

SMC Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee meeting minutes
Tuesday, April 5, 2016
1:30pm to 2:50pm
Library 275

Present: Andrew Nestler (chair), Sherri Lee-Lewis (vice-chair), Trish Burson, Nate Donahue, Tracey Ellis, Mitch Heskell, Moya Mazorow, Will Pachas-Flores

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:35pm.
2. A motion to add to the agenda discussion on AR 3211.3 Department Chairperson – Tenure and Selection was made by Moya and seconded by Nate, and approved unanimously.
3. There were no public comments.
4. Announcement: AR 3211.3 was approved by the Senate Executive Committee on March 1 and was approved by the full Senate as a first read earlier today.
5. Discussion on AR 3211.3 (Department Chairperson – Tenure and Selection): At Exec earlier today, this AR was approved with a recommendation that we strike the sentence, “Elected faculty leaders are subject to the same department election procedures as chairpersons.” It was stated at the Senate that this would be a political move, since the Senate President and Faculty Association leadership are attempting to negotiate away from the term “elected faculty leaders.”

Sherri mentioned that she is focused on the users of this document, who are current or prospective department chairs and elected faculty leaders. Moya pointed out that according to section 22.2 of Article 2 of the faculty contract, a department may have a chair or a faculty leader, but not both. The contract does not refer to any specific regulation. Article 22 of the faculty contract states, “Department chairs and departmental faculty leaders are selected in accordance with administrative regulations.” The committee wishes to keep this disputed sentence in the document; the committee would feel more comfortable with losing the sentence if this AR were specifically referred to in the contract.

Also at the Senate meeting, it was requested that we remove one third-person singular use of the word “their.” With this one revision, the draft was moved by Nate and seconded by Moya, and approved unanimously.

6. The draft of the minutes of the March 1 meeting was amended to include mention of the committee’s discussion of an idea not to require letters of recommendation at the first stage of the full-time faculty hiring process. Moved by Trish, seconded by Tracey, approved unanimously.

7. Discussion on AR 3214 (Sabbaticals): It appears that the Faculty Association leadership views no conflict between paragraph 2 of the AR and the contract language regarding when a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for a sabbatical. The committee further revised the paragraph in order to make clear that 6 years of full-time service must follow a sabbatical prior to going on a subsequent sabbatical.

According to paragraph 11, sabbatical awardees have 60 business days following their return in which to submit a summary report. The committee found the use of business days here problematic, and recommended changing this to a number of days or weeks, such as 12 weeks.

The committee discussed section 12, the “due process” portion of the AR. Questions that perhaps should be answered in this AR include: When should the Sabbaticals Committee begin its evaluation process? In the event of a preliminary determination that the sabbatical project was not substantially completed, what if a required meeting is not held by the stated deadline? The committee realized that this AR is the appropriate place for a general evaluation timeline, while details of implementation should still be left to the Sabbaticals Committee.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 2:50pm.