

**Faculty Handbook Revision Committee**  
**Minutes, November 18, 2014**

**Present:** Chris Craig, Chris Herr, Roberto Canales, Alicia Mathis, Sharmistha Self, Dick Williams, and Dave Goodwin

Minutes from the last meeting were reviewed and approved.

The PRESENT AND ENGAGED handout was discussed. The revisions made in the document were highlighted and presented. An overview of the Faculty Senate meeting was given. The last highlighted paragraph was suggested to include the wording “for example” so that it wasn’t interpreted that those were the only reasons for department head approval. It was then suggested, discussed and decided to remove everything after the word approval with no examples and additional wording.

Chris Craig asked Sharmistha Self if there would be any pre-steps to take before presenting this to the senate. It was suggested to talk with Steve, that there wasn’t any way to predict what faculty would say.

Item 2 was then reviewed and discussed. It was decided that the map did not need to be presented to senate since it was just an index not anything of substance being changed through the handbook. The issue of having Department Head input was also discussed. It was agreed that the additional wording in regard to Department Heads should be added. Dave will draft a document cataloging all the places in the handbook that deals with in some way with being present and engaged. That will then be reviewed by the committee and then will be sent out to the department heads to help them as an artifact from the committee and not a handbook change.

Minimum Enrollment standards were discussed and it was questioned if this needs to be included into the handbook. It was agreed this would be a change to the handbook. This would be added to clarify what is meant by enrollment standards. Break even points were also discussed. Chris suggested that he and Sharmistha bring this up in ALC and bring the feedback to the next FHRC meeting.

4.7 timeline issues with appeals was then discussed. The fact is that there isn’t a timeline. It was agreed that this was an issue that needed to be addressed. It was suggested to have a window of time for someone to say they didn’t agree, then a time line to get with the PPC. Appealing a case was discussed. It was stated that the Provost decision on tenure is right before spring break in the middle of March. Finding other university timelines was discussed. Chris will go to general counsel and ask them how they recommend we proceed. If any universities need to be contacted Chris will have his GA work on gathering the information.

No meeting in December. Next meeting will be in January.