Round up from Jan. 28th Meeting of By Laws

In Attendance: Mike Duvall, Deanna Caveny-Noecker, Katie Walker, and Rick Heldrich
Meeting started at 4 pm

Started by acknowledging that no formal committee work could be conducted, too many folks out (escorting faculty hire candidate, sick, working on play); but we would take the opportunity to comment on thoughts regarding pending items coming our way.

On FAM language regarding special titles for Adjuncts and courtesy appointments: No agreement on best term for what are current proposed to be Adjunct Lecturer and Adjunct Senior Lecturer. Some concern that “Lecturer” is a bit too old school, lots of college instruction avoids tradition lecturing; but no thoughts on any solid alternative. Generally agreed that use of instructor (Adjunct instructor) or professor (Adjunct professor) not ideal solutions. Wondered (hoped) that maybe the use of Adjunct Senior Lecturer might entail some sort of salary bump over Adjunct Lecturer title. Wondered if perhaps discussion of courtesy titles like “Adjunct Associate Professor” would be better treated as independent issue from Adjunct Senior Lecturer. Courtesy titles do not imply employment, but do offer privileges to institutional resources, and they do give the opportunity to enhance the collective academic stature of the institution by giving acknowledged affiliation with community professionals/experts. Some discussion that use of Affiliate Associate Professor, might be preferred to Adjunct Associate Professor to avoid confusion; and perhaps more clearly differentiate titles of employment from those that do not involve employment. Especially important if courtesy appointments carry a time limit of several years duration, whereas active teaching temporary employment is by semester only.

On FAM language regarding Faculty Awards. After discussion we seemed to conclude that it might be better to keep the section under IX. Faculty Awards, limited to faculty with regular status. Might want to separate out any staff awards to staff relevant policy statements, but not in FAM (Advising Award). Put VAP teaching award consideration into distinguished adjunct faculty teaching award, essentially lumping all temporary faculty into one category, and permanent faculty into another. We generally preferred affording Provost greater authority/freedom to construct selection committees, and recommend something like: “ad hoc” committee appointed by the Provost of at least five members, to include at lest two past recipients of the award. We did not think that award winners were the only faculty members capable of recognizing excellence, akin to current policy of having Associate Professors serve on T&P committee to make recommendations on promotions to full Professor; but we did think some representation from past winners was appropriate. Thought in service award, that it might be necessary to specify that only an administrator holding faulty rank would be eligible to receive faculty awards, but since awards are open to all regular faculty, including
administrators that hold faculty rank, not sure any mention of administrators needs to be made.

On Faculty Welfare proposal regarding Dean evaluations: We supported the notion that the Provost meets with Welfare to get a better sense of the specific objectives of the proposal, rather than trying to wordsmith the currently proposed language. We thought that some of the currently proposed language might be too prescriptive, too focused on process. We were not sure trustees should be encouraged to participate in reviews at this level, the role of the board seems to come in at a higher level, especially if a review might end up as part of a Grievance or Hearing. We did think having school boards or foundation was input was a good idea. No objection to faculty input, but we are not sure how much direct knowledge most faculty will have about a dean’s job performance, but we liked getting input from other deans and chairs that serve under a dean. We hoped that while dean evaluation is under review, that dean section could be updated to better describe and categorize all new deans.

On Policy Issues: Katie will explore with Brian and Deanna the possibility of removing the individual sections of the FAM from their current location on the policy website. Our concern is that policy be removed from FAM to extent possible, that only policy of peculiar interest to faculty appear in FAM, and that however FAM is linked to Policy matters outside FAM that faculty get relevant policy information needed.

On Grievance/Hearing Committee: Thought Katie might want to get update from Kathryn. As far as we knew issues were centered over streamlining and clarifying process (including conduct of hearings); bring FAM into compliance with any relevant state or federal laws; afford faculty on a committee involved in any mediation process formal mediation training; clarifying differences between role of Grievance and Hearing; examination of possible merger of the two committees.

Warning About Upcoming Issues:
- Issues related to Graduate faculty
- Attempts to limit FAM to Faculty rank and file, put staff things in separate document or location
- Updates to FAM for release in early August after faculty votes on senate approved motions

Meeting adjourned at 6 pm