**Faculty Development & Policy Committee**

College of Education, Health & Human Services (CEHHS)

Minutes – February 7, 2018

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

**Committee Members:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| X | Alison Scheer-Cohen, Co-Chair  School of Health Sciences & Human Services |  | Elvira Gomez  School of Nursing |
| X | Rebecca Brooks, Co-Chair  School of Education |  | Geri Schmotzer  School of Nursing |
| X | Fernando Soriano  School of Health Sciences & Human Services | X | Madeline Lee  At-Large |
| X | Laura Wendling  School of Education | X | Emiliano Ayala, Dean  CEHHS ***(Non-voting)*** |

Guest(s): Deanna Asakawa

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

Establish quorum: Yes

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

Approved as it stands.

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

December 6, 2018

No changes suggested. Approved as they stand.

**OLD BUSINESS FROM 2018**  (BROOKS)

**Working Document Review**

**To Do:** Committee members should review the Questionnaire for Junior Faculty and Suggestions for RTP documents in the Working Documents folder in SharePoint by the next meeting. Ask, open-endedly, unit representatives to obtain feedback from their department regarding items to be included in the questionnaire.

These documents were focused on providing support to the faculty by receiving feedback from the faculty body regarding the tools/mentorships they were using. Partially discussed during the meeting:

* Soriano addressed the need to increase clarity in the RTP documents concerning the expectations of faculty under review. It would be more beneficial if it addressed how to be competitive when writing.
* In addition to identifying areas needing clarity, the questionnaire should also address what clarity is needed.

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (FAC) UPDATE** (DEANNA ASAKAWA)

* How can FDPC support FAC?
  + Deanna asked to attend for the rest of the semester as liaison with CEHHS FDPC after the 8wk mark of the semester as her schedule will permit.
  + One overarching goal of FAC came from the Executive Committee of Academic Senate, which was the simplification and streamlining of the RTP process. Coordination with the college FDPC would benefit this. FAC will create a 2yr subcommittee with representatives from each college to review the university and college level RTP document/processes since both levels must be cohesive.
  + Faculty Center Director does not sit ex-officio on FAC, but are included in relevant discussions.
  + FAC aims to allow greater flexibility in mentorship so junior faculty in smaller units (where the other faculty are likely on the RTP committee) may still seek mentorship from relevant faculty in the discipline. These guidelines are geared to make sure that serving on the RTP doesn’t get in the way of mentorship, providing guidance, and answering questions while balancing the propriety of sitting on the review committee.
  + FAC hopes to include commitment to diversity and inclusion as elements of the University RTP.
  + The student grade appeal process didn’t come through FAC. Academic Senate is reviewing a policy that will grant faculty with students with grade appeals access/vision after the semester for a specified period in cougar course. These changes can be viewed on the senate website.

**NEW BUSINESS FOR 2019**  (BROOKS)

* Suggestions for the committee:
  + **To Do:** Rebecca Brooks suggested the committee should review the FAC guidelines for mentoring mentioned by Deanna.
  + **To Do:** Committee Chairs will make a request of the CCC of the Dean’s Office to send an announcement regarding the FAC guidelines for mentorship and then the Dean’s Office will post the document on our website under Resources for Tenure Track.
  + **Dean Ayala – Faculty Service:** The Dean posited the need for standards of faculty service given the normalization and clarification of RTP standards across campus given the context provided by Deanna. He asked the committee their opinions regarding setting up standards for faculty service due to the possibility of disproportionality in recognized service amongst the diverse and varied programs of CEHHS, postulating that homogenization of the standards would incite greater recognition of faculty efforts. Subsequent discussion items included:
    - What constitutes service? Should there be levels of expected service commensurate with years under review and faculty seniority/rank?
    - Is a junior faculty’s effort scrutinized the same as a senior faculty? Is participation satisfactory for junior faculty while possibly insufficient for a senior faculty?
    - How should mentorship and other forms of service be gauged? Are disparate measurements required or would one equitable policy weighing the elements of the service suffice?
    - Is presence for a committee tantamount to participation? How does taking lead in policy or survey creation compare to other forms of service contextual to faculty experience when reviewing for retention and promotion?
    - What rubric is created for considering the context of events and service at the time they transpired when later reviewed? If, for example, the committee only had one policy to create during the academic year, then is participation for all members weighed the same since there wasn’t enough opportunity for leadership and contribution?
    - Absences – how should the variability of schedules and classes during a member’s tenure on a committee be factored into the service measurement of presence and participation in a committee?
    - Committee determined that additional consideration would be given this important issue in coming meetings.
* Dr. Soriano informed the committee of a conflict with his schedule for the May 2 meeting due to his class schedule. If possible, could the committee move the meeting to 12pm on the same day?
  + Committee took under review.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT** (SCHEER-COHEN)

11:45 A.M.

*Next Meetings:*

*March 7, 2019*

*10:45 A.M – 11:45 A.M.*

*May 2, 2019*

*10:45 A.M. – 11:45 A.M.*