

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes

March 21, 2024

Attendees

- Jessica Lester
- Minjeong Kim
- Travis O'Brien
- John Carini
- Cale Whitworth
- Katherine Ryan (virtual)
- Shu Cole
- Cassandra Coble
- Colleen Ryan (ex officio; arriving late due to class)
- Lana Spendl (ex officio;)

Agenda

1. Approval of January's meeting minutes
2. Review and discussion of revisions to BL-ACA-D22
3. Review and discussion of revisions to BL-ACA-D27

Minutes

Approval of February 2024 Minutes

Unanimously approved

Update on teaching ranks

- Needing to update teaching ranks – no time to produce a draft before agenda is set for next BFC mtg; this will be pushed to the next year's committee

Review and discussion of revisions to BL-ACA-D22

- Should the policies be separated from D27. There seemed to be an agreement to separate them.
- Should the policy clarify the relationship between mediation and FBOR (and which comes first)?
 - Suggestion was to give the grievant the autonomy to decide which route to go; there was general agreement
- Jessica indicated that FAC would receive an e-mail and further discussion would occur over e-mail
- The committee discussed proposed revisions to language in the bl-aca-d22 policy statement; suggestions were given to make the policy more clear re: which review committee applies
- Discussion point: what to do with grievances related to salary? Should it be possible to go to FBOR or mediation, or just FBOR. Key point was that generally salary review may need a recommendation rather than a discussion.
 - A point was raised that the policy document would benefit from a flowchart overview (SAA has something similar, which Lana created)
 - There was general agreement that salary should go to FBOR; language in D22 will be updated
- (change of topic) Colleen reported on a conversation with Docherty. Main point was that everything should start with ACA33
 - In the case of an investigation, the starting point would be ACA33 with no choice for path: just
 - Re: the FBOR: (paraphrasing) “A decision has been made at some level (or hasn’t but should have), which is the point when FBOR could be brought in to review”
 - A bit of history about FMRC was noted: started life as a post-tenure review policy, morphed into a more general faculty misconduct review committee.
 - In general, it was noted that FMRC has a quicker process than FBOR, which can be an advantage for rapidly reviewing severe sanction decisions before they are applied
- Should the mediation part of the policy need a clear expectation on timing of response materials from administration? General agreement of ‘no’ because mediation is more formal and by definition is entered into mutually agreed by both parties
- Is there a way to build in mediation training for the mediation committees? Lana raised this with VPFAA; conversation is still ongoing
 - A question was raised about whether the university might hire a permanent mediator; VPFAA presented a proposal to the Provost this year and it is still being reviewed. If funded, there would be a mediator who can both mediate and train faculty
- A point was raised that there is no incentive or sanction if units do not comply with requests for information from FBOR.
 - FBOR makes recommendations to the Provost, so something like a ‘summary judgement’ as a sanction might not be applicable
 -

Review and discussion of revisions to BL-ACA-D27

- (did not make it to this topic)