Faculty Affairs, Minutes
May 4, 2010

In attendance: Carol Kellett, Ellen Urton, Jim Nechols, Kaleen Knopp, Judy Hughey, Naiqian
Zhang, Kristine Young (for Rebecca Gould), Kyle Reynolds

1.  April 20, 2010 minutes approved

2.  Modified Instructional Duties up for vote at Fac Sen on May 11th.
    The concerns of the A&S caucus regarding back filling and the associated costs, the
    tracking of the 4%, the distribution of the 4% across the campus fairly, etc., were
    discussed.
    V. Prov. Dyer will attend the Fac Sen meeting to serve as a resource.

3.  Dependent/Spouse tuition waiver task force will be up for vote at Fac Sen on May 11th.
    We received this report at the last FAC meeting. Given the details that are not addressed
    in the proposed recommendations, it is part of the current plan to request that central
    administration convene another committee to further research implementation.

4.  Policy Library
    FSLC met with Provost office staff and university attorney, Attorney Pete Paukstelis
    assembled a policy workflow. Judy Hughey (together with Ruth Dyer) has put together a
    shorter workflow for Handbook revisions.
    The goal of the university administration and our senate is to develop an on-line policy
    library where policies coexist and can be cross-referenced. This requires not only
    updating policies but also a consistent and logical workflow.

    BOR Manual
    Instead of the UH spelling out details of issues of concern to faculty, the UH
    needs to reflect existing language in the BOR and the PPM and refer to that language. As
    a body, Faculty Senate needs to be careful about crafting language that is contradictory to
    the guidelines set forth by the BOR/PPM.
    This is relevant to our current discussion of the Spoken English Policy.
    The Provost's office and the attorneys would like our entire Spoken English Policy to
    read: 'refer to PPM.'

    Nechols brought up that Faculty Senate and its committees are not always aware when
    they set out to work on a policy whether or not there is existing language in the
    BOR/PPM.

5.  Spoken English Competency
    The subcommittee compared their proposed revision plan with the BOR PER20 form and
    came up with the major difference that the PER20 plan contains remediation while the
    affected individual is teaching and the proposed revision sees passing the spoken English
    test before an individual can teach.
    Another crucial difference is that the proposed revision outlines more clearly how
    remediation should happen and how follow-up could be managed. (Current policy is
    unclear on whether or not one can teach while the individual is remediation for spoken
    English.)
    One last key difference is that the BOR PER20 does not address remediation for the
    GTAs.

If we as a body have the ability to refer to the BOR policy and then go above and beyond it, these issues could be addressed by our body.

Zhang & Nechols, the members of the subcommittee, discussed with FAC some of the issues that should ideally be addressed by a policy (including assessing graduate students, including how to craft this language in job announcements, etc.)

The subcommittee feels strongly that we should pass along their recommendations to BOR.

Zhang: would like to record his objection to the current BOR policy. Mentioning a test by name in the job description is less than ideal. Assessment should not be limited to a test, especially given that the tests are inefficient. If each candidate has to do a teaching demonstration, then students and faculty can assess whether they want him/her in the classroom. But there are also faculty members who are not hired for their teaching ability. Zhang also pointed out the impossibility of doing this assessment of spoken English w/o behaving in a discriminatory fashion (where do you come from? What is your ethnic background or original citizenship? We aren't allowed to ask these questions.) (Although I think these evaluations have something to do with citizenship? Or do the forms ask candidates to declare native language?)

The chairs asked Zhang to consider making his points in writing. Kristine Young and Jennifer Askey both asked to have opportunity for their units (OIP and Modern Languages) to add and comment on these concerns.

6. Open Access Information Sheet (Draft) (Urton, Nechols, Askey)

   Significant change 2$^{nd}$ page under open access business models.  U. Minnesota website has excellent summary of various categories of partial to full open-access.  Send Ellen suggestions or questions; subcommittee will look at it again; need to have Repository Services Team review and "sign off" on the document.

   Kaleen:  Goal of open access?
   Kaleen:  In fall, should make this a FS agenda item and have a presentation on it. Provides a good teaching opportunity for FS.

   Jim:  Think we should educate campus about open access – all forms.  Also would like to endorse it.

   Carol:  Should ask Provost to consider this for campus seminar series.

   Ellen:  Dean Goetsch interested in knowing about support for this on campus as it affects how to respond to demand with respect to library staffing and programming.

   Judy:  Glad to see hotlinks that could be shared with colleagues for further information. This helps to allay concerns.

   Kaleen and Judy thanked Ellen for excellent work on project.

7. Appendix G in its most current iteration
   The flow chart has been brought up to date to match the narrative description of events and a few language issues were cleaned up to reflect how a grievance might occur in the real world.

There is not a tiered system but it is clear the processes the grievant has to go through before filing.
For our May 18th meeting, each member of the committee should carefully read the new document.

NEW BUSINESS for May 18th—we need elections for chair/s for the next academic year.