

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Handbook Committee on February 16, 2017, at 9:30 p.m. in the Slovak Room of Grasselli Library.

Present: Ruth Connell (chair), Roy Day, Paul Lauritzen and Dianna Taylor.

FHC meeting Feb. 16, 2017

- I. The committee discussed Pam Mason's email of February 12 (appended below) and subsequent communications. We talked about the timeline that the committee has set for themselves and their desire to have us help draft amendments to the faculty handbook to accommodate the addition of clinical faculty. Since getting us all together is difficult, would we be willing to help draft changes individually, discussing the groups' findings later at our meetings? We divided up the Jesuit schools so that each of us will look at the Faculty Handbooks closely for how they treat non-tenureable faculty in terms of status, voting, contracts, etc. That list is:
Paul: Santa Clara, USF, Georgetown, St. Peter's
Roy: Xavier, Marquette, Loyola Chicago, Rockhurst
Karen: Creighton, Boston College, Holy Cross, Loyola New Orleans
Dianna: Scranton, Canisius, Gonzaga, Loyola Marymount
Ruth: Loyola Maryland, Fairfield, Fordham, LeMoyne
Jeff: Wheeling, Spring Hill, Georgetown, Saint Louis University
- II. Paul suggested that we try to get an amendment on Colleen's drafts soon after we receive them.
- III. Al Miciak joined us and had a few remarks about governance.
 - a. He thinks that our Handbook would work when things aren't contentious but might not hold when they become so. He would like to see tenure requirements consistent across the university (he thinks Boler is consistent but that the College of Arts and Sciences is dicey). He believes that if standards were university-wide it would make the outcomes more uniform. He likes tenure and promotion committees that function at the school or university level. Our standards should look in the 3rd year at potential, but at the point of tenure at excellence defined by a single document. He gave us a document from Duquesne University with their standards and which is an appendix in their Faculty Handbook.
 - b. He also expressed that he thinks our Handbook equivocates because our language is not rock solid. He expressed frustration with the annual evaluation form itself and that it is not online. It asks "did you do this" in a list format while it should be in a more open format. Roy mentioned that Finance and Compensation are looking at this now.
 - c. Dean Miciak further believes that there is too much time between when the work is done and when it is evaluated and suggests that if we can't shorten it we should make it calendar year instead of academic year.

- d. Lastly, he mentioned that sometimes the Handbook moves into Administrative issues when that is unnecessary. His example was contracts for part time people. He would like that process to be digital, too.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45.

(Notes written by Ruth Connell)