**Committee on Faculty Affairs Minutes  
March 25, 2015**

**Present:** E. Borland, S. Carroll, J. Gevertz, W. Keep, G. Pogue, J. Row, D. Shaw, V. Tucci (chair), P. Wiita (vice chair), T. Youngblood, I. Zake, S. Arjani

**Excused**: J. Neves

**Absent:** O. Hernandez

**Minutes:** The minutes of the meetings from Feb 25, 2015, and March 11, 2015, were approved.

**New Business: Sabbatical Leave RFP**

SLC Chair Tamra Bireta and Vice Chair Ruth Palmer came to the meeting for CFA’s annual review of the RPF for Sabbatical Leave, and described some changes proposed by their committee. Small changes included section headers and some clarifying language. The more significant proposed change was an evaluation rubric that would assign points for various components of each application. Under current procedures, Tamra said the committee’s range of scoring was 1-10, with 1 being the best, and that committee members would get together to average out their scores. But this was problematic because newer members weren’t familiar with the differences between, say, 1 and 2. So the proposed rubric would transform the categories currently used by the committee into weighted scores, with 50% based on presentation of the proposed project, 30% based on potential professional development outcomes, and 20% based on the qualifications of the applicant. Several CFA members questioned the 1-10 scale, suggesting that it could be narrowed to reduce confusion, to 1-7 or even 1-5. They also suggested switching the weights of categories 2 and 3, which would put the process more in line with SOSA, and they questioned the proposed scoring for scholarship and service under the third category. But Tamra said SLC members now have a clear understanding of the 1-10 scoring system, and to change it would mean more confusion. It was agreed that the SLC would keep that system for now. Tamra will make some revisions to the third category before the next CFA meeting.

**Old Business**

1. Review discussion at open forum, especially on the number of summative reviews: CFA members agreed that, although it involves more work, we need three reviews.
2. Review proposed composition of CPTC: CFA members agreed that it will not be possible to limit membership to full professors, although we want to encourage it. We need to guarantee diversity as well as full representation, as some departments have no full professors. CFA agreed that, for now, at least 7 of 12 members should be full professors.
3. Promotion standards for tenured assistant professors: The memo by Jackie and Joao took care of this item.
4. Tenure and promotion standards for merged tenure/promotion: It was noted that people will apply for promotion under the document that was in effect when they were hired.
5. Disciplinary standards for 2015 hires subcommittee report: So far, the subcommittee has received four sets of standards for review, and is awaiting nine more. New standards must make note of the extra year that has been added to the process.
6. Disciplinary standards for 2014 hires – reference to 2014 PRD: As the disciplinary standards predate the revised PRD, it was agreed that CFA will recommend language so departments can revise their documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Shaw