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Overview Narrative:
This year the Personnel Committee made progress on numerous Requests for Consultation (RFCs) from the previous year. One was closed, and the rest remain open for continued monitoring and/or action. It should be noted that in the prior year a Sub Committee on Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE) faculty issues was established, and a series of RFCs resulted from the Sub Committee’s work. The Personnel Committee this year voted not to activate and staff this Sub Committee, since there were already many NTE RFCs for the PC to work on. This Sub Committee is therefore dormant until any time in the future that the PC would want to activate and staff it. The Personnel Committee has confirmed that the most important issue for all the NTE RFCs going forward is data. There does not exist a transparent and accessible way to attain data on NTE faculty employment and issues, and it is felt that information is needed before action can be taken on any item. The academic year ended during the COVID-19 global pandemic, and the final PC meeting of the year also addressed faculty questions and concerns about a possible continuing campus closure and ensuing uncertainties about course loads, tenure, salaries, continued employment, and parking fees.
Section II

Request for Consultations and/or topics reviewed by the committee and outcomes (topics reviewed by the committee decided not to act/review should be listed here with, no action taken):

RFC-124 Review of Merit Pay Systems at ASU

**Summary:** A letter drafted by the University Senate Personnel Committee and revised and approved by the UAC and the University Senate Executive Committee was sent to President Crow in spring 2019. The transmitted letter is posted on the senate website (https://usenate.asu.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/Documents/5981/salary_letter_to_president_crow_12-18-18.pdf).

On 11/2/19 Provost Searle briefed the Senate on the status of this requested review and stated that the review of tenure track faculty was complete, but they still needed to complete the review for non-tenure eligible faculty. This review should be complete by spring and the Provost would update the Senate.

**Outcome:** At the final Senate meeting (4/27/20) Provost Searle stated that the review was not completed, with many activities in the Provost’s Office sidelined by the COVID-19 pandemic, but that there is every intention to do so; the RFC will remain open.

RFC-63 Unit bylaws and response time from Provost and OGC

**Summary:** Approval of unit bylaws has taken up to several years in some cases, and this RFC was created to investigate. The PC initially suspected that the length of the bylaws might play a role in their approval time and investigated the possibility of creating a template for units to follow, especially if a more concise bylaw document with expedited approval is desired (see Personnel AR 2017-18). This year the PC investigated this issue in more detail. Data from the Provost’s website was collected, and it was discovered that there does not seem to be a direct connection between the length of the bylaw and approval time. PC members agreed that the process appears to be ad hoc and that by-law approval time is too long for some units. The real fundamental fix is to have a predictable and reasonable time frame for by-law approval. The PC’s recommendation is to keep this RFC open and continue to monitor and push for progress.

Gary Sweeten reviewed the Provost website to look for updates since his last review in March 2019. The website has been revamped although the number of submissions has increased from 10 units to 14. There are 132 documents on the Provost website, with less than half listed as current or in-use, and most listed as under-review or submitted. At least 6 documents listed as submitted in 2016. The Provost’s Office suggests that units submit P&T changes separate from Bylaw changes in order to expedite the proposals and approvals.

**Outcome:** Senate President Shirley Rose suggested communicating with the Provost’s Office about organizing this better on the website, so the PC recommends following up and the RFC will remain open.
RFC-120 Dependent documentation requirements for ASU benefits

**Summary:** VP Salcido and Director Cato sent a letter to the state (https://usenate.asu.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/Documents/5395/paul-shannon-adoa-aug-2018.pdf) at the beginning of fall 2018. An update was provided in October 2018 by VP Kevin Salcido stating that he met with the new director of benefits from the ADOA. The new director mentioned that he clearly sees the issues we raised and that he was communicating with the Attorney General’s office on this.

**Outcome:** On 1/23/20 VP Salcido communicated he would re-contact the ADOA for follow up; he also noted that this was one of the reasons ASU is exploring having its own insurance plan. The RFC thus remains open.

RFC-191 Study abroad faculty leader gender requirements policy

**Summary:** This RFC was created in February 2019, when Dave Wells brought the issue of a new gender balance requirement for faculty leaders of study abroad programs before the PC. The Senate President communicated with the Study Abroad Office (SAO) and inquired about the requirement. The Director of the SAO responded to the issue, indicating that it is a recommendation to have gender diversity if possible: https://mystudyabroad.asu.edu/developing-new-international-fd-program

**Outcome:** There is concern over maintaining the language of gender balance on the SAO’s website regarding program leadership. It is contended that faculty expertise and competence to lead a program is paramount, not gender. The SAO is currently undergoing a leadership change and in the process of a Director search. The decision was made to follow-up on this issue when a new Director is announced; as of 4/20/20 no such announcement has been made, and the RFC remains open.

