

## Faculty Senate Personnel Policy Committee

Dan, Katharine, Walt, Michael, Anne, April

Agenda for November 7, 2023 meeting

- 1) Possible updates to [Reg 05.20.34](#) as it pertains to professional track faculty (Dan Monek)
- 2) IOC regarding training to address interpersonal violence - update (Anne Burke)
- 3) SFR template language (Walt Robinson)
- 4) SFR review (WR)
- 5) New business

### 1. Dan, OFE - policy role

Template for units to add better (or any) prof. track rules

Lack of clarity in original reg - clean up

Next step is template for unit rules

Consultative

Template would address IOC (define title changes ⇔ duty changes)

But reg doesn't address this

More clarity in lecturer role and track

Biggest change in section 11

    Pulled language from prof track prof. rank

    Defining DVF (typically at rank of above)

    Lecturers excluded previously from DVF for lecturers

        Now include senior lecturers in DVF for lecturers

    Other items;

        When SFR is needed for prof track faculty

        Consultation of head with DVF

Katharine: 1 or 2 units, adding senior lecturers to DVF may make majority on DVF (outnumber professorially ranked faculty) - could this be an issue?

Biggest concern - making DVF big, but unit can have smaller group do initial review

E.g. English has 60 lecturers

Change is including senior lecturers in DVF for promotion to senior lecturer

All ranks of professional, tenure track faculty are in lecturer -> senior lecturer DVF

DVF for dept business differ from RPT DVF? Yes, Campus DVF is only in relation to DVF

University assigns DVF only for RPT and contract renewal

PPC will want to see template

Q. What is head discretion in not renewing contract for lecturer (consult DVF)?

    DVF can elect to defer 2 years or less decisions to head

    No DVF can defer 2+ contract decisions to head

### 2) Interpersonal violence training IOC (from Jo-Ann Cohen)

    Requiring faculty to participate training to prevent IPV

    Jeanine Kossin, Katie Giffel (sps) brought in

    What happens when IPV training is req'd on campus - can lead to negative consequences

Does not necessarily reduce offending behavior

What scope or scale is best?

More narrowly scoped plan - administrator level (heads, DUPs, DGPs)

Does Women's Center have bandwidth/\$ to do or contract training?

Pilot this with one or two departments?

Training to perpetrators doesn't work, bystander training does work

Training observers or people to whom it is reported

Q) what are data on ineffective training

Pilot - what would it look like, how assessed

Goal of training?

Answer might lead to way to assess

Bystander used loosely - identifying behaviors and IPV (short of sexual assault), how to report and pursue resolution

Survivor support

Is goal to reduce number of occurrences? Not viable.

Q) who makes mandated trainings at Campus level?

responsive to (e.g.) Title IX

Students get 30 minute thing - most people get - clearly insufficient, people click the box "Mandatory"

Could be diluted

Make good training available on volunteer basis - that is impactful

Maybe mix of mandatory and voluntary (e.g. DUPs would volunteer)

Responsible reporting training - there is section on IPV, how to provide support to survivors

Some training already happening

This training is not useful (boring, not educational)

All about regulation

A great training is appealing

Most effective, small classes in person or on Zoom

People bring scenarios

Check the box ineffective and a turn-off

Equity-based training is politically possible

Uptake varies across Campus

Senate could lift up importance

CoS pilot: workshop for DUPs, DGPs, Heads, advisors, deans - 1 - 1.5 hours focused on survivor support.

Big group!

On Zoom can do big group - up to 69

WR - check with Jo-Ann - how will it be evaluated

3) Delete "striving" language

Policies are more important

SFR is guidance

That said, language is inappropriate

Remove "exceed"

Change just to meet?

"not sufficient": what does it refer to?

What else do you have to do?

Flexibility in "not sufficient" - language is negative - biased towards employer  
Should explicitly refer to unit rules

Purpose of SFR?

Feels fine to set core bare minimum

System requires SFR

Michael will propose new template language to take to next Senate meeting (addresses IOC)

4) SFR review?

New mandate, from system

Good motivation for reviewing SFR