Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – October 12, 2016

Minutes:

Meeting began at 2:15 p.m. in the Kayak Room

Present:

- Committee Members: Andy Anger, JAK Maier, Debu Misra, Jeff May, Val Gifford, Jeff Benowitz, Paul Layer, Sine Anahita, Troy Bouffard
- Non-committee members: Kayt Sunwood, Melanie Lindholm

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Sine moved that we amend the agenda to add a discussion today regarding the proposed changes in language to the Program Review Process

process. Chris responded to Andy with an answer by email. We reviewed that email as a group. The email is attached to these minutes. (See email correspondence from Chris Fallen to Andy Anger, Sept. 27, 2016).

- It is a fairly informal process. All faculty are welcome to contact Orion Lawlor or Chris Fallen directly and that information/concern can be forwarded to the appropriate committee. The most formal method is the contact their elected representative who can then bring the issue to the attention of the Senate. The admin committee discusses the issues brought to them and that committee may assign the issue to an appropriate committee who will develop a recommendation and get that back to the Faculty Senate.

New Business

1. Revisions to Academic Program Review

Background:

At the last Faculty Senate meeting the Curriculum Affairs Committee (CAC) presented for discussion some proposed revisions to the current Program Review process description. This was meant to clarify the process and to make the policy actually match the practice. Those suggested revisions are attached to these minutes. (See "Suggested Revisions to Program Review" – suggested language changes in BOLD). During this Faculty Senate meeting Sine Anahita suggested that the process be amended to increase the

There was agreement that Sine will start by working up a new draft of that process that includes language for greater faculty involvement and earlier in the process. That language will be emailed to the members of the FAC to review and make suggestions. When we finalize and come to agreement on that language, the FAC members agreed that Sine can be the FAC Committee member to take this language back to and work with the Curriculum Affairs Committee who is ultimately in charge of these revisions.

2. Discussion of Adjunct Faculty Issues

Sine presented some of the issues and concerns with adjunct needs in a document she created. That document is attached to these minutes (See Adjunct Faculty Discussion Notes by S. Anahita). Sine reviewed the problems and reviewed several possible solutions.

Paul Layer discussed how many of these issues are part of contractual terms of the CBA for adjuncts. Perhaps some of these issues are not under Faculty Senate purview and authority and are really union issues that should be addressed through the CBA. In response, Sine said that maybe the role of Faculty Senate is to urge the administration to better recognize adjunct needs and show support for the adjuncts.

Andy encouraged us to develop a draft Faculty Senate resolution to bringtaf02 r3.4anard.1(t)- 2.9)1oJ0 Tc 0 Tw 4 16(0 8Td

Question from Andy: Does UNAC support the changes? Jeff, yes, they do now. Took some discussion.

Paul: MAU process is the purview of the Faculty Senate, so if the process is not correct, then it is a