

MINUTES
Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
January 20, 2009

Attending: Ellen Urton, Amy Schultz, Jennifer Askey, Kaleen Knopp, Clyde Howard, Stacey Warner, Dick Hoag, Jim Nechols, Bill Hsu, Donita Whitney-Bammerlin, Judy Hughey

Visiting: Donna Fullmer from CAPD (will replace Hoag who is moving to Exec), Lydia Peele from SGA

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of Dec 16, 2008 minutes
--add Kaleen Knopp to the attendance list for Dec. 16th, 2008
3. Misc—a representative from Salary & Fringe Benefit Committee will come to a future FAC meeting and talk about dependent tuition
--IDEA Center Bill Pallett and Kelli Cox would also be willing to come to a FAC meeting to discuss their evaluation system
4. Administrative Evaluation – action item --
section C41.4 proposed changes Administrative Evaluation

Discussed wording of “executive administrator” in the document and moved to strike that wording, in favor of retaining “dean, vice-president, provost, or president in all three instances in the document.

Wordsmithing on C41.4(a) regarding “input”; comma insertion in C41.4(b)

Motion to approve C41.4 (Knopp, Schulz). Approved unanimously.

Motion to approve C157, B123, and C41 (Schulz, Hsu). Approved unanimously.

5. Graduate Student Grievance policy. Dean Shanklin and Provost Nellis are questioning the role and need for Faculty Senate to be involved in dialogue and/or approval of changes to the Graduate Handbook. Our committee feels we do have the right to review, make suggestions, and issue final approval because FS and FAC are charged with any issues dealing with faculty, including faculty-student interactions.

a. Appendix V, University Handbook (UH). What we need to discuss regarding changes to this appendix applies to all students for whom grievance policies exist (undergraduate, graduate, students in vet medicine)

b. Appendix A, Graduate Handbook (GH)

Section B.3.c. This item will present a difficult issue for Faculty Senate to approve. As written, the final step in the pre-grievance procedure conflict resolution involves only the academic dean and the associate dean, thus taking power and participation away from the affected department and faculty member.

Knopp suggested adding wording to that section that included “a representative from the respondent's department.” Hughey suggested that we add the student representative as well. In general, need to find a way to provide for a consistent message and a consistent story (tracking) to the grievance.

Schulz pointed out that A/B/3/c also doesn't include student input, which would be desirable.

Knopp and Hsu mentioned that the procedure for grad student grievances does not mirror in any way the other grievance procedures on campus for other constituents. When the grievance moves beyond the initial faculty/student interaction to the student/department interaction, and on to the grad school level interaction, there is no paper trail, no consistency of information. There is a fear in our committee that by the time a complaint makes it to the grad school dean's office, it is hearsay, not document based, etc.

Knopp: Why not make this (and other student grievance processes) more closely mirrors the faculty grievance procedures outlined in Appendix G. It is also the opposite of how the Honor Council addresses issues & hears voices.

Suggested that we invite Dean Shanklin and members of the grad council to come to an FAC meeting and discuss the issue of faculty and student involvement in the issue.

Could we, as a committee, compile a list of questions to send to the Grad Council and Dean Shanklin in advance of a meeting in the spirit of inviting meaningful dialogue?

Questions and concerns about Appendix A, Section B, should be sent to Jim Nechols and to our FAC listserv by Jan 27th with the intent to invite Dean Shanklin to our meeting on Feb 17th. Also might ask a leading member of Grad Council to come so that we can discuss questions or concerns from that body.

6. Student Government Assn. report on teaching evaluations (Amy Schulz)

SGA wants to know what FAC and FS need from SGA in order for a proposal to be considered. Amy & Co will present a document that outlines the justification and plan for improving the faculty evaluation system for all students in all sections to both FAC and SGA.

7. Meeting was adjourned ~ 5:10 pm.