

## **Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** November 13, 2025

**Location:** Zoom

#### **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.

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

The meeting was called to order and the committee briefly acknowledged the upcoming workload for Spring.

#### **2. Approval of Minutes**

The committee reviewed minutes from:

- September 18

The minutes were approved.

#### **3. Approval of Agenda**

With no edits proposed, the agenda was approved.

#### **4. Update on Referrals and Workload**

The chair reviewed ongoing and newly assigned referrals. Major continuing items include:

- Revisions to the **Unit RTP process**
- Revisions to the **Sabbatical Application & Rubric**
- **ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures**
- **Teaching Modality** referral
- **President's Cabinet structure** and related handbook updates
- **First-Year Seminar** instruction concerns
- Several new referrals regarding **unit criteria, faculty review timelines, acting/interim MPPs, and term limits for chairs/directors**

A substantial referral regarding **Periodic Evaluation of Faculty** will require careful review later this year or early next semester.

## **5. Old Business**

### **5.1 Sabbatical Application & Rubric**

Several high-level issues were discussed:

- **Clarification of “meritorious”:** The committee agreed it refers to meeting the basic standards outlined in the call and being eligible for review, not necessarily being exceptional.
- **Role of the department chair:** Chairs should comment on curricular/scheduling implications but not act as evaluators determining merit.
- **Rubric feedback:**
  - Need for consistent language across performance bands.
  - Clarification of terms like “public reputation.”
  - Acknowledgment that some projects may have minimal “prior productivity” if they are long-term or developmental.
- **Possible additions:**
  - A simple front-end checklist to determine whether the application is complete and eligible.
  - A brief evaluator guide describing the purpose of each rubric section.

The committee cautioned against overly complex revisions prior to Senate second reading and agreed to focus on clarity, consistency, and modest structural improvements.

A revised draft and evaluator guide will be prepared for a future meeting.

### **5.2 ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures**

The proposed clarification of who is eligible for the lecturer Senate seat received no substantive concerns at Senate first reading. The committee voted to move the item forward to **second reading**.

A suggestion was made to narrow the list of lecturer job codes to those actually used at CSUB.

### **5.3 Unit RTP Resolution**

The committee discussed extensive Senate feedback and concerns from various departments. Key themes:

- **Interpretation of committee structure:**  
Some faculty believe the proposed language suggests forming large numbers of distinct committees, creating major workload concerns. Members agreed that much of this confusion stems from wording and that the intent—that each candidate has a distinct committee, but membership can overlap—should be clarified.
- **Committee size flexibility:**  
Departments vary widely in size. Some prefer small committees; others traditionally include all tenured faculty. The committee discussed allowing flexibility while still promoting fairness and preserving meaningful elections.
- **Candidate rights and transparency:**  
The policy aims to ensure candidates clearly know who is reviewing their file and that elected committee members meaningfully participate.
- **Committee chair selection:**  
The group expressed interest in allowing candidates to **recommend** a chair but ensuring the committee itself selects the chair.
- **Eligibility when undergoing review:**  
The committee noted the need to clarify whether faculty undergoing promotion or post-tenure review may serve on other committees, balancing workload needs and potential conflicts.
- **Level of prescription:**  
Members emphasized avoiding overly prescriptive rules that may not fit all departments. The resolution should center on transparency, fairness, and consistency rather than rigid structural mandates.

Given the complexity of the issue, the committee agreed that more time is needed to refine the resolution before returning it to Senate for continued second reading.

## 6. Upcoming Work (Preview Only)

Members were asked to review materials for several referrals that will be discussed in future meetings, including:

- President's Cabinet structure
- First-Year Seminar instruction
- Teaching modality
- Term limits for department chairs
- Criteria for faculty reviews

- Acting/interim MPP handbook language
- The report of the Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Task Force

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting concluded with thanks to the committee for thoughtful discussion. The next meeting will occur the following week.