

**Faculty Affairs Committee  
Minutes**

Thursday, October 27, 2022  
10:00 –11:30 AM

Attending: Mandy Rees (chair), John Deal, Anna Jacobsen, Rhonda Dugan, Kristine Holloway, Debbie Boschini

Not in attendance: Zach Zenko, Brian Street, David Gove

**I. Call to order**

**II. Volunteer to Take Minutes**

Anna will take minutes this meeting. Rhonda volunteers for the next meeting.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Rhonda first, Kristine second. Minutes approved.

**IV. Approval of Agenda**

Rhonda first, John second. Agenda approved.

**V. Old Business**

**2021-22 Referral #02: Department Formation Criteria Revision**

Discussed at the recent Academic Senate meeting

Minimum number of faculty will remain at three, but with the clarification that faculty may be jointly listed or formally affiliated.

Other change was at the end regarding the process when the proposal does not pass a certain level of review.

Does the proposal process need to require that a potential pool of faculty to serve on RTP/PTR committees be included? We discussed several options and scenarios for this. Committee fine with this being required (if wanted by others on the senate) or not included. We don't have a position on this issue.

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

The AVP FA is working to get example language for lecturer review from other campuses. This effort is continuing, but information will likely not be available within the timeframe needed to make changes for the review cycle for this academic year.

Can we get examples of language on what constitutes a cumulative review? Are there small changes that we need to make ASAP while larger handbook changes and restructuring can be delayed?

Information distributed to chairs could be able to fill the gap in on knowledge for how the process will/should work. Guidance can be given immediately, and this can carry use through to next year while we work on this issue.

Content list (appendix) for the lecturer file is something that we can continue to work on and develop as well.

## **VI. New Business**

### **2021-22 Referral #39: The Personnel Action File (PAF) and the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) - Handbook Change**

The PAF resides in each dean's office by school. The WPAF is the set of documents that the faculty member compiles and submits for review (currently submitted through Box).

Where do files for AV faculty reside? They reside with their discipline-based dean.

Who must sign the PAF during review? This isn't currently stipulated within the handbook. Access to the WPAF is recorded through the access log. For the PAF (in the dean's office), practice differs from no one viewing this as part of the PTR/RTP/PEF process, the whole committee reviews and signs in, or only the committee chair views and signs it.

The CBA indicates that the WPAF and PAF are both part of the review process, so are both required to be reviewed? This should be clarified in the handbook if review of both files is required.

When items are added to the PAF, a faculty member is notified of additions to their PAF. Reprimands can be requested to be removed after three years.

Suggestion: We could add to the handbook a statement that any unit committee member may review the PAF during the unit review. This is optional except in the case that a faculty member returns an incomplete WPAF or fails to submit a WPAF, in which case the PAF must be reviewed.

Counter suggestion: The CBA suggests that the "file" under review includes both the WPAF and the PAF and both should be reviewed as part of the unit review process. This should include a minimum of viewing by at least the chair of the unit committee.

If the PAF must be reviewed, does this need to be the whole committee or only the committee chair? Or only a member of the committee as a representative of the committee? The PAF is still a hard copy file and would preclude an entirely electronic review process and file at the current time. The timeline for digitizing PAF is delayed and will still be several years.

There is a separate referral on electronic files, but there are several issues regarding security and confidentiality associated with electronic files.

Not all PAF are accurate and faculty have little curation ability for some of these materials.

**Article 15.9 CBA** includes language on the relationship between the WPAF and the PAF. The index from your WPAF is supposed to be added to the PAF.

Agreement that reviewing and signing of the PAF should be added to the handbook to clarify the process. This could be added to section 305.6.3 in the University Handbook. First draft of suggested handbook language was developed.

**Article 15.12 CBA** indicates that personnel recommendations shall be based on material from the PAF (and the WPAF, which becomes part of the PAF).

Potential handbook changes (bold underlined newly recommended text):

**305.6.3 Evaluation and Recommendation by the Unit Committee**

*While faculty and students may contribute to the deliberations concerning a faculty, only unit RTP committee members shall participate in forming the written performance evaluation and recommendation.*

- a. *The views expressed by individual members of the unit RTP committee during the committee's deliberations shall be confidential.*
- b. *The unit RTP committee shall prepare a written evaluation and recommendation based ~~primarily~~ on information in the RTP file, **which includes information from both the WPAF (submitted by the faculty under review) and the PAF (maintained by and located in the respective dean's office). All unit committee members must review the contents of the WPAF and sign the WPAF access sheet. At least one unit committee member must review the contents of the PAF and sign the PAF access sheet.***
- c. *The evaluation and recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee. An abstention shall count as a negative vote. ~~e.~~ All committee members shall sign the unit RTP committee evaluation and recommendation. Any member of the unit committee may submit a minority report. If any minority reports are submitted, a cover sheet signed by all committee members shall be included to indicate that they have reviewed the minority report(s).*
- d. *The RTP file, including evaluations and recommendations from the unit committee and from the unit chair (if provided), shall be forwarded to the dean.*

**2021-22 Referral #40: Digitizing the Performance Review Process**

Access for the URC to the PAF? Did the URC ask for this? They usually review for process and not the detailed content of the file.

Digitizing of the PAF, which is currently housed in the dean's office as a hard copy file. But do contract and some other personnel items need to be kept hidden from those viewing the PAF?

FAC Chair will ask for additional guidance on where this referral originates.

What is the underlying issue that we are needing to address?

**VII. Adjourn**