

FAC Committee
Meeting Notes--16 September 2022

The FAC met on the afternoon of 16 September 2022 to set an agenda for the 2022-2023 academic year. Patricia Welch began the meeting by providing updates on the senate by-laws committee, and information about Gradescope, which the university is piloting more broadly this year.

The FAC committee will continue work on a few issues that were begun last year (or earlier), including a review of digital measures, and the special leave evaluation rubric. In addition, the committee will review and update items in the FPS. Discussion of the FPS items (provided below, though not exclusive) was tabled until the next meeting, so that people can review the items.

Subcommittees were formed for the following items:

Digital Measures: Sylvia, Rebecca, Stu

Special Leaves Rubric: Brian McF., Comila, Pat Welch

Pat Welch also asked members of the FAC to review the definition of the FAC in the By-laws.

FPS items to review:

- i. 6 [Summer School Teaching](#) (rev. 1981)
- ii. 18: [Annuity](#) (rev. 1986)
- iii. 19: [Insurance](#) (rev. 1981)
- iv. 25: [Faculty Loans](#) (rev. 1969)
- v. 28: [Retirement](#) (rev. 1986)
- vi. 29A: [Courtesy Privileges of Active and Retired Regular Faculty Members](#) (rev. 1984)
- vii. 30: [Death Benefits](#) (rev. 1986)
- viii. 38: [Faculty Study Rooms in the Library](#) (rev. 1981)
- ix. 40: [Permanent Vehicle Registration](#) (rev. 1969)

NOTE: this list is not exclusive; there are others, so it would be helpful if people could look through the list.

FAC Committee
21 October 2022
Minutes

Members Present: Rebecca Natow, Xiang Fu, Patricia Welch, Kevin McElroy, Brian McFadden, Stuart Bass, Sylvia Silberger, Comila Shahani-Denning.

Minutes from the September FAC committee meeting were approved.

Sent Back to Committee: Adjunct Recognition Award. In 2021-2022, the FAC came up with and approved an Adjunct Recognition Award, which passed at Senate and after it went to the Provost's office, we were told that this was an item that was to wait until Charlie Riordan assumed his position as Provost. He has since reviewed and is in general agreement with the desire to have an adjunct recognition system, but he wanted us as a committee to review the process and criteria by which the faculty of the year are selected.

Lively discussion followed. Kevin said that most awardees in the law school are 1L; Questions about the number of participants and how students voted; in the law school, voting seems to be robust, which doesn't seem to be the case in the rest of the university. Comila mentioned how the sample size is very small, and adding adjuncts would make the sample size much smaller. In response to a question, she mentioned that it's limited to graduating students, and that they have to log into the portal, and decide from a very long list of faculty. Adding adjuncts here would make a very very long list.

Xiang Fu suggested in the chat that maybe it would be wise to limit the faculty that students vote for to only the profs that they have had with the technical expertise of IT. Committee members seemed to think that this would make the voting much more appealing since they would only see their own profs, not the whole list.

There was then a discussion about changing the system for teacher of the year, perhaps as a nomination system. Rebecca and other members spoke very convincingly how this is student driven, and that it wouldn't be good if we removed this student driven award. There was discussion about the mentor of the year award, which is nomination driven.

Decision to form a subcommittee to find out facts and figures about the process at Hofstra. Pat mentioned that she had looked at the process of other similar awards at other universities, and then look again at adjunct recognition systems once the process has been examined. Comila offered to help facilitate this committee. Also that Rich Apollo handles it in the provost's office.

Subcommittee: Stu, Xiang, Brian

Committee Reports: neither the Special Leaves Rubric or the Digital measures committee had a report at this time. Comila mentioned that she had actually changed the deadlines a bit

(making them later); and that a special provost's office email would be used for the applications.

Review of the FAC committee definition from By-Laws (Appendix B)

Pat mentioned that there is a special committee of the Senate that is reviewing the by-laws, and that she wanted to have a discussion of the FAC as it currently exists. She pulled it up on a shared screen for review. Does the definition of the committee as it exists in the by-laws fit the purview of the FAC?

Rebecca asked if there were actually grievances. Pat said, yes, it does happen; then Rebecca asked what was different about that committee and what the FAC does. Pat showed the definition in the by-laws and said that they hear cases that rise to the level of grievances when they are not related to the CBA.

