

Commission on Faculty Affairs

October 26, 2018

10:30 – 12:00 Noon

130 E Burruss Hall

In Attendance: B. Hicok, J. Finney, M. Abbas, R. Sebek, M. Agah, J. Spotila, J. Ogorzalek (for GSA), R. Blythe, J. Hawdon, M. Paretti, M. McGrath

Absent: Z. Mackey, L. Brogdon, G. Daniel, T. Schenk

Guests: M. Lewis, E. Plummer

1. Approval of agenda **B. Hicok**

Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m.

2. Approval of October 12, 2018 minutes **B. Hicok**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Continue the initial read-through of P & T revision **B. Hicok**

B. Hicok continued with the reading of the P&T revision document. M. Paretti noted that the word “written” should be taken out of section 3.4.4.3.2 when referring to how a vote must take place. This allows for secret voting without it being written (e.g., Qualtrics).

In section 3.4.4.3.3, should the president have to refer to expectations document, as well? M. Paretti asked whether their needs to be a time component in section 3.4.4.4, which indicated a point for future discussion. M. Agah asked whether there is an effect on administration based on who wrote recommendations, as outlined in section 3.4.4.4.

M. Paretti noted that in section 3.4.5, the passage referring to appealing a P&T decision should be based on university calendar days, as opposed to “calendar days” due to holidays. It was noted that once an ombudsman office is launched, there may be changes to the last paragraph in section 3.4.5 referring to “seeking advice.”

M. Paretto asked why, in section 3.4.5.2, there is a specific reference to appealing “orally” (can this be in writing or orally?). Additionally, can the word “may” be replaced with “the right to.”

In section 3.4.5.2., notes that there is no appeal at the department-level. B. Hicok and M. Agah questioned whether this is appropriate. Should there be an appeal process at the department-level?

In section 3.4.5.2, there is reference to the dean forming an ad hoc committee at the college-level. M. Agah, M. McGrath, and others asked whether this is appropriate. Should this be in consultation with the provost office or the candidate? Or, should oversight here be assigned to the provost office?

The committee discussed the specifics of appeals and the differences between a rebuttal and an appeal in the P&T process. M. Paretto and M. McGrath initiated questions regarding the wording differences between a rebuttal (which doesn’t exist) and an appeal (which is based on improprieties during the P&T process). M. Agah initiated a discussion on whether there should be an additional page added to the faculty’s dossier after the department’s decision (whether yes or no).

4. Possible topics for Employee Benefits Committee to take up this year **T. Schenk**

T. Schenk was not present for this agenda item. Thus, it was not addressed.

5. November meetings **B. Hicok**

B. Hicok noted that the November meetings will be in 330 Burruss Hall.

6. Other business **B. Hicok**

No other business was presented.

7. Adjourn **B. Hicok**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

