COMMITTEE: Faculty Governance
MEETING DATE: October 13, 2004
PERSON PRESIDING: DeeDee Glascoff
REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Patricia Anderson, DeeDee Glascoff, James Holloway, Edson Justiano, Bob Morrison, and Tinsley Yarbrough,
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Puri Martinez, Catherine Rigsby, James Smith, and Paul Ziga
OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Saaed Dar, Jack Karns, Lori Lee, Boni Boswell, and Beth Velde

ACTIONS OF MEETING
Agenda Item: Approval of Minutes from September 8, 2004
Discussion: none
Action Taken: Minutes were approved without correction or discussion.

Agenda Item: Review of Hearing Committee concerns.
Discussion: Members of the Hearing Committee met with the Faculty Governance Committee to share concerns about the following items:

1. Who is in charge of the process? If faculty members are in charge of the hearing process, they don't always get complete information. If administrators are in charge of the hearing process, they have all the information and sometimes don't share that information with the faculty. How could these two processes be linked and improved?

2. Lack of clarity. In repeated instances, the Faculty Manual is silent on certain issues or unclear. For example, can either “side” call witnesses not named ahead of time? For example, what legal representation is allowed during a hearing for a complainant? As allowed by the Faculty Manual, the complainant can have a faculty advisor present, but can that person be an attorney? If that is not desired or should not be allowed, that decision should be specified and written into the policy in order to ensure fairness and equity. Karns suggested removing attorneys for both sides and suggests that a faculty member would be most likely to need assistance in substantive ways before the actual hearing, as the petition is written. Rigsby and Martinez encouraged the removal of the attorneys in hearings. Boswell suggested that a list of counselors with experience in hearings be compiled and made available to complainants.

3. “Teaching is the first consideration.” This statement from Appendix D, I. B. 2. presents a confusing message when combined with further explanations and statements regarding both promotion and tenure. Is this a necessary condition? Is it required that excellence be documented? Unit codes have their own statements on annual evaluations and weights; are these reflected in the progress toward tenure letters on an annual basis? Is the progress toward tenure letter a cumulative decision/statement? Justiano asked if there were a way for these letters to be better connected to reappointment decisions and removed from annual evaluations. The group agreed that emphasis should be on continuous feedback to the faculty member. Glascoff reminded the group that proposed changes to Appendix D including having the Tenure Committee and Department Chair collaborate to write the progress toward tenure letter in the future. Karns questioned whether it would be advisable to include a “tracking sheet” in the personnel action dossier (PAD) to document who has reviewed the PAD for what purpose.

4. Reviewing the letter. When the Hearing Committee reviews the complainant’s letter with contentions, the committee can limit the contentions to be considered. Can other areas be determined by the committee be considered irrelevant?

5. Timeline concerns. Would “backing up” the due dates at the VCAA office be helpful in ensuring that timelines can allow hearings to occur before the end of the academic year or summer school session?

6. Conduct of hearing. The official conduct of the hearing may vary widely. The Chair of the Committee will develop an official “agenda” which the complainant and respondent will follow.
7. Who’s in charge? A protocol for the days of hearings needs to be established, especially when a hearing takes a lengthy time.

Action Taken: Continuing discussion will occur on these issues. Assigned additional duties to: a subcommittee composed of Edson Justiniano and Beth Velde who will contact other members of the Hearing Committee for further meetings and discussions.

Agenda Item: Division of Labor

Discussion: Chair Glascoff asked everyone on the committee to take on additional areas of focus for upcoming meetings. Using the materials distributed at the last meeting, (refer to the business carried over document), the following assignments of tasks were made to these faculty members:

- PAD, including Part 12 of the Faculty Manual, Edson Justiniano
- Appendix C, I. D., criteria for appointment, Bob Morrison
- Appendix L, Bob Morrison
- Appendix L—Should the Faculty Senate have oversight to the formation of a constitution?—Jim Holloway
- Definition of voting faculty (Attachment #6)—Tricia Anderson
- Part VII, Patents, Jim Holloway
- Appendix A, editorial revisions, Tinsley Yarbrough
- Attachment #9, administrative officers, DeeDee Glascoff
- Commission on Scholarship—Bob Morrison, Catherine Rigsby, and Tricia Anderson
- Item #11—Hearing committee—Edson Justiniano

Members were asked to return to the next meeting prepared to discuss progress on these individual items.

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, October 27, 2004, 3:00 p.m.