FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES 3/23/11

Present: Teresa Beck, Sheila Blackman, Jan Brashler, Sonia Dalmia, Kurt Ellenberger (Chair), Jon Jellema (ex-officio), Paul Jorgensen, Diane Kimoto, Cynthia Mader, Scott Richardson (ex-officio), and Janet Vigna

- 1. Approved agenda
- 2. Approved minutes
- 3. Larry Burns, chair of FSBC was a guest at meeting. He provided a review of salary distributions from pre-2006 to current policy

Specific reasons in A and B, not liked by Tom, he said reasons are specific and thus can leave out specific. So take out specific and put back in "the"

Old Business

4. Kurt provided the revised policy for reporting procedures of the CPCs back to the unit. After discussion with legal counsel, it was suggested that "reasons" are specific enough and can leave out specific and put "the" back in. Thus the revised policy would read:

2. Committee Does Not Accept Unit Recommendation.

a) Committee disagrees with Unit's negative recommendation on the candidate

If the Committee does not accept the unit recommendation and the Committee recommends a personnel action in favor of the candidate, the recommendation will be made in writing to the Dean with a copy to the candidate and the Unit Head or Designate. The written recommendation must include the rationale specific reasons for not accepting the unit recommendation with reference to the relevant unit, college, and/or university criteria in the three areas of evaluation. The Unit Head or Designate will report on the Committee's recommendation to the unit.

b) Committee disagrees with Unit's positive recommendation on the candidate

If the Committee does not accept the unit recommendation and if the candidate does not have the support of the Committee, the opportunity for a personal appearance before the Committee by the candidate shall be given. Only after such an opportunity is given to the candidate, can such a negative recommendation become official. If the candidate appears before the Committee, the candidate shall address the Committee on her or his own behalf and without an outside advocate or observer. The recommendation of the Committee will be made in writing to the Dean with a copy to the candidate and the Unit Head or Designate. The written recommendation must include the rationale specific reasons for not accepting the unit recommendation with reference to the relevant unit, college, and/or university criteria in the three areas of evaluation. The Unit Head or Designate will report on the Committee's recommendation to the unit.

Motion made to approve changes. Motion passed.

5. Pilot project for Personnel Procedures representative was discussed. A couple questions were raised: 1. To be a PPR, does one have to be an inclusion advocate?; 2. To what extent do we know a problem exists? and 3. Should Jeanne attend an FPPC meeting for inclusion on discussion.

After discussion and reviewing comments from colleges involved in the pilot project (COIS – unit and college level; CLAS – college level), comments for further consideration are:

- The PPR be instituted at the unit level, but not college level. However, a concern is that with each unit having one person does this person need to be tenured at a certain rank so it does not impact personnel decisions later on for the Inclusion Advocate.
- The department chair and the college committees trained.
- All faculty should be trained at unit retreats at the beginning of fall semesters.
- 6. Brief discussion regarding workload for faculty on 12 month contracts. Most of the 12 month contracts are in health professions and library with a few in nursing and some engineering. Need further data on contracts: what type and expectations for teaching, significant focus, services, administrative responsibilities and what are baseline expectations.
- 7. Brief discussion on joint appointment contracts. Review of joint appointment contracts found that the contracts were explicit and had a great deal of oversight (unit heads/Deans/Provost).

Respectfully Submitted Teresa M. Beck