

**Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)
Annual Report 2003-2004**

FAC dealt with the following items this past academic year:

1. A major concern of the FAC this year revolved around the issues of P and T Standards after departments are reorganized. After consultation with the Faculty Welfare Committee and the University P and T Committee, FAC presented its recommendations for revisions to the Faculty Handbook at the general faculty meeting on May 1, 2003. When that recommendation was forwarded to the Academic Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees on June 6 it had been substantially revised. Most important was the provision that faculty members hired prior to 1995 were to be given only three years to opt for the standards to be applied to future promotions -- those under which they had been hired, or the new ones. The latter provision, as the chair of FAC stated at the Boards of Trustees Subcommittee meeting in June, contradicts the current Faculty Manual.¹ On June 10, FAC agreed to express its concerns about both the time limits imposed and the bypassing of the faculty on this important matter. After consultation with the provost's office and a meeting of the Senate Steering committee, the administration agreed that the three year grace period would be extended to five years and that before going to the full Board of Trustees on the matter, it would be referred again to the faculty at its fall meeting. The FAC chair, at the Steering Committee meeting, asked that the ruling of the legal counsel that the proposed changes presented no problems in law be presented in written form to FAC prior to the faculty meeting.

2. FAC made a recommendation to the Faculty Senate to refer the issue of salary grievance to a special committee to be appointed by the president of the Senate, reporting back to the Senate at its May meeting. The measure was approved. The committee had not met by the time of the May Senate meeting, so its recommendations will be held over to the fall. The issue arose initially because 1) the chair of the grievance committee expressed his view that the committee should opt out of its role in dealing with salary grievance; and 2) because the Faculty handbook requires some sort of review process for salary issues. FAC made preliminary inquiries into other possibilities, including the role of the salary equity committee appointed by and reporting to the provost. That committee, we understand does not routinely give notice to individuals whose salaries depart from the statistically predicted norm, though any faculty member can ask for his or her own analysis. Privacy considerations, the chair of the FAC committee was informed, limits the administration from indicating how that person ranks in regards to others in the unit involved. Several FAC members expressed their hope that any potentially new grievance unit would have some kind of access to that information.

3. In consultation with the Dean of the Graduate College, a proposal for defining Graduate College membership was drafted and then approved by the faculty in its spring meeting. The report was approved by the Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees at its meeting on June 6, 2003. The solution worked out defined membership in the graduate college and indicated that decisions as to membership would be made at the

time when other faculty review processes were undertaken. An appeals process was also mandated.²

4. In the fall of 2002, the FAC dealt with the case of a professor who wanted to be evaluated by departmental guidelines that were in place several years before a major departmental reorganization. His claim was based on a provision in the Faculty Manual that “in no event shall any change in tenure and promotion regulations be made retroactive for faculty hired before Jan 1, 1995, unless the faculty member chooses.” The matter was dropped when we were informed that some resolution of the matter was being made outside of FAC’s purview.

5. FAC was presented with a tenure revocation case by the previous University President and supported by the present one. The charge was that Professor X had violated university policies and state law by refusing to employ student teaching evaluations and/or to meet with his departmental chair as designated in the department annual review process. In accord with the provisions in the Faculty Manual, FAC wrote a letter to the relevant faculty member, asking him if he thought the statements alleged against him were true. If they were true, would it be of such a nature as to warrant the revocation of his tenure? President Sorenson then wrote the chair of FAC that he had directed the university legal counsel to meet with her to ensure that the FAC understood its role in the tenure revocation process. In a subsequent meeting with the entire FAC committee, the university legal counsel informed FAC that negotiations were underway with the person involved to work out some resolution of the matter. FAC decided it would remain active in such cases, seeking no changes in the Faculty Manual relative to its role in tenure revocation.

6. At the request of the provost, FAC examined the possibility of a uniform two-day teaching schedule. Feedback from members of various departments was mixed. In Gint practically everyone favored a two-day schedule. But several persons teaching English and foreign languages and mathematics felt that a three-day schedule was better for their students. Moreover, short scenarios worked out by Tamir Datta of the FAC and Barbara Blaney the University registrar suggest that strict two-day schedules would limit the number of classrooms available for instruction purposes. Though the committee chose not to make a recommendation on this matter, the provost has been informed of FAC’s findings.

7. The problem of procedures to deal with conflict of interest cases was briefly addressed by the committee. No actions were taken and the matter was turned over to the new FAC committee at its June 10 meeting.

8. At the June 10 meeting, FAC nominated William Bearden as the new chair (a position which he has accepted), and welcomed new member Laura Woliver to the committee.

¹The relevant provision reads as follows: No change shall be made in the university wide tenure and promotion regulations except by vote of the full voting membership of the

university faculty or by direction of the Board of Trustees. In no event shall any change in tenure and promotion regulations be made retroactive for faculty hired before January 1, 1995, unless the faculty member chooses otherwise. Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995, shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their hiring. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

²The original SAC recommendation was that the Graduate College list only active members of the Graduate College faculty and that eligibility requirements for teaching graduate courses and serving on committees should be clearly defined and publicized. Smith to Glad, November 6, 2002

Submitted by Betty Glad, Chair of FAC, 2002-03

FAC Members 2002-2003:

James Augustine

William Bearden

Thorne Compton

Tamir Datta

Wolfgang Elfe

Provost Jerome Odom, ex-officio

Robert Wilcox – Chair of Senate, ex-officio