

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

March 17, 2009 (12:30 p.m. – 1:145 p.m., Middlefork 338)

Attendance-Laverne Nishihara (Chair), Kumara Jayasuria, Marilyn Watkins, Denise Bullock, Emily Samborsky (recorder), Cathy Foos

P&T Policy Revision Discussion-Reports by School, Unit

HSS-Laverne reported that HSS discussed the document and had some questions but no suggestions.

Nursing-Denise reported that the School of Nursing did have some concerns about the P&T process. One concern was that external reviewers may not have dossiers returned on time. The faculty also thought that having an alternate to the Dean was a good idea in times of Dean transition in the School. Otherwise, the nursing faculty thought the proposed changes were good and did not have suggestions.

Business-Denise reported that the School would not be meeting until April.

Library- Emily Reported that the information had been distributed via email and librarians would report back to Emily with concerns or questions.

NSM-Kumara reported that the School would discuss this topic at the next meeting.

Education-Marilyn reported that the School of Education did not have any major questions.

The committee then discussed the P&T provisions for a new Dean being appointed when a faculty of that school is coming up. Cathy made note that the EVCAA would be in consultation with the new Dean about the candidate and suggested that we could have the former Dean write a detailed letter of support. Denise commented that she thought the letter written from the actual Dean may get more notice or weight compared to the other letters.

Also, it was noted that circumstances are different for each change of Deanship.

Cathy commented that Faculty has the authority of Senate at this level of P&T discussion and could determine the fact that the policy could allow for a change in the main reviewer.

UFC Draft for Considerations on Campus: Comment to be sent by March 31st.

Discussion of Part C of document

Chancellor will not send a letter ahead of a dossier and would write a letter after a meeting with the President. The rationale is that McRobbie said he wanted to make collaborative decisions. This would only be a major issue if there have been red flags with recommendations before they reach that level.

The discussion followed that more problems exist with this because the ex-Vice President and President are not getting entire Dossiers. Denise feels like the entire Dossier should go to that level with that change. Laverne pointed out that if the Chancellor is seeing the entire document while the Vice President and President do not, then they are not commenting on the same thing. Cathy asked what does the EVCAA do that the Chancellors letter does not do? Why not stop with the EVCAA and the Chancellor only write a letter after the meeting with the President as suggested? Others pointed out that if all of the previous information has been consistent before a dossier arrives at the Presidents level then it isn't an issue. If there are disagreements it can be a problem. What will happen if the EVCAA recommends positively and the Chancellor recommends negatively? Also, for regional campuses it is common practice to have the candidate to receive a letters from each level. Several committee members felt that this was a valuable practice that should not be stopped.

Also, the document draft states that the President will only entertain arguments for tenure decision changes under the following conditions--dispute in procedure or the campus grievance process has identified a problem.

Question A2-

This policy may not even be possible for this campus because of the size of the East campus. The number of faculty at each level of Rank do not make up enough to create a P&T committee when Faculty come up for Full.

#3 Seems fine to the committee

#4 This is considering whether P&T committee members can participate via technology. Discussion included that the wording of this section needed to be changed, and that the technology should be utilized if it does not disadvantage a candidate.

#7 This section discusses that participants that vote should only vote at one level of the deliberations.

Submitted by Emily Samborsky