students to help with their research should indicate how their research agenda benefits student learning, or faculty who do extensive student service activities could indicate how this helps inform their teaching."

v. 8.6.3.2

1. Showing how trajectory on what you want your career to look like. This includes their past, their current, and their future.
2. Will work on language to make the scholarly, artistic, and professional growth that tis more specific

vi. 8.7

1. To clarify how faculty need to show all work/materials during 4th year review and tenure, not since the last review
2. Will try to rewrite 8.7…….for less ambiguity and specificity

vii. 8.8

1. Using the word "candidate" to indicate what person rather than "faculty member"
2. Identify with whom the candidate needs to meet with in regards to their responses under the collective bargaining agreement
3. The level of how the days of notifications need to be made the Sme for the purpose of consistency

**5. Announcements:**

a. No secret ballots

**6. Adjourn at 4:03pm**

# Professional Standards Committee
# Minutes 2/23/15

Notetaker: Gita Mathur

1. **Call to order at 2:05 pm**
   a. Present: Kenneth Peter, Rod Fatoohi, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Shannon Rose Riley, Joshua Romero
   b. Present after approval of minutes: Brandon White
   c. Absent: Rocio Dresser, Kell Fujimoto, Elna Green

2. **Minutes of February 16 approved by consensus 6/6; Ken will correct typos identified**

3. **Ken provided update on Assigned Time Approval by Senate**

4. **ARTP Policy discussion (RTP Draft 2023 Current.docx)**

   a. 7.4.2
      i. Election of members of the university level committee was discussed.
      ii. Committee agreed to keep the content of this section as is with the following three modifications:
         1. Add: All nominees for service at the university level must have served at the college level of review.
         2. Change shall to may in the following statement: Each department in the college shall be informed of the pending selection and may nominate one person.
         3. Strike "with more than 25 FTE/F".
      iii. Ken will check the entire policy for General Unit and 25 FTE/F references.

   b. Resolved 2. Implementation of Criteria and Standards
      i. Implementation of Criteria and Standards in the front, Resolved: Section 2 was discussed.
      ii. Committee agreed to the contents of this section.

   c. Secret Ballots
      i. Committee discussed secret ballot requirements and agreed on the following: all mixed rank personnel committees shall use secret ballots for voting, but other committees may devise their own process.
      ii. Ken will create the language.

   d. Revisiting Baselines for the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion
      i. The following question was raised and discussed: How is a RTP candidate to be evaluated on teaching if he/she gets buy-out due to research grants

and as a result, does not have a extensive teaching record?

ii. Committee discussed how we might define the baseline for academic assignment, scholarship, and service so that we can sustain diversity with faculty excelling in one dimension with respect to others. It was determined that we need some cases to test the baselines and also need to revisit the baselines.

iii. Ken will look at definition of academic assignment and protection for those who change the trajectory of their career due to success in one dimension during their probationary period.

iv. The committee was not satisfied with the wording of the criteria for tenure and promotion, and decided to revisit the policy to discuss criteria at the next meeting.

**5. Adjourn at 4:05 pm**

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes 3/9/15**

Note taker: Rocío Dresser

1. **Call to order at 2:05 pm**
    a. Present: Kenneth Peter, Rod Fatoohi, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Shannon Rose Riley, Joshua Romero, Brandon White and Kell Fujimoto
    b. Absent: Elna Green

2. **Minutes approved by consensus 9/9**

3. **ARTP Policy discussion (RTP Draft)**

    **a. Much discussion centered on the review of the "baseline" descriptions of achievement in all three categories. These areas had been discussed an approved by last year's committee but this year's committee wished to review them.**

    b. 3.3.1.3.1
        Evaluating criteria for teaching faculty were discussed.
        i. Ken shared that the previous committee had already revised this section.
    c. 3.3.1.3.2 Outlined sections were revised. The following was discussed:
        i. The candidate has taught a range of the assigned courses (within his/her expertise) as expected in their teaching assignment.
        ii. Student evaluations, taking into account contextual factors such as the difficulty of the teaching assignment, the resources provided, and the workload outlined in the appointment letter--approach the norms appropriate for the classes reviewed.

