

Faculty Caucus Minutes
Wednesday, February 6, 2008
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Holland called the caucus to order immediately following the Senate meeting.

Approval of Faculty Caucus Minutes of January 23, 2008

Motion: By Senator Fazel, seconded by Senator Alferink, to approve the Faculty Caucus Minutes of January 23, 2008. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Action Item:

01.29.08.01 ASPT Calendar Proposed Revisions (University Review Committee Representative)

The proposed ASPT Calendar revisions were previously presented to the Faculty Caucus as an Information Item on January 23, 2008 by Rodger Singley, University Review Committee Chairperson. At that time, Senator Borg noted that the language appeared to require a meeting be requested whether a faculty member desired an appeal or not. He suggested adding "such a meeting" so that it would be clear that a meeting could be requested in the context of an appeal, but that it was not mandatory to request a meeting. The URC, therefore, revised the language and forwarded the revised document to the Academic Senate Faculty Caucus for approval.

The proposed changes are in bold:

REVISION AS OF JANUARY 29, 2008: To each of the three dates and before the bolded and underlined, add "***If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the _____ recommendation, then***" **the candidate must . . .**

A. Calendar for Promotion and Tenure: (ASPT Page 53 and continuing)

November 15 DFSC/SFSC must notify promotion and tenure candidates, in writing, of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. **If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within 5 working days of receiving the recommendation.**

February 1 CFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations and provide opportunity, if requested, for candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. **If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the CFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the CFSC within 10 working days of receiving the recommendation.**

C. Calendar for Performance Evaluation Review: (ASPT Page 55)

February 1 DFSC/SFSC recommendations for performance evaluation must be reported to the candidate by February 1 in each year that the faculty member is performance-evaluation eligible. DFSC/SFSC must notify candidates of intended recommendations to CFSC at least 10 working days before submitting these recommendations to CFSC and provide opportunity, if requested, for the candidates to meet with the committee to discuss these recommendations. **If the candidate wishes to request a formal meeting to discuss the DFSC/SFSC recommendation, then the candidate must request a meeting with the DFSC/SFSC within 5 working days of receiving the recommendation.**

Since no member of the URC was available to attend the Faculty Caucus this evening, Senator Fazel was asked to address any questions that might arise.

Senator Holland reminded the caucus that the proposed changes to the calendar involved requiring a faculty member to make his/her intent to appeal known no later than five days for the ten-day DFSC/SFSC deadline and no later than ten days for the 20-day CFSC deadline. Senator Wang noted that the most recent language revisions to the document were rather repetitive. Senator Fazel responded that the URC wanted to ensure that the meaning of the language was completely unambiguous, so certain language was repeated within the document in each of the three paragraphs.

Senator Ellerton noted that if the campus happened to be closed, such as it was on February 1 due to the weather, then a letter of recommendation might not be issued within the requisite five days. She asked if it were a tacit assumption of five days after the receipt of the recommendation. Senator Holland clarified that the requirement was for five “working days”. The day(s) on which the university is closed, for whatever reason, would not be considered as “working days”. Senator Wang noted that the ASPT calendar includes specific dates: November 15 and February 1. He asked if in the event either of these dates fell on a Saturday or Sunday, whether the deadline would be moved to the next working day. Senator Fazel responded that she assumed that it would be the next working day, but that she was not completely sure. Senator Holland stated that that, too, would probably be covered by the term “working day”.

Motion: By Senator Alferink, seconded by Senator Stewart, to approve the revisions to the ASPT Calendar. The revisions were unanimously approved.

Adjournment

Motion: By Senator Klitzing, seconded by Senator Stewart, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.