

Faculty Affairs Committee
November 29, 2012
3:30 p.m., HMSU 227

MINUTES 2012/2013: MEETING #06
APPROVED January 30

**PRESENT: D. Hantzis, T. Hawkins, J. Kuhlman; B. Phillips, L. Eberman, M. Miller;
J. Pommier
M. Morahn (ex-officio)**

ABSENT: N. Rogers (ex-officio)

1. Approval of Minutes of November 1, 2012 – approved with one change **Vote:**
5:0:0

2. Ex Officio Reports

- a. Executive Committee (Hawkins) – Exec. appreciates FAC work done thusfar. Voting Rights and Prior Credit motions from FAC were approved. Regarding Constitution reviews: continuing discussion at College level regarding College-level constitutional autonomy
- b. Academic Affairs (Rogers): n/a; possibility of re-appointment of a rep to improve attendance & participation
- c. Contingent Faculty Advocate (M. Morahn): no report; noted that she does not receive Senate Exec *Musings*; possibility that others do not as well

3. Chairperson Report

- Reported on meeting with Senate Officers to discuss biennial review revisions as an aid towards today's document contemplation
- Senate Meeting November 15
- Brief conversation with AVP Powers re: Special Purpose Faculty and PTF guidelines
- Data request re: faculty attrition submitted to Linda Ferguson (will also provide information in support of charge to review path to promotion to full professor), July 1, 1989 to present list of faculty document forthcoming (demographics, not actual names)
- Nominees to serve on Faculty Awards Committees sent to Executive Committee
- Review of Faculty Grievance Pool completed (communicated to Executive Committee) – every 3 years 20 new people are appointed to the pool; the current Handbook is wrong in one place regarding staggered terms. There is no definitive list of who has served in the pool.
- Determination of spring 2013 meeting times

4. Old Business

- a. UNTABLED: Motion to Revise Biennial Review Procedures, revised November 21, 2012 - INCLUDING new permanent role of this committee -

IMPORTANT PROCEDURAL Note 1: related to calendar for this process, Sedona OUTPUT, i.e. the Template for any report for Biennial Review, will need to be created by the Colleges asap, BEFORE the SPRING 2013 semester begins, because individual faculty will need to have their information input by September 1, 2013 (for the time period August 1, 2011-July 30, 2013)

IMPORTANT PROCEDURAL Note 2: Each College/Library 'appeal' committee needs to be prepared to deal with any appeals from this new process in mid-October, 2013

Discussion regarding process, Sedona, role of Dean. Dean & Committee decisions are reconciled, which is different.

MOTION TO REVISE BIENNIAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES REV NOV 21, 2012

Preface to Motion

CALENDAR NOTES (Fall 2013 evaluation)

Period: August 1, 2011-July 30, 2013

- September 1, 2013: Faculty submit materials
- October 10, 2013 (or earlier): Department reviews submitted to faculty member and dean (Department Committee completes, submits to chair, chair completes/consults with committee if needed)
- 5 working days after October 10, 2013 (or after date of notification of dept. review): Faculty submits one-page objection statement to Dean
- November 15, 2013 (or earlier): Dean completes review/consults as needed with College Committee; notifies faculty member of recommendation

Within 15 working days of notification of overall assessment, faculty member submits appeal to the College appeals committee

February 15, 2014 (or earlier): the College appeals committee issues its recommendation to the faculty member and Dean of the College

March 1, 2014: Dean notifies the faculty member and chair of committee his/her final recommendation and forwards to the Provost his/her final recommendation and the Committee recommendation

Within 5 working days, the faculty member may send a response to the Provost, if the overall assessment is *Contributing Below Expectations*

Motion to Revise the Faculty Performance Evaluation (biennial review) process in response to charge to propose an appeals process (and any other changes resulting from review of the pilot run) for the biennial faculty review procedures.

Motion

Vote: TO ACCEPT THE ORIGINAL 3 REVISIONS, AS WRITTEN BELOW

Vote: 1:6:0 – Discussion ensued. Most of the document is fine as written but consensus that further revision still needed. Revision will be sent and Committee will vote via e-mail.

Post-meeting Email Vote: 6-0-1

- b. Motion to Revise 305.10 (hiring procedures for non-tenure track faculty)

Recommended revisions – nomenclature only: fully implement the changes in faculty classifications adopted in August 2011 by **striking** references to “Special Purpose Faculty” and inserting appropriate references to Regular Non-Tenure Track faculty (i.e. Instructors); **add** the hiring process governing appointment of non-tenure track faculty (regular and temporary) to the Handbook, rather than relegating the process to the status of guidelines maintained by Academic Affairs to ensure transparency, consistency, and faculty review of the process.

Motion: Miller/Harmon

Vote: 7:0:0

- c. Motion to Revise 305.11.1 and 305.11.2 (annual evaluation of non-tenure track faculty)

Motion: Revise sections 305.11.1 and 305.11.2 of the University Handbook to **include** a **specified process** of annual **evaluation** of Regular, non-tenure track and Temporary Faculty (Instructors and Lecturers, respectively) in accordance with section 305.2.3 requiring that faculty shall be regularly evaluated with established criteria and performance standards appropriate to their positions. (draft November 29, 2012)

Motion: Miller/Harmon

Discussion: getting language into the Handbook such that all processes are parallel, except that there is no right-of-appeal for termination of Temporary Faculty. Due process is not abrogated (does not mandate an appeal). Several (all?) colleges are already doing a department-level review. Viewpoint of the single-year contract person vs the multi-year would be different.

Vote: 7:0:0

No meeting in December but committee needs to finish the bi-ennial review. In order to speed conclusion, suggestion that Hantzis email revised language draft and committee vote via email.

Motion: Kuhlman/Pommier

Vote: 6:0:1 [see results of email vote above]

Adjourned 4:50