Dennis Wignall: (passed out ballots for three candidates for college-level RTP committee; Senate was informed that if they voted on-line, not to vote on paper, too; ballots will be collected shortly)

Ed Reber: On your copies, revisions are usually marked in yellow (the ones we put in), as we (FSEC) have considered them, plus many contributions from others, especially Robert Carlson, Pam, Julie, Martha, etc. have also worked through them. One thing we’ve done is e-mail them for clarification. Dennis wants to vote on at least some of these today; I will explain how we’ve made changes on many things – Donna, glad you’re here to give context and perspective.

**POLICY 5-14: Student Records:** Has to do with transfer: one of the big changes made is dealing with transcript credits (on 6th page from end): 5.47 E & F. Acceptable grade changed from C- to D -- addresses disparity between acceptability between schools.

Donna Dillingham-Evans: The discrepancy between our students for graduation & others coming in – at the time, it was decided to accept equivalent grades.

Ed Reber: Now, a department may not decide to accept the grade to pass a prerequisite, even if it was OK to get into college...?

Donna Dillingham-Evans: Yes.

Ed Reber: OK, I was just looking for reasoning behind this.

Victor Hasfurther: Let’s talk about G.

Ed Reber: iii was something we added in.

??: Where it says “as part of baccalaureate program,” can it say “degree program” so it covers Associate’s degrees, too?

Curtis Larsen: Then what about Certificates? Can it just say “programs” without a qualifier? (change noted)

Ed Reber: In G: we inserted “lower division” & “upper division” because not everyone uses the 1000-2000 numbering system.

Curtis Larsen: If someone takes class at a 2 year institution that is equivalent to one of our 3000+ level classes, then we can’t accept it?

Karmen Aplanap: Across the nation, all dental hygiene programs teach the same stuff, but many are at community colleges that can’t offer upper level classes, so when they come in, they have taken essentially the same classes as we offer at upper levels but with different numbers – this says we cannot accept those.
Ed Reber: Would it be more appropriate if G said “programs & departments will evaluate student’s courses to see if they can substitute for 3000+ level classes coming in”...? (general agreement of something to this effect) For Hi (regarding religious classes), I tried many different words – how do we say this? Do we even need it?

Donna Dillingham-Evans: If a class is teaching someone to be a Catholic, rather than being a comparative religion course – that’s where schools nationally draw the line of what’s not acceptable.

(ALL): “Doctrine” is OK phrasing.

Ed Reber: Other changes are very small words, you should be able to see these in your copies and see if they work for you; if not, send your suggestions to me & cc Dennis. OK, POLICY 3-3 IIB: I’m not sure what is intended here (“non-tenure track faculty may include...”) -- does this mean non-tenure-track people can apply for rank advancement but not tenure?

Donna Dillingham-Evans: Rather than calling them instructors, we can bring them in at a given level, but they cannot advance.

Ed Reber: Maybe we need to say that non-tenure track faculty may be appointed at the rank of...

Dennis Wignall: Should this list also include full professors?

Donna Dillingham-Evans: Yes.

Ed Reber: “They shall not be eligible for tenure; non-tenure track faculty may be appointments to ranks of associate, assistant, etc. at time of hire.”

Donna Dillingham-Evans: If we change RTP policy to address this issue, this will have to be revisited here, too.

Ed Reber: The big issue that raised hackles was 3-27...we changed it to make clear that initiation of an ANNOUNCEMENT of a position could be made by administration, but they just cannot go out and APPOINT someone as faculty without going through normal faculty process of a search by the department in question. Does this sound all right?

Erin O’Brien: But this just says that departments can initiate a search but so can administration; it doesn’t say anything about administrators cannot HIRE a faculty member without initiating a search. If you are trying to restrict the ability to HIRE without a search, that needs to be explicit.

Dennis Wignall & Ed Reber: There needs to be a “ivb” under “iva.” Says: “initiations of a search does not give the right of administration to directly appoint any candidates” or something.

Donna Dillingham-Evans: I think that will hamstring the president’s ability to move into areas that would benefit departments on campus, so what you might want to say is PERMANENT or TENURE-TRACK faculty, or REGULAR faculty, or something. That way, he has freedom that presidents have
anyway to say who does and doesn’t work, but if it is to be a PERMANENT hire, it has to go through search.

Victor Hasfurther: At University of Wyoming, the president can appoint whoever s/he wants, but THEN the department of that faculty has to accept that appointment.

Erin O’Brien: As we grow and have more opportunities to attract more high-profile people, one way we might succeed in that is if they happen to be a two-academic family, so if we want one of them, we might create position for the spouse.

Donna Dillingham-Evans: That’s the reason why I don’t want to see NO allowance for the president to have the ability to do this...

Ed Reber: Well, then the president can just say that an appointment is not regular faculty... OK, further down, there is a bunch of stuff crossed out (27.1.3, VI, 27.1.3, etc. plus stuff in yellow at VII) concerning the Hiring Committee. We got feedback from nearly everyone; our rewrite is based on that. The gist of the change is that HR will train all department chairs or their designees for search committees – the idea of a Hiring Committee is gone.

Dennis Wignall: Many departments are now large enough that the department chair does not have to chair a search committee, but someone from the department on a search committee must be trained on compliance.

Ed Reber: C was eliminated because it referred to the Hiring Committee. We do have some cases where people would probably want more than just 2 people from within a department on their committee, so “minimum of 2” added. ...that’s the revision language, and this is the issue most were concerned about – anything else about it?

Erin O’Brien: Given the number of minority people on campus, do we need to put in language saying minorities can turn down a request to serve because they’ve already been on a large number of searches in a given year? Maybe change “possible” to “feasible” or something...

Debbie ?: Farther down, re: telephone interviews: should these be applied to ALL candidates, BEFORE a search committee narrows them down?

(ALL): get rid of XIIA because XIC covers it already and better.

Debbie ?: Also, something about restricting candidate interactions...

Ed Reber: Can you reword that and get it to me?

Donna Dillingham-Evans: This came from the departments; I don’t think we need to be super-restrictive.

Philip ?: XIVC should say “may include but are not limited to the following” or somesuch.
Donna Dillingham-Evans: What we’re trying to control there is that the SCHEDULING of interviews should minimize interactions between candidates, not that candidates themselves are restricted.

Dennis Wignall: I appreciate attendance – get any other changes/comments to us ASAP and we’ll get revisions posted in order to get a vote ASAP.