

## **Faculty Affairs Committee**

**October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025**

### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order. Minutes from previous meetings were not yet organized for approval; review was deferred. The Zoom recording was enabled to support accurate documentation.

### **Members/Guests Present**

Zack Zenko, Amber Stokes (Vice Chair), Sarana Roberts, Najmeh Kamyabi, Sumita Sarma, David Gove, Debbie Boschini (AVP Faculty Affairs), Kristen Gallant, Dan Stockwell.

### **2. Announcements**

#### **2.1 Forthcoming Referrals**

The committee was briefed on several referrals expected in the coming weeks, including:

- **Department Chair Term Limits:**  
FAC will consider whether to establish a more consistent and potentially more restrictive limit on consecutive terms (e.g., two terms unless no other qualified faculty are available), while allowing flexibility in smaller units.
- **Exceptional Criteria for Early Tenure and Promotion:**  
FAC may clarify whether all departments must articulate “exceptional” criteria in their unit RTP policies and whether these criteria must be reviewed or updated on a regular cycle.
- **Timeline Clarifications:**  
FAC may address inconsistencies in references to academic year timing and evaluation cycles across Handbook sections.

#### **2.2 Upcoming Meetings**

- **Academic Senate:** November 6
- **FAC:** Two meetings scheduled the following month to accommodate Thanksgiving.
- **Goal:** Bring three resolutions—Sabbatical Rubric & Feedback, Lecturer Representative Procedures, Unit RTP/PTR Composition—to first reading at the November 6 Senate meeting, with a goal of moving them to second reading by December 4.

### 3. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda passed unanimously.

### 4. Sabbatical Rubric & Feedback Resolution

#### 4.1 Overview

The updated resolution was presented, integrating earlier FAC input and rubric examples. Changes included:

- Clarifying application steps and timelines.
- Establishing a formal rubric to guide merit-based evaluation.
- Defining structured written feedback for all applicants.

#### 4.2 Key Discussion Themes

- **Chair Signatures on Cover Forms:**  
The signature will be updated to indicate acknowledgment rather than endorsement; outdated checkboxes will be removed.
- **Rubric Categories:**  
The rubric includes:
  - Proposed Project
  - Professional Productivity & Preparation
  - Benefits to the University  
Teaching and curricular projects were confirmed as fully qualifying for evaluation.
- **Tie-Breaking Procedures:**  
In the event of tied scores, ranking will be determined by:
  - Seniority (time since last sabbatical or original hire)
  - University impact
  - Professional productivity
  - Committee deliberation
- **Scoring Granularity:**  
Members discussed whether scoring ranges—particularly the upper band—were too subjective. The consensus was to keep the rubric structure but provide a **Reviewer's Guide** to support consistent application.
- **Feedback Standards:**  
All applicants should receive structured feedback, noting strengths, areas for improvement, number of applicants, and number of awards available.

- **Training Needs:**

The committee acknowledged ongoing misconceptions among some chairs and committee members and noted the need for strengthened training and orientation.

#### **4.3 Action**

Motion to forward the Sabbatical Rubric and Feedback Resolution to Academic Senate for first reading passed unanimously. Minor editorial corrections were incorporated.

### **5. Lecturer Representative Resolution**

#### **5.1 Background**

The resolution clarifies eligibility and procedures for electing Lecturer Faculty Representatives to the Academic Senate and, when applicable, the ASCSU.

#### **5.2 Key Elements of Discussion**

- **Definition of Lecturer Faculty:**

Eligibility clarified using CBA-aligned lecturer classification codes to avoid ambiguity about other campus employees who occasionally teach.

- **Eligibility Requirements:**

Representatives must hold a Unit 3 lecturer classification with a minimum 0.6 time-base entitlement.

- **Term Length:**

Two-year terms were affirmed; statewide ASCSU service continues through the end of the statewide term even if the campus term ends.

- **Editorial Clarifications:**

Small grammar and punctuation adjustments were made.

#### **5.3 Action**

Motion to move the resolution to first reading passed unanimously.

## 6. Unit RTP and PTR Committee Composition Resolution

### 6.1 Overview

The committee reviewed proposed revisions to the Handbook's RTP/PTR sections, reflecting feedback from Senate leadership, department chairs, URC, and prior campus discussions.

The revisions aim to clarify committee formation, candidate-specific committees, eligibility, and conflict-resolution processes.

### 6.2 Key Provisions and Discussion

- **Eligibility and Composition:**
  - Tenured faculty generally eligible unless serving on URC or in administrative roles.
  - FERP or sabbatical faculty may serve voluntarily.
  - Each candidate must have a **distinct committee**, though membership may overlap across candidates.
  - Higher-rank representation should be used when possible.
- **Elections and Service Limits:**
  - All eligible faculty are included on the initial nomination slate.
  - Individuals may serve on up to four committees per cycle.
  - Voting is limited to probationary and tenured faculty.
- **Committee Chair Selection:**
  - Earlier drafts assigned this choice to the candidate.
  - After discussion, consensus supported a model where:
    - The **candidate may recommend**, but
    - The **committee selects** the chair.
- **Appointed Fourth Member:**
  - Candidates may appoint one additional committee member from the unit, college, or a related discipline.
  - Consultation with the appointee is required.
  - Appointed members hold equal standing in deliberations.
- **Conflict Resolution:**
  - Candidates may appeal committee composition concerns to URC.
  - URC may appoint members or reconstitute committees when needed.
- **PTR Alignment:**
  - PTR sections were updated for consistency with RTP language and clarified timelines and notification expectations.
- **Additional Considerations:**
  - Removal of outdated language from prior Handbook editions.

- Recognition that workloads differ across departments.
- Emphasis on transparency, training, and consistent application of policies.

### **6.3 Action**

Motion to forward the Unit RTP/PTR Composition Resolution to Senate for first reading passed unanimously.

## **7. New Referrals**

Brief previews were provided for upcoming topics:

- **First-Year Seminar (CSUB 1029):**  
Clarification of who may teach these courses and whether unit lecturers receive priority.
- **Teaching Modality Policy:**  
Examination of who determines modality (faculty, department, or dean) and how institutional online-course thresholds should be managed.
- **President's Cabinet Structure:**  
Updating the Handbook to align with the current administrative configuration and ensure consistent processes for future changes.

Members were encouraged to review referral documents in the shared Box folder.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned with expressions of appreciation for the committee's work. Members were wished a happy Halloween.