Stu B provided some additional information and clarification. Clearing up that the FAC doesn't sit on the grievances, but that the FAC helps constitute the committee, and then receives a report after the hearing of the Special Committee.

No one raised any additional questions about the definition of the FAC as presented in the by-laws.

New Business: CTR discussion. could we include this in our meeting next month. Agreement.

Review of FPS

Summer Teaching FPS 6. Seems to contradict the CBA by limiting summer teaching to a single summer session; also, we should consider how some of the newer programs organize their teaching models, without a strict fall start.

Subcommittee: Brian, Kevin, Sylvia

Annuity, FPS 18. Needs to be changed because it is outdated in terms of the annuity plan

Subcommittee: Rebecca, Yasser, Mario

Insurance FPS 19 may need to update

Subcommittee: Xiang Fu, Pat, Anthony

Faculty Loans FPS 25:

Subcommittee: Pat, Stuart B, Xiang Fu

After briefly discussing the above FPS, and assigning subcommittees to look further, the meeting adjourned.

Appendices (from Agenda 21 October 2022):

Appendix A: Faculty Recognition award, as determined by FAC 2021-2022

- a. **MOTION:** P. Welch made a motion to amend the Teacher of the Year voting process to include all adjuncts who met the eligibility criteria for the award. With this motion, a single ballot would be created containing the names of all eligible faculty, both full-time and part-time; following the voting process the respective full-time and part-time awardees for each school and division of HCLAS would be selected.

Motion Passed.

(Existing) Eligibility for Teacher of the Year Award.

Eligibility is as following: All faculty members who have taught a minimum of three (3) full years at Hofstra are eligible for the Teacher of the Year award. A faculty member who receives the award will be removed from the ballot for the following four (4) years (i.e., excluded for one four-year academic cycle). Once back on the ballot, the faculty member would be eligible for the Teacher of the Year Award after three (3) additional years. Following this procedure, both potential first-time and past Teacher of the Year recipients are treated equally.

<https://www.hofstra.edu/provost/>

Appendix B: Faculty Affairs Committee (from the by-laws of the Senate)

V. The Faculty Affairs Committee¹

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall consist of a minimum of four elected faculty senators and enough faculty senators-at-large so that each of the academic units and divisions shall be represented (Frank G. Zarb School of Business, School of Education, Health and Human Services, the Lawrence Herbert School of Communication, Hofstra College of Liberal Arts and Sciences divisions of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences, University Library, School of Law). It shall be advised by the Provost or his/her designate.

It shall:

1. recommend to the Senate appropriate policy regarding:
 - 1.) the definition of the responsibilities and privileges of faculty members;
 - 2.) the problems of academic freedom and tenure
 - 3.) standards of remuneration of faculty members; including other-than-monetary

benefits customarily or contractually enjoyed by the faculty, such as grants, leaves, aid to research and publication, and related matters

2. serve as a Board of Appeals for faculty members for conciliation or adjudication of those complaints which constitute grievances.

FAC minutes—November 2022
For meeting of 11 November 2022

Approval of October Minutes

The FAC met to continue discussion on FPS items that may need to be updated and other items.

FPS 25. Faculty Loans. The committee decided that no revisions were necessary since occasionally faculty request them.

FPS 6: Summer School Teaching. Committee made a report indicating how the FPS needs to be brought into compliance with current CBA. This language will be voted on at the December meeting.

FPS 18: Annuity—no report

FPS 19 Insurance—no report

The FAC also hopes to come up with a more robust rubric for the special leave applications; the committee has not yet met, but will meet before the semester ends.

There was additional discussion on the Teacher of the Year process.

With respect to the Blue Ribbon Report on CTRs, the committee decided to invite the co-chairs Stavros Valenti and Kevin Nolan to speak at the next FAC meeting in December.

to continue work on updating FPS items that we believe to be outdated, to bring them into compliance with the CBA or otherwise reflect current practice. We had hoped to be able to finalize our discussion on most of them by the December meeting, but that may no longer be possible, so we are focusing on revisions to the rubric for the special leave applications, which we plan to complete by the end of the semester, prior to review of applications in January. At our next meeting we will have three guests: Stavros Valenti and Shaun Thelen with respect to the Blue Ribbon CTR report, and Jen Mone, counsel regarding process for the Special Committee on Grievances.

