FAM By-Laws Minutes – 3/1/2018


After others in the past year and on other committees have had a chance to send us feedback including Larry Krasnoff and Jon Huddleston.

The pronoun issue will likely be a separate matter that will be handled in the entire FAM.

Clarifying the grounds by which adjuncts can file a grievance in the Proposed Modifications & Additions document. We don’t want to convey the idea that any reason given by managers will be the final result of a question about a hiring/firing decision. That would then place the burden on the grievant to show the committee that the reason given is unpersuasive.

Richard: We’ll have a short pair of motions in place to insert in the front of these documents so that they don’t get lost in the verbiage.

PTR – “proposed PTR language for the FAM”

Deanna:
The committee had presented recommendations but the FAM language had yet to be marked up. In the mark up period, some of those recommendations were walked back a bit. We’ll focus on the substance of the issues. The notion that all tenured faculty should go up for formal review once every 6 years is clear. The second recommendation is to clarify when someone can go up after receiving a satisfactory or superior. Third, the period of review language. If someone goes up for superior and fails then comes up two years later, what is their period of their review? Just the last two years? A common-sense approach to this question would assume it is not just the last two years. Fourth, they wanted to get rid of deferrals. We need to leave some deferrals in for extenuating circumstances or faculty on sabbatical someone internationally or somewhere remote or have valid medical reasons or have “exceptional professional commitments” like service as department chair. You could defer a superior ranking in that last circumstance and just go up for satisfactory.

The only other new language concerns chairs going up for PTR. This is Deanna’s language on p. 6 of the document. If the chair is seeking superior, then there is a panel. If the chair is seeking satisfactory, the dean handles it. Deanna will incorporate these changes into a new document with a new chair.

Who chairs the chair’s superior rating panel?
The most senior member of the department, even if that person has no administrative abilities? That person should convene the panel, but not necessarily chair it. Some specificity here in the FAM could avoid messy political situations as well. What if that person has health issues? What if that person has a conflict of interest? Let’s person some language in the FAM that leaves a door open. Insert “and normally chair” language to note that the process is adjustable based on local circumstances.
Richard’s proposed criteria for a superior rating:

We could clarify that departmental PTR guidelines are not applicable for this review unless otherwise noted in the department guidelines.

The current FAM section is quite short on this topic, so PTR panels can operate by their own guidelines or take a more stringent approach. Additional language should help avoid wild year-to-year swings because the committees are in the dark.

Deanna wonders whether there really is evidence of year to year swings and suggests that their isn’t a substantive problem as it exists.

The group considers language to make sure that the research criteria is substantial but does not equal the standard of being promoted to professor again. The same is true of the “leadership in service” standard.

Richard is going to shorten the language, submit to us and Dinesh’s committee, and then hopefully prepare us for Senate consideration.

New issues:
The ad hoc committee on grievances recommendation about training. Deanna suggests that language might not be FAM language, at least not initially. Training can happen without FAM adjustment or, at least training can begin in order to clarify FAM language.

Deanna: previous Senate discussion about participation during sabbaticals issue
There was language proposed that faculty on sabbatical are allowed to participate in DEP should the so choose to do so and can participate in all deliberations. But this language isn’t in the FAM. The full text of the sabbatical policy isn’t in the FAM. Nevertheless, this is a College-wide issue. We should check the Senate minutes to clarify this discussion’s date, duration, and conclusion. It could have been more than 10 years ago.

Could this professor only participate in 3rd year review and tenure cases but not cases for full or PTR? The general consensus is yes but that faculty on sabbatical have to do all cases of 3rd years and tenure, not picking and choosing particular cases or just one class of these two cases but not both. Jeannette suggests that folks who want to participate should delay their sabbatical.

Richard: there might be issues about how many sabbaticals are coming up.