Faculty Affairs Committee AY 2014-2015 Report

Introduction

FAC meets weekly for two hours. The committee membership for the academic year was the following:

Carmen Nava, At-large 14-16, chair
Ann Fiegen, Library 14-16
Ahmad Hadaegh, CSM 14-16
Sheryl Lutjens, CHABSS 13-15
Laura Makey, Lecturer 14-16
Anthony Rosilez, At-Large 14-15
Marie Thomas, At-large 14-16
Vacant, CoBA 13-15
Vacant, CEHHS, 13-15
Michelle Hunt, ex-oficio, Faculty Affairs; Bob Rider, interim
Anne Lombard, CFA 14-15

Nava completed three years as FAC chair. Ann Fiegen (Library) has been elected FAC chair for Fall 2015. The next FAC meeting is Monday September 14, 2015 10am-12pm (room TBD).

FAC acted on fourteen documents this academic year. A significant number of these were new written documents and included detailed reporting on fact-finding and feedback. FAC reviewed five different department RTP documents (FAC approved four and is awaiting response to feedback on one).

FAC Documents Approved in Academic Senate

- “FAC Guidelines for Department RTP Standards,” update
- Application for Salary Increases for Market Purposes, revision
- Emeritus Policy, Revision
- Wang Award Procedure
- Coach Evaluation, Revision
- School of Nursing RPT Standards
- Department of History RTP Standards Department of Communication RTP Standards
- Department of Social Work RTP Standards

FAC Revisions to University RTP Document Approved in the Academic Senate

- University RTP document, revision--Applicability of Department RTP Standards
- University RTP document, CBA Changes
- University RTP document, PRC Revision
FAC Revision to University RTP Sent to Academic Senate Office


2. Use the new title, “University RTP Document,” consistently
The document on Policies page appears currently as a webpage entitled “Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Standards—University” but on the Faculty Affairs page, the hyperlink opens a .pdf entitled “Faculty Personnel Procedures for Retention, Tenure & Promotion”

3. Correction, for consistency:
   University RTP Policy IV.B.4.c.1
   c. Written college or equivalent unit standards shall address:
      1. Those activities which fall under the categories of Teaching performance, Scholarly Research and Creative Activity, and Service.

   University RTP Policy IV.B.5.c.1
   c. Written Department or equivalent standards shall address:
      1. Those activities which fall under the categories of Teaching Performance, Scholarly Research and Creative Activity and Service;

4. Correction:
   IV.B.5.b add “, CBA “after “law” and before “or University policy.”

5. Different versions of the University RTP Policy appear on Faculty Affairs (a scanned version of the correct document)
   http://www.csusm.edu/fa/allfrontpagedocs/documents/UniversityRTPPolicyEffective082014Corrected121114.pdf
   On the Policies page, the webpage version lacks the table of contents

FAC Documents Not Approved in the Academic Senate

- FAC wrote the “Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students” on a high priority timeline, but then the item was pulled from the Senate agenda because the Chancellor’s Office had discovered some problems in the new CBA language. The program is on hold.

- FAC wrote the “Changing from Paper to All-Online Student Evaluations of Instruction” which recommend the Academic Senate endorse changing all student evaluations of teaching to a single, online system. Although FAC worked on the issue over two academic years, collaborated with administration to conduct two pilots, and presented an ample report, the item did not pass on the floor vote. It appears that the majority of voting senators were concerned that switching to all-
online student evaluations of teaching would result in lower response rates that might harm faculty in the evaluation process. With no action taken, the present practice will continue that some courses will be evaluated online (e.g. all online courses; most courses in the College of Education, etc.) while other courses will be evaluated using a paper evaluation. As a next step, FAC recommends that the Academic Senate facilitate a focused discussion to assess and improve the evaluation questions (a task which is overdue). This opportunity to assess the current instrument should be broadly inclusive of all CSUSM faculty, and should give special attention to considering how the evaluation instrument should address new pedagogies such as all-online instruction, flipped classrooms, etc.

**FAC/NEAC Lecturer Task Force Recommendations Submitted to Senate Chair Laurie Stowell**

The FAC-NEAC Task Force has met over the last four semesters and has addressed the tasks with which it was charged. The charge received from Academic Senate Chair Vivienne Bennett in AY 2012/2013 was to meet and discuss part-time lecturer inclusion in the Academic Senate and also to address the issue of compensation for part-time lecturers on Senate and Senate committees. In AY 2013/2014, the task force included: Laura Makey (Lecturer representative, FAC), Carmen Nava (Chair, FAC), Richelle Swan (Chair, NEAC), and David Chien (member, NEAC). In AY 2014/2015, Ian Chan joined the committee as the second NEAC representative, replacing Dr. Chien. Terri Metzer (Faculty Center Fellow) and Anne Lombard (CFA, Faculty Rights) attended the task force meeting in February 2015 and contributed to the task force’s conversation.

