2015-2016 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee:
Professional Standards

Chair: Kenneth Peter	**Chair-Elect for 2016-2017**: Kenneth Peter
Number of Meeting held:	(Please include phone/zip/email if available) 45562 kenneth.peter@sjsu.edu 0119

Items of Business Completed 2015/2016

1. S16-13 Rescinds S02-8--Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy

   F15-2 Further Clarification of the Transition to the new System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)

   S15-6 Amendment A; S15-7 Amendments A, B, C;

2. SS-16-8 Calling for Widespread Consultation Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies Pertaining to Electronic Communications

3. Production of numerous documents and workshops assisting with the transition to the new RTP system; mostly available on the "RTP Transitions" website.

   Evaluated 18 sets of department guidelines.

Unfinished Business Items from 2015/2016

1. a. Selection, Review, Removal of Program Coordinators? Do we need a policy—perhaps very basic? Committee has discussed a policy that permits departments to create their own systems for handling these important procedures, provided that the systems are transparent. The default system could be appointment by the Chair but only after all interested faculty have an opportunity to compete fairly for the position.

   b. POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending F97-7 Modification of Policy on Electronic Information & Communication. Conversation with CIO Terry Vahey and Information Security Officer Mike Cook suggest substantial revisions to the first reading draft. Suggestions include the requirement of a written finding signed by two or more appropriate authorities (from a limited list) to authorize a breach of privacy; and a limited number of specified reasons for a search. The problem with the language "maximum privacy under the law" proves not to be a problem, given that case law provides the flexibility required for security and maintenance requests.

2. c. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility. For the third year in a row, we have not reached conclusion on the BAFPR policy. There are draft documents and draft revisions that can be used going forwards. Should PS rewrite the policy on its own? Does BAFPR have the membership to be functional?

   d. Revisions to S14-8 "Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors." The Provost will be forwarding some concerns that the Deans have discussed with the policy. The placement of the voting for Chairs in a separate policy than this one continues to create confusion. What to do in the event of a tie? Is an untenured faculty member or even a Lecturer a viable candidate if there literally is no other person? To this we can add a collection of ambiguities and situations that have arisen in recent years that I am aware of that could use clarification. Also note that this policy did not revise the review process of Department Chairs, which is looking rather old.

3. e. Report to Senate on results of Faculty Office Hours IEA focus group study.

New Business Items for 2016/2017

1. Provost requests consideration of policy on administrator emeritus standing.

2.

3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by May 31, 2016.

Guest: Provost Feinstein

Senator Peter notes that we have quorum (Joshua absent)

Introductions with Provost Feinstein

Discussion of items:

1. discussion of language for all 3 policies re rescinding language re old policy
    a. Ken asks for permission to revise language re "rescinds" to comport with eliminating the relevant parts of the policy and using the term "amends" in its stead.
2. Regarding 2.2.4 of Procedures policy: line 168 (regarding probationary period being extended by leave, etc.). Senator Peter wants to amend language re people who have 2 years of service credit so that they have review in 4th year rather than 3rd.
3. Question re student research section 2.3.5.4 of Standards policy: need language to distinguish between aspects of student research that count under teaching and that which counts as scholarship. Senator Peter's suggestion is to cut the entire section. Agreed—stricken.
4. Criteria 3.3.2.3.: Definition for Baseline: Provost's concern is that we don't want someone coming in at last minute with a research agenda (say in year 5). "Over the course of the review period, documented
    a. Rod is concerned about what "documented" means—it means recorded in the dossier, not published. Ken responds with clarification of the language: Completed works achieve the greatest weight.
    b. Provost tries to weigh in on Rod's concerns. Rod doesn't offer language change. Provost distinguishes between steps:
    c. Ken proposes: over the course of the probationary period created
    d. Elna wants to say "also shows promise" (add "also")
    e. Sang reminds us about language conflict with full professors (e.g. no probationary period).
    f. The candidate has over the period of review created a body of XXX that shows the promise of continued growth.
    g. Also make changes in "unsatisfactory" section.
5. Provost Feinstein reviews changes just made.
    a. Concern especially over works in progress
        i. Agreed by Shannon
    b. Ken responds that works in progress have always been marked as reviewable according to old policy.
    c. Provost does not place any weight on works in progress
        i. In press counts as published
    d. Ken responds that this is why you need college-level committees to interpret works in progress
    e. Brandon describes difference between an abstract versus a manuscript in progress

f. Rod brings up “lack of work in progress”
g. Brandon asks whether you can be excellent in two and below baseline in a third? Yes Provost answers.
h. Provost answers that service is discounted or teaching is so bad but a rock-star researcher.
i. Provost raises question regarding resources:
    i. 2.3.6: Provost concern 2.3.6.3 & 2.3.6.4: how will this be operationalized for a reviewer? A reviewer will see a dossier that has a list of grants, of assigned time, and their start up package to look at whether they’ve been productive enough in scholarship?
    ii. Elna replies that you aren’t just goint to throw numbers out there, but the dossier preparer will narrate and explicate.
    iii. Provost worries that a committee will say “this person has no research because they have not been given any resources or insufficient resources.”
    iv. Elna states that this is what we already do. We already list assigned time. The only thing that’s different is the inclusion of material about startup package.
    v. Rod reiterates Provost response.
    vi. Brandon thinks that offer letters account for the discrepancy.
    vii. 2.3.6.2 Ken points, should address the issue that the Provost is concerned about.
    viii. Provost continues: two last things
        1. We have no external reviews of promotion to professor
        2. Ken notes that there is language that permits such external reviews
        3. Elna replies that this is a Research 1 model
        4. Provost replies that long-term it is something to think about to make it an improved process
        5. Ken agrees to put it on the long-term list
        6. Unit 3 includes counselors and librarians but Provost notes that he has a hard time reviewing counselor dossiers. He wishes there was a better way of creating a process of reviewing counselors that was more reflective of their discipline.
        7. Elna notes that there is a problem because counselors don’t have a rep to the University committee
        8. Brandon asks if counselors have departmental level review.
            a. Yes
        9. Kell replies that it is hard to fit the counselors into the teaching faculty model; they have their own guidelines to try to create a parallel process