RFC-187 on ACD 510-01 Outside business arrangements could not exceed 312 hours per academic year for those on academic-year contracts or 384 hours per fiscal year for those on fiscal-year contracts.

**Summary:** Faculty in certain disciplines must work more hours than this for professional reasons. A request was sent to the Provost’s office to add a sentence to this section of the ACD: For faculty in certain circumstances these hours might be exceeded, per approval by the Provost.

**Outcome:** The Provost has agreed in an email to Senate President Shirley Rose, but the ACD has not yet been amended. A question has been raised as to whether or not ACD changes are subject to Senate approval. It was also noted that this coming academic year there will be
revisions to the bylaws, so this could be a good time to amend. This should be followed up on and the RFC remains open.

RFC-172 Funding formula from ASU online to academic unit

Summary: There is a question of how ASU Online resources are distributed to the ASU, including within and between Colleges and Schools, and that the funding formula has not changed, despite rising costs. During this academic year PC members gathered more data on online classes and teaching and revealed more questions and potential issues that should be addressed in terms of ASU’s growing online classes. It was also brought up that there was a temporary Task Force on Online Education that articulated many of these issues.

Outcome: A new ad hoc Committee on Digitally Enhanced Teaching and Learning was approved by the Senate on 4/23/20. This RFC should go to that committee next year, as decided by the PC and the Senate President.

RFC-197 ACD 510-03 and concerns with summer pay – CISA (Dave Wells)

Summary: Dave Wells from CISA in the previous year: “We ask the University to explore further revisions to ACD 510-03 that may be necessary to assure that faculty who choose to teach in the summer have a clearer sense of how their compensation will be determined well before the summer session commences.”

Outcome: RFC was closed after the committee examined the issue and did not find it to be a university-wide problem.

Section III
Request for Consultations and/or topics that were not started or remain unfinished and need to be carried over to the next academic year.

In addition to the RFCs still open as noted above, there are outstanding items that the NTE Sub Committee raised in 2018-2019. These RFCs are listed below, with commentary on PC action that has been taken, as well as recommended actions for next year.

RFC-171 Fifteen percent cap on multi-year contracts for the NTE faculty
RFC-163 Exploring sabbatical type leaves for NTE faculty on MY contracts
RFC-162 Exploring Instructor career pathways
RFC-161 Exploring notification periods for non-renewed NTE faculty members
RFC-164 Review of instructor and lecturer pay/career progression and other NTE issues
Proposed by the PC Committee Chair:

- Maintain RFC-171 Fifteen percent cap on multi-year contracts for the NTE faculty
- Maintain RFC160 Professional Development and other Issues for NTE faculty
- Close the other RFCs from this Sub Committee, as they are addressed in the two above.

Actions Taken: The PC agreed with the above motion but maintained that more data about NTE faculty was needed, both in terms of status and in terms of perceived concerns. PC member Karen Watanabe created a survey for NTE faculty (https://forms.gle/2q4S8UzbkvrsvSzFA), which Senate President Shirley Rose reviewed and sent to the Provost. PC Chair Mary Jane Parmentier sent a request to the Provost’s Office, for data on multi-year contracts, as well as other NTE data. At the time of this report the PC is awaiting notification on these items, with the presumption that the COVID-19 global pandemic has immediately taken priority.

Outcome: All NTE RFCs remain open, and the PC pursues this data.

Section IV
Recommendations to the Senate or Final Comments

This academic year ended with the COVID-19 global pandemic, and in the conclusion of the final Personnel Committee meeting there was discussion of some of the present concerns of members’ constituents. These included workload and family caregiving responsibilities if the stay at home order continues, what tenure extensions mean, when we will know about summer B and fall courses being online or in person, if there is a potential for furloughs and salary cuts, and if parking permits would be reimbursed in anyway due to the closure of campus to most employees. These questions were sent to Provost Searle before the last Senate meeting (4/27/20), and he responded that leadership recognizes the challenges of working at home and taking care of family members, and as the situation persists the University will seek ways to be supportive. (It should be noted that in the PC meeting the question of faculty using sick leave came up; this should be pursued by the PC if the situation persists.) The Provost also mentioned that extending tenure timelines by one year simply means that faculty have an extra year but there is no expectation that an extra year’s work should be shown. University leadership is making many potential plans for how the rest of summer and fall teaching might take place, depending on the pandemic situation. The question on parking fees has been referred to the Facilities Committee as RFC 211 by Maria Coca, Senate Manager.