The outcome of the task force’s work in AY 2013/2014 was to propose changes in the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws that allowed for increased part-time lecturer participation. (All lecturers with full-time entitlements were already eligible to serve on the Senate and in the majority of Senate committee seats. There was one seat reserved for a part-time lecturer as well.) The proposed amendment to add four seats to the Senate for part-time lecturers a second Spring referendum in May 2014 did not pass, because of an insufficient number of voters. However, it did pass later in Fall 2014.

The outcome in AY 2014/2015 was to suggest an approach for compensating part-time lecturers for work in the Academic Senate. The recommendation was accepted by Senate Chair Stowell, who then submitted it to Provost Oberem. The provost will announce his decision in a forthcoming memorandum.

**FAC Referrals Deferred to AY 2015/2016**

- Change name of Faculty Awards Policy to “Brakebill Award Policy”
- Pending approval of documents by the Senate and President, update the charge of the Faculty Awards Selection Committee to include review of Emeritus nominations and Wang Award nominations
- Update the Faculty Awards Document, “I. Faculty Awards Selection: Committee”:  

3
The Faculty Awards Selection Committee shall recommend a Brakebill recipient to the president, serves to evaluate nominations for the Brakebill Award, the Wang Award, and Emeritus status. The Academic Senate shall conduct elections for this committee during its Spring election. The committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each College/Library, one part-time faculty representative, one at-large member from former recipients of the Brakebill Award, one student (recommended by ASI), and an administrator recommended by the provost. Members of the committee may not nominate candidates for the award.”

- Waiting for Response to FAC Feedback
  - Department of Economics RTP Standards

- Review Sabbatical Policy
  - Questions raised
  - New CBA: Section 27.8, Sabbatical Leave Policy

- Review Department RTP Documents
  - Biology
  - Chemistry
  - Computer Science and Information System
  - Math
  - Liberal Studies Department RTP Standards

- Consider conflict of interest for evaluators of RTP files (per PTC)
  
  From the P & T annual report: “FAC may want to consider a policy that clarifies the roles an evaluator may or may not play in the RTP process when s/he and the candidate under evaluation are collaborators insofar as the evaluator is evaluating, in part, his/her own work as this presents a conflict of interest.”

- Consider Drafting Visiting Professor Guidelines/Policy

- Review Brakebill Policy—Academic Senate Office realized in promoting the award this month that the criteria only address teaching, research/creative activity, & service, but this is inconsistent with the eligibility rules which allow all Unit 3 employees. FAC is to discuss and resolve the inconsistency.

**Issue for Future Discussion— The Issue of “a university” in Various RTP Documents**

As FAC was reviewing the proposed RTP standards from CEHHS, most recently the Department of Social Work’s proposed RTP standards, FAC observed that the phrase “a university” had been used in procedures for early tenure and promotion regarding where
previous work may have been completed. In addition, FAC observed that a number of approved college RTP policies used similar language. (See Appendix I.) A number of departments are also using similar language in their RTP documents, including Speech Language Pathology, Human Development, Kinesiology, and School of Education. These observations raised a number of questions and issues for the members of FAC.

The CBA is clear that a normal period of probation shall be six years, which can include up to two years of service credit approved by the President at the time of initial hire. Any deviation from the normal six-year probationary period shall be the decision of the President. (CBA 13.3, 13.4) The corresponding CSUSM policies are RTP articles I.B.5.c, II.A.2 and IV.B.3.c. (See Appendix II.)

FAC believe that certain questions and issues should be considered in the next academic year, such as:

- Is it permissible that a particular unit (college, department, school, program) can create its own early tenure or promotion policy? Since there appears to be nothing in the CBA or university policy that strictly prohibits this, it may be permissible with the caveat that any exception must be approved by the President.

- Can the work performed by a tenure track faculty member at a university other than CSUSM be considered in the tenure and promotion process? Clearly if the faculty member has received service credit (maximum of two years) by the President, then it will be part of the evaluation process.

