

### 2.11.3 Reduction in Force Associated with Discontinuance or Reorganization of Programs

Late in the year, the CFA began work on this section. It was intended that this policy be made more workable, and the issue of the 5 year guaranteed employment after a RIF decision be addressed:

The proposed policy contains language that:

- \* ensures joint decision-making between university officials and affected programs' faculty members
- \* details the precise procedures to be followed in restructuring or discontinuing program
- \* clarifies the meaning of "program"
- \* underscores the reciprocity of faculty and university interests
- \* changes the period of notice for tenured faculty members to three years

It calls for early involvement of faculty in the process of making decisions on program reorganization or discontinuance.

The draft of this policy has been published twice in the Spectrum ( May 4 and October 5) and sent to University Administrators, Deans and Department Heads, with a call for comment.

The CFA will review and consider all comments which are received before sending a revised version forward for approval

-----

### Commission on Faculty Affairs Minutes

03 November 1995

Approved: 17 November 1995

Present: Paul Metz (chair), Dave Beagle (scribe), Greg Brown, Bob Dyck, Darlene Grega, Janet Johnson, Mary Denson Moore, Don Mullins, Sam Riley, Bob Sumichrast, Reginald Thabede

Guests: Susan Brooker-Gross

1. Approval of minutes. Sam Riley asked that his statement concerning affirmative action and its intended role in the draft RIF policy be added to the minutes of 20 October 1995, which were then approved as modified.

2. Reduction in force.

Paul asked Don Mullins to oversee the discussion of draft policy 2.11.3. Don distributed copies of

additional comments on the RIF policy that he has received since the last CFA meeting.

A change in the title suggested by Tom Sherman from "Reduction in Force for Program Reduction or Discontinuance" to "Reduction in Force for Program Restructuring or Discontinuance" was accepted.

There was considerable debate at the previous CFA meeting and at this meeting about the definition of a program. There was agreement to retain the definition of a program as "smaller than a department" and "larger than the activities of a single faculty member."

Another issue that received close scrutiny at the previous meeting, affirmative action, was discussed again at length.

Sam Riley stated his view that there is a role for affirmative action, but that it would be dangerous from a legal perspective to proscribe the exemption of women and minorities in a reduction in force policy. Departments should have sufficient flexibility to handle affirmative action as needed.

Don argued that the needs of students should play an important role in a reduction in force policy. He also reported that he has received several notes from faculty who regard merit as a key element that is missing from the current version of the document.

The "affirmative action" guideline was rewritten to incorporate these suggestions: "A primary consideration in decisions about the termination of faculty should be based on the programmatic needs of students. Within programs identified for reduction, tenured faculty must not be terminated before untenured faculty, except that individual departments should consider affirmative action. Within the tenured faculty as a group and the untenured faculty as a group, rank and merit must be considered."

Don will produce a revised document, which will be distributed at the November Faculty Senate meeting for one last review before being acted upon by the Commission.

### 3. Post-tenure review.

Both Pat Hyer and Tom Sherman had reworked the previous version of the draft post-tenure review policy. Paul suggested that we extract the best parts of each. Several topics were discussed, including:

A. Time to assemble dossier. There was agreement that the minimum time a faculty member will have to assemble a post-tenure review dossier is three weeks rather than two weeks as had been originally proposed.

B. Minimum expectations. There are departmentally defined minimum expectations that are used to gauge a faculty member's performance. In Tom's version, these expectations are termed "minimal standards." There was some uneasiness that this phrase has unflattering connotations, so it was dropped.

C. Trigger mechanism. The number of successive unsatisfactory annual performance reviews that triggers the post-tenure review process was changed from three to two.

D. Remediation. The previous draft specified a period of remediation not to exceed two years in those cases where the post-tenure review has resulted in a "certification of deficiencies with mandatory improvements specified." Commission members prefer an open-ended period of remediation that gives the departmental committee some flexibility, so this provision was eliminated.

The sub-committee will incorporate these changes into a revised document that will be reviewed at the next CFA meeting.

4. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 PM. The next meeting will be on Friday, 17 November 1995, at 2:00 PM in room 236 Wallace Hall.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dave Beagle (scribe)