

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee  
1-12-16  
Notes

Those present were: Cathy Pearman, Chris Herr, Mike Foster, Penni Groves (guest), Roberto Canales, Jamaine Abidogun, Barry Wisdom and Chris Craig

The meeting was called to order by Roberto Canales. The minutes from the December meeting were reviewed and approved.

Roberto stated that he submitted the recommendation from last month's meeting to Faculty Senate. That will be presented at next week's Faculty Senate meeting. He is going to spend a minute to explain what was done as a committee on each issue.

Chris Craig gave an overview of what would be discussed next month in regard to a consensual relationship between a student and faculty discussed in February meeting. Penni added that she asked the committee members who were involved in the case and they thought strongly that the handbook needed to be revised to handle situations like that circumstance.

Next month's agenda will include the language suggested by the UHP to be reviewed and discussed.

12.3.3 APRC Annual Report to the Faculty Senate was reviewed. It was stated that a minority report is not needed. Specific information is not needed, only the broad information of what kind of issues. "x number of cases and how they were resolved, not the gory details." It was stated that nothing about this is located in the bylaws. The bylaws committee should address this. Mike Foster will take this back so that the bylaws committee will know that this issue exists.

12.3.6 Notification to Parties Involved – it was just shown that the Provost wasn't in the loop.

12.3.8 APRC Recommendations – it was stated that there was a plural "parties". The sentences must be modified so that it is clear that both parties need to agree to it. It was agreed to add "and the Provost" to the sentence "This report is given to the faculty member, the party against whom the grievance has been alleged and the Provost." In regard to the second highlighted sentence, it was suggested to read... "The faculty member and the party against whom the grievance has been alleged must inform the APRC in writing within five business days whether they agree to the recommendations."

12.3.9 Right to Initiate Formal Review Process – It was questioned if it was appropriate to give the faculty member additional time to submit additional key documents. There was discussion. It was stated that 12.3.2 provides the faculty member an opportunity to bring up additional information and documents. It was decided that "filing written notification" would then suffice. It was also discussed that failure to file in a timely manner, barring extenuating circumstances, the APRC recommendations will stand. It was decided the sentence should read.... If the case is not resolved after the APRC has been disseminated, the faculty member may initiate the formal review process for APGP by filing written notification with the APRC in the Faculty Senate office and sending a copy to the Provost Office. Absent

exceptional circumstances, notification must be filed within ten business days of the receipt of the APRC report, or the APRC report will stand.

12.4.1.1 University Hearing Committee – the issue was reviewed. It was stated that the UHC is on rotating terms. It should read that they serve until the next annual election. It was suggested to add that on the panel as part of their role. An agreement to serve on the UHC means to agree to serve on the Hearing Committee. Discussion continued.

Roberto will send an email to close up ideas on this discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.