

Faculty Affairs Committee - September 21, 2023

Meeting began at 1:30pm and concluded at 2:31pm. No action items at the beginning of the meeting.

Attendees

1. Jessica Lester
2. Cassandra Coble
3. Shabnam Kavousian
4. John Carini
5. Gerry Lanosga
6. Colleen Ryan (ex officio)
7. Jonathan Michaelsen
8. Travis O'Brien
9. Minjeong Kim
10. Cale Whitworth
11. Shu Cole
12. Katherine Ryan
13. John Gibson
14. Lana Spendl (ex officio)

Introductions

Determining who will take minutes

Travis O'Brien

Overview of Charges and Timeline for the '23-'24 year

ACA-22 is a priority for year: to vote this year.

- Faculty annual review policies
- ACA-E17 anti-bullying, and sexual harassment
- Impacts of AI on faculty

Emeriti faculty definition/process

- VPFAA doesn't have an active project working on defining Emeritus faculty, so clarification is needed. It might be in the docket though.
- Concern relayed by FAC chairs: not all Emeriti listed go through a formal application process. They constitute a large pool of voting faculty. "Emeritus" has traditionally been a title that is very specific and doesn't apply to all faculty
- Definition does not appear to be clear and process for attaining Emeritus status does not appear to be clear.

Discussion on ACA 22 – grievance policy

Discuss current concerns with policy

- Board coordinator: concerns about an ‘outside person’ sending all correspondence. Currently BFC director has been serving in that role, but doesn’t have faculty authority
 - No consistent point of contact year-to-year; lack of continuity
 - Could be BFC office records grievance, but communication has a private channel
 - Current process is inefficient b/c
 - **Suggestions:**
 - appoint BFC chair as member or chair of committee
 - have BFC office maintain central records
- Board of review has procedures, and a section on appeals. Challenge: does the appeal follow all the procedures of the grievance (doesn’t seem to make sense), but appeals section doesn’t list procedures that seem necessary
 - Note: there are re-reviews and appeals, which are separate process. Re-review is formal and has a well-defined process. Appeal might not be as structured.
 - **Suggestion:** have specific procedures for appeals in Appeals section, even if they are relatively simple
- Was mediation touched on?
 - No, T&P policy was priority. It was essentially completed, codifying how balanced cases are defined and clarifying that IUB policy requires that balanced cases must be an allowed path to tenure.
 - **Action requested:** Former FAC co-chair asks that this be added as an agenda item and put forward to BFC for a vote.
 - **TODO:** current FAC committee will re-review document and correspond over e-mail. Shu will verify which version to be considered. Will be scheduled for 1st and 2nd readings at upcoming BFC meetings.
 - What issues are there with mediation policy?
 - Current policy might need ‘teeth’: requirements and requests aren’t always satisfied; e.g., mediation or requests for additional information from committee goes ignored, then what happens?
 - Could this go to VPFAA to enforce compliance (if they’re not the one being complained against, would/should go to the Provot(?) in that case).
 - Question: what is the faculty committee’s authority?
 - Question from a prior year: is mediation even a necessary option?
 - +Cases often go to Faculty Board of Review (FBOR), bypassing mediation
 - -Faculty who do use the mediation option reported they found it less ‘threatening’
 - +Mediators are not often trained in mediation
 - Summary:
 - Coordinator role on FBOR
 - How to manage non-response to request for communication
 - How to manage chain of command in above
 - Logical consistency and structure
 - Clarifying appeals procedures
 - Look over mediation portion (decided to hold on revising in current round)

Misc

There was some discussion about anti-bullying, relationship, etc policies. It was noted that there might be two separate groups working on this: UFC and University Graduate Faculty Council (nepotism, relationships with graduate students, cheating, etc.).

TODO

- FAC chairs take first pass at line-by-line change to FBOR section of ACA-22; will distribute
- VPFAA to report back to FAC about the status of Emeritus definition project in their office and (*missed what was said*)