Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

January 30, 2020

Attendees: R. Bonifas, L. Brown (Chair), M. Crosby (guest), H. Gallatin, J. Gustafson, J. Inlow (Secretary), D. Selman (Vice Chair), V. Sheets (Ex-Officio), C. Spicer (Ex-Officio)

Absent: S. Powers (Ex-Officio), J. Weust

1. L. Brown called the meeting to order at 9:36 AM.
2. L. Brown introduced Malea Crosby, a guest who was observing the meeting as part of her work toward a Ph.D. in higher education.
3. Discussion of minutes from 11-8-2019
   1. The 11-8-2019 minutes provide a record of FAC’s concerns about the changes to Policy Library Section 922. FAC voted not to endorse the policy changes without seeing the procedures document which stipulates how the policy will be enforced.
   2. V. Sheets explained that the Senate Executive Committee understood the concerns raised by FAC, but nonetheless voted to move the policy changes forward.
   3. D. Selman wondered whether the procedures document will eventually be made available.
   4. Minutes were approved (D. Selman/J. Gustafson; 6-0-0).
4. Academic Affairs Liaison report (S. Powers)
   1. None—S. Powers was not in attendance.
5. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison report (V. Sheets)
   1. At the Exec meeting this week there were discussions concerning: how FAD data is pulled into the faculty profiles for the ISU online directory; complaints against the bookstore; several curricular proposals; and new charges that will soon be sent to FAC.
6. Chair report (L. Brown)
7. Regarding charge 4 to revise the faculty grievance policy in Policy Library Section 146.14:
   * 1. L. Brown met with ISU General Council Katie Butwin last semester, and separately with the Chair of Faculty Senate, to discuss the current policy and get direction for how FAC should proceed to revise it. K. Butwin had agreed to talk with Provost Licari to get his input, but L. Brown did not believe this had happened yet.
     2. FAC discussed various possible changes to the policy. There was general agreement that the college-level grievance committees should be eliminated, and that all grievances should be settled by a university-level committee that would be populated from a diverse pool of faculty who have received recent and specialized training. FAC members also favored the introduction of a two- or three-tiered system where grievances would be handled by different university-level committees, according to the seriousness of the grievance.
     3. L. Brown, D. Selman, and R. Bonifas will draft a new policy that incorporates the features described above. L. Brown will consult with Provost Licari to determine if he would be supportive of these changes.
8. Regarding charge 13 to develop an orientation manual for part-time temporary faculty: L. Brown will work with C. Spicer and Rob Perrin to draft a manual. R. Perrin already has such documents that he has developed for his department, and these can provide a starting point.
9. New charge from Senate to revise Biennial Review (BR) procedure
   1. The BR replacement proposal received from Senate was discussed.
      1. FAC favored the following model: (a) If a faculty member receives a negative review from the chair, the chair must provide justification, and a departmental committee will then review the dossier. This is necessary to prevent chairs from unfairly targeting faculty who are actually meeting expectations. FAC members favor review by a departmental committee at this step, rather than a college committee, because members of the department understand the discipline and will be most familiar with the work of the faculty member. However, for very small departments that are unable to form a reasonably sized committee (~3 members), review can be done by a college committee. (b) If the committee provides a positive review (in disagreement with chair), the dean will review the dossier and settle the disagreement. (c) In the case the chair review is positive, there will be no review by departmental committee, in order to keep the process simple and minimize faculty workload.
      2. There was consensus that a faculty member who receives a negative review by the chair has the right to know and should be notified, even if the ultimate outcome is a positive review from the committee and dean. This is also important in order to hold chairs accountable for their reviews.
      3. FAC discussed the pros and cons of conducting the review every year rather than biennially.
      4. D. Selman raised the question of whether or not this new procedure should become part of the Handbook.
   2. J. Gustafson, L. Brown, D. Selman, and R. Bonifas volunteered to work together to draft language for a BR replacement procedure based on today’s discussion.
10. V. Sheets had additions to his Senate Executive Committee Liaison report:
    1. Senate Exec will soon be sending another new charge to FAC, requesting changes to the faculty constitution to bring it up-to-date.
    2. A sports wagering policy will be sent to FAC for review.
    3. Senate Exec wants to form a task force that will be charged with formulating a response to the declining enrollments resulting from demographic changes. Related to this, there is an open faculty meeting scheduled for Feb. 6 at 3:30 PM to provide background and solicit input from the faculty.
11. Next meeting: Thursday, Feb. 13, 9:30 AM, Root Hall A-186.
12. Adjourned at 10:51 AM