

## **Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **Minutes**

Thursday, March 9, 2023

10:00 –11:30 AM

### **Humanities Office Building Conference Room**

In attendance: Mandy Rees, John Deal, Anna Jacobson, David Gove, Rhonda Dugan, Brian Street, Zach Zenko, Kristine Holloway, Debbie Boschini

**I. Call to order:**

**II. Meet with WSCUC Team (10-10:45)**

**III. Volunteer to Take Minutes:**

Rhonda taking minutes

**IV. Approval of Minutes:**

Brian moved, Anna seconded. Minutes approved after meeting ended with WSCUC (10:50AM)

**V. Announcements**

No announcements

**VI. Approval of Agenda—with new item, referral #12**

Kristine moved, John seconded. Agenda approved.

**VII. Old Business**

**1. 2022-23 Referral #20: RTP Review Calendar Timeline**

- Question raised about review calendar/timeline, specifically on how it will affect those who serve on committees. The potential effects will depend upon the review cycle, which had been organized by quarter, but now organized by semester.
- It is a good time to be more specific on what constitutes a cycle. The Q2S made the timeline process “muddy.” It is important to avoid conflict of interest between a faculty member under review when said faculty member also serves on a review committee with a colleague who reviewed them.
- If the Post Tenure Review (PTR) process ends with the Dean’s review, then the person under PTR can serve in Spring semester and the conflict of interest is resolved. However, a person going up for promotion, their file is under review for both semesters, and they should not serve on any review cycle.
- When can PTR faculty member serve?
- A PTR reviewer cannot serve on another PTR?
- Using “academic year” rather using “cycle” will provide consistency and clarity.

- There will not be a conflict of interest. Do we need to use the term “cycle” anymore? Or do we need to define what a cycle means now? There needs to be clarity.
- Section 305.4.1, G—the Handbook language states “undergoing review” but does not specify which type of review.
- Section 305.6.1 J states that PTR faculty can serve unless requesting promotion.
- Can we create language that captures a conflict of interest without creating more [conflict of interest]?
- If a faculty member is going up for promotion, can they review lecturers? There may be a feeling of vulnerability for the person under review, that they may feel under pressure serving on the lecturer review committee if other lecturer reviewers also served on their review committee.
- The Unit review is completed by the time in the calendar to review lecturers.
- Using “academic year” may be better; what if someone wants to make a rebuttal if going up for a promotion? Using “academic year” addresses a variety of cases/situations.
- Since there is no decision made with PTR, it is not necessarily a conflict of interest
- There is a period of active engagement during the rebuttal. If a faculty member is under review for promotion, they do not participate. The word “cycle” is part of the problem; either remove word “cycle” or provide a conceptual definition of what cycle means in the Handbook language.
- Keep “j” [of Section 305.6.1] as currently written in order to maintain internal consistency [of the Handbook]
- Lecturers under review during the fall would eliminate someone under PTR/PTR promotion.
- We have to make sure that changes are made across the entire Handbook.
- Add the word “NOT” to letter “j” [of Section 305.6.1]

## **VIII. New Business**

### **3. 2021-22 Referral #23: Faculty Hall of Fame Selection Process Change**

- Took language from Emeritus and added to draft. Suggested new title change from previous meeting. Added the word “career” and added language from previous meetings.
- Minor suggestion for title change: “Faculty Retired or Separated from the University”
- Combine 308.2.1b with 308.2.1 to make one section. Capitalized “E” for emeritus.
- 308.2.5—Faculty Hall of Fame language. Revise language for criteria: “Retired, separated from the University, or deceased faculty can be considered.”
- State “significant contribution” rather than “significant, lasting contribution.”

- When notices are sent out, observed there is no language regarding self-nominations for Emeritus. The Hall of Fame and Faculty Awards both have language that states no self-nominations. Suggests making change now.
  - Maybe consider self-nominations, as a faculty member asking their colleague to nominate them may be awkward.
  - New language under Faculty Hall of Fame Nominations. Section for “In all instances....” Do we need the department to weigh in on the nomination?
  - At 11:30AM, propose an additional five (5) minutes for meeting. (Approved)
  - Department involvement may be a different issue and maybe consider all awards rather than just the Faculty Hall of Fame award. It may be nice to do this in the Fall, possibly October, so as not to compete with numerous awards for Spring.
  - Leave sufficient time for Feb 28 and then have nominations due in Fall semester.
4. 2021-22 Referral #40: Digitizing the Performance Review Process
  5. 2021-22 Referral #41: Sixth-year Lecturer Review - Handbook Change
  6. 2022-23 Referral #02: Academic Integrity Campaign- Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility- ON HOLD
  7. 2022-23 Referral #03: Holding Exams on Last Day of Class
  8. 2022-23 Referral #16: GST Instructor Classroom Observations
  9. 2022-23 Referral #22: General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) Review and Appointments
  10. 2022-23 Referral #23: Effect of Sabbatical on Assigned Time and Release Time
  11. 2022-23 Referral #24: Academic Support & Student Services Membership— Bylaws Change

## **IX. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 11:35AM