

**Faculty Affairs Committee  
Minutes**

Thursday, September 1, 2022  
10:00 –11:30 AM

**University Advancement Conference Room**

Attending: Mandy Rees (chair), John Deal, Anna Jacobsen, Zach Zenko, Brian Street, Rhonda Dugan, Kristine Holloway, David Gove, Debbie Boschini

**I. Call to order, Welcome Members**

Chair Rees welcomed the new committee members and outlined upcoming committee referrals and activities.

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes**

A. Jacobsen volunteered for this meeting.

J. Deal volunteered for the next meeting.

**III. Announcements**

Conference room is booked for our next meeting (Thursday, September 15, 2022) so for that meeting only we will meet in an alternate room.

**IV. Approval of Agenda**

K. Holloway moved, B. Street second, approved.

**V. New Business**

**1. 2022-23 Referral #04: Scheduling Office Hours Policy**

Reviewed and discussed current handbook language and policy on the scheduling of office hours (303.1.3).

Antelope valley concerns—how do you divide time between the two campuses. Does that need to be clarified? Can a policy be developed on if you can be in-person at one or both campuses? Do AV and main campus faculty need to have in-person office scheduled on both campuses? Does there need to be a specific policy to address different campus assignments?

Office hours are for meetings with colleagues, staff, administration, and students and faculty need to be around and involved in all of those interactions. Online only office hours, even when teaching only online, would prevent and/or reduce some of these functions of office hours.

In-person office hours can also be structured to accommodate online interactions at the same time (you can Zoom from your office). In-person does not mean that you are not available virtually.

If you are not holding office hours in person, should you lose access to an assigned physical office?

Perhaps a portion of office hours could be structured to match course modalities?  
Is there fairness across schools and departments? Should the policy be structured to take away the option for flexibility to ensure that everyone is meeting the same requirements?

Who are office hours “for”? Students only? Faculty colleagues, staff, administration, others? Does this need to be altered or further clarified?

The policy, as it is, seems like it adequately addresses many of the potential issues. This is an important policy that is used to compel faculty to come to work and campus. Issues that are being raised about this policy are coming from colleagues who moved away and/or don’t want to engage fully with the university community.

If your course is virtual, you should be virtually available to your students, but that can happen from your office.

Office hours are part of our diverse professional responsibilities to be part of campus life (CBA Article 20.1.b).

There is a process for receiving approval for medical and family accommodations and that is important in documenting policy and accommodations. It is important that this is documented.

Committee consensus is that the current policy is appropriate as it is. The issue was carefully discussed and considered. No changes are needed at this time.

## **2. 2021-22 Referral #27: Composition of Search and Screening Committees - Handbook Change**

Reviewed catalog language in University Handbook Section **309.5.A.** with tracked changes below for our initial thoughts on the handbook language. The committee wanted to ensure appropriate faculty representation on these search committees and to make sure that AV and library faculty were well-represented and included:

For university-wide positions: five full-time tenured faculty members one from each school and one at-large (drawn from the General Faculty including librarians, counselors, and coaches). For individual school deans, Library or Antelope Valley Dean positions: four full-time tenured faculty members drawn from and elected by the affected-relevant school constituency. For library and Antelope Valley dean positions: four full-time tenured faculty members, one from each school, and one faculty member drawn from and elected from the affected constituency (i.e., a librarian for the library dean position and a current Antelope Valley faculty member for the Antelope Valley dean position).

Second issue: does a committee need to be reconstituted if a search fails or if it continues for longer than an academic year, longer than 18 months, or some other length of time?

This seems to be addressed in **309.6.n.** indicated that the “search process shall begin anew” if the search doesn’t result in a successful candidate being identified.

Recommended handbook edit:

“If consultation between the committee, the appointing officer, and president, determines the search to be unsuccessful, the search process shall begin anew.”

Do we need to further interpret this or is this pretty clear? Does this section language need to be modified? What about when a search is unsuccessful but no offer is made?

Should a “slow” committee be able to continue if the search hasn’t yet actually been unsuccessful?

Searches may take differing amounts of time and time limits may be difficult to unilaterally apply across different searches and positions.

**VI. Adjourned at 11:39 am.**