Patricia Welch
Chair, FAC

FAC Minutes
December 2, 2022, December 9, and January 2023

2 December 2022

On 2 December, the FAC committee met. The agenda for the meeting included a discussion a process that would be determined to govern the meeting of the Special Committee on Grievances with Jen Mone, general counsel; a meeting with the co-chairs of the Blue Ribbon Committee on CTRs, as well as to finalize discussion on FPS #6 (Summer School Teaching) and FPS #18 (Annuity). Because discussion with Jen Mone took most of the meeting, we met only briefly with the co-chairs of the committee on CTRs and tabled the remaining items.

Process for the Special Committee on Grievances
Jennifer Mone, General Counsel, Guest

Prior to the meeting, Jen Mone provided the FAC with a document process for the Special Committee on Grievances, which handles grievances otherwise not covered by the CBA. This document was based largely on the disciplinary process outlined in Article 12 of the CBA.

Jen Mone walked the committee through the document, and briefly exited the meeting at moments when the committee wished to discuss certain item numbers in the document, mostly regarding.

The committee was pleased with the document at the end of the meeting, though agreed to meet one week later to approve this process for the current grievance. They agreed to consider ruling on this process as a general process for Grievances under the Special Committee on Grievances in the spring semester.

Discussion of report of the Blue Ribbon Committee on CTRS
Guests: Kevin Nolan and Stravros Valenti, Co-chairs of the committee

Because the discussion with Jen Mone extended almost to the end of the scheduled meeting time, we tabled a full discussion until spring 2023. Stavros did provide background on the committee and its results.

We agreed to invite them to the first meeting of the Spring 2023 semester.

The following items were tabled:

FPS 18 (Annuity)

FPS 6 (Summer School Teaching)

9 December 2022

Motion: The FAC committee met solely to vote on whether to approve the process governing the Special Committee on Grievances for the current grievance. **Motion passed.**

The FAC will discuss whether this document should be approved as a general process for governing grievances under the Special Committee on Grievances in the spring semester.

**FAC March 3, 2023
Minutes**

Present: Tony Basile, Patricia Welch, Stuart Bass, Yasser Salem, Mario Tomei, Sylvia Silberger, Brian McFadden, Jean Paul Rodrigue, Rebecca Natow, Comila Shahani-Denning

Not Present: Xiang Fu, Kevin McElroy

Guest: Stavros Valenti

The FAC met on March 3, 2023, mostly to discuss the work of the Blue-Ribbon Committee on CTRs and proposed changes to FPS #49. Stavros walked us through the work of the committee, the new instrument, and the proposed way it might be administered. He also spoke about how the 2-step process of the current on-line administration (which is the result of an emergency MOU during the pandemic) might suppress participation though on-line ctrs are lower in general compared to in-person administration.

The committee had questions about various aspects of the proposed instrument (mainly the combining of certain elements) and of the proposed implementation, though there seems to be fairly strong consensus that the instrument is better and we will be moving to on-line administration of CTRs. There was some concern that there are two things at stake here, both of which needs to go through shared governance. We need also consider that the next full faculty member is in May, which makes changes to FPS #49 unlikely this semester,

We also discussed FPS #43, which is the sexual harassment policy. Due to an incident in the fall, it became clear that those covered under Appendix A of the policy have no right of appeal. At present, appendix A also covers adjuncts. This reflects a time when there was bias against adjuncts. In recent years, the senate has tried to address bias against adjuncts and others in the FPS. (In fact, FAC #43 was revised last year to cover the unique role of chairs.)

We have formed two subcommittees to address these issues, and the FAC, together with the Union, will be hosting a faculty forum on zoom on March 29 at noon to discuss the proposed CTR instrument and administration. (This will be a zoom meeting.)

Subcommittee on FPS #43

Tony Basile
Patricia Welch
Stuart Bass
Yasser Salem
Mario Tomei

Subcommittee on FPS #49

Tony Basile
Patricia Welch
Sylvia Silberger
Brian McFadden
Rebecca McElroy

FAC Minutes
28 April 2023

In attendance: Patricia Welch, Mario, Sylvia, Tony Basile, Brian McFadden, Kevin McElroy,
Guest: Caroline Schreiner (for FPS 43)

Patricia Welch began by asking permission to record the meeting for the purpose of minutes. There were no minutes to approve as Welch hadn't completed preparing them for the last two meetings.

