FAC Minutes for 9/21/2023

CMTE approves minutes for 9/7/23

No Announcements

Agenda Approved

OLD Business (new referral numbers)

2023-24 Referral #10:

FAC will put together a formal recommendation.

**Discussion**:

Fundamentally the selection of standing committee chairs. Problem - the process is usually the last issue during AS. Process doesn’t allow for anyone outside of the room or list to participate in the process. Do standing comte chairs have to have experience on the senate & if the senate is trying to make the decision in the 2nd half of the last meeting of the year, if the noms occurred prior to that with their statement of interest or noms could be done at a prior meeting the whole process starts from the new senate that only attends part 2 of that meeting, ie lack of formal procedure of nomination process.

What qualifications are required or desired of the Standing CMTE Chair?

**Suggestion:**

If we knew the qualifications, then a pool of names could be available ahead of time. senate office could send out call for nominations of standing CMTE Chairs from eligible people (already elected members senate) already identified, and the list could be emailed.

Do you want the candidate to have a written statement in advance?

**Suggestion:**

Positions are not competitive, what is the value of putting up more hurdles, e.g. interests and experience, having new people is appreciated. What is the issue that needs to precisely be fixed. Statement of interest would be useful for all of the senators, not just CMTE chairs. Re eligibility based on experience - 1 year is fine, 2 years already implies one terms some members may want to only serve a single term. What happens when someone is (Standing committee chair) SCC has zero senate experience, results in a tough year in terms of errors, minutes not taken, resolutions not being taken up or resolved, increase in workload. “One year of experience strongly preferred” would be a good guideline to have in bylaws. One year of experience on that certain committee. Statement of interest is helpful bc it happens after elections but before final meeting. Put together a referral for a reasonable timeline to put out a call for recommendations, e.g. no fewer than two days before that meeting. You have to be a senate member to be a chair. FAC CMTE members agree to draft a recommendation to AS.

Referral #03: Sixth-year Lecturer Review Handbook Change

**Discussion**:

Sixth year requires a cumulative evaluation - this threw lecturers off in terms of documentation materials. Is super important, if the review is favorable, you’re entitled to teach that number of WTUs or more and classified as a full-time for the next three years. Consecutively, what you teach in the 3rd year following that, then you’re entitled to teach that many WTUs or more. (Once you get through 6 years it’s reviewed every 3 years) Entitlement is contingent upon positive review and enrollment. If candidate hasn’t been doing a good job and review is poor, a candidate that performs well might get contract with entitlements to WTUs and full-time. Not allowable that if the review is so negative, they don’t get entitlement, they should be separated from employment. Handbook has groups in which the language is confusing, it’s impossible to follow. This section should be rewritten, the 6th year review is embedded in this section with PTR. The issue is not so much that “cumulative” isn’t clear, but that it was not communicated by department chairs. Handbook and CBA needs to be made clear by department chair. Lecturer Representative should be reminding candidates of the cumulative sixth year review. This is based on department workload. FAC CMTE members suggest creating a table that determines who gets reviewed, etc to address issue of those lecturers that continue onto entitlement and contract renewal without ever getting reviewed. Revisions need to be made to sections 306.1 and onward of the handbook, specifically as it applies to the different groups mentioned in the handbook. FAC CMTE member suggests that every member review the issues with the goal in mind of rewriting the handbook. Summary: FAC CMTE working on last bullet point of the referral, meaning that we’ll be working on clarifying the language in the handbook.

Referral #12: Three-Year Lecturers and PTR Committee - Handbook change

**Discussion**:

Issues in the PTR (Post-Tenure Review) section

-who can serve? Becomes problematic when there’s not enough faculty to serve bc the language in the handbook states that if you’re undergoing PTR, you cannot serve on someone else’s PTR cmte.

If not enough people to serve, what does the process look like to get an outside cmte member? Review cmtes should not be by invitation. Include language in the PTR section of handbook that there are recommendations what to do if there are less than 3 eligible cmte members. It should be the same for RTP as it is in PTR. There should also be language for instances when a candidate would like 4th cmte member. Suggestion that the language be clarified in section F to replace “...or more” with a subclause that states “to fill the vacant spots to fill the total number seats up to three.” Augmentation needs to be clarified so that the requesting of a fourth member is an actual right and not an option. Language should be clarified in having an external cmte member in the handbook. In re faculty who avoid serving on PTR or RTP, language in handbook does not state anything about refusing to be nominated for a PTR cmte. FAC CMTE concludes there is not a need for procedure when recommendations outside of the problem. FAC CMTE concludes a member will review the handbook and make recommendations for clean up of issues re augmentation and filling in seats when there are not enough faculty to make a PTR cmte of 3 within the department.

**New business item:**

Option to Retreat Policy, CMTE Chair decides it will be put on the agenda for the next FAC meeting.