10. Provost would like to think longterm about a policy about what it thinks to be a tenured counselor and what that entails.
11. Ken suggests using a college-level committee as a second-level review system
12. Provost thinks long term that a paradigm shift is needed (after Kuhn)
13. Ken notes that librarians and counselors craft their own guidelines
14. Provost reminds that they still have to fit into the three categories: service/research/teaching
15. More careful look in the future re external reviews and another policy for librarians/counselors

ix. Provost discusses pushback in senate
    1. People get worked up on semantics
    2. Ken notes that any minor changes should be done via email in order to prepare a list of friendly agreements at the start of Senate. With regard to Procedure policy—controversy will probably be over University committee reviewing everything
        a. Provost wants to address that for a moment. With the reduction of stages of review, how will the committee workload be changed (question for Elna)
        b. Currently don't review 2nd years or promotions (Elna's response). Now they will review negative retention cases, and it is impossible to predict what the burden would be for the U committee.
        c. Ken mentions language: "When allocating its workload, the U committee should pay special attention to…"
        d. Provost reiterates value of full Professor
        e. Ken replies with language from policy again.
        f. Provost acknowledges that full professor requires a tremendous amount of work

6. Ken entertains motion to approve Procedures document with amendment for a final reading: vote (9-0-1) Joshua absent
7. Vote for appointments policy for final reading: vote (9-0-1) Joshua absent
8. On Criteria and Standards: any modifications
    a. Rod brings issue
    b. Ken says bring amendment
    c. Rod raises question re retention
        i. Ken confirms language is almost identical to S98-8
        ii. Rod: we count three areas but what if they don't publish a paper and never serve on a committee

1. Example: five years in Engineering consulting but no publishing—should that person be retained?
2. BRAndon tries to clarify what Rod is asking. Are they above or below baseline?
3. Rod tries to explain again.
4. Ken replies: the 6 years probationary period is sacrosanct and the only reason to fire before then is if they are harming their students. If they're making inadequate progress, they should receive info that they will not be tenured if they do not improve—but you do not fire them early. At R-1 universities, they do get fired early.
5. Elna points out that you don't retain just to retain but you retain to let them develop over time.
6. Sang reiterates that you can request an additional review.
7. Rod brings up another example from Engineering.
8. Provost Feinstein understands Rod's point: they are wasting the University's resources. Provost asks Elna what has to be done if someone is in third year and isn't doing anything. IT's been our policy not to fire them unless teaching is the problem.
9. Rocio mentions one faculty who had 7 preps in first few years and as a result, scholarship suffered. Rocio defends the time period so that they can change.
10. Rod wants to add teaching and one of the other two areas.

9. PROVOST leaves and nurse policy folks arrive
10. Massive debate over firing people in 3rd year:
    i. Ken reads change: effectiveness in teaching and one of the other areas.
    ii. Brandon clarifies next line would be impacted as well.
    iii. "should not" be retained
    iv. VOTE: 5-4-1 (5 for; 4 against; 1 absent)
    v. Riley goes on record that this is not good (people "should not be retained" in 3rd year! Before end of probationary period.
    vi. Gita mentions this is in 3rd year review.
    vii. Rod defends that people should be fired in 3rd year
    viii. Brandon is not sure again that it's below baseline and it puts an onerous task on a committee to say that "you're below baseline". He agrees with what Rod is saying that you shouldn't drag out someone for 6 years if they are never going to improve their teaching or research.
    ix. Rod: we will return to this before end of session and move to time certain
11. Time Certain with Nursing:

a. Kathy ? Director of School of Nursing
b. Colleen, Prof. in School of Nursing
c. Ken starts: a draft that has had a few changes since 1998
    i. Kathy corrects: 2003
    ii. Kathy summarizes: the issue re Rtp guidelines for faculty
        1. How can we maintain excellence in teaching
        2. Service—been expanded
        3. Scholarship: many faculty are nurse practitioners and need to continue practice
        4. RTP guidelines: issue of leadership expected at this level: pro organizations with leadership in those areas, e.g. Board of Directors, etc.
        5. Quality not only quantity—e.g. prestigious journals or venues, etc. Depth and breadth of research and prof. work
    iii. Colleen describes how they needed to address the doctorate in nursing rather than phd.
        1. Rod asks if they've looked at the new guidelines.
        2. Kathy responds that they have skimmed them
        3. Ken thinks that they would be adaptable
        4. Sang thinks that some of the guidelines for nursing are addressed in the new policy. Sang notes the contradictions regarding terminal degree requirements.
        5. Elna reminds that there is no waiver for a terminal degree.
        6. Comments made about no service credit given for work done prior to terminal degree (Riley—and Peter reiterates). Kathy confirms that no service credit was given for pre-terminal degree work.
        7. Rocio makes language recs:
            a. 2a: last sentence: grammatical correction or point of clarification
            b. C: "the candidates […] responsibilities are clearly defined"—Rocio asks where they are defined
            c. Kathy replies that it is in the Faculty Handbook
            d. Spell out that they are defined in the Faculty Handbook
            e. Rocio asks about Professional Development statement:
            f. Timelines is one word
        8. Rod asks about SOTEs: within University Norms for two semesters.
            a. Ken notes that this is from old policy and that it may be irrelevant now
            b. Ken notes that SOTEs have multiple norms available, not just the University

    c. Ken suggests that they expand that a bit to document what they in fact do regarding their own Departmental norms
    d. Ken reminds them that guidelines are for people who are not in the Department
9. Rod asks about below norm:
    a. Kathy states that we write them up—she is tough after third review about having concerns about whether someone meets standards for teaching, etc.
10. Rocio seconds what Ken said: that we need to be able to understand the doc. E.g. 3A-1 is in passive voice, long sentence and hard to understand. Do away with the passive voice with makes it very vague. #2 for example, "should be collected and be generally positive"—Rocio does not understand that phrasing.
11. Ken asks if some terms should be defined in a glossary.
12. Rod asks if the Committee approves and Ken makes clear that Elna approves and we recommend or not…
13. Elna asks re bottom of p2 III-A-1: effectiveness in teaching: lots of people involved in assigning peer evaluators.
14. Next sentence: Elna notes that policy on teaching evaluation that it is the Dept. Chair responsibility to assign these—and that it's not an option.
15. Elna agrees with Rocio "generally positive" is too vague
16. Elna: p.4 re SOTEs and SOLATEs "with few exceptions"… "and should represent a variety" does not match up with the new SOTE policy re evals of every class.
17. IV: criteria, #1: regarding doctorate: whatever you put there has to mirror what you've put in the terminal degree document. Elna warns they need to be identical.
18. Sang: last page: involvement in accreditation—was also listed under scholarship rather than service. Sang wants clarification. Kathy explains that there are different levels, e.g. at a national level, is a form a scholarship.

