COMMITTEE: Faculty Governance Committee

MEETING DATE: March 10, 1999

PERSON PRESIDING: Patricia Anderson

ACTIONS OF MEETING:
Minutes of February 10, 1999 were approved as distributed.

Several concerns of the Unit Code Screening Committee in regard to the Cumulative Review Policy were discussed: the size of the committee; the procedure for review; the fact that new faculty don't have access to this information in a public document and the location of this policy. Information relevant to these concerns will be collected by Killingsworth and Lee. It was clarified that this information will be treated as an attachment to the Code ("attachment" was defined as "not part of the Code") and that it will be housed in the Faculty Senate office.

Item #4 was removed from the agenda since the Governance committee is not presently looking at Appendix D.

No new activity or information was available from VCAA Ringelsen regarding the Faculty Workload Policy.

The subcommittee on revisions to Appendix C had no additional information at this time.

Discussion ensued on possible contradictions in Appendix D in regard to non-tenured faculty members of personnel committees participating in a review of PAD materials. Concerns had been voiced about possible conflict of interests when non-tenured faculty members review other non-tenured faculty members. It was decided to drop this issue for the moment and to reconsider it when we get back to Appendix D.

OTHER BUSINESS
Killingsworth reported several items. One concerned changes in the PAD format. A question had been raised about which format had to be used (the old one or the new one) and about the impact of a change in format on existing procedures. The following process has been arranged and approved by the Chair of the Faculty:

1. When a change in format occurs, the Chair of the Faculty will review it and provide an interpretation.

2. If a new format comes out, the faculty member has the option of using the old Format in the first year. After that, the new format has to be followed.

The second item reported by Killingsworth involved clarification of how to handle disagreement about the cumulative review at the unit level. The procedure is as follows: When there is a disagreement within the unit about a faculty member's evaluation it is forwarded to the Dean who makes a decision. When a faculty member is found to be deficient, it is the unit administrator's job to notify such a faculty member. If a faculty member wants to request reconsideration this request must go to the unit administrator. The faculty member has 20 days to get the
request to the unit administrator. If no action is taken, a
development plan has to be prepared.

A third item reported by Killingsworth involved a question
about the necessity of a first and second reading of changes
in a committee charge. Appendix A, Section XIV,
"Amendments to the Faculty Constitution" states that
amendments must have two readings before the Faculty
Senate and that likewise, changes to the committee charges
should follow the same process of amending their initially
approved charges.

Sexauer presented a new item regarding a possible
Appendix C and D violation in the School of Art. It was
decided to have Killingsworth raise this issue with the Vice
Chancellor and ask him to check it out. After further
investigation this item will be brought back to the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35.

Minutes recorded by Christa Reiser