

**College of Education  
Policy Council Meeting**  
Wednesday, March 15, 2017

**12:30 - 2:30 p.m.**

EBA 342

**MINUTES (DRAFT)**

**Bold means Present; *Italicized means arranged a proxy***

2/3 of elected members required for quorum (10 elected members total)

**Alfaro, Cristina (DLE)**

**Lamb, Lisa (STE) Executive  
committee**

**Bredvold, Marilyn (Staff  
Rep.)**

**Lazarevic, Vanja (CFD)**

Butler-Byrd, Nola (CSP)

Lozada-Santone, Patricia  
(Student Rep.)

Bezuk, Nadine (Dean's Office)

**McClure, Mendy (Lecturer  
Rep.)**

Frey, Nancy (EDL), Secretary

**Philipp, Randy (STE)**

**Ingraham, Colette (CSP)  
(Colette has proxy for Nola  
Butler Byrd)**

**Frank Harris, Proxy for  
Tucker, Mark (ARPE)**

**Johnson Jr., Joseph (Dean's  
Office)**

IVC Rep. (Vacant)

**Kraemer, Bonnie (SPED)  
Chair**

*Quorum was reached.*

1.0 Approval of Agenda

Colette moved that we approved the agenda. Cristina 2nded.  
Motion approved unanimously

2.0 Approval of Feb 15 2017 Minutes

Suggested Revisions.

Frank Harris moved to approve. Randy 2nded  
Motion approved unanimously

3.0 Old Business

Marilyn, staff development committee was not exactly as outlined in Policy File. Wanted to look at the section on the Staff Development committee and update to include the additional funding sources, and to update the policy to be consistent with its operation. As part of the

update, Marilyn noted that staff could not vote on changes that were pertinent to staff. The question: would it be feasible to have staff vote on part of Policy File related to Staff Development committee? Marilyn investigated with two Staff Senators and to Staff Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) lead. Staff senators indicated that university Policy file said nothing about staff voting rights and could be left to College to decide. Marilyn contacted CBA who turned question over to Labor Relations. When posed question about staff voting rights. Staff Labor Relations stated that having voting rights within the COE Policy File would constitute an “unfair labor practice,” for any staff group to be consulted within the scope of representation within the scope of hours, wages, and working conditions.

With that result Marilyn suggested excising that part of the Policy File related to the Staff Development Committee, except for a brief mention of the Staff Development committee. Marilyn volunteered to draft new language of the Policy File in relation to the Staff Development Committee. Marilyn and Bonnie acknowledged that the news from Labor and Relations was disheartening.

Marilyn asked what management thought about the new plan. Dean Johnson replied that he supports a change in Policy that would make little reference to the Staff Development committee.

**For New Business for next time: Marilyn will draft revised language for the Policy around staff development committee. She will consult with members of the staff development committee.**

Colette wondered whether there is a way to communicate the recommended changes to staff to clarify that the change would be made to *not* tie the hands of the committee. Rather, this route (reducing language in the COE policy file) was chosen in response to recommendations from the Labor and Relations committee.

### 7.0 College Committee Reports

- Karen Cadeiro-Kaplan, from curriculum committee

Proposal for changes to the COE Policy File. With the transition to CurricuNet, when a proposer submits a proposal, it goes to the curriculum services committee before department chair gets proposal. Karen and the COE curriculum committee would plan to recommend changes to the COE policy in relation to CC. **Goal is to have the revised policy shared at Policy Council at the May meeting.**

### 3.0 Old Business

- Policy File Revisions re: Search Committee. Colette Ingraham shared draft policy language regarding make up of COE department Search Committees to be more aligned with University Policy Language (see Colette for new draft policy). Came up with language that establishes a minimum of a 3-person T/TT search committee (including chair as 1 of the 3). Clarifies who can serve. Language is broad enough that it allows small departments to elect members from outside of their department. Can have committees larger than 3 (any number). Can have others serve as non-voting members in a supportive role. Revised language suggestion for 2.0: FERP faculty may serve as voting members on a search committee. They may not count as one of the three T/TT faculty members required on the committee.

