

## Minutes for Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Mar. 16 2021

Present (via Zoom): David Armstrong (scribe), Josh Burk (co-Chair), Sarah Day (co-Chair), Maria Donoghue Velleca (Dean), Cathy Levesque, Jack Martin, Peter McHenry.

Guests: (PRC: Procedural Review Committee) Chris Tucker (PHIL), John Parman (ECON), Pam Hunt (PSYC), Vivian Hamilton (Law), Jeanne Wilson (Business), Carl Friedrich (VIMS).

1. We approved the minutes from Mar. 9 2021.
2. Updates from the Dean: Maria discussed a meeting she had with the Provost on the academic vision for the Esports initiative. We also discussed mechanisms for gathering ideas for new academic programs from the A&S faculty – perhaps a Qualtrics survey as a start? We discussed the request from Dean Zeman to bring forward, at the April FAS meeting, a proposal to make Data Sciences into a department – should such a motion come from EPC, from FAC, from Dean Zeman, from the leadership in the program? We will research the procedure that was adopted the last time a new Department was created (Applied Science). It needs to be determined whether Data Science would be in Area III or Area II. Assuming an affirmative vote from A&S, approvals would be needed from both the BOV and SCHEV.
3. Editing of the Dean’s memo on RPT procedures will be undertaken by Jack, Cathy and Peter. This is to turn this from a “memo” into a policy document that can be voted on by A&S, and also to update to accommodate the new structure in the Dean’s office. There was discussion of the criteria for promotion to Full (*i.e.*, the expectation for increased university service), and the fact that the memo says that “*Promotion to full professor after less than six years may be possible, based on exceptionally strong performance in research, teaching, and service*”, which may be too restrictive of early promotion. The Faculty Handbook states “*However, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor shall normally have completed at least six years of service at the rank of Associate Professor*” but notes in a footnote that the time in service expectation may be different in particular Schools.
4. Members of the PRC joined the meeting. The present labyrinthine procedure by which policy and procedures are approved was reviewed. The main point of discussion was: how can this be made more efficient, for A&S in particular? Other questions – what is the location of officially-approved policies, do Programs (as opposed to Departments) need Personnel Policies? The Dean suggested that template policy documents could be generated by the Dean’s office, to aid in consistency across departments and programs. Should there be a content management system (like Curriculog) for managing policies? Can we better separate what is a Policy or a Procedure, which requires PRC approval, from a Practice or Implementation guideline which would not? The value of informal back-and-forth discussion between the generator of a policy and the PRC during the approval process was emphasized. The FAC thanked the PRC for their important work.
5. The meeting was adjourned at 3:28pm.