

Drew University Faculty Meeting
Minutes
February 26, 2009
4:15 p.m., Great Hall, S.W. Bowne

Voting members present: E. Anderson, W. Ariarajah, M. Beach, M. Boglioli, J. Caldwell, L. Campos, A. Candiotti, J. Cassady, L. Connors, L. Culmer-Nier, M. David, E. DuBord, L. Edwards, R. Fenstermacher, J. Fox, J. Golden, P. Gunter-Smith (presiding), L. Hamilton, H. Huffmon, S. Jamieson, M. Johnson-DeBaufre, J. Kavaloski, A. Koritz, E. Lawler, L. Ledeen, J. Levin, N. Lowrey, K. Madden, A. Mascio, J. Miller, D. Miyamoto, K. Moore, S. Moore, P. Mundo, R. Murawski, A. Nadler, N. Noguera, F. Occhiogrosso, P. Peek, M.-P. Pieretti, R. Ready, C. Riihimaki, J. Romance, R. Rosales, A. Rosan, J. Rose, L. Saganic, V. Samuel, A. Scrimgeour, G. Smith-Wright, A. Son, S. Sundue, H. Tate, R. Timmons, L. Van Blerkom, A. Yardley, E. Zappas,

Guests: J. Elowsky, D. Raikes-Colbert

Preliminaries:

The meeting was called to order by Provost Gunter-Smith at 4:17 pm. She welcomed all to the meeting and thanked the Agenda Committee for setting the agenda. The minutes of the meeting of May 1, 2008, were approved.

Draft of the Faculty Review Section of the University Faculty Handbook:

The Provost thanked the University Faculty Committee on Faculty for their work of the past 1 ½ years. The Committee membership was Erik Anderson, Shannon Bradshaw, Joslyn Cassady, Bob Ready, and Elise Zappas, chaired by Sandra Jamieson and Virginia Burrus. Because Virginia is on sabbatical, Sandra presented the report. The charge was to develop an umbrella policy on reviews that would apply to all faculties, under which separate faculty documents will be able to fit. The committee found the University of Redlands document helpful for a preliminary framework.

In the current document, teaching and service are considered to be common concerns, without distinctions specific to schools. However, there are differences among faculties and even between disciplines in the areas of scholarship such that each faculty will need to define scholarly excellence on the department or discipline level. Guidance for junior faculty has yet to be developed.

Currently feedback, substantive or editorial, is sought and should be sent to Sandra. The intention is to bring the final document to the University Faculty in the fall for a vote of approval.

Discussion:

- Q: After departments develop standards, does CLA need to approve and coordinate (see p.4.)? A: It will go to the Committee on Faculty and the Dean.
- Q: “Standards.” (p.3.) Does each unit devise its own assessment means? Or individual committees on faculty? See p. 8 on contents of what is submitted.

- Item 2.1 (p.8) change it for all reviews, not just tenure
- Q: What is the timeline for faculty currently up for tenure? A: Can't use this document because faculties and departments won't have done their work, so not for this fall, but probably implemented beginning fall 2010.
- Provost: The committee did a good job. This work should help faculty de-mystify the process. It is meant for clarity and not hindrance. There isn't a clear formula. Want departmental best practice, or examples of expected excellence which should help the CoFs.
- Q: Is there a mechanism to update? Regulations say changes to handbook made via UFacCoF. A: The Provost wants to add a clause requiring a review by the committee every 3-5 years.
- Can the committee somehow show the highlights of the changes?
- Q: Regarding letters of evaluation (p.9), what is current practice with internal and external letters, and what does "extent permissible under the law" mean. A: There are no guidelines addressing letters. Currently faculties don't have detail. This draft clarifies. The phrase relates to confidentiality and it is the intent that letters are confidential.
- Sandra: There is new language but no profound changes to any faculty policies. This was an effort to explain and create an umbrella
- Q: There has been a fear of single Committee on Faculty imposing standards. This product is reassuring. Should we consider that promotions of an associate to full be sent to the full University CoF rather than the individual CoF? A: This is elegant, but no one knows of models.

Retiree Benefit Changes:

Deborah Raikes-Colbert reviewed the current retiree health benefits plan which was implemented April 2001 after several years of study. At the time of the study Drew's health care contribution for retirees was \$266.50/month. A provisional cap of \$533, double the 2001 cost, was established which requires re-evaluation of the health care plan when costs approach the cap. Since the current cost is \$464/month, Human Resources, with the Compensation Monitoring Committee and management consultants AEO, are preparing an RFP to find options and evaluate them. The study should be done by August 2009, with the new plan announced in early fall 2009, for an implementation date of January 1, 2011.

Deborah emphasized that any changes to the benefits plan will affect only those who retire after the implementation date. Individuals who retire before the implementation date will retire under the provisions of the current plan.

Discussion:

- Q: Was there faculty input? A: Yes, through the Compensation Monitoring Committee
- Please distribute this information in the next HR newsletter
- Currently retirees pay 30% and Drew pays 70% of the premium, but this might change.
- Drew should take advantage of new Medicare plans such as Schedule D for prescriptions, to reduce Drew's costs

Human Rights Policy:

The Provost reported that it is clear that the policies and practices of the Grievance and Professional Conduct Committees need to be revised. They are being reviewed in relation to the new Human Rights Policy.

Dean Virginia Samuel presented the policy noting that it is not eligible for major re-writes, although stylistic changes may be made before it is printed up for distribution. Work on a human rights policy began several years ago. Recently the Sexual Harassment policy, which has generally been viewed as successful, was used as a skeleton for a broader human rights policy including sexual harassment. The president has determined that this is the policy and, also, that since the essential process had been vetted and approved by all constituencies for the sexual harassment policy, it did not need approval by all constituencies. The Senate has also approved it.

Discussion:

- It is now important to look at the grievance and professional conduct committee to mesh them well
- How will this be enforced and how will students be aware? Use the common hour? It is essential to educate students.
- Q: Is double jeopardy possible? That is, can a decision made through the HRP process be appealed to the Grievance Committee? A: The grievance process must be revised to avoid this.
- A: If a complaint is against a member of the faculty, should the issue be referred immediately to PCC? A: Probably not because the HRP counselors will be trained but the grievance and PCC members will not be.
- On p. 3 add assignment of grades to Free Academic Inquiry
- What about non-academic speech?
- There seems to be overuse of the word “offensive,” which is hard to define
- There will be 5 co-chairs, all of whom will be trained. Their job will be to sift appropriate from inappropriate, try to define reasonable accepted norms, and educate.
- In recent documents the term “collegiality” as a characteristic of faculty has been removed. Has this led to greater incivility?
- A policy with a lot of process protects both accused and accuser and creates an educating environment.
- Q: The institution is liable if there is a known issue even if there is no complaint filed. If we overhear or are aware of an incident, does that require us to report it? A: Yes, the University must act on and investigate issues about which there is knowledge.
- Q: How is a sanction made public? This is the way to educate and change the culture. A: Sanctions and cases may not be made public.
- The policy is expected to be finally approved, but not yet implemented, in a few weeks.

There being no other committee reports, old business, or new business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lessie Culmer-Nier
Chair, Agenda Committee