During the meeting, suggestions were made to revise statements about recusing oneself if there is a conflict of interest (COI). Dean Johnson shared that COI is different than knowing someone, having a professional relationship, so one might want to think more deeply about what constitutes a COI. If the person being considered is for instance, somebody with whom you have a financial relationship where that person at their institution is paying you to be a part of their grant, then that is a clear COI because committee members could have financial repercussions. In contrast, if a former student applies for a position (as has happened), then no one in a small department could serve if s/he had to recuse for serving on a doctoral committee. Colette summarizes suggested changes: Keep the first proposed sentence related to COI. Revise 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. Delete 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence. Remove the term, *Significant*, throughout. **(Colette will email revisions to Maribel to be included as Appendix to these minutes).**

- Colette read the revised proposal as discussed during the meeting that included revisions to 2.0, and revisions to the paragraph about COIs.
- Frank Harris moved to approve, Cristina Alfaro 2<sup>nd</sup>ed the amendment to the revised COE Policy File. Motion was unanimously approved. Language will go to Maribel. COE Faculty will vote electronically this semester. Randy Philipp suggested providing context for changes when revised policy is sent to electorate.

#### 4.0 New Business

- COE policy question related to definition of electorate in Senate/SDSU Policy file. Marilyn shared. In COE Policy File—electorate is defined as those assigned to COE on at least a half-time basis (p.6, 3.2 and 3.3). Marilyn suggested that we make it clearer that those who are eligible to serve (as identified at the beginning of the COE Policy File) are also those who are eligible to vote on changes to policy file (see page 7, 2.1, Report of Action). **Bonnie recommends carrying this item over for next time and making sure that we have consistency.** Marilyn and Bonnie volunteered to help ensure consistency in the language.
- Proposed policy revision for faculty search committees. Discussed in Old Business 3.0 bullet 2.

#### 5.0 Announcements from the Dean

- Rankings from US News and World Report made public. Last year ranked 69<sup>th</sup> in the country. This year ranked 57<sup>th</sup>. Among public universities, we were 51<sup>st</sup>, now we are 39<sup>th</sup>. 8<sup>th</sup> in CA after Stanford, UCLA, Cal, USC, UCSB, UCD, UCI. #1 among CSUs, #1 in SD County ahead of UCSD and USD. Significant aspect of the rankings is our total dollar research grants. COE total grant funding for 2016 was greater than the COE total grant funding at UC Berkeley and University of Michigan. Our ratings are adversely affected because we are not as selective as the other universities and the Dean is OK with that feature. Some universities are ranked high because they turn down many. Rankings are also adversely affected in “reputational” rankings. Scores are growing but not as quickly as in other categories. Another important part of rankings is our success rates/graduation rates. We provide opportunities for our students to have a high likelihood of graduating from our programs (more impressive given that we do not have selective admissions criteria). Frank Harris noted that if the rankings were going down, admin would contact Joe, so when rankings are going up, we should credit Joe with the increases. All in attendance concurred.
- President Hirshman is leaving the university. He has made clear that he is fully engaged until he leaves on June 30. The Chancellor will visit next week and will meet

with at least four groups (Campanile Foundation, the President's Cabinet, The Associated Students Executive Council, the Faculty Senate Executive committee, and possibly the Academic Dean's Council.) The chancellor's goal is get a sense for what folks are seeking and then appoint an interim president.

#### 6.0 University Committee Reports

- None

#### 7.0 College Committee Reports

- Curriculum Committee (Karen Cadeiro-Kaplan, shared earlier in the meeting when she was able to attend)
- Colette asked. For next time, could we **get an update on RAT applications from the Research Committee**, if the number is increasing or decreasing, # applications, those funded, and how is it working? Good time to check in now that criteria are altered. Dean Johnson shared that numbers who qualify (attention to publications and grants) seem related to increase in rankings. Substantially more faculty members qualify for RAT than in the past. Priority to determine how to reinforce the success/work of faculty and whether to adjust RAT further.

