

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE  
PERSONNEL PLANNING AND REVIEW COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING September 29, 2021 APPROVED BY COMMITTEE \_\_\_\_\_  
Sub. to Exec. Comm. \_\_\_\_\_ Approved by Exec. Comm. \_\_\_\_\_  
Sub. to Acad. Senate \_\_\_\_\_ Approved by Acad. Senate \_\_\_\_\_

POLICY ITEM:

POLICY INTERPRETATION ITEM:

Members Present: Lindsay Brown, Tracy Buenavista, Dennis Halcoussis, Michael Neubauer, Dino Vrongistinos, George Wang, Peggy Roller, Jeffrey Auerbach, Pat- Alford-Keating, Tamarah Ashton, Debi Choudhary, Michael Hoggan

Members Absent: Sylvia Macauley

Staff Present: Diane Guido, Executive Secretary, Letty Vargas & Megan Dozier, Recording Secretary

Staff Absent: None

1. Chair called the meeting to order at 1:02pm.
2. Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2021
  - a. **MSP:** Minutes were approved
3. Announcements
  - a. Introduction of new PP&R Members Michael Hoggan and Debi Choudhary
  - b. An RTP Candidates' Meeting with the Provost was held on September 20<sup>th</sup> and was well attended.
4. Update on Section 600 Searches
  - a. Dean for College of Humanities Vice President of University Relations and Advancement: The search firm met with the Search and Screen Committee on 10/1/2021.
  - b. Interim Dean for HHD: A new search was announced for an Interim Dean. It will be limited to current CSUN employees. The goal is for the new interim dean to start on November 1, 2021. PP&R endorsed the search.
  - d. The "Manual of procedures for Search and Screen Committees for Academic-Administrative Positions" was discussed. The committee made no changes to last year's document.

**MSP:** The committee approved the manual for 2021-22 with no changes.
5. CECS College Guidelines
  - a. Professor Jeff Wiegley attended to voice concerns about a draft policy initiated by the Dean of CECS which he provided to committee members. The committee discussed the concerns and noted similar concerns in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
  - b. MSP –The committee approved a motion that Professors Brown and Neubauer will send a memo to the two deans regarding the concerns about online scheduling policies.
6. Updates on Section 600 Decisions, Approvals, Inquiries
  - a. Section 703 – Professional Responsibility for Lecturers

- no update
    - b. 606.1.b.1 – Deadline for submitting material to PIF
      - no update
    - c. 634 – Consultation
      - no update
    - d. Review of new administrators after 3 years – 622.2.2a (VP), 622.3.5 (Academic Admin), 622.4.3 (Deans), 622.5.2a (Associate Deans)
      - The committee will look at proposed edits at the next meeting. Suggested wording discussed is: “Such evaluation shall occur no later than three years for the first review, and not to exceed five years for subsequent reviews.”
    - e. 703.1.2.c – Placing items in lecturers’ PAF: The committee reviewed edits to this section.
      - MSP: approved with changes
    - f. Review of committee eligibility chart: The Committee reviewed edits to the chart. The revised chart should be distributed widely, as it answers typical questions about committee eligibility.
      - **MSP:** approved
    - g. Lecturer Evaluations - 621.4.2b: The Committee reviewed some changes and will finalize at the next meeting.
    - h. Guidelines for CPC/DPC Elections: A subcommittee was identified to work on this issue.
    - i. The Committee considered a request for change in RTP review timeline for a second year faculty due to a Fall 2021 leave.
      - **MSP:** Faculty is approved to undergo a second-year retention review during the standard 3-6 year review cycle in Spring 2022.
7. Update on Adoption of Policy Recommendations
- a. Results from Senate first reading on 9/23/21
    - i. Written Comments about Lecturers – 707: Committee discussed additional changes and will finalize at next meeting.
    - ii. Lecturer Evaluations - 621.4.2b: Committee discussed additional changes and will finalize at next meeting.
    - iii. Three-year faculty and annual application to pools – 709.1.2a-b: No additional changes made. This will be moved forward to Senate for a second reading and vote.
8. Department and College Personnel Procedures
- a. 2021-22 Subcommittees: Subcommittees were confirmed and may now begin outreach to Departments and Colleges.
  - b. Process Review: PP&R reviewed the process for making changes and approving department and college personnel procedures.
9. Review of PP&R Documents
- a. PIF & ePIF Guidelines – PP&R reviewed a merged document and made additional edits. The final version was approved by the committee and will be uploaded to the PP&R and Faculty Affairs eRTP websites.
  - b. Guidelines for Review of Department and College Personnel Procedures & Guidelines for developing/revising Department and College Personnel Procedures: No action.
10. Standard Operating Procedures (PP&R Bylaws): Committee members were asked to bring any questions about the draft bylaws to the next meeting.

11. Quality of Scholarly Publications: The subcommittee on this topic gave an update and noted that the results of their efforts will be an updated LibGuide, readily available to DPCs.

12. Other/New Business

- a. GRIF minimum buyout (652.3(b)): The committee discussed whether the formula for the calculation of GRIF should be lowered from 40% to 37.5% so that it coincides with 9 units which is more applicable to a portion of faculty workload. More information is needed from Research and Sponsored Programs.
- b. Sabbatical Application
  - i. Review of Deadlines – The application deadline was moved one week later to accommodate the new AdobeSign process. The committee discussed whether to also push back the four subsequent review deadlines in order to give reviewing bodies sufficient time for their decisions.
    - **MSP**: PP&R approved the extension of the review dates by one week each, keeping the date of the final notification of awards the same.
  - ii. Consultation with DPC Permitted: The committee reviewed whether sabbatical applicants can review their draft applications with DPC colleagues as this seems like it could be a conflict of interest. After discussion, the committee did not take action on this point. Although it is generally not best practice for reviewing bodies to also provide feedback on drafts, some small departments and programs are limited in personnel and this is unavoidable.

13. Adjournment 4:37pm