12. [Brandon leaves at 3:19pm]
13. Elna recommends that Nursing takes it back and rewrites it and submit a revision
    a. The Prof. Standards committee recommends passing with a revision that includes our feedback
    b. Motion to approve a revision for Faculty Affairs approval
14. The recommendation to revise RTP
15. Moved to reconsider vote by SRR
16. Second by Elna
17. Votes of 6 mean it is reopened

18. Vote to restore to original language 7-1-2 (7 in favor; 1 against and 2 absent)
19. Chair entertains motion to approve this draft:
    a. I move to approve
    b. Moved by SRR
    c. Seconded
    d. Approved 7-1 against and 2 absences
    e. SRR asked Rod to come up with language for next Senate; he states he does not do that work

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

August 24, 2015
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:05

1. Call to order and roll
   Quorum was met-- six of eight members were present. Representatives from Education and Engineering are not selected yet.

   Present: Ken Peter (Chair), Sang Lee (Note taker), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White, Meg Virick, Grecia Cuellar

   Absent: Elna Green, Paul Kauppila

2. Approval of minutes of April 20: Passed unanimously.

3. Introductions of members.

4. Ken provided an overview of the Academic Senate and general PS committee work.

5. Request from Counseling: Counseling is a part of unit 3 faculty and they have to go through all review processes like other unit 3 faculty. For AY 2015-16, they do not have 5 professors for their second-level RTP review committee (equivalent of college level review). Their guidelines indicate 5-member committee. They may reduce the size of their second-level RTP review committee from 5 to 3 for AY 2015-16. This would conform to the old RTP policy but requires a modification of their internal guidelines.

   Motion and approved: we will recommend 3-person committee to Faculty Affairs.

6. Review of main task for Professional Standards AY 2015-2016: preparing the campus for implementation of S15-7 (RTP Procedures) and S15-8 (RTP Standards.)

   Ken discussed these items with Elna.

   a. Informing new hires. Immediately, Search Committees and Deans need to know and to distribute and explain S15-8 to new hires and prospective hires instead of the old policy. Everyone hired this year will be covered by the new policy. Faculty affairs will be in charge.

   b. Updating department guidelines. None of the old department guidelines works for the new policy. All departments with guidelines need to know that, if they want to have operative guidelines to cover candidates who may be reviewed under

the new policy beginning AY 2016-17, they will need to draft them this fall 2015 semester so their College committees, PS committee and Faculty Affairs review them in spring 2016 semester.

Counseling and Library are the only two academic units that are required to have operative guidelines- both in old and new policies.

Workshops will be set up for department chairs. Faculty affairs, in collaboration with the PS committee, will plan and schedule the workshops.

c. Clarifying timelines for choosing which RTP policy. Elna and Amy are working on this item and we can see a draft probably next week. Faculty short of full Professor have five years in which they can operate under the criteria and standards of the old policy. It is anticipated that many will choose to be evaluated under the new policy. Clear guidance is needed as to when they may make that choice so that they do not fall between the different review schedules of the two policies.

d. Educating faculty in how to prepare dossiers for the new system. To shorten the RPT policy, dossier preparation contents are removed. Dossier format manual is needed and will be created by Faculty Affairs with the help of PS committee. Manual needs to be done in early spring 2016 semester.

e. Educating committees and evaluators in how to apply the new policy and evaluate dossiers under the new system. Guidelines need to be created about how to evaluate the dossiers.

Discussion: Can PS committee get involved in preparing the guidelines? Creating a Canvas course for training purpose was suggested.

f. Assisting Faculty Affairs in choosing the new electronic platform for RTP. Provost is really keen to converting to electronic dossier. Four vendors are the current candidates. This item will be discussed with Elna next time.

Ideas entertained: To use an electronic system, faculty need to choose the new policy. Those who choose to stick to the old policy, they need to use paper format. Devising two versions of online system can be cumbersome and costly. Those who already started a three-ring binder dossier are likely to remain in that format rather revamping the entire dossier electronically.

7. Other possible business:

a. Inquiry regarding academic freedom and university web pages (administrative removal of David Chai's favorite pizzerias from his webpage.).

Discussed and agreed: On behalf of PS committee, Ken can express the concern

to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility in relation to academic freedom. This way, the board can report to PS committee and the committee can review the policy along with their report.

b. S99-9 BAFPR (Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility) revisions

   Discussed: The current policy is lengthy, which caused slow operation of the Board. The policy needs to be more manageable and more effective. Additionally, it is currently under Faculty Affairs and would function better as an independent agency which directly reports to the Provost. PS committee (Elna, particularly) can offer to revise the policy. An idea of splitting PS committee was proposed – a half for RTP policy and the other half for BAFPR. This matter will continue to be discussed.

c. F97-7 Privacy of Electronic Communications and Information. The policy says faculty email will be kept private under the law. It was created before the CSU system wide guideline, thus, it needs to be revisited and revised.

d. Approved "That for AY 2015/16 the Professional Standards Committee shall devote itself exclusively to educating the campus in the use of the new policy; any pressing policy items within its purview shall be temporarily diverted to the Executive Committee."

   PS committee should implement this clause unless there is an item the committee wants to get involved – e.g., review of department guidelines in spring 2016.

8. New business
   a. Michael Kimbarow, Senate Chair, brought to PS committee's attention that office hours policy needs to be reviewed by the PS committee.

9. Adjourn at 4:05pm

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

August 31, 2015
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker for today: Seat C: Meg Virick

Attending: Kenneth Peter, Sang Lee, Elna Green, Grecia Cuellar, Meg Virick, Rocio Dresser, Paul Kauppila, Brandon White

Approval of minutes of August 24 (Sang Lee). Minutes approved.

Office Hours Policy:
The question was posed to the committee to consider assessing policy on office hours.

Updates:
1. Academic Freedom Issue: Ken indicated that the censored website (David Chai) in which a faculty member had recommendations for pizza places was restored when Elna Green spoke to Dean Vollendorf. Additionally Ken sent this case to BAFPR for them to review the policy and make suggestions since this may have implications in other areas.

2. Digital Platform for RTP: Elna Green updated the committee on the vendor selection for the digital platform for RTP. Eight software products were initially considered by Faculty Affairs. Of these 4 vendors will be giving presentations on campus to a smaller group consisting of members of Professional standards, Chair of senate, AALT and others. One or two finalists will present it to a larger faculty audience.

Review of SOTE and SOLATE instruments
Rachel, chair of the SERB committee presented the revised SOTE and SOLATE instruments. The last revisions were done in 2004. Both instruments were reviewed; feedback was provided. The changes to SOLATE are more significant.
Action: Rachel to consult with Thalia, take suggestions back to the committee.

