Faculty Personnel Policies Council Agenda

Minutes Meeting #3

October 20, 2017

People present were P. Soni, R. Marcus, G. Reynolds, L. Kermode, A. Colburn, J. Torabzadeh, D. Ottolia, U. Lassiter (Lecturer rep), Liesl Haas (CFA rep), M. Wiley. Absent: J. Pattnaik, S. Pavri.

1. Approve Minutes. Approved.
2. Announcements:
   1. Norbert’s health
   2. Emeritus policy approved by Senate
   3. Conflict of Interest policy in Senate: “head of organizational unit”; was brought up that there is an EO that would trump that. Policy was tabled but will be brought to the next Senate meeting.
3. Reassigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students
   1. Deliberation over whether it is necessary for faculty to have already been engaged in the activity (as opposed to create one in the proposal) in the quoted phrase from the CBA in the first paragraph. Mark: it is designed to remunerate someone for uncompensated work not to create a competition. Liesl will contact Doug as to whether CFA has the same interpretation as Faculty Affairs. Under review Criteria 2.2, from CBA, it states “priority should be given.” This implies it is possible to present new proposals.
   2. 1.2 Restrictions. Richard’s Question: if it is beyond the normal compensated area is it still eligible given the language “same general category”? Mark: you would have to make a case that it is a different category.
   3. 2.2 Review Criteria. Discussion about whether we want to include #2 #3 #4. Debate over collapsing 2.1 and 2.2 and what exactly must be included.
   4. Discussion of committee structure and, particularly, the relationship between college and university level. “Appropriate Administrator” is the Provost.
   5. Appeals will be handled by Senate Executive Committee.
   6. For the next meeting the Council agreed that the issues to resolve are:
      1. Review Criteria
      2. Guidance about what goes in the application
      3. Selection process – how much guidance to give committee
      4. Committee structure: College level? Relation to University level?
      5. Information provided to applicants (who will write to those who are rejected)