Faculty Personnel Policies Council Agenda

Minutes Meeting #2

October 6, 2017

People present were P. Soni, R. Marcus, J. Pattnaik, G. Reynolds, L. Kermode, A. Colburn, J. Torabzadeh, D. Ottolia, U. Lassiter (Lecturer rep), Liesl Haas (CFA rep), M. Wiley, and S. Pavri. Absent: None.

1. Introductions

2. Approval of minutes from organizational meeting, spring 2017

* Approved unanimously.

3. Approval of minutes from Sept. 15 meeting

* Approved by acclamation with no objections.

4. Announcements: FPPC needs rep to University Awards Committee

* Jalal Torabzadeh elected to University Awards Committee
* Praveen: request to add Nepotism to Agenda

**New Business**

5. Revision of Policy 13-01 Emeritus Faculty: Rights and Privileges

* Goal is to delete the line “if not actively employed by the University” to simplify parking rights. Suggested edit approved by Mary Stephens, DAF.
* First reading waived.
* 2.6 and 2.7 changes were approved deleting “if not actively employed by the University”
* Discussed possible other areas that may be in need of change. Focus predominantly on 4.2 and 4.3. Added “department chair” to 4.3 Added plural (more than one department, chair dean) to 4.3. Passed 10 to 1 with 1 abstention.
* Policy passed unanimously.

6. Development of a policy to implement Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 20, Section 37 (<https://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#article-20)>

* Who gets to decide. Who gets the awards. To date it has been the Senate Executive Committee. Question of appeal. Last year approximately 60 applied and approximately 20 awarded. MGSS Committee raised. Question of workload.
* Formula comes from the CO but Academic Senate determines policy and procedure. Discussion of level. Eg. Faculty Councils. Mark: it is useful for faculty closer to the ground to evaluate. They can choose their structures. Advocating pro rata distribution to colleges. This also minimizes workload and new structures as there are only about 2 to 5 awards per college.
* Agreed that colleges need to be involved but there are two options going forward: either 1) college or 2) college recommending to a university committee. Seeking data from Mark’s office on pattern of applications from past two years. Tabled pending that data.

Old Business

7. Discussion about 17-05 Student Evaluations of Teaching

* Richard: Concern with differences between online and print response types (as opposed to rate)
* Mark: Response rates and qualitative are two different questions. Change of conditions leads to lower response rate. Bracket that to consider qualitative differences. Need to think about increasing student understanding of what they are supposed to do. Students don’t understand what SPOT forms are used for. We also don’t do a good job how our faculty might encourage response rates. Doing all classes: 500,000 sheets of paper and 2000 hours of time.

8. Discussion about developing a policy for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

* Not heard. Held for next meeting.

9. Policy on Conflict of Interest

* Praveen: concern that there was not significant enough consultation by FPPC before sending to Senate. Requests sending it to Faculty Councils.
* Richard: expressed concerns that this impunes the FPPC and that it is out of order at FPPC since it was already referred and heard by the Academic Senate.