RTP Guidelines Workshop
A session will be held on September 28th from 2-4 pm to Deans and Chairs on the procedures for creating RTP guidelines (Guidelines can be created at the college or the department level). The purpose of the guidelines is to describe the matrix of the 3 criteria and the 4 levels, and answer questions.
We will use our Sept 21 meeting to prep for this. Ken will confer with Elna to get her input since she is unavailable on Sept 21.

Clarification of 2-4-6 Cycle

Amendment to S15-7 proposed to address the issue with faculty members who are doing their second year review this year, and – according to the Procedures will be required to submit another full review in Year 3. This amendment addresses the issue so that this cohort of faculty does not have to be reviewed two years in a row.

Motion to approve as a final reading the following amendment:

"Adjusting the timing of Performance Reviews During the transition to the new system for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion'

Result: Unanimous approval of amendment

Issue with incoming faculty

Another issue emerged which affects faculty who have started this year, since they will *have* to move to the new criteria when they go up for tenure in their 6th year. One suggestion is to have them decide which criteria they will use when they submit their next mini review, which also need to be revamped and adapted to the new criteria. The question arose if we need another amendment with respect to criteria and this entering group? No clear solution, but we need to resolve this issue.

BAFPR

We did not get to discuss the issue about the working of the BAFPR. Postponed to next meeting. Ken recommended that we review the amendments– and the 3 example policies from other universities. Elna clarified that other campuses do not engage with FA on this, so perhaps this restructuring will improve the functioning of the committee.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:00 pm

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

September 21, 2015
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker for today: Rocío Dresser

Attending: Sang Lee, Grecia Cuellar, Meg Virick, Brandon White, Kenneth Peter, Shannon Rose Riley
Absent: Elna Green, Paul Kauppila,

1. Approval of the minutes

2. Follow-up from previous meeting: Faculty 180 was found to be the most flexible, advanced, and user-friendly product of the four, with Interfolio being a second choice. Elna is arranging for another viewing of these two tools for the full campus before making a final decision. It was recommended that the next viewing be a hands-on session so that faculty can try out the tools.

3. Follow-up from previous meeting: Elna would like advice on how to address questions concerning elections to RTP committees, and specifically how to handle faculty who refuse to stand for election or refuse to serve.

    a. How can we ensure that faculty serve on RTP committees? It is important to make them aware that serving in this committee is one of their most important professional responsibilities. We will discuss this issue further when Elna can join us.

4. Elna sent an email inviting: Deans or their designated representative, Department Chairs, members of this year's or last year's University RTP Committee, this year's or last year's Chair of each College RTP Committees to attend the workshop: *Revising Department Guidelines for the New RTP Policies*, Monday, September 28, 2:00-4:00
King Library 255

5. Ken shared the PowerPoint *Revising Department Guidelines for the New RTP Policies* with the committee. The committee provided feedback. Ken will edit it based on the suggestions provided and will send the PowerPoint one more time to the committee for additional feedback.

6. All committee members should attend the workshop and be ready to record questions faculty, Deans and representatives have on how to revise and/or create new guidelines.

7. Adjourn at 4:00PM

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – October 19, 2015 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Cuellar, Green, Kauppila, Lee, Peter, Riley, Virick, White

Absent: Dresser

1. Minutes of the Sept. 21 meeting were approved.

2. Demo of electronic dossier platforms set for Oct. 30, 12:15pm.

3. Discussion of BAFPR (Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility.) Should BAFPR be moved from Faculty Affairs to the Provost's office? BAFPR members will talk to faculty at other CSU campuses for input.

4. Elections to RTP committees – are faculty obligated to serve even when they do not wish to? Can faculty be taken off the ballot or refuse to serve? New RTP policy affirms importance of serving on RTP committees. Unwillingness to serve can cause problems, especially in small departments. Use new RTP policy language in response to those unwilling to serve.

5. Declaration of intent for new or old RTP policy. Candidates may need to examine both policies. Does the declaration need to be included in both the Personnel Action File (PAF) and the dossier? Should there be an earlier deadline for the declaration to be included in the PAF? Not addressed in official RTP policy. Faculty Affairs needs a "wet ink" original document. If deadline was earlier, committees would have advance notice of which policy candidate intends to use. Many dossiers may have structure of old policy even though candidate will be evaluated under new policy.

6. The committee reviewed the Quick Facts Power Point slides. Will 4th and 5th year reviews be a common occurrence? Speculation that many faculty will use the late add procedure for the 3rd year review. There will be considerable variation in disciplines regarding how well the 3rd year review will reflect candidates' accomplishments. Will additional reviews be seen negatively? It will become more important for committees to provide 4th and 5th year feedback.

7. The committee examined questions compiled from the RTP guidelines workshop. Many of the questions were about the new RTP policy itself and not necessarily departmental guidelines. The committee discussed the timing of additional workshops. Should there

be workshops for each college? Should the committee use the University Council of Chairs and Deans as a communication channel?

It was suggested that the questions from the workshop be divided into categories.

The committee discussed the section of the new policy on resources. It is designed to provide guidance to candidates regarding the resources that may be needed to reach desired levels of achievement. Are the resources supplied by the department or by the candidate? Some disciplines need extensive resources, others not as much. Larger question: Are the guidelines mostly for candidates or are they designed mainly to educate committee members on disciplines they may not be familiar with?

8. Can professional service be included in the same category as RSCA (Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity)? It is now in the service category unless it is defined as RSCA activity in departmental guidelines. The suggestion was made that accreditation standards could be tied to the evaluative "descriptors" in the new RTP policy.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes
October 26, 2015

Chair: Ken Peter
Present: Riley, Virick, Green, Kauppila, Dresser, Lee, Peter
Absent: Cuellar, White

1. Approval of Minutes of 9/21 meeting

2. Insert new Agenda Item: Review of Documents from Faculty Affairs

3. Discussion of electronic dossier platforms. Elna seeks opinions from other members and faculty. Ken says in general that Faculty 180 was generally praised and Interfolio thought acceptable while the other two were considered negatively. Discussion of differences, pricing schemes, etc. Faculty180 and Interfolio are comparable in cost.

4. Review of documents: "Declaration of Intent for RTP Candidates" is now a single document appropriate for both tenure-track and faculty going up for promotion to full. "Timeline" has only one change: a clarifying parenthetical statement about overlapping timelines. "Quick Facts" has had changes on the first page, "timing of reviews." Middle bullet added re 98-8 in terms of timing of reviews. Under "Categories of Review," items are labeled I-A-B and II under S98-8, so the slide reflects this. "Levels of Review" URT vs URTP committee name changes. No changes to "Standards" but "Standards for Promotion to Full" is a new page. Senator Kauppila brought up distinction between AY and Calendar Year. Suggestion by Senator Virick to post all relevant documents on Faculty Affairs web page.

