

Faculty Personnel Policies Council Agenda

Minutes #4

October 16, 2020

Present: Al Colburn, Richard Marcus, Erlyana Erlyana , Rebecca Sittler, David Wallace, Terry Ross, Don Haviland, Jalal Torabzadeh, David Stewart, Kirsty Fleming, Leslie Andersen.

1. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

2. Announcements

3. RTP Policy revision

- discussion about Oct. 8 campus forum and faculty response data
 - No cookie-cutter presumptions (provost, president)
 - Need for president/provost guidance. Is there is a global question for which we will need direction? Views on types of things that could be counted, such as applied research, our values.
 - Our job in FPPC is to try to sift through the ideas that were generated at the forum.
 - New faculty want clear instructions. "Bean counting."
 - Dave. Provost hinting at negotiating with union research vs teaching. Union negotiation needs to be brought in.
 - Engagement and its subheadings – top level, recognizing research on pedagogy and teaching. Consideration of service. How do you create through RTP a university in which service to the university is valued and recognized? Maybe 200 or 300 faculty engaged in service. And, there are those that choose the least difficult committees. Or, some who don't show up but claim it.
 - Richard: Jessica's comments about reinventing the wheel – we are a comprehensive institution and can rethink what RTP means at a comprehensive. Broader top-line thinking about what colleges and departments can include.
 - Al: Support what we can from the data not just what we and senior administrators say.
 - Dave: WordCloud based on long set up suggestions. We need an index.
 - Kirsty: can we pull out specific things?
 - Richard and Don to run the summary RTP docs through NVivo for text analysis and WordCloud.
 - Al to separate out in the existing summary docs those things that are 1) not the job of policy and 2) not the job of the FPPC.

- Kirsty- 1) about diversity and equity and 2) about pandemic. Should policy handle pandemic?
- Jalal: differentiating needs and categories – agree. Special consideration should not be part of policy.
- Dave: Should we put COVID in a special memo for next year? Pandemic Impact Statement
- Rebecca: categories are useful for seeing the comments the areas more clearly. More of what we value more holistically, particularly on equity issues.
- Jalal: equity is not short term so that *does* need to be included.
- Kirsty: We as a group might not know all of the options, or have that expertise. Leslie knows more about open access, consideration about other RSCA elements and how they might count.
- Erly: Defining open period?
- Dave: Since letters might come in – I would seem to argue for open period. Solicited and unsolicited. Kirsty: rules do exist, but it isn't in policy. Putting it in policy might add weight.
- Dave: Not immediately, but may want to bring in nominating committee chairs for senate and FCs, or give us data about the number of volunteers.
- Al: the bigger question may be what counts for service.
- Jalal: Lack of tenure/tt to serve on committees.
- Kirsty: there are forms of service that women and minorities take on that don't count for service. I would argue against quantifying too much. A lot of the time, service is not taken seriously. There is a lot of discussion around RSCA. Some are very thorough on teaching, some focus only on SPOT. The way we evaluate, and where we put our money, makes service unimportant.
- Al: Where does (non-compensated) advising fit?
- Al will divide into 4 "bins" the type of responses. Richard will run text analysis for each "bin".
- preparation for next campus forum

4. Emeritus Policy

- Discussion of 1.0: "...The criteria for employees to be granted emeritus status shall be: (1) retirement from the University, (2) completion of a minimum of ten full-time equivalent years of service at the University, (3) membership in or retreat rights to an academic department or unit, (4) recommendation by the respective department/unit chair or dean, and (5) approval by the President or President's delegate. Emeritus status continues at the prerogative of the President." The question is who makes the decision and what consultation.

- Jalal has looked through what other institutions have done. Is there an eligibility requirement or is everyone included unless they do something “bad.”
- Al: All are eligible as long as they meet the criteria above.
- Jalal: ex from other universities: nomination from chair, dean, or Senate. In some cases it needs support from at least three full professors. All nominations are forwarded to the school dean. The decision of the dean can't be appealed.
- Leslie: concern that a chair or dean review might leave the candidate to politics of the chair or dean.
- Kirsty: it is a recommendation from dean, the president decides.
- Richard: because the previous language says “critiera” then a “recommendation” implies an affirmative. Need qualifying word or clause, then, to make clear that recommendation need not be affirmative and the faculty member is still eligible to be evaluating by the president.
- Don: “Proposed new sentence 1: In recognition of their contributions to the university, all UNIT 3 faculty shall be nominated for....”
- Richard: Non-substantive: I suggest moving this sentence to the end of the paragraph: “Emeritus status continues at the prerogative of the President.”
- Dave: Concern for “disgrace?” Kirsty: you can't hold someone's stance against them just their actions. Eg a White Supremacist can't be held against them, illegal action can be.
- Terry: Concern with “recommendation” language in “Shall be nominated.” I would go back to “eligibility.” Language on “Eligible to be nominated” and “Emeritus status will be granted based upon” worked on.
- Kirsty: what was the motivation for looking at this policy? Al: because there was no criteria. Kirsty: then that letter should be substantive. How else will the president make that decision?
- Consensus that the revised Section 1 now works. No amendments suggested for other sections. Tabled until the next meeting for consideration of passage.

Next scheduled meeting is November 6.