

Faculty Senate Policy Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 3, 2014

3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Melinda Tinkle (Vice-Chair), Kimberly Gauderman, Lee Brown, and Charles Cunningham

Members Absent: Martha, Muller, (Chair) and Joseph Barbour

Ex-Officio: Leslie Morrison, Vice-Chancellor HSC, Vivian Valencia, University Secretary, Office of the Secretary, and Carol Parker Associate Provost, Office of the Provost & EVP for Academic Affairs, Kimberly Bell, Deputy University Counsel

Ex-Officio Absent:

Staff Present: Candyce Torres, Office of the Secretary, Administrative Coordinator
Carol Stephens, Office of the Secretary, Professional Consultant

Guest Present:

Meeting began at 3:30pm

1. The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee was called to order at 3:30PM on Wednesday December 3, 2014 in Scholes Hall, Room 101 with Vice-Chair, Melinda Tinkle.
2. **E60: Sponsored Research** will go out for 30-day campus comment after the start of the Spring Semester.
3. **C200: Sabbatical.** L Although this draft was approved to go to Operations for approval to send out for campus comment, prior to submission to Operations a substantive proposed change from faculty member, William Michener from University Libraries was received for consideration by the FS Policy Committee. His recommendation included the following: *"Sabbatical applications may be submitted 18 months (or three semesters) in advance of the proposed sabbatical leave in order to provide applicants with sufficient time to acquire fellowship support, obtain visiting faculty status at a host institution, enable family members to accompany the applicant (school*

and employment logistics for spouse and child(ren), and acquire housing and airline tickets at reasonable rates.”

Vice-Chancellor from HSC expressed the following concerns to the FS Policy Committee: “I don't think I like the new language proposed for the sabbatical policy because it seems to imply that the internal approval processes can all take place prior to the faculty member's obtaining all of the necessary permissions and support and making all of the necessary arrangements. Currently the review process includes permissions and support information as part of the review to determine the "...merit of a proposed program from the point of view of the validity of the program and the probable value of the program to the faculty member and to UNM..." The proposed language could put the review committee(s) in the position of having to decide on the basis of incomplete information, and could add extra work since they could be reviewing applications for sabbaticals that might never happen. If I am misreading the language, it would be useful to have someone - perhaps the faculty member who proposed it - come to the committee to explain the proposed addition.”

Action- Insert language in the beginning statement under **Procedures and Guidelines**, proposed item number 4: “With the department Chair's permission sabbatical applications may be submitted 18 months (or three semesters) in advance of the proposed sabbatical leave in order to provide applicants with sufficient time to acquire fellowship support, obtain visiting faculty status at a host institution, enable family members to accompany the applicant (school and employment logistics for spouse and child(ren), and acquire housing and airline tickets at reasonable rates. However, they must be submitted no later than the deadlines listed in the following sections.

Action- Strike proposed language: sabbatical applications may be submitted 18 months (or three semesters) in advance of the proposed sabbatical leave in order to provide applicants with sufficient time to acquire fellowship support, obtain visiting faculty status at a host institution, enable family members to accompany the applicant (school and employment logistics for spouse and child(ren), and acquire housing and airline tickets at reasonable rates and replace with academic and personal arrangements. Draft language and insert after “at reasonable rates” such as: In such cases approval will normally be granted 9-12 months prior to the sabbatical leave.

4. **Policies A91 and Standard A91#1 RE: Creation, Review, Reorganization, and Termination of Non-HSC Research Centers and Institutes.** The Research Policy Committee (RPC) revised the restructured drafts and approved them for review by the Policy Committee. Policy **A91** applies to all research centers and institutes including HSC and Main Campus. The **A91 Standard** document applies to non-HSC. RPC Chair, David Hanson did not have substantive changes to the document except he made it clear on behalf of RPC that HSC would indeed need to develop a **Standard** for HSC and would like to review that document. Trotter asked if Richard Larson is aware of the request to draft a **Standard** document.

Action- Send proposed changes to Richard Larson.

Action- Add as a standard process for every policy creation/review would be to identify office responsible for administration. The office listed should be the first offices involved in the first review process. The Office of the Secretary will help oversee the commitment to do this.

Action- Develop a template for HSC **Standard** document.

5. **Discuss meeting which included AF&T, Faculty Senate, Council on Governance, and Policy Committee leadership.** Meeting was called to discuss the relationship between Section B AF&T and Section C of the Faculty Handbook and AF&T concerns about Policy A53 “Development and Approval of Faculty Policies.” The process pertaining to a proposed draft of Professor of Practice was discussed.

Action- Remove AF&T from **A53** and pull that governing body out of this policy. This will be sent to the Faculty Senate for approval. AF&T does not have to comply with this policy process. Valencia and Stephens will work on the revision of this policy. Cunningham suggested that it would be useful for each of these policies in the Faculty Handbook to have a paper trail when being presented to the respective reviewing committee(s). A flow diagram perhaps would be very helpful for understanding the vetting and approval process for Faculty Handbook policies.

6. **Intellectual Property.**

Action-The FS Policy Committee should look at the IP memo and **E70** to see if they have concerns and bring them back for further discussion. Carol Stephens will start the process of review first and note comments to take back to the next FS Policy Committee.

7. **D170 Student Attendance.** Candyce Torres will communicate with Colt Balok who is overseeing the proposed policy revisions to request an update regarding his research/data analysis that was requested by the FS Policy Committee in November. Once Balok has all of his data compiled, he will be invited back to the FS Policy Committee to discuss his findings.