5. Review of "Questions & Answers about Dept. Guidelines":
    a. The policy says nothing about Dean's approving such guidelines. Technically, they do not need the Dean's approval by 1/27 but it is advisable to consult with Dean. Discussion about nursing "joint appointment" language.
    b. Keep first three bullets under "Concerns and Other" and the "Service" piece. Pull out bit on "grading faculty" to go into another context. Discussion of "Resources and Guidelines." Questions about resources and policy ensued: Senators Green, Virick, Riley, Dresser, and Peter. (See 2.3.6.1—can depend on availability of resources. 2.3.6.2 if Guidelines exist, candidates should use to strategize. Provide lists of resources received. Achievement should be considered in relation to the resources. Much discussion about resources and how to help departments figure out how to write up something about resources.
    c. On "Content of Guidelines"—some discussion of establishing levels of impact. Some discussion of Urban Planning's situation regarding service

in terms of scholarship. In cases where professional service will fall under service, the Dept. should be encouraged to establish clear guidelines for establishing baseline in scholarship in that area. Peter, Riley, Dresser, and Green agree with this. General consensus on making more general guidelines over all. What about College guidelines? Rarely—language about Dept. Guidelines as only official document is excellent.

d. On “Timelines for New Guidelines”: Old guidelines never apply to the new policy. If no new guidelines put in place, they operate without guidelines until the point when some are produced. The new hires starting next year will never have old guidelines for a choice.
e. Guidelines must be approved by full-time faculty. FERP faculty get to vote in their active semester.
f. We must approve these questions for distribution by 11/9 or earlier by email.

6. Any new business? None. Adjourned at 3:52pm.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes for November 16, 2015

In attendance: Cuellar, Dresser, Green, Kauppila, Peter, Riley, Virick, White
Guest in attendance: Scott Heil (Director, Institutional Research)
Absent: Lee

1. Called to order at 2:00 pm

2. Approval of minutes for November 9 delayed until next meeting

3. Discussion with Scott Heil on conducting a survey on faculty office hours

   Senate policy S12-1 requires that we review the policy to make sure that "it is effective and workable, particularly in the context of changing educational technologies." The Committee discussed several questions:

   - What is the problem we are trying to solve?
   - Do we even know that there is a problem to be solved?
   - Has there been an outpouring of complaints from students?
   - Can we just add a question to the SOTE instrument to do a survey? [Heil: No, the SOTE instrument cannot be reprogrammed until next year.]

   Heil suggested that, depending on the information we are trying to solicit, maybe a focus group is a more appropriate method than a survey. A focus group could help us frame the questions that we might then want to ask in a larger survey. But we have to determine the questions for the focus group first.

   The Committee decided to conduct a student focus group in the spring semester. A sub-committee of volunteers (Dresser, White, Riley, Peter) will work with Scott Heil to put assemble questions to discuss with a focus group. We plan to complete this in the spring 2016 semester, report our progress to the Senate in the spring as well, and possibly follow up with a larger survey next year.

4. There was no new business

5. Adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Minutes submitted by Elna Green (Seat A)

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

February 1, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00

1. Call to order and roll- Quorum was met.

   Present: Ken Peter (Chair), Sang Lee (Note taker), Shannon Rose Riley, Brandon White, Meg Virick, Grecia Cuellar

   Membership update: Rocio Dresser (Education) resigned; and a representative from Engineering will join the committee after confirmation.

2. Approval of minutes of Nov 9 (Elna Green)- Unanimously approved

3. Updates

   a. Appointment of the PS committee member to the exceptional assigned time appeal committee.
      - Two members are needed. Three appeals have been submitted. A meeting in March is anticipated.
      - Brandon and Sang volunteered.

   b. Scott Heil's suggestion regarding faculty office hours.
      - Scott wants to broaden the scope of the survey/focus group including other campus issues such as campus climate and student retention and success.
      - PS committee wants to make sure that faculty office hours topic is still central when other topics are added.
      - Ken will discuss the matter again with Scott.

   c. Electronic dossiers.
      - Elna updated that it is in procurement process. A committee of faculty will review the bids- both written proposals and demonstrations. This process is in compliance with procurement process. Final decision by the first week of March is planned.
      - Implementation of electronic dossiers in the next AY is not clear at this time. Preparation and training using the selected platform/vendor will take time.

   d. Posting guidelines?
      - Approved departmental guidelines will be posted at RTP webpage for reference purpose.

e. Dossier preparation guide and workshops.
   - A guide for the narrative statement, which was removed from the old policy, needs to be prepared and to be submitted to the Senate this semester for approval. A guide prepared by Amy Strage under the current system can be a starting place.
   - Shannon, Elna, Ken and Amy Strage will work as a guide preparation working group.

f. Dossier interpretation guide and workshops.
   - Education is needed for campus community about difference between old and new policies.
   - PS committee will plan pilot workshops - one in late spring 2016 and another in early fall 2016.

4. Counseling RTP amendment. Should PS adopt this amendment to S15-7 for a final reading at the Senate on February 8?
   - Adopted, 7-0-0.

5. SOTE revisions. Should PS adopt these changes and send them to the Senate for consideration, or provide more feedback to SERB?

   PS committee provides the following feedback to SERB:
   <u>SOTE</u>
   - Q7. "Responsive" can be changed to "sensitive." Concept of diversity can be different. Examples of diversity can be provided.
   - Q 19-20. Is there any use of responses of these questions? Chairs and faculty do not get responses. Questions can be simplified – "without undue influence" can be confusing. Chairs do not get responses. Any use of responses? Simplify the question.
   - Free response questions need to be placed after Q13 for continuation of the contents.

   <u>SOLATE</u>
   - There are questions that TAs cannot control because labs are tied to lectures- e.g., grading criteria. Introductory statement needs to clearly address the point that lab evaluations are independent of tied lectures.

6. Consideration of department Guidelines.

   a. Draft common template for distribution
      - This style guide will be distributed as a suggested template after incorporating committee's suggestions
      - When to send the submitted guidelines to college committees? Suggestions for revision will be sent to the departments and college committees at the same time. Deans will be copied.
      - Elna provided updates about Music and Dance and English: She met with both departments and suggested to take out post tenure review part and

general policies from their guidelines. She also informed that the new policy sets higher standards for promotion to full processor so they do not need to create separate standards. Two departments will resubmit their guidelines and Associate Deans are working with them in their revisions.

b. Engineering

Comment and Discussion - general

- General Engineering and Aerospace are programs, not departments.
- Electrical engineering showed 9-4 vote and the results can be perceived as divisive.
- Departments did not approve the submitted guidelines mean that they have no departmental guidelines - Aviation and Civil Engineering
- This is not "college" guidelines as not all departments approved it.
- There needs to be preamble about resources.
- Elna suggested that the PS committee provides feedback now to the Engineering college committee and discuss the guidelines again when Engineering representative is present in the PS committee meeting in two weeks.

