

Officers:

Sabrina Hom, Chair

Frank Richardson, Vice-Chair

Stephanie Jett, Secretary

Committee Charge:

V.Section2.C.3.a Membership. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall have no fewer than eleven (11) and no more than thirteen (13) members distributed as follows: no fewer than nine (9) and no more than eleven (11) members selected from the Corps of Instruction faculty, at least seven (7) of whom are elected faculty senators, one (1) member who is the Chief Academic Officer or an individual appointed by the Chief Academic Officer to serve as a designee in compliance with V.Section2.C, and one (1) member appointed by the University President in compliance with II.Section1.A.5.

V.Section2.C.3.b Scope. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall review and recommend for or against policy relating to faculty welfare (e.g. authorities, responsibilities, rights, recognitions, privileges, and opportunities), which includes, but is not limited to, policies relating to academic freedom, workload, compensation, recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, recognitions, development, and instructional support. This committee also provides advice, as appropriate, on procedural matters that affect the welfare of the faculty.

Committee Calendar:

8/8, 9/2, 10/7, 11/4, 1/6, 2/10, 3/3 (joint meeting with RPIPC), 4/14

Executive Summary:

The committee worked with ECUS and the office of the Provost to fill a gap in GC policy and allow faculty to pause the clock for a Post-Tenure Review (PTR). While BOR guidance allows for such a policy, GC did not have a means for faculty with extenuating circumstances to pause the PTR Process. While the committee initially hoped to permit faculty with a wider range of circumstances to pause the clock with documentation (ie we discussed those who had a FMLA qualifying event but did not take formal leave; those with other personal circumstances, like a house fire or a divorce) the Provost's office pointed out that an overly broad policy could be perceived to weaken the rigor of the PTR process itself. As a result, the committee withdrew its original suggestion and reformulated, resulting in the policy passed on 4/14, which allows clock stoppages only for those who have taken FMLA leave. In drafting this policy, the committee prioritized confidentiality for the PTR candidate (stressing in the policy language that it is not necessary to disclose the reason for FMLA leave) and worked to maximize the time period in which a candidate can apply for a clock stoppage.

The committee also discussed the ongoing process to update Departmental and College policies on T&P and annual evaluations, in light of the BOR's revisions to PTR and other evaluation policies.

The committee was informed of a revision to the Amorous Relationship Policy and engaged with Human Resources to understand the policy and discuss interpretation/implementation. A number of questions and inconsistencies emerged in this conversation, which were discussed and largely resolved in subsequent meetings.

**AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR:
 “P” denotes Present, “A” denotes Absent, “R” denotes Regrets**

Meeting Dates	8/8	9/2	10/7	11/4	1/6	2/10	3/3†	4/14	
Sabrina Hom (chair)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	
Stephanie Jett (secretary)	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	R	
Frank Richardson (vice chair)	P	P	A	P	P	P	A	P	
Christopher Clark	P	P	R	P	P	R	P	P	
Matt Milnes	P	P	P	R	P	P	A	P	
Holly Croft	P	P	P	P	A	A	P	A	
Hank Edmondson	R	A	R	P	P	A	R	A	
Robert Blumenthal	R	R	P	P	R	A	R	A	
Peter Rosado-Flores	R	P	P	P	P	R	R	A	
Olha Osobov	A	P	P	P	P	P	R	P	
Jinkyung Park	A	P	P	P	R	P	R	P	
Stephen Rutner*	A	P	P	P	A	---	---	---	
Melanie DeVore	P	P	R	P	R	P	R	A	
Karl Manrodt**	---	---	--	---	---	P	P	P	

†Joint meeting with RPIPC, which had a quorum

Motions brought to the Senate floor:

2223.FAPC.002.P, Motion to Create a Post-Tenure Review Period Pause Policy, passed 4/14
 2223.FAPC.001.P, Motion to permit extensions to the Post-Tenure Review period for specified family and medical reasons, withdrawn 1/6

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions): See Executive Summary and Recommendations

Ad hoc committees and other groups:

Several FAPC members participated in an ad-hoc committee to discuss implementation of the new Amorous Relationship Policy with RPIPC members and HR.

Committee Reflections:

The committee members have worked hard and have engaged thoughtfully and creatively with the issues at hand.

Committee Recommendations:

FAPC should continue to track issues around Post-Tenure Review (PTR), as well as workload issues and numbers of part-time faculty related to the current budget issues and large incoming class. The Provost is willing to share aggregate numbers on the outcomes of PTR processes (how many end in a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), how many PIPs end in demotion or termination.) The committee should actively seek this information to see how the new PTR impacts local faculty. Aggregate numbers of part-time faculty are also available from the Provost by request. While GC obviously needs to take necessary steps to weather the current budgetary issues, FAPC should track trends and advocate for the values that most faculty share (i.e. valuing small class sizes taught mostly by full-time and permanent faculty) in the medium term.

Each year, FAPC is asked to address issues related to faculty evaluations, especially Student Ratings of Instruction. Universitywide policy seems to be largely in sync with Faculty interests. I would suggest that future chairs be careful about how and when to engage this issue, since many of the concerns take place at the department or college level. Furthermore, it is suggested that further efforts to alter the SRIS start from the Center for Teaching and Learning, since they have the most knowledge about evaluation and also the capacity to maintain committees for more than one academic year, to start pilot programs and do institutional research, etc. Future FAPC chairs should engage with such efforts when they arise and encourage FAPC members to participate and offer feedback.

FAPC was informed after the fact when BOR policy changes led to an update of the Amorous Relationship policy. While this local policy is entirely dictated by BOR policy, the committee was able to engage with HR about interpretation and implementation of the policy in order to ensure that the policy is transparent to faculty (and other stakeholders) and that it is implemented in a way that is consistent with academic workflow and lines of authority. It is very important for ECUS/Committee chairs to be aware of all revisions to the Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual (PPPM) and to invite relevant speakers in to discuss these as informational items. Faculty need to be aware of relevant faculty changes. The committee should carefully read over the policy ahead of time and be ready to ask granular questions. Especially since these policies are often handed down quickly and with little discussion by the BOR, it is important to have some thoughtful conversations about what exactly the policies mean, how they will impact faculty, and how to handle them. These conversations can be formative in terms of policy interpretation and implementation.

I think that many committee members found it useful to share information and drafts as we worked on our respective Department and College evaluation policy revisions. I am not sure that FAPC is the proper venue for this, but it is certainly useful to create a space for these kinds of conversations when University-wide policy revisions take place.

The committee updated its operating procedures to ban recordings of online meetings and to make it clear who is present therein. There were also instances in which faculty preferred to send questions for guests anonymously. Many faculty feel strongly about confidentiality, and future chairs will need to be open to practices that allow faculty to feel safe while expressing their views.