By-Laws Agenda, Tuesday, 20 Feb, 2018

Faculty Hearing Revisions:


Top of p. 16  Insertion of Dean as one of the parties to be notified about grievance

pp. 17-19  (a) Relocating language assigning the Committee the authority to determine whether there are any conflicts of interests among the parties to the hearing from top of p. 19 (Manual 183) to bottom of 17 (Manual 182)

(b) Giving conflict of interest language some operational significance (ad hoc Committee did nothing to say what comes next)

(c) Conceding fact that panel judgment is merely a matter of adding to record of a hearing when panel finds that college rep has a conflict of interest. (But it is important to make that part of the record in advance of hearing.)

pp. 13 & 22  Proposal that college representative have ‘the same’ opportunity to comment on alleged procedural error & error of fact during hearing as grievant, prior to President rendering decision. (Not yet adopted.)

What does ‘the same’ mean in this context?

Issue of giving Provost the last word with President. (Deck is arguably already stacked against grievant; current language is a ‘no stone unturned’ approach.)

Issue of President possibly using language to invite comment from Provost.

Minor FAM clean-up language

FAM 162  VIII.A.9 Class Attendance: Instructors ascertain whether both excused and unexcused absences count in determining the basis for a grade of “WA,” which stands for “withdrawn failure due to excessive absences” and is equivalent to a failing grade.

(Request by Mary Bergstrom, to more accurately reflect what a ‘WA’ grade means, which is an ‘F’, not a ‘W’, with respect to GPA.)

FAM 164  VIII.A.11 Final Examinations and Final Course Grades: At the request of the student, a faculty member should make available information and/or an evaluation of the student’s progress prior to the drop date withdrawal deadline.

(Request by Lynn Cherry, to comply with current institutional language.)

More significant FAM consistency issue in VI.H.6 & 7 (FAM p. 140):

The Deans will review packets and forward written recommendations to the Office of the Provost. At this time, each Dean shall also provide each candidate and chair of the department or the departmental PTR panel with copies of the Dean’s recommendation.

a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall review and forward its recommendations on applications for superior ratings to the Provost by the announced deadline, typically at the end of February. At this time, the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall also provide the candidate, chair of the department or the departmental PTR panel, and the Dean copies of that recommendation. The Provost may make a recommendation and shall forward all recommendations to the President by the announced deadline.
These additions would bring the PTR process into better conformity with the T&P process, in which T&P Advisory committee evaluations were first made available to candidates in 2009, and made available consistently each year after this transparency policy was added to the FAM in 2012. (See Procedures for Third-Year Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion: VI.D.11 Faculty Advisory Committee Action [FAM 123-124]

**Modifications proposed by Chris Fragile on behalf of 2017 PTR Committee**
(submitted & modified somewhat [?] last summer by Deanna)

H.1 Post-Tenure Review Schedule:
Aug 2017 approved language currently in FAM (p. 135) more moderate than what was proposed by Fragile & written up by Deanna: does not explicitly limit repeat reviews of failed PTR Superior case to one extra year within a six-year period (as proposed by Fragile).

H.4 Deferments:
a. ‘Exceptional professional commitments’ (FAM 137) not yet deleted in 8/17 modifications.
f. not included at all in Aug 2017 modifications.

H.6 Recommendations by...
First paragraph (FAM 139-140) has not yet been modified as proposed in Deanna’s memo. This is also the paragraph where the language about departmental panels occurs, the wisdom of which George was questioning at our last meeting.

H.9 Appeals...
Modification of language proposed in very last paragraph of FAM section on PTR (in “Appealing a Satisfactory Rating”) has not been done. (FAM 142)

---

H.5 Preparation and Submission of...Packet for Superior Rating
a.(6) Candidates seeking a superior rating must also furnish clear evidence that they continue to perform at the level expected for the promotion to the rank of Professor, or Librarian IV, in accordance with the criteria of the Faculty/Administration Manual, as indicated in Sect VI.A.4.c. for instructional faculty and VI.C.4.d for library faculty. (FAM 139)
Not proposed for change by Chris Fragile last year, or by Deanna last summer, but this is the language at the heart of what worries me about inconsistent application of PTR standards. (We may not want to tackle this yet, though. Would probably prove controversial, maybe even among ourselves!)