Academic assignment

- Hypothetical examples are not provided and the current descriptors just restate the original policy. "Other considerations" are not incorporated in the descriptors.
- In the "excellent" category, publications in teaching and grants are indicated. The PS committee needs clarification whether they can be still counted as RSCA or only in academic assignment. The new policy states inclusive profiles, not exclusive ones.

RSCA

- Need clarification about a phrase, *possible overlapping period with any employment prior to SJSU*. Does it mean service credits or something else?
- Descriptors just focus on number of publications and do not include hypothetical profiles.

Service

- Examples are not provided and the general policies are just paraphrased.

c. School of Information – not reviewed.

d. School of Music and Dance- not reviewed.

7. New Business – None.

8. Adjourn @ 4:00 pm.

Professional Standards Committee

Minutes

February 15, 2016
Clark Hall 445: 2:00-4:00 pm

Present: Ken Peter (Chair), Sang Lee, Brandon White, Meg Virick, Shannon-Rose Riley, Elna Green, Paul Kaupila, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh

Notetaker: Meg Virick

The meeting was spent reviewing RTP guidelines that were consistent with the new RTP Policy 15-7 and 15-8.

Guidelines from the following departments/units were reviewed.

i. Library: Guidelines were reviewed, edits were noted, and the decision made to get back to them with suggestions.

ii. Counseling: Decision made that the counseling department needs to revise their guidelines to be aligned with the new policy. The version they submitted would be sent back to them.

iii. School of Information: Guidelines were reviewed, edits were noted, and the decision made to get back to them with suggestions.

iv. Occupational Therapy: Guidelines were reviewed, edits were noted, and the decision made to get back to them with suggestions.

v. Journalism: Guidelines were reviewed, edits were noted, and the decision made to get back to them with suggestions.

Communication of Suggested edits:
Elna and Ken would gather all comments related to the guidelines, and communicate all suggested changes to the departments.

Workshops
It was decided that workshops on the new policy would be held on Friday, April 22, 2016.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – February 22, 2016 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Green, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, Lee, Peter, Riley, White

Absent: Virick

1. Minutes of the Feb. 15 meeting were approved.

2. Discussion of assorted departmental RTP guidelines:

   Justice Studies: Should the section about "skills courses" be included? If so, those courses should be listed. The committee considered the department's definitions of the descriptors for evaluation of service. Guidelines, not appointment letters, should describe expectations for faculty. Hypothetical profiles should be provided to help with evaluation of scholarship and service.

   Nutrition and Food Science: The committee suggested that discussion of service be eliminated since there was nothing discipline-specific about it. Most discussion of academic assignment was similarly not discipline-specific. Vagueness of language in scholarship section was mentioned – how to define "high number" of publications? The committee debated whether various aspects of thesis support should be included in the academic assignment or service sections of the dossier. Is it a conflict of interest for faculty to be credited as second author on a thesis? Clarification was needed regarding the transition from a thesis to a journal article.

   Nursing: Lists of potential achievements should be inclusive, not exclusive. As with JS, the department should consider using profiles. The guidelines quote extensively from the department's accrediting body documents. Language should be adjusted to be more inclusive. The scholarship examples are very general – are the guidelines even necessary? Post-tenure review section should be removed and made a separate document.

3. Discussion of dossier preparation guide: The section about narrative statements was removed from the policy and added to the dossier preparation guide.

   The meeting was then adjourned.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Meeting 3/14/2016

2:02pm Call to order with quorum established

Present: Sang, Paul, Meg, Elna, Ken, Sotuodeh, Shannon

Introductions to new student member, Joseph Sandoval-Rios

Minutes to be taken by Brandon White

No minutes for approval from February 22 meeting. Paul is still working on them.

Secret ballots issue and current search committees: Committees did not elect by secret ballot and therefore in violation of current policy. Should this interfere with the searches underway? Committee agreed to let Elna handle this. Professional standards need to educate everyone better for next year. Concerns over departments who have committee of the whole and the process of the secret ballot, but can resolve this by vote. All committees next year will have to do ballots.

Ken followed up with Rachel French regarding Professional Standards comments on SOTES/SOLATE. Rachel indicated that SERB is still working on this but they have not met and discussed what Professional Standards sent to them.

Item 4: Consideration of revised departmental guidelines. School of Information submitted with corrections based upon PS feedback. The updated guidelines still needs to be reviewed by college committee. Professional Standards discussed the updated guidelines and made the following comments:

a. Concerns on page 5 for Good in scholarship and distinguishing peer reviewed vs refereed and whether everything has to be peer reviewed. Need some clarification.

b. Service on page 8…Section 3.3.3.5, only quote half of the Excellent descriptor. Is this intentional or a typo. Need to clarify this. Also question as to "Acted as a core course or course cluster coordinator" is something that should be in the excellent or baseline category since every tenure-track faculty member will do this at some point.

Item 5: Dossier Preparation Guide. Distributed to senate and a few comments that were received. Motion to approve the Dossier Preparation Guide was made by Shannon, seconded by Meg with vote of 9-0-0 to pass. Next steps are to have the University committee review and approve.

Item 6: Preparation for April 22 workshop. No large conference rooms available, however, Paul believes the library rooms may be available and he will follow up on this. Groups for presentation: Deans, Chairs, Senior Faculty (potential RTP Committee members), General Faculty. 1 hour/group to include refreshments. Need to send out an announcement and schedule more meetings if there is overflow or other concerns, but will occur on another date. RSVP will be sent to just get an idea of the number. Times will be 10am, 11am, 1pm, and 2pm. Probably will need to do this again in the early fall. Topics to be discussed at the meeting will be an explanation of the 3 criteria and 4 levels, voting procedure, differences between the old and new policies, how guidelines work under the new policy, Q&A session. Think about this and bring

back for more discussion next week. Discussion of making a video(s) (15-30 minutes) that can be posted for people to view whenever they want to do so or developing a CANVAS course with information on the new RTP guidelines. Volunteers: Brandon, Meg, and Shannon on putting this together over the summer.