Update on FPS #43, Harassment Policy. The committee had begun a discussion of potential changes on it, to ensure protection for adjunct faculty members; In reviewing the document on line, P Welch realized that it didn't contain the revisions the FAC had worked on and had been approved by the full senate in February 2022. Caroline looked into what had happened and learned that it is still under legal review. What this meant is that the FPS subcommittee was working with a document that is earlier than that which we have approved, though which is our intention.

Caroline agreed to look further; the committee needs to determine which version we need to be working on, as well as when. There was agreement among the committee members that it would be appropriate to extend protection to adjuncts as we had to chairs in their capacity as faculty members.

Patricia Welch's suggestion was to use what we consider our most recent document (ie with the chair protection, though wait until that moves forward to make additional changes. After some clarification, the committee agreed we should use OUR most recent document to propose changes to FPS #43 and submit once we hear about the version in legal so we are using the most recent version.

With that agreement we proceeded to review language.

Patricia Welch asked Comila for an update on the faculty of the year award. Without providing numbers, Comila was able to confirm that the response rate did go up though not dramatically. Patricia asked for clarification, as she had heard from some students that they were to write a statement about the professors they chose. Having understood that there was no statement in the past, Pat wanted clarification as to the possible change. Comila didn't seem to know about this, but Brian confirmed that one of his students had told him about the statement and had shared that they had voted for him.

Update on FPS #49. FAC had voted on it at the previous meeting; it was approved by the SEC with some changes and will be going up for a vote.

Tony asked to make a statement about the announcement regarding CTRs, which had gone out from the provost's office last week announcing online CTRs. Tony stressed that he has no

objection to online CTRs, but that in the absence of an agreement the status quo IS paper, not online as the provost had suggested, and was thus concerned about governance issues. He stated that he had suggested a joint statement from AAUP and the Provost's office numerous times, and that the union would be filing a grievance against the provost about its absence. He suggested in the absence of a statement that the union might recommend voting against FPS #49 in order to make a statement about governance.

Patricia asked if a recommendation for a statement could come from either party to the contract, and was there anything precluding Tony, as a representative of the deliberative body considering revisions to a governing document from doing so.

Tony recognized the point, but reminded the committee that the document in question is a senate document not a union one.

Comila asked to go on the record about the work of the Blue Ribbon Committee on CTRs. She relayed how the committee was a shared Admin and Union committee, and that they had been trying to work with shared governance, that she didn't think the admin was trying to bypass governance, merely that the email was relating the on-lie procedure. She also mentioned that one faculty member was upset that he not allowed to speak at the faculty forum about the work of the committee. She stressed the need to work collaboratively.

There was some back and forth between Comila and Tony about the dismantling of the CTR office rendering paper CTRs unlikely despite that being out of compliance.

Patricia Welch broke in to remind when we got the document and how we too have been working hard to seriously consider FPS #49 and the work of the committee, and that the provost and the union should work out a compromise to take care of the compliance gap for this semester. She asked if there might be some way for the union and administration to come together to make a shared statement before the faculty meeting? There was agreement from other FAC members that would be a good idea.

Tony agreed he would be willing to meet but had to step away from the meeting.

There was a bit more discussion about the faculty forum. Patricia repeated that the intent was to gather questions and concerns not promote a particular document.

Discussion ended with a general discussion of the teacher of the year process. If the process has been changed beyond allowing all class years to vote, Patricia has some concerns, since the requirement to write a statement may have turned off potential respondents.

After thanking the committee for their service, the meeting adjourned.

1. Greetings
2. Request for permission to record for the purpose of minutes
3. Approval of minutes from March (2 sets) (if available)
4. FPS #43
5. Update on Faculty of the Year Award
6. FPS #49—next steps
 - a. Instrument
 - b. DL teaching
 - c. Anything else?
7. New Business

Pending Items—Tabled Until Next Year:

8. Motion: Updated language re Summer School Teaching (FPS 6). (pending AAUP lawyer's evaluation)
9. Motion: Updated language re Annuity (FPS 18) (pending AAUP lawyer's evaluation)

Attachments:

- 1) FPS #43