Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes – attached
3. Qualification for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles - Justification Review – attached
4. Contributions to Diversity Language – Update
5. Duration of part time lecturer appointments - suggested language attached
6. Openness in P&T – discussion
7. Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. The agenda was approved.

2. Review and Approval of minutes
Minutes from the February 21, 2012 were approved with modifications.

3. Qualification for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles - Justification Review – attached
Chair Rich Christie asked if Councilmembers had objections to sending the part-time lecturer appointment language forward as Class A Legislation with the justification as modified by email discussion. As there were no objections, this legislation will be sent to the Senate Executive Committee.

4. Contributions to Diversity Language – Update
A brief update was given regarding the Class A Legislation to add contributions to diversity to the promotion and tenure guidelines in the Faculty Code. This legislation has passed the first consideration in the Faculty Senate, and is being reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (informally known as “code cops”) and the President before returning for a second consideration by the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. It was noted that this revised language is a significant improvement from the initial Legislation. The Council remains concerned about whether such language is required as nothing in the current code prohibits consideration of work on diversity.

5. Duration of part time lecturer appointments
Christie presented revised wording for this legislation and noted that the proposed legislation on renewal of appointments does not permit multi-year appointments to be delegated. Cheryl Cameron asked the Council to discuss criteria to be considered by the Provost when approving multi-year part time appointments.
The Council again discussed the justifications for multi-year appointments for part-time lecturers. Positive elements would be that women heading back into the workforce would be benefitted however the negative tradeoff would be disproportionately holding women within part-time roles. Additional discussion followed on the value of having a multi-year appointment for part-time lecturers. AAUP has expressed concern on the shift from tenured faculty at Universities to more flexible positions, or holding faculty titles which do not fall in the traditional tenure track. While the intent of a multi-year option is not to have part-time lecturers substitute for core faculty, the multi-year option in some programs can help ensure program/instructional continuity. Student perspective would be to ensure instructor qualification and commitment, while taking into account the budget scenario. Ultimately, these issues were identified as concerns for consideration at the department level. The major reason for requiring approval by the Provost for multi-year appointments of part time lecturers is to ensure the appropriate search process is used.

Christie noted that it appeared the Council would like to proceed with such legislation. He proposed to draft a justification, send to the Council for review, and then submit as Class A Legislation.

6. Openness in P&T – Discussion

This topic has been discussed with the Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Cheryl Cameron, and the Board of Deans, to identify support or opposition for changes. Christie drafted an outline of the process and feedback / informational response and briefly discussed the outline.

Christie suggested the following steps can be taken towards openness:

1. Shift the second written response (to the college) to after the chair’s recommendation. Turn chair’s report of faculty vote into a verbal discussion prior to chair decision. A response to candidate comments by the Chair was not considered necessary since the Elected Faculty Council and Dean can request information from Chair.

2. Require the Dean to offer the candidate the opportunity to meet should the Dean’s recommendation be negative. Allow the candidate 7 days to provide a written response for the Provost. Allow the Dean the opportunity to respond – or, the Provost can request a response from Dean.

3. In no case shall the candidate’s input require a reversion to a prior stage of the process.

4. Wherever the decision is made – Chair, Dean, or Provost – the Dean shall ensure that the decision and the reasons for it are communicated to the candidate.

It was commented that Deans may not wish to offer feedback due to additional labor that this would add to the process. Discussion occurred regarding the length of the decision process, differences between departmentalized and undepartmentalized schools, and the number of cases where faculty notified the Secretary of the Faculty with concerns of being inadequately informed during the promotion and tenure process. Emphasis was placed on liability of written communication to candidates, and thus to be wary of adding any additional written requirements.
Christie asked if Council members want to pursue these changes in the process. Council faculty members agreed, noting it provides standardized communication throughout the process and they thought that specific reasons for denial should be given to candidates. Tradeoffs were discussed between providing clear rationale why candidate’s applications were denied and dangers to candidates to have negative notes on their record or be liabilities for the University. Christie raised the question of whether having a conversation with the Dean rather than having written information provided would be best. He noted that the question is not if candidate should be informed, rather how. Christie will draft language to present at the next meeting.

7. Adjournment
Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:24 a.m.
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