Draft policies from O&G that have been sent to Professional Standards:
(1) Privacy of Electronic Communications. New policy proposed to replace F97-7 policy because from our current Internet Security Group. Need to split this into two things. One is a policy recommendation to revise F97-7. Second, is a Sense of the Senate Resolution, of review a document that has been created by the Internet Security Group (Standard_Email_Campus_Communication.pdf). Considerable discussion over this policy. Reaching out to the appropriate people to determine the status of this policy and what has been updated. Will continue discussion at next week's meeting. Committee needs to compare 97-7 to current suggested policy for discussion next week.

(2) Responsible Use of Technology policy. Modification of S02-8 policy. Discussion about whether we should remove this policy and just use the CSU policy. The committee needs to review the CSU policy and be ready to discuss at the next meeting. We may want to consider updating our policy if there are things that we find useful in our policy that is not found in the CSU policy. Shannon and Sotuodeh will compare the two policies and present to the committee for next week.

Meeting adjourned at 3:36 pm.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

March 21, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker for today: Seat B (Sang Lee)

1. **Call to order and roll.** Quorum was met.
   Present: Peter, Lee, Virick, Green, Sandoval-Rios, White
   Absent: Riley, Kauppila, Hamei-Hagh

2. **Approval of minutes** of Feb 22 (Paul Kauppila): Not available yet.
   Approval of minutes for March 14 (Brandon White): Approved.

3. **Update**s:
   a. Scott Heil and focus group: IRB is not needed at this point and Scott can go ahead and conduct focus group. It will be a small focus group about faculty office hours.

4. **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending S15-7 to Clarify Membership on the University RTP Committee. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 4?**
   Discussion: The issue is about choosing General Unit members of URTP committee. General Units include those who are not eligible for /related to for the RTP committee such as coaches, and service professionals. Currently only Library has a representative in URTP committee. Requirement of College level committee is not applicable for Library and Counseling.

   Decision: Eva can run the election. Only tenure track and tenured faculty can participate.

5. **Sense of the Senate Resolution: Calling for Widespread Consultation Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies Pertaining to Electronic Communications. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 4?**
   Discussion: There are two separate issues- one for resolution to start conversation and the other about policy recommendation (see item #6). Ken has not heard from Michael Cook about the current status of the draft document, *Standard email and campus communication*. Questions and clarifications are needed about the contents in the draft document.

   Decision: Ken will send the draft resolution to Michael Cook and give him an

opportunity for his input. The resolution will go to May Senate meeting.

6. **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending F97-7 Modification of Policy on Electronic Information & Communication. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 4?**
   Discussion: Lines 62-66 are added by O &G. Does this addition provide flexibility? is the addition needed? There is another option that the PS committee rewrites the policy.

   Decision: We will send it to April Senate meeting for the first reading, solicit information from the Senate, and give O &G to explain why they added those lines. The policy recommendation will be circulated to the University Council at the same time.

   Motion to bring it to the senate next Senate meeting on April 4. Approved, 6-0-0.

7. **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Rescinds S02-8 (Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy) Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 4?**
   Discussion: Currently, it is said: rescind and adopt. However, there is no need to adopt as the CSU-wide policy is already applied.

   Motion to move this item to the next senate meeting on April 4 as the first meeting. Approved, 6-0-0.

8. **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending S15-6 to Clarify How to Document the Recommendations of Recruitment Committees. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 4?**
   Discussion: In recruitment search committee, the current policy does not say simple majority votes of the committee. Tied vote is no vote. How to ensure that the committee members read the written recommendation form? 3.3.3.2. says Dean can cancel the search – it overlaps with 3.3.3.5. Is minority report really needed (3.3.3.3.)?

   Decision: This item is tabled for now. Ken will review S98-8 and see what is already available there – e.g., Minority report is included in S98-8.

9. **Selection, Review, Removal of Program Coordinators? Discussion item. Do we need a policy—perhaps very basic?**
   Discussion: This is a conversation item. Some departments brought up the issues- mainly about transparency. There are different arrangements by different departments and a single model would not work. We may need a basic rudimentary policy about transparency. We can ask Deans for their input. This will be continued as a discussion item.

10. **Preparation for April 22 workshop**

- Date change: April 29 because there is a schedule conflict with a competency training for Chairs on April 22. Ken will ask Eva to reserve a room.
- Elna will announce the event.
- Ken will work on the contents during spring break and distribute to the committee via email for feedback. In-person discussion about the contents will happen in April 11 committee meeting.

11. **New Business**
    - Elna reports that the URTP committee reviewed the dossier guidelines document and provided feedback.
    - School of Information guidelines were sent to the College RTP committee and Elna heard back okay from some members so far.

12. **Adjourn** @ 3:56pm

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

April 11, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker for today: Seat E (Hamedi-Hagh)

1. Call to order and roll

   Present: Peter, Green, White, Virick, Kauppila, Lee, Sandoval-Rios, Hamedi-Hagh
   Absent: Riley

2. Approval of minutes of Feb 22 (Paul Kauppila); Approval of minutes for March 21 (Sang Lee)

   Approval of minutes for Feb 22 (Paul Kauppila): Approved.
   Approval of minutes for March 21 (Sang Lee): Approved.

3. Update: POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Rescinds S02-8 (Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy). No questions at the Senate, on track for final action on April 25.

   Discussion: None

4. Update: POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending F97-7 Modification of Policy on Electronic Information & Communication. See "Items to be carried over to Fall."

   Discussion: There was a meeting with Mike Cook and Terry Vahey on Thursday 3/24. University can look into emails without a court order. However, a certain precautions should be drafted.

   Decision: The policy will be moved out of academic senate reading schedule and will be discussed more in Fall 2016 in Professional Standards committee.

5. Recommendations on Nutrition and Food Sciences Resubmission of department RTP Guidelines.

   Discussion: Need to better clarify scholarly publication with Master students by providing examples. It seems thesis publications are counted towards scholarly publication for faculty.

   Decision: They will be invited to visit Professional Standards meeting next time to

answer questions in person.

6. Sense of the Senate Resolution: Calling for Widespread Consultation Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies Pertaining to Electronic Communications. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 25?

   Discussion: FERPA contract mandates faculty to use the adopted securely encrypted email service such as gmail. Students can opt out and use other email services. Canvas does not show students email and faculty will be unaware if student emails will be unofficial with respect to what FERPA suggests. Mike Cook and Terry believe the Electronic Communication draft should be okay.

   Decision: The Electronic Communication draft will be forwarded to academic senate for final reading in 4/25/2016 meeting. Approved 8-0-0.

7. POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending S15-6 to Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees. Majority voting and reporting mechanisms. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 25?

   Discussion: The old policy had a section applicable to all personnel committees. After revisions, no clear statement on recruitment policy is left.

   Decision: Forward recruitment committee procedures to academic senate as final reading in 4/25/2016 meeting. Approved 8-0-0.

8. POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending S15-7 to Clarify Procedures for RTP Committees. Election of RTP Committees by Secret Ballot. Shall we adopt this for a first reading before the Senate for April 25?

   Discussion: There need to be a link between Library and Counselling to elect their general unit RTP committee. Dr. Green has also suggested an additional amendment to the RTP Secret Ballot proposal.

   Decision: Both sets of amendments will be forwarded to academic senate in 4/25/2015. Approved 8-0-0.

9. Preparation for April 29 workshop.

   Discussion: Dr. Peter is preparing presentation slides on new RTP policy. About twelve possible questions will be answered. Dr. Green will be the main presenter. Some possible rating scenarios were discussed. During third-year review, voting will be either retain or do not retain. During sixth-year review, voting will be based on four levels of achievement which are Excellent, Good, Baseline and Unsatisfactory.

10. Items to be carried over for the Fall:

a. Selection, Review, Removal of Program Coordinators? Do we need a policy—perhaps very basic? Committee has discussed a policy that permits departments to create their own systems for handling these important procedures, provided that the systems are transparent. The default system could be appointment by the Chair but only after all interested faculty have an opportunity to compete fairly for the position.

b. POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending F97-7 Modification of Policy on Electronic Information & Communication. Conversation with CIO Terry Vahey and Information Security Officer Mike Cook suggest substantial revisions to the first reading draft. Suggestions include the requirement of a written finding signed by two or more appropriate authorities (from a limited list) to authorize a breach of privacy; and a limited number of specified reasons for a search. The problem with the language "maximum privacy under the law" proves not to be a problem, given that case law provides the flexibility required for security and maintenance requests.

c. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility. For the third year in a row, we have not reached conclusion on the BAFPR policy. Next year PS should rewrite the policy on its own, since BAFPR is becoming non-functional.

d. SOTES/SOLATE Revisions (SERB). SERB received our recommendations regarding their draft revisions, but has not yet acted on them. We should urge them to do so early in the Fall.

11. New Business

12. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

April 18, 2016
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00
Chair: Kenneth Peter

Notetaker for today: Seat J (Sandoval-Rios, assisted by Meg Virick?)

1. Call to order and roll

   Present: Peter, White, Virick, Lee, Sandoval-Rios, Hanedi-Hagh, Green, Kauppila
   Absent: Riley

2. Approval of minutes of Feb 11 (Hamedi-Hagh)
   Approval of minutes: APPROVED 8-0-0

3. Recommendations on Nutrition and Food Sciences Resubmission of department RTP Guidelines. Joined by Chair Lucy McProud and Clarie Hollenbeck (NUFS Department RTP representative to the College RTP committee.) 2:30 time certain

   Discussion: Discussing about the Revised recommendations on Nutrition and Food Sciences Resubmission of department RTP guidelines. Chair Lucy McProud and Clarie Hollenbeck join us for discussion. Peter asked a question about the master's thesis. The committee wanted to know the nature of the publication. McProud stated that it would be a Peer-reviewed Journal. Peter asked for more clarification in the recommendations. The way its currently phrased does not make it clear in the guidelines. McProud stated that the reason the faculty would receive recognition was because without them, it would most likely not have been approved for publication as a Peer-reviewed Journal. If it only can go to one category, it shall go under Scholarship. The master's thesis language confused the committee. White recommended taking out the first part and clarifying a co-author. Minor publications count for something, so they should be added somewhere in the guideline. Green will be in touch with Chair Lucy McProud and Clarie Hollenbeck.

   Decision: Recommend an approval of the Nutrition and Food Sciences Resubmission of department RTP guidelines, pending clarification of the position of master's thesis and project.
   Approved 8-0-0

4. Recommendations on Library Resubmission of department RTP Guidelines.

   Discussion: They have discussed peer evaluations were not required in the new guideline, however we don't know which guideline. Peter asked if the teacher evaluation falls under the librarians as well.

Decision: Leave this pending for clarification.
Approved 8-0-0

5. Preparation for April 29 workshop.

   Discussion: Referred to the Understanding and Implementing the New RTP Policies PowerPoint.

6. SOTE/SOLATE Revisions. SERB has returned modified SOTE/SOLATEs. Shall we pass these to the Senate for its debate and approval. (Note, neither we nor the Senate may amend these.)

   Discussion: SERB declined to change the diversity question. We need to decide whether we should send it to the Senate. Only SERB can amend question errors themselves. The Senate has the power to only approve/deny it. SOTE has never had a free-response section before.

   Decision: Send the modified SOTE/SOLATEs to the Senate for a first reading.
   Approved 8-0-0

7. ASSIGNED TIME FOR EXCEPTIONAL LEVELS OF SERVICE TO STUDENTS revisions to S15-1. (The new contract will extend this program.) The policy needs extension and Elna has suggestions for changes.

   Discussion: The committee wants clear and exact guidelines. This will be a one-year extension on the contract.

   Decision: Peter will work on some changes and will circulate changes via email and send it to the Executive Committee in the summer.

8. New Business

9. Organizing summer activities

10. Adjourn

    Items for the Fall:

    a. Selection, Review, Removal of Program Coordinators? Do we need a policy—perhaps very basic? Committee has discussed a policy that permits departments to create their own systems for handling these important procedures, provided that the systems are transparent. The default system could be appointment by the Chair but only after all interested faculty have an opportunity

to compete fairly for the position.

b. POLICY RECOMMENDATION: Amending F97-7 Modification of Policy on Electronic Information & Communication. Conversation with CIO Terry Vahey and Information Security Officer Mike Cook suggest substantial revisions to the first reading draft. Suggestions include the requirement of a written finding signed by two or more appropriate authorities (from a limited list) to authorize a breach of privacy; and a limited number of specified reasons for a search. The problem with the language "maximum privacy under the law" proves not to be a problem, given that case law provides the flexibility required for security and maintenance requests.

c. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility. For the third year in a row, we have not reached conclusion on the BAFPR policy. There are draft documents and draft revisions that can be used going forwards. Next year PS should rewrite the policy on its own, since BAFPR is becoming non-functional.

d. Revisions to S14-8 "Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors." The Provost will be forwarding some concerns that the Deans have discussed with the policy. The placement of the voting for Chairs in a separate policy than this one continues to create confusion. What to do in the event of a tie? Is an untenured faculty member or even a Lecturer a viable candidate if there literally is no other person? To this we can add a collection of ambiguities and situations that have arisen in recent years that I am aware of that could use clarification. Also not that this policy did not revise the review process of Department Chairs, which is looking rather old.