**Committee on Faculty Affairs Minutes  
Oct. 22, 2014**

**Present:** E. Borland, S. Carroll, J. Gevertz, W. Keep, R. Morin, J. Neves, G. Pogue, D. Shaw, V. Tucci (chair), I. Zake

**Absent:** S. Drozd, O. Hernandez, T. Youngblood

**Excused**: P. Wiita

**Minutes:** The minutes of the Oct. 1, 2014, meeting were approved as submitted.

**Announcement:** Val said that, because of the Thanksgiving holiday, there will be no CFA meeting on Nov. 26.

**Ongoing Business: Review of Disciplinary Standards for Fall Hires and for other departments that revised their standards.**  
Counselor Education standards were approved with two small changes. On page nine, “rough guidelines” should be changed to “guidelines.” And it should be added that it is up to the candidates to assert their scholarly outcomes.

Special Education, Language and Literacy standards were approved, with the committee noting that the scholarly outcomes are more rigorous than for most other departments.

Electrical and Computer Engineering standards are still pending.

**Ongoing Business: Discussion of interim timelines and combining tenure/promotion processes.**

Val reviewed AFT opinions on these topics and noted that, when the document was to be presented to the Board of Trustees in Sept. 2014, Jackie had Legal package the timeline together with the issue of delaying reappointment evaluations due to FMLA events in addition to process changes to improve security. But AFT divided this document back into three separate issues and raised issues about the number of Board of Trustees reviews in the new timeline for fall hires. At the most recent AFT meeting, Ralph said there would be an MOA regarding the interim timeline for fall 2014 hires. Greg said this issue has to be resolved before the trustees’ December meeting because it’s on the agenda. Regina said CFA’s work on this issue is done.

**Ongoing Business: Review of MUSE RFP**

Stuart and Jana led this discussion, noting that our charge does not mention mission but the Senate language says we should address it. So CFA has to decide what to do. Regina said some faculty feel their disciplines are discounted, and their research is not seen as important as lab sciences. But the issue, Jana said, is what language in the RFP suggests this? Liz said we may want to go back to Steering to clarify our charge. Bill said if we grow MUSE so that approved proposals from non-science departments are proportional to those from the sciences, the college couldn’t afford it; he also noted that the structure of MUSE fits the sciences very well. So the question is, do we have a program that puts money into all faculty research or don’t we? Liz and Joao suggested that the problem may be with the people who are judging the applications, not with the RFP language. Ieva said the only way to resolve this would be to allocate MUSE funds proportionally across the schools, but this isn’t our charge. We are charged with looking at the language of the RFP. Stuart said the immediate issue was for CFA to vote on the 2015 RFP. CFA members agreed and voted to approve the RFP. But members also agreed that we want to pursue the larger question, so Stuart will write to Steering.

**Ongoing Business: Structure and Function of College Promotions Committee**

Because CFA recommended joining the process for tenure and promotion to associate professor into a single process, we now need to make recommendations on two closely related issues: Should the College Promotions Committee become a College Tenure and Promotion Committee? What should be the timeline for the joint tenure/promotion process? Val reviewed the process for collecting comments at CFA’s upcoming Oct. 29 open forum. It was decided that CFA members will use large sheets of paper, posted in front of the audience, to record all comments on each of our six proposals, plus another page for other proposals.

**Ongoing Business: Faculty reassigned time**

Bill said this issue is not yet on the Council of Deans agenda but may be added on Friday 10/24.

**Outstanding Charges from Steering and Sub-committee members:**

Clarify Service Section in Promotions and Reappointment Document – Regina and Liz

Modifying Peer Review of Teaching in Promotions and Reappointment Document

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Shaw