Minutes
Steering Committee
October 28, 2005

All members were in attendance. (Bill Baker, Swaminathan Badrinath (Chair), Martha Doran, Massoud Saghafi, Howard Toole and Tom Warschauer. Ex Officio members also attended: Dean Gail Naughton and Associate Dean Jim Lackritz.

Guests attending: Bonnie Zimmerman, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Nadine Bezuk, College of Education Representative to the University Promotions and Tenure Review Panel.

Minutes of the October 14, 2005 had been approved via email. The committee agreed to the agenda.

Committee Membership
The Chair announced that Martha Doran has resigned her position on the Steering Committee in order to serve on the University Graduate Council. The College Policy File states that the remainder of her term should be filled by the person receiving the next highest number of votes in the last election. As there was no such person, the Committee agreed to hold a special election at the end of the Fall semester for a new member to serve the remainder of Martha’s F05-SP08 term.

Representation
The Committee discussed its outreach to CFA and to other possible representatives. Warschauer indicated that he will contact the UAW and Teamsters to determine their interest. The Committee is contacting other CSU College of Business Faculty governance committees.

Tenure and Promotion
In Spring 2005, a presentation was made to College of Business faculty describing College and University RPT standards and procedures. Subsequent to that presentation, several concerns were expressed by attending tenure-track faculty to the Steering Committee. In June 2005, the Steering Committee wrote a letter to Gene Whittenburg, the College representative on the University RPT Committee requesting clarification of several issues that were raised. After receiving his written response, the Steering Committee decided to invite other members of the University RPT Committee to its meeting (see SC Minutes, September 2, 2005).

On October 28, 2005, the Steering Committee was joined by Bonnie Zimmerman, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Professor Nadine Bezuk, College of Education Representative to the University Retention, Promotions and Tenure Panel. Nadine indicated she was speaking on her own behalf and not representing the Panel. The guests were provided a copy of the correspondence between the Committee and Gene Whittenburg. A number of questions were asked and the following issues discussed.

- Is the University standard for tenure and/or promotion that of Big Ten schools?
Nadine indicated that no discussion of “Big Ten” schools as a standard was ever discussed by the Panel or was in effect.

- Is a national reputation a specified standard?

Nadine indicated that that standard had not been explicitly applied. Bonnie indicated that Provost Marlin had not stated that as an explicit standard, but she would discuss it with Provost Marlin. After the meeting, Associate Dean Jim Lackritz received the following e-mail from Bonnie Zimmerman, which is summarized below with her permission. “Provost Marlin stated that she may have used that term, but what she means by it is that by the time you are a full professor, you should have carved out an area of research in which you made a mark, and be recognized by colleagues in that field as an expert. She contrasted that with research that is scattered all over the place, never achieving critical mass or depth. It doesn't mean being covered in the Chronicle or the NY Times. “

- Are the standards now significantly higher?

Yes, but only over very long periods of time, and not particularly so in the last ten years. There has been no annual “ratcheting up.” These changes appear to be the result of the changed culture of university faculty and the characteristics of the members serving on the Panel. They are not driven by top-down mandates.

Other points mentioned by the Guests:

- The RPT Committee looks at all three areas- teaching, research and service. The Committee does read student comments from evaluations. The Committee is concerned when there is inconsistency between student comments and recommendations. Teaching is one of the most important criteria and the Provost is as likely to turn down a candidate for inadequacies in that area as for those in research.

- It would be helpful if Department and College letters were consistent with the candidates’ file and more specific on how to judge the quality and importance of the research output of faculty. The letters should not just make the candidates for tenure and promotion look good, but should include information on what the department and the College valued (collaboration, mentoring etc).

- The process is not a winnowing process, each decision is an independent decision.

- Sometimes candidates are being advanced prematurely, including good candidates that are not quite ready.

- There is a balancing act between equity (treating candidates from different colleges the same way) and the unique needs, characteristics and cultures of each department. The Committee is very sensitive to differential issues.
Panel members are not advocates for their college’s candidates. They may request representatives of College RTP Committees to provide clarification.

**Governance of Joint Programs**
The Dean explained that the PSFA Department of Parks and Recreation was undergoing a Departmental Review and HTM was part of that review. Despite a very short period for comment, a number of CBA faculty had indicated a lack of participation by the CBA in important decisions regarding the HTM program. The Steering committee urged the Dean to insist that the HTM program be overseen by a joint faculty committee.

The Dean also reported that the CBA is now increasing its role in the management and governance of the International Business program with three faculty on a joint IB Faculty committee. CIBER is now autonomous from the undergraduate program.

**Sabbaticals**
Associate Dean Lackritz presented a proposal for modifying the College policy file with regard to Sabbatical procedures. It attempted to:

a) Clarify the role of the Department;

b) Deal with the situation of a Professional Development committee member as a sabbatical applicant;

c) Requiring Departments to rank proposals.

Several amendments were proposed and were accepted as friendly. Warschauer moved, Toole seconded a motion to adopt the Lackritz proposal. Motion Passed. It will be voted on along with other changes at the end of the semester.

**Strategic Planning**
The Committee took up the Strategic planning process. Key documents are being finalized by Belch and Baker and should be available within a few days. The Committee decided to table the handling of the Strategic plan until the next meeting, and consider it as a major item at that time.

The Steering Committee adjourned at 3:15 p.m.