**Faculty Development & Policy Committee**

College of Education, Health & Human Services (CEHHS)

MINUTES – November 1, 2018

10:45 a.m. - 11:45 a.m. in UNIV 449

**Committee Members:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X | Alison Scheer-Cohen, Co-ChairSchool of Health Sciences & Human Services | X | Elvira Gomez School of Nursing |
| X | Rebecca Brooks, Co-ChairSchool of Education |  | Geri SchmotzerSchool of Nursing |
|  | Fernando SorianoSchool of Health Sciences & Human Services |  | Madeline LeeAt-Large |
| X | Laura Wendling School of Education | X | Emiliano Ayala, DeanCEHHS ***(Non-voting)*** |

Guest(s):

**CALL TO ORDER** (SCHEER-COHEN)

 A quorum was not established.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA** (SCHEER-COHEN)

Alison Scheer-Cohen called for any changes to the Agenda.  No changes were made.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING** (SCHEER-COHEN)

 October 4, 2018 minutes could not be approved due to lack of quorum.

**RTP: Review RTP for CEHHS** (BROOKS & SCHEER-COHEN)

Review of comments from Fernando Soriano (see document with track changes on SharePoint)

* 1.B.5
	+ Agreed with the need to reword the term ‘departments’ because our college also has programs. Consider a preferred term (e.g., units) and discuss use of the term in the preamble.
* 2.A.2
	+ A key issue is what range of items can be included in the consideration of the RTP review. Some units are only considering items and events since the last periodic review, while others are incorporating the entirety of the faculty’s tenure at CSUSM.
	+ Whether this can be applied uniformly across the departments is an item for discussion with Faculty Affairs and the entire college.
* 2.A.4
	+ Each unit should determine what is included as evidence in teaching, research and service.
* 2.A.9
	+ How should we evaluate a “defined program of research or scholarship?” Fernando points out that individuals have been denied tenure due to a lack of focused study/research.
	+ Dean Ayala encourages looking to each unit for the standards of focused research and scholarship. He mentioned there should be a logical connection between the service, research and scholarship that demonstrates a relationship and trend within the candidate’s narrative.
	+ Scheer-Cohen suggested adding this deferral to the unit’s discretion to each subsection from 2.A.4 to 2.A.9.
* 3.B
	+ Which level of articulated standards must the candidate meet? University, college, department or all three?
	+ There should be consistency across the standards. For example, by meeting the department standard(s), the college and university levels should also be met. This requires additional clarification in the RTP policy.
* 3.C
	+ Service credit needs to be clarified. For example, does a candidate discuss the service credit he/she received in their file? If service credit is discussed, is this the previous year(s) or previous academic year(s)?
* 3.E
	+ The Provost (President’s designee) provides recommendations to a faculty member that is denied tenure. Consider discussing process in policy.
* 3.F
	+ The word ‘gleaned’ should be changed to ‘specified.’

**RTP PROCESS** (BROOKS)

 Brooks asked if there was any follow-up discussion or questions from Patricia Runzel’s presentation

 and discussion during the October meeting.

**RTP PROCESS FOLLOW-UP AND NEXT STEPS** (BROOKS)

* Spring All College Meeting: Alison and Rebecca have contacted Lori Heisler and Blake Beecher (co-chairs of CCC) to develop a plan for including a discussion of the RTP process on the agenda for the Spring All College Meeting.
* Each FDPC committee member will elicit feedback from their unit (department, program, school) regarding our work on the college RTP document. We would like to know if each unit would prefer a revision to the current college RTP policy or if the college should consider a guidance/advisory document (e.g., FAQs) as a means to provide faculty with additional clarity and support for the RTP process.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT** (SCHEER-COHEN)

 3:45 p.m.

*Next Meeting: December 6, 2018*