- Does all of the work performed and to be evaluated in the tenure and promotion process need to be formally recognized as service credit by the President? Can the work performed by a tenure track faculty member at a university other than CSUSM be considered in the tenure and promotion process when no service credit was given (not denied)? Since promotion requires sustained contributions in all areas over the faculty member’s professional career, it seems to imply that this work shall be included as part of the faculty member’s record for promotion. [Note from R. Rider, as per discussions with Margaret Merryfield (Assistant Vice Chancellor – Academic Human Resources) “service credit” can only be given for probationary faculty at the time of appointment and applied toward tenure. 4/7/2015]

- If and when work performed across different academic institutions is appropriate for review, what are the appropriate weights to be attached to such work? Should the preponderance of evidence for tenure and promotion be the work performed at CSUSM? The language of the CBA that states up to two years of service credit can be given suggests that most of the evidence should come from work performed on the particular CSU campus. In addition, a small sample of other CSUs provides further evidence for this position. (See Appendix III.)

- Is there a need for consistency or uniformity of policies concerning early tenure and promotion across the various academic units? Or are there particular needs in
some units that require flexibility? For example where a program faces challenges in recruitment, being flexible on early tenure or promotion may be a necessary incentive for hiring qualified faculty.

- Similar to the above point, is there a need for differentiated consideration of these policies as applied to non-instructional or other positions within Unit 3?
- Given the understanding that the President or designee may allow limited exceptions in consideration of early tenure and/or promotion decisions, and that the President’s Office has approved the current University and unit RTP documents; a clear understanding of the President’s (or designee’s) understanding and interest within the early tenure and/or promotion review process must also be considered.
- Are there possible grievance issues associated with any changes in existing RTP documents already passed? Faculty have used these established policies to prepare for tenure and promotion. If changes are made is this a violation of the CBA?
- Finally, if discussion on the items mentioned herein supports consideration of work completed outside of CSUSM and approved prior-service credit for early tenure and/or promotion purposes, then a broader discussion of the role of service credit, itself, is likely needed.

FAC is recording these questions here in our year-end report to capture our initial discussion and also to facilitate what we believe should be a detailed and inclusive conversation next year. FAC believes that, depending on the outcome of the review and discussion of these items, a revision of the University RTP document may be necessary, which might impact RTP documents in some colleges/schools/departments (or equivalent). But FAC is not simply requesting a referral because these questions not only address evaluation—they also may impact hiring/recruitment. FAC sees these questions emerging at a time when certain units on campus have been growing rapidly, and has become aware that this conversation needs to take place outside the normal review of proposed new or revised documents, when FAC focuses on evaluating documents individually for clarity and coherence with the CBA. FAC sees this an important juncture for the various constituents to check and compare practices and policies across the university, to make sure all policies and practices in the area noted here are clearly defined across academic divisions, and that all policies and practices across the university are consistent with the CBA. Therefore, FAC believes that a broader discussion needs to take place including FAC but also including the Academic Senate Chair and Executive Committee, the CFA, and administrators.

Appendix I – College and Unit RTP documents at CSUSM

Note: In Appendix I, language variations within RTP documents related to the items discussed in this memorandum are highlighted.

**CoBA:** H. The recommending of early tenure (prior to the 6th year in rank) for assistant professors is considered an exception. An individual should have a minimum of three
years of service at CSUSM. A positive recommendation requires that the candidate's record clearly exceeds the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure/promotion decision and that the record demonstrates a sustained level of accomplishment at CSUSM in all areas.

I. Faculty who are hired at an advanced rank without tenure may apply for tenure after two years of service at CSUSM (i.e., in Fall of their third year at CSUSM). A positive recommendation requires that the candidate’s record at CSUSM clearly demonstrates a continued level of accomplishment in all areas and, together with the candidate’s previous record, is consistent with the articulated standards for the granting of tenure at the Faculty member's rank.

**SSP-ARs:** C. Early Tenure (prior to the 6th year in rank): This option for SSP, AR I is considered an exception. A positive recommendation for early tenure requires that the candidate’s record clearly meet the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure and/or promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for early tenure, a candidate must show a sustained record of successful experience at a university, and that experience must include at least one full year at California State University San Marcos prior to the year of review for tenure (CBA – 13.3.)

D) Faculty who are hired at an advanced rank without tenure may apply for tenure after two years of service at CSUSM (i.e., in fall of their third year at CSUSM). A positive recommendation requires that the candidate’s record at CSUSM clearly demonstrate a continued level of accomplishment in all areas and, together with the candidate’s previous record, be consistent with the articulated standards for the granting of tenure at the faculty member’s rank.

**CEHHS (proposal):** C. Early Tenure (prior to the 6th year in rank): This option for assistant professors is considered an exception. A positive recommendation for early tenure requires that the candidate’s record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure/promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for early tenure, a candidate must show a sustained record of successful experience at a university, and that experience must include at least one full year at California State University San Marcos prior to the year of review for tenure.

