

TO: Chris Taverna, FPAC  
FR: Beez Schell, liaison  
CC: Bruce Simon, University Senate  
DATE: April 9, 2009  
RE: VP Council responses to questions

---

The following is a list of responses from VP Council members regarding questions about the “draft policies” document.

April 9, 2009

Beez gave background on the Senate discussion and the plans to engage the FPAC in organizing comments.

Q 1: What do we see as open to consultation with the Senate?

Anything that is not a mandatory subject of bargaining can be determined in a draft by the Senate. Other subjects should be negotiated with the UUP, but people can give their opinions to the Senate.

Q2: What current practices are occurring that need to be clarified?

- Inconsistencies among local policies
- Lack of clear and equitable standards
- Lack of a pathway for pre-tenure faculty to clarify expectations
- Lack of clear terms and advice about appropriate evidence
- Lack of clarity about constituencies of committees, processes
- Lack of clarity in the timeline for professionals (people fall through cracks)
- Lack of clarity in how professionals can participate in reviews and response processes
- Lack of a clear system and rational timeline

Q3: What are the biggest issues that we need to address?

- Equity, consistency, integrity, clear policies needed for accreditation
- Need to connect evaluation of faculty and professionals with mission
- De-politicizing the process
- Clarification of who is involved and roles in reviews
- Clarifying appeal processes to allow for review and response
- Clarifying institutional practices and processes
- Preserving each individual’s rights in the process
- Clarifying criteria for reappointment and promotion, including early promotion or continuing appointment

- Clarifying timelines
- Clarifying that departmental autonomy is not the first principle of a university; it is a shared academic mission. Disciplinary perspectives are important, and the department is the basic academic unit. But we need more cooperative understanding to ensure integrity and equity.
- Clarifying that tenure is at the university, not in a department, and all share in the responsibility of mentoring faculty
- Clarifying the reasons that the policies recommend adding a SUNY Fredonia faculty from outside the department to the department committee. Including external members to the department was an attempt to provide a validation process that is standard practice in academe. We need to have faculty eyes from more than one department, as faculty have a shared responsibility for the academic mission. This step makes transparent the achievements across campus, the varied but shared qualities of how we approach teaching, scholarship, and service.
- It's a peer process. Particularly in department with few faculty, it's common and equitable to have more people involved in the review of a broader group.
- Resolving the issue of election to University Personnel Committee? Perhaps the Senate Executive committee could develop a slate, in consultation with the VPAA, that the Senate could vote on to amend or approve. Perhaps the senate executive committee can nominate (two ?) members to the VPAA who would serve along with the other members appointed by the VPAA.
- The draft policies are not any person's or even the VP Council's. They represent our attempt to codify the suggestions from the Task Force report and to address the recurring issues that arise in FPAC forums and in departmental issues. They are meant to be discussed and edited.

If you need any clarification on these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me [beez.schell@fredonia.edu](mailto:beez.schell@fredonia.edu).