

COMMITTEE: Faculty Governance Committee

MEETING DATE: February 15, 2012

PERSON PRESIDING: George Bailey

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: George Bailey, Mark Taggart, Catherine Rigsby, Charles Boklage, Edson Justiniano, Gene Hughes

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Marianna Walker, Mark Sprague

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lori Lee, Puri Martinez, Linda Ingalls, Donna Payne

ACTIONS OF MEETING

Agenda Item: Approval of the minutes from the February 8, 2012 meeting

Action Taken: minutes approved

Agenda Item: revisions to the workload policy

Discussion: Dr. Walker presented the revisions. Is the scope too narrow? Should we adhere to the language used in the PRRS? How to address reductions in course loads was discussed. Define "workload" as described in the PRR and refer to "reassigned time" with "course reduction." Make terminology consistent between the PRRs and the draft. State how workloads are determined at the university, college and departmental level.

Action Taken: Dr. Walker will revise the draft, reordering the paragraphs, and will send the revisions to the committee.

Agenda Item: Administrator surveys for spring, 2012 to go online.

Action Taken: approved

Agenda Item: Appendix D; issue with external reviewers. Proposed language:

~~"If, prior to August 1 of the summer during which a candidate's material is under review, someone who has agreed to conduct a review withdraws or it otherwise becomes known that an agreed-upon review will not be forthcoming, the Tenure Committee will attempt to engage an additional reviewer from their prioritized list (or will first add to the list if necessary.) to ensure that the candidate receives a minimum of three external reviews at least one of which is from a reviewer selected by the candidate. When fewer than three external reviews are received by the deadline set in the letter to the external reviewers that accompanied the candidate's materials, this information, by memorandum from the unit administrator, shall be made a part of the candidate's PAD. If an external review arrives after the deadline but before the Tenure or Promotion committee has met to deliberate and vote, the review shall be included in the candidate's PAD."~~

Discussion: Alternate wording was discussed. Add "in an effort" prior "to ensure." Above language with strikethrough has been removed. Proposed adding "the candidate may request an extension of the deadline."

Action Taken: approved.

Agenda Item: Appendix D -

There is disagreement about which subjects can be discussed by the committee when deliberating on a candidate. Time is being spent in committee meetings arguing about this. Sometimes it is accepted that the committee can only talk about what is *literally* in the PAD – excluding things referenced by materials in the PAD, for example. Other faculty say that they can introduce any information they want, as long as it relates to teaching, scholarship, or service (etc.). If this matters, we can say:

“Only such matters and materials as are contained in, or directly or indirectly referenced by materials contained in a candidate’s PAD shall be discussed by the appropriate committee or shall serve as the basis for an action by the committee.”

After much discussion, two issues were distinguished. (1) Should the contents of the personnel file be placed in a PAD for a reappointment, Tenure, or promotion review by the appropriate committee (and should they be added for progress towards tenure evaluation). (2) Should the appropriate committee’s discussion be limited to what is in the PAD and what is directly or indirectly referenced by what is in the PAD? Or, would the discussion only be limited to excluding what Federal law prohibits as a reason for a recommendation?

To begin addressing the first issue, this motion was made:

The Faculty Chair will ask the chancellor if he will issue a ruling that unit administrators will ensure that a copy of all information in a candidate’s personnel file is included in the candidate’s PAD (exclusive of anything that state law prohibits disclosing, if anything).

The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

NEXT MEETING: February 22, 2012