D. Early Promotion (prior to the 6th year in rank): This option for associate professors is considered an exception. A positive recommendation for early promotion requires that the candidate’s record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure/promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for early promotion a candidate must show a record of successful experience at a university, and that experience must include at least one full year at California State University San Marcos prior to the year of review for promotion.

E. Faculty who are hired at an advanced rank without tenure may apply for tenure after two years of service at CSUSM (i.e., in fall of their third year at CSUSM). A positive recommendation requires that the candidate’s record at CSUSM clearly demonstrates a continued level of accomplishment in all areas and, together with the candidate’s
previous record, is consistent with the articulated standards for the granting of tenure at the faculty member’s rank.

[The Library does not specify a required time spent at CSUSM but the candidate must show a sustained record of successful experience at CSUSM.]

**Library:** Early Tenure is considered an exception. A positive recommendation for either early tenure or early promotion requires that the candidate’s record clearly meets the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure and/or promotion decision in ALL areas. To be eligible for either early tenure or early promotion, a candidate must show a sustained record of successful experience at California State University San Marcos.

[CSM and CHABSS do not address early tenure but state that evaluation will be based on performance during the probationary years.]

**CHABSS:** The granting of tenure at any rank recognizes accomplishments and services performed during the probationary years. Further, the granting of tenure is an expression of confidence that the faculty member has both the commitment to and the potential for continued development and accomplishment throughout his/her career. Tenure should not be granted to individuals whose record does not meet the standards required to earn promotion to the rank at which the tenure will be granted.

**CSM:** The granting of tenure at any rank recognizes accomplishments and services performed during the probationary years. Further, the granting of tenure is an expression of confidence that the faculty member has both the commitment to and the potential for continued development and accomplishment throughout his/her career. Tenure should not be granted to individuals whose record does not meet the standards required to earn promotion to the rank at which the tenure will be granted.

**Appendix II – Relevant articles from the CBA (2014-17) and CSUSM RTP policy**

**Article 13.3** (CBA) states that “(t)he normal period of probation shall be a total of six years of full time probationary service and credited service, if any. Any deviation from the normal six year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his/her consideration of recommendations from the department or equivalent unit and appropriate administrator(s).”

**Article 13.4** (CBA) states that “The President upon recommendation by the affected department or equivalent unit, may grant to a faculty unit employee at the time of initial appointment to probationary status up to two years of service credit for probation based on previous service at a post-secondary education institution, previous full-time CSU employment, or comparable experience.”

According to **CSUSM RTP policy I. B.5.c**, “(i)f service credit was awarded, the Candidate should include evidence of accomplishments from the other institution(s) for the most recent years of employment.”

**CSUSM RTP policy II.A.2** states that “(t)enure track faculty may be given credit for a maximum of two years of service at another institution. The amount of credit allowed shall be stipulated at the time of employment and documented in a letter to the faculty member. This letter should be included in the file. If one or two years of credit are given,
the review process begins with the first year level of review. The mandatory promotion and tenure decision is shortened by the number of service credit years given.”

**CSUSM RTP policy IV.B.3.c** states “(i)n promotion decisions, reviewing parties shall give primary consideration to performance during time in the present rank. Promotion prior to the normal year of consideration requires clear evidence that the Candidate has a sustained record of achievement that fulfills all criteria for promotion as specified in University, College/Library/School, and Department standards. For early promotion, a sustained record of achievement should demonstrate that the Candidate has a record comparable to that of a Candidate who successfully meets the criteria in all three categories for promotion in the normal period of service.”

**Appendix III – Sample of other CSU policies**

**SJSU**: “Probationary credit of up to two years may be awarded by the President at the time of appointment. This award may be made only upon the recommendation of the department and the dean, following 1) their consideration of previous service and achievement in teaching and in scholarly or artistic or professional activities at a post-secondary education institution, previous CSU employment, or comparable experience (CBA 13.4 cited above); and 2) upon their assurance that the candidate has been advised of possible hazards of receiving this award, which include the provision that only accomplishments during the one or two years preceding the appointment to regular faculty status may be listed and considered in tenure and promotion decisions (emphasis added).” S 98-8

**CSU-Fullerton**: “In evaluations for retention, tenure, and promotion, accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion to those achieved during probationary years at CSUF. However, accomplishments during service credit years shall never be sufficient (emphasis added) in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.”

**SDSU**: “The entire professional record of the candidate shall be considered including accomplishments prior to the appointment at this university. Work developed or sustained while serving at this university shall be essential (emphasis added) to the award of tenure and or promotion.”

FAC Report respectfully submitted by Carmen Nava
May 3, 2015