Unit Code Screening Committee

Meeting #4, November 17, 1998, held in Rawl 206, 3-5:10 pm

Agenda Item I. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of the previous meeting were approved without amendment.

Agenda Item II. Report on Rulings from the Faculty Governance Committee:
Prof. Grossnickle reported the following rulings:
1. App. L does not apply to Assoc. and Asst. Deans, or Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies
2. Units may deviate from the minimum relative weight of 10% for teaching, research, and service under special circumstances with approval from the appropriate vice chancellor.
3. If the Personnel Committee is a standing committee, its membership must be specified in the unit code.
4. Criteria for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty will become an addendum to unit codes, and policies concerning this subject will become App. B of the FM. The Unit Code Screening committee was asked to set a timetable for receipt of Cumulative Review Policies from units and to report on compliance.

There was considerable discussion of this issue, including that the approval process for unit codes may differ from that of (and thus violate) policy on Cumulative Review. In particular was concern that policies developed by departments of professional schools would be subject to a vote of the tenured faculty of the entire unit under a code amendment, though the requirements under the Cumulative Review policy provide only for agreement between the unit head and the tenured faculty of the departments. There was also question of what was meant by "addendum" since items are either part of the unit code or not. The Governance Committee was asked to consider these matters and provide clarification before the committee accepted its charge.

Agenda Item III. Department of Political Science Code:
Global: The next revision should be submitted with 1) a cover letter signed by the chair of the unit code committee indicating that the code was amended in accordance with the amendment procedure of the old code and was approved by at least a majority of the tenured faculty; and 2) a signature page as per the committee's Guidelines for Writing and Revising a Unit Code of Operations.

Typos: p.10 l. 482 capitalize "Assembly"; p.11 l.549 specify "faculty" senate.

The committee had the following specific suggestions for changes:

p.1 11.7-11 This appears to be an old form of the preamble. The updated version is contained in the Guidelines.
11.36ff Move the definition of voting faculty to this section or cross-reference for clarity. There was discussion that much of the department's business, including the nomination of most directors is done by the "General Faculty" which seems to be the same as the voting faculty
with the addition of fixed-term faculty. It seemed odd to
some that these tasks were not performed by the "Voting"
faculty, and there was question as to whether the distinction
of membership between the General faculty and the Voting
faculty and the reasons for it were clear to the dept. If so,
the committee had no further recommendation.

p.2 1.62ff To the duties of the Chairperson should be
added provisions contained in FM App. L-4 C.3.g-h and a
responsibility to "ensure that code procedures are followed".
Though there is some language pertaining to budget in 11.79-
81, there is no provision for faculty to indicate their approval
of the annual budget request, and there is no mention of the
other items contained in these portions of L. These items
may be found on the Committees "Check List" which is part
of the Guidelines.

1.87 Criteria for the evaluation of fixed-term faculty
are contained in App. D-4 II.B.2; change "Appendix C" to
"Appendices C and D".

1.89 Delete ", and the Appendix to this Code".

p.4 1.207 Clarify "report" to "assign"?
p.6 1.263 Change "Personnel Action Committees" to
lower case?

11.272, 294 Since on both of these committees, it is
theoretically possible for a situation to arise in which
untenured faculty might exceed the 1/3 proportion of the
membership allowed by App. D, it might be advisable to
clarify "defined in" to "limited by" and suggest what method
of determining membership will be followed in the event of
too many untenured potential members.

p.7 1.327 NASPAA should be spelled out the first time it
is mentioned and the phrase "as defined by the NASPAA
Guidelines" is perhaps best moved up front to p.1 1.48.

1.329 "ex officio" members ordinarily have a vote
under Robert's Rules, is that your intention? How will the
rep. of the graduate student body be chosen?

11.342-50 The committee's preference would be to
delete this section, but it was made clear that to do so would
cost the department its accreditation. The central concern
of the committee amounted to this: that faculty denied
reappointment, tenure or promotion on the basis of the MPA
committee's recommendation would have grounds for a
grievance. The FM does not provide for a body other than
personnel action committees to make recommendations that
may be used in personnel actions, even of an advisory
nature. Evaluation of candidates is to be based on
materials contained in the P.A.D. and is to be performed by
bodies authorized by the FM. There was mention of a ruling
that administrators may seek any advice they choose, but a
vote of a standing committee such as this would constitute a
"formal process of evaluation" (The pertinent sections are
App. D-9 IV.F.2.h-i on what materials may go in the P.A.D.,
and App. C-6 VI on what materials may go in the Personnel
File). It was suggested that the department read the fine
print of the NASPAA guidelines to find another solution, or
consider asking for approval for two sets of personnel action
committees for the department (a suggestion with which
some on the committee were uncomfortable), or seek the
advice of the Governance committee for some sort of
exception.
p.8 11.396-97 If language pertaining to Cumulative Review is included here, the criteria should be given in the code.

11.405-7 Language pertaining to relative weights should be deleted since these apply only to annual evaluation. At least rudimentary criteria for each level of professional advancement should be developed by the department as per App. L-4 C.3.e.

1.414 Change "is expected to prepare" to "prepares".

p.9 1.425 It may be best to specify, concerning "normally" that deviations below 10% for teaching, research or service will require approval of the VCAA.

11.451, 455-56 Include "mandatory peer evaluations of probationary faculty", perhaps in place of "peer comments", and perhaps distinguish this from voluntary peer evaluation (alluded to in the last sentence) that may be elected by other faculty.

1.461 Delete "attempt to". At some point in the code, perhaps on p.10 after "Voting" there should be inserted provisions for Evaluation of Unit, Unit Administrator(s) and University Administrators, items found in App. L-5 E, F, and G and in Section VI of the Committees Guidelines.

p.10 1.487 "member of" or "service to"? what exactly is meant here?

The committee set its next meeting for Tuesday, December 1st. to consider the School of Music code.