

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes**

Thursday, September 15, 2022
10:00 –11:30 AM

Administration 101 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

Call to order at 10:03.

II. Approval of Minutes and Volunteer to Take Minutes for Current Meeting

Minutes from 9/1/2022 meeting approved (B. Street moved, R. Dugan seconded)

J. Deal volunteered to take minutes for current meeting.

III. Announcements

The FAC chair presented the FAC position not to make changes in section 303.1.3 of the handbook with reference to the scheduling of office hours to the Executive Committee. The Chair was informed that members of the CFA expressed concerns that the current policy limited flexibility even though department chairs and deans could approve exceptions. In particular, the CFA members expressed concerns over the safety of minority faculty during office hours. Some concerns were also raised as to the reason that virtual classes should require in-person office hours. As a result, the position of the FAC on the scheduling of office hours was not forwarded to the Academic Senate. FAC was encouraged to revisit the issue (Referral # 04).

FAC discussed the issues raised by the CFA. The Committee agreed that the safety of faculty was an extremely important issue, but that it should be addressed as a separate issue from the office hour policy. Committee members raised the issue of lack of office space for part-time lecturers. Where could they hold office hours? Many committee members felt that office hours should be held in person, though some accommodations should be made for students who needed to have access to virtual office hours. Those members argued that office hours requiring faculty to come to campus were intended for more than student contact, such as interaction with colleagues.

CFA had not finished their discussion on office hours, and FAC will be open to hear their concerns.

IV. Approval of Agenda

A. Jacobsen, moved, Z.Zenko seconded, approved.

VI. Old Business

1. 2021-22 Referral #27: Composition of Search and Screening Committees - Handbook Change

FAC continued previous discussion on how you would define a “failed” search and should a new search committee be reconstituted? A number of questions were raised in the discussion. Should the committee continue after the academic year if an offer has not been accepted? Does the search fail if an offer has not been accepted? Does a failed search designation depend on the reason that a candidate was not hired? If the search committee extends into the following academic year, should candidates from the previous year be included in pool for following year (e.g., should a scheduled Zoom interviewee in one year be guaranteed an interview in following year?). In this context, it was pointed out that the failure to include some previous candidates could generate legal liability issues.

The committee seemed to agree that the decision to designate a search to be failed should be determined by the search committee, the appointing officer, and the President. It was pointed out that the final determination would not be made by the search committee, though the decision should be made in consultation.

The resolution was amended with the following language: If, **after consultation between** the committee, ~~in consultation with~~ the appointing officer and President, **it is determined that the search is unsuccessful or needs to be extended** ~~there are no further acceptable candidates, the search process shall begin anew~~ **a new search committee is to be formed.**

In addition, earlier in the resolution, a job title was updated (from “Associate Vice President for Academic Programs/Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies” to “Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs, all Academic Deans.”)

VII. New Business

1. 2021-22 Referral #02: Department Formation Criteria Revision

The Committee continued the discussion of the following two issues – faculty composition requirements to form a department and the procedure to review the department creation proposal. Committee members discussed the need to have some formal commitment from tenured faculty members not formally housed in the department to undertake duties for the department, such as acting as RTP or PRT reviewers. It was suggested that a formal MOU could be developed to outline the “affiliated” or “jointly-appointed” faculty member duties.

The committee discussed the proposal to eliminate Section III.B. from the procedures for the Establishment of a New Academic Department requiring the department formation proposal to be reviewed from the beginning if any level failed to grant approval. Some members suggested that any changes that occurred after the proposal was forwarded by one level that failed to meet the approval of that level could be addressed through a memo to the Academic Senate. It was also pointed out that the President has final approval, and the process stops with her decision; therefore, it is not appropriate to request her comments or recommendations to revisit the proposal.

Recommended changes to document:

II. B. Faculty Composition

1. a. New departments are required to have a minimum of three tenured faculty assigned to their unit (whether through appointment, joint appointment, or Memo Of Understanding) in order to document that they will be able to fully carry out the hiring and performance review duties of the department.

III. B. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, the proposal shall not proceed to the next level of review. In this case, the proposers may choose to revise and resubmit to the level which did not give approval. Any revisions of a proposal shall be forwarded to previous levels of review; these levels have the option of sending a memo to the Academic Senate with comments on the revisions.

2. 2021-22 Referral #41: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - Handbook Change

Question raised as to the inconsistency of practice across campus for the sixth-year lecturer review. Currently the requirements are being determined by the departments and schools. The CBA requires that “periodic evaluation shall consider the faculty unit employee’s cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period for the three-year appointment”. Committee concluded that the requirements should be communicated to department chairs before the six-year review process took place. The Committee discussed the time required for non-tenure track faculty to write personal statements for review. The handbook states that personal statements are optional.

The Committee will continue discussion on this topic and look at clarifying the requirements for lecturers in the handbook.

VIII. Adjourned at 11:32 am.