Dear Provost Moser:

The reorganization effort has spent considerable effort to ensure consistency both within and across initiatives. As the reorganization continues to evolve, four initiatives have come into conflict with one another regarding required committees. Specifically, FGRC Initiatives #4 Uniform College Documents and #7 Developing School Level Policies and Procedures, which have been approved by the President, require a standing “Personnel Committee” at the School and College levels. As originally conceived in Initiatives #4 and #7, this committee oversees annual evaluations, promotion, tenure, and other associated personnel matters, including grievance issues, allocation of raises, evaluation of sabbaticals, etc. However, ASEC Initiatives #1 Annual Evaluations and #2 Promotion & Tenure call for different committee framework. ASEC recommends the following:

1. Rename previously approved Personnel Committee to Promotion and Tenure Committees at the School, College, and University levels. The committee at the School level will be ad hoc while the College and University committees would be standing. These committees will only oversee promotion and tenure issues, including pre-tenure review.

2. At the School level only, add Faculty Evaluation Committee as a standing committee to oversee annual evaluations of faculty and other faculty evaluations’ related issues, such as grievances (regarding annual evaluations), allocation of raises, review and ranking of sabbatical applications, and other related sundries.

The suggested titles for the committees represent (1) a more direct reflection of tasks of the committee, and (2) a specific focus on “faculty” given that “personnel” is a general term that can include faculty and staff. (ASSC Initiative #11 includes consideration for staff evaluations.)

Initiative #4 (p. 17) specifically notes the possibility that such a reconciliation might become necessary:
“Note: The membership of this committee and members' voting privileges will have to be reconciled with recommendations in the Tenure and Promotion Initiative of the Academic Structure and Evaluation Committee once those have been approved.”

Although Initiatives #4 and #7 have already been approved, whereas Initiatives #1 and #2 are in the approval and consultative phases, we believe this adjustment is both necessary and useful in the long run. Thus, the ARIC requests that the names of the committees be approved as indicated above and disseminated to the campus community. The timeline is especially critical given that schools are, in some cases, already working in these committees.

To address this issue, the ARIC recommends the following actions:

- An addendum for Initiatives 4 and 7 be posted to the Provost’s website recognizing this reconciliation;
- An updated School Policies and Procedures template posted to the Provost’s website;
- Deans and Directors updated with the approved committee titles. These new committee titles will be included in the working School Policies and Procedures document and the College Policies and Procedures document;
- An update Reorganization Glossary posted to the Provost’s website.

Thank you,