    **Other suggestions/Comments/ Concerns**:
        i. What if the candidate is evaluated on courses outside of his/her expertise?
        ii. Should the candidate need to be evaluated solely on the range of course outlined in the appointment letter? This would protect someone teaching outside his/her field.
        iii. There was a discussion as to whether the overall evaluation of a candidate would be quantitative or whether it would be more based on the textual descriptions in the policy.
        iv. There was a discussion about the difference between outstanding and excellent.
        v. Higher levels of achievement, like outstanding, is more useful for those applying for Professor or for early decision than for a basic tenure decision, under the current language.
    d. 3.3.2.2. Needs improvement. The candidate has not documented scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline

level as described below.
Baseline refers to the department's baseline criteria.

e. 3.3.2.3. Brandon will send the revisions of this section to Ken.
f. 3.3.3.5. This may include leading University task forces and administrative searches, positions of Senate leadership, leadership in CFA, leadership in professional organizations, and similar activities.
Revised to: This includes service such as .. (it is important that faculty serve their departments)
g. 3.3.3.6. The committee discussed "baseline".
    i. Can faculty be penalized because their service was at the department level only?
    ii. Some department advise junior faculty to begin with department committees and then transition to college and university committees. The goal is for junior faculty to succeed in scholarship and teaching.
h. 4.1.4.1. The terms excellent and excellence are used throughout the document. They will be change to excellent to be consistent.

**4. Adjourn at 3:45 pm**

# Professional Standards Committee
# Minutes

## April 13, 2015
## Clark Hall 445

Note taker: Seat E: Fatoohi

1. Call to order and roll @ 2:08 pm.

    a. Present: Rocio Dresser (arrived @ 2:50 pm), Rod Fatoohi, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur (left @ 3 pm), Kenneth Peter (Chair), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White

    b. Absent: Kell Fujimoto, Joshua Romero

2. Approval of minutes of March 16 (Fujimoto): postponed to next week

3. ARTP policy

    a. Ken reviewed feedback from Senate, campus, Deans, and Provost

    b. Ken reviewed possible changes in response to feedback

The main change is dividing the main policy into three policies: appointment, procedures and Criteria and Standards. There are proposed changes in each of these policies.

    c. Next steps

The committee moved into discussing each of three policies and requested changes.

    I. Appointment policy

The committee debated the proposed changes and voted 8-0-2 to send the policy to the Senate for final reading.

    II. Procedures policy

The committee debated the proposed changes and voted 7-0-3 to send the policy to the Senate for final reading.

    III. Criteria and Standards policy

The committee debated some of the proposed changes and decided on continuing debating the remaining proposals during the next meeting.

4. New Business:

   Rod requested that this committee to look into S86-5 with regard to faculty requesting reassignment from one department to another in F15/16. Ken took note of the request.

5. Adjourn @ 4:10 pm

**Professional Standards Committee**
**Minutes 3/16/15**

Note taker: Kell Fujimoto

1. **Call to order at 2:05 pm**
    a. Present: Kenneth Peter, Elna Green, Sang Lee, Gita Mathur, Shannon Rose Riley, Joshua Romero, Brandon White and Kell Fujimoto
    b. Absent: Rod Fatoohi

2. **Minutes approved by consensus 9/9**

3. **ARTP Policy discussion (RTP Draft)**

    a. Draft sent to Provost Feinstein and select faculty.
        i. Feedback received from Marc D'Alarcao & Pat Becker. Provost Feinstein is half way through it; has some concerns, but supportive in general.
            1. Becker responded briefly, but more around college guidelines and Dean creating guidelines.
            2. Feinstein – Electronic Version: "Gonna make it happen." Can we mandate conversion to electronic? Can we rewrite that part of policy with stronger language.
                a. Willing to meet w/committee
                b. In favor of 5 way criteria in 3 areas
                c. Too easy on early promotion
                d. 2.3.5.3.1. – uncomfortable w/language. May need to connect more with Boyer Model.
                e. Baseline vs. Satisfactory
                f. Online – should we put page limits?
            3. D'Alarcao – Teacher/Scholar Model
                a. Model should not encourage, but require and requriements should not be equal (3 areas)
                    i. It weakens the teacher/scholar model
                b. Baseline is not enough = undervaluing teaching & scholarship
                    i. Needs to be tweaked so that they are not all equal & faculty can pick.
                c. Objection to department guidelines
                    i. Doesn't like guidelines because of equity
                    ii. We need to revise what policy says for department guidelines
                    iii. QUESTION: Do we want guidelines that provide examples?
4. Committee decided that department guidelines section need to be changed.
    a. 3 Options presented to committee:

i. Chair edits document as best as can from feedback and take to Senate's next meeting for First Reading and more feedback.
ii. Continue editing, have Provost visit, and take to Senate at the last meeting for First Reading
iii. Keep editing on policy even through the summer.

b. Committee decided Option 1.
i. Chair will talk with Provost Feinstein and if changes are minimal then rewrite and present to Senate.

**5. Adjourn**