

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Minutes

Meeting #7

February 1, 2019

Present: Alan Colburn, David Stewart, Unna Lassiter, Leslie Anderson, Richard Marcus, Don Haviland, Jalal Torabzadeh, Kirsty Flemming

1. Agenda approved unanimously. Minutes approved unanimously with minor correction to typo in the name of Don Haviland.
2. Announcements. None
3. Policy 08-15 Range Elevation for Lecturers
 - a. III. Evaluation Criteria – recommend 6 years (as opposed to mandate?)
Suggested: “The review period shall cover the period since the date of initial appointment or the date of the last range elevation. In either case, if this period is more than six years or more, candidates only need to provide documentation for the most recent six years (they may choose to document additional years)…”
 - b. I.A. Debated adding reference to CBA or the language from CBA. Decision is to refer to CBA. Change: Eligibility rules are governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and supporting documents.
 - c. I.C.a. Notification. Suggested language: “On or before November 1, Faculty Affairs, shall notify those lecturers who may be eligible for range elevation. Every department shall receive a list of eligible lecturers.
 - d. Discussion about keeping list in Section III. Consensus in December 18 was that list was necessary. Suggested adding: “other work to further the mission of the university.”
 - e. Added “Review Period” separate from “Evaluation Criteria”.
 - f. Policy passed unanimously.
4. Discussion about policies the council may edit this semester
 - a. From Kirsty: Diversity statement (from retreat). To explicitly call it a diversity statement. What would that look like? FPPC to start getting input into the diversity statement. It will only be advisory, not policy. (Vote to consider = Yes)
 - b. From Norbert: Emeritus policy. Issues of office space, other benefits. Can it be revoked (an issue of a particular professor). Does FPPC recommend opening the policy to revisit the question of removing emeritus status or making it an honor as a criteria. Consensus view: there is not a reason to open this for one person. It is a right (or at least customary since the president must offer) not an honor, an extension of the professoriate that protects Academic Freedom. Decision not to open. FPPC may consider to open in the future to consider such questions as the degree to which it is a right and/or parameters for awarding so it is not as automatic. (Vote to consider = No)

- c. Teacher Evaluation of Teaching. All classes with a "C" classification. AI: For some classes it doesn't work great, e.g., C6-C21. Begin a process to create a SPOT form for classes in the C6 to C21 designation. Additionally: online SPOT. Kristy: Changes are that students want it online. It is not the content of the form, it is how the data is used. When only one question of ten is usually used. David: Evaluation and formation (formative vs summative assessment); split them. Don: meaningful content differences in terms of course classification. (Vote to consider: Not to take up as policy yet but for AI to represent FPPC in exploring how significant the issue of course classification is for SPOT).