

Minutes of the March 21, 2017 FAC Meeting

Present: Chera LaForge, Justin Carroll (recorder), Daron Olson, Lee Zhong, Laverne Nishihara (chair)

Minutes of the 2-28-17 meeting were approved (no corrections).

Proposed revisions to Lecturer Policy

FAC reviewed comments sent via email by Denise Bullock. (In response, FAC proposes a sentence added to the description of Lecturer's responsibilities, and stating explicitly that candidates are sent separate copies of letters at various stages of the dossier review.)

Discussions in Schools, academic units:

There were no questions or comments at the HSS meeting. However, it turns out that some individuals never knew that there is a Lecturer Policy. There is a need for people to learn about the policy. So far in BUSE, there have been no questions or comments; Lee has asked individuals about it, and BUSE will discuss the Lecturer Policy revisions in a future meeting. We need to make sure that people discuss the document for the security of lecturers. Emails to Social Work from Chera have not received responses.

FAC discussed the yellow and red text and highlights on pages one and two; the difference of expectations between lecturers' and senior lecturers' responsibilities. Laverne suggests using some of the general language from the p & t policy about how senior faculty have more service responsibilities than junior faculty. Daron suggests we may not need to change the current language, but could simply add a sentence that says "in exceptional cases, lecturers may be assigned..." to accommodate situations where lecturers have been given more responsibilities.

NSM had a question about the school committee with all senior lecturers, but there was no suggestion.

We moved on to page 11. To clarify that the candidate receives a copy, Laverne suggest striking some of the language, and adding a clause that states the candidate receives a separate copy of the letter. Daron brought up an issue of who actually sends the letter. FAC decided not to specify this in the policy.

We moved on to page 16. All course evaluations are included to help contextualize comments, for example in annual reviews. Someone in NSM commented that student evaluations are not good evidence for evaluation of faculty members' teaching. FAC discussed this as a concern. FAC decided not to propose removing course evaluations from dossiers because something substantial would need to take the place of course evaluations. A lot of time, and a campus-wide effort, would need to be invested in this before such a decision is made.

We moved on to page 18. More than one dean asked why FAC is proposing school criteria for lecturers' service. The response is that this is a long-standing paragraph in the policy, not a revision that FAC is now proposing. NSM and EDUC are working on school criteria for lecturers.

Open meetings DRAFT schedule

FAC members are okay with the draft schedule so far. The draft schedule will be sent to all members.

Possible revisions to P & T Policy

We moved on to page 7 – discussed red comment about membership on school p & t committees. FAC agreed to the proposed addition, which is a clarification to help prevent mishaps such as senior lecturers voting on p & t cases.

We then moved on to page 10, with proposed clarification that separate copies of letters are sent to candidates at various levels of dossier review. FAC agrees to the red additions, and agreed to take out the green additions (about when letters are sent by the chancellor and following the Board of Trustees' vote).

Other

FAC coordinated open meeting times and dates.