#### 8.0 Adjourn, motion to adjourn by Vanja, 2nded by all.

## **Proposed New Faculty Search Policy**

Draft approved at the 3/15/17 COE Policy Council Discussion

### **Intentions**

- Bring COE policy into alignment with university policy
- Use university terminology (“search committee”) in lieu of terms currently used by COE (“peer review committee” and “recruitment committee”)
- Encourage larger departments to include many and diverse individuals on search committees (i.e., to go beyond minimum compliance with policy with respect to the number of individuals serving on the committee)
- Promote diversity in the composition of search committees.

### **Proposed Policy Language (would replace section II-A-2) (note: current university and COE policy statements appear further below for reference)**

Once a faculty search is approved by the Dean, departments or schools shall, as soon as feasible, elect search committees comprised of a minimum of three tenured/tenure-track faculty members, inclusive of a committee chair.

Search committees shall, as a first step in the search process, familiarize themselves with MOU Article 12 and SDSU PF II-B-I and II-B-2.

- 1.0 Search committees should be comprised of faculty members with demonstrated records of excellence in research, scholarship, or creative activity and currency in the field; committee membership should also reflect the campus commitment to diversity. Departments and schools are encouraged to be as inclusive as feasible with respect to the number and diversity of faculty serving on search committees. Departments may include more than the minimum number of members on a search committee.
- 2.0 FERP faculty may serve as voting members on a search committee. They may not count as one of the three tenured/tenure-track faculty members required of the committee.

- 3.0 Tenured/tenure-track faculty members from other schools or departments may be elected by COE departments and schools to serve as voting members on search committees.
- 4.0 Non-tenured/tenure-track faculty members and other stakeholders such as students, administrators, and staff, may serve only in an advisory or support role.

All members of the search committee should consider carefully whether service on a search committee may entail conflicts of interest from the standpoint of personal or professional connections with any candidates. Faculty having professional or personal conflicts of interest with any candidate, or who may present an appearance of or actual conflict of interest, if elected, should recuse herself or himself.

**For your reference, here are the exiting COE and University Policies on this matter. If approved, the proposed COE policy would replace the Current COE Policy. (next page)**  
**Current University Policy**

As soon as feasible, departments or schools elect search committees of at least three tenured/tenure-track faculty members and a committee chair. Committees should be comprised of faculty members with demonstrated record of excellence in research, scholarship, or creative activity and currency in the field; committee membership should also reflect the campus commitment to diversity. Faculty should consider carefully whether service on a search committee may entail “significant conflicts of interest from the standpoint of personal or professional connections.” (Non-tenured/tenure-track faculty members—for example, students or staff--may serve only in an advisory or support role.)

### **Current COE Policy**

11-A-2 Peer Review Committees and Recruitment Committees shall, as a first step in the search process, familiarize themselves with MOU Article 12 and SDSU PF 11-B-1 and 11-B-2.

A department may choose to form a Peer Review Committee or to have all tenured faculty in the department serve as the Peer Review Committee and from that group, select a Recruitment Committee.

1.0 Peer Review Committee. The department may elect a Peer Review Committee of at least five (5) full-time tenure-track faculty and eligible faculty on FERP at least three (3) of whom are tenured. Faculty having significant professional or personal relationships with any candidate, or who may present an appearance of or actual conflict of interest, if elected, should recuse herself or himself unless authorized by the Dean to serve. Significant professional or personal relationships may include but are not limited to serving on dissertation or thesis committees, co-authorship of publications, team teaching, or family relationship. The Peer Review Committee is charged with selecting finalists for interviews and for making the final selection of names to be forwarded to the Dean for consideration for appointment. Recommendations by department or school committees shall be reconsidered

by the full-time tenure-track and eligible FERP faculty members of the unit if a majority requests such reconsideration.

2.0 Recruitment Committee. The department may elect to have all full-time tenure-track and eligible FERP members of the faculty serve as the Peer Review Committee, subject to the selection stipulations in 11-A-2, 1.0. A department acting as a Peer Review Committee may elect a Recruitment Committee of at least three tenure-track faculty members. The committee may act on behalf of the Peer Review Committee, except in determining the list of finalists to be interviewed and the selection of candidates' names to forward to the Dean for consideration for appointment. The Peer Review Committee performs these tasks by formal vote.

3.0 Faculty from other departments may be elected to serve as voting members on both Peer Review and Recruitment Committees.