

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – October 12, 2016

Minutes:

Meeting began at 2:15 p.m. in the Kayak Room

Present:

- Committee Members: Andy Anger, JAK Maier, Debu Misra, Jeff May, Val Gifford, Jeff Benowitz, Paul Layer, Sine Anahita, Troy Bouffard
- Non-committee members: Kayt Sunwood, Melanie Lindholm

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Sine moved that we amend the agenda to add a discussion today regarding the proposed changes in language to the Program Review Process currently being worked on by the Curriculum Affairs Committee and to make sure we got to the discussion about adjunct teaching conditions while we had visiting adjuncts present.

These suggested changes were agreed to and the agenda was approved.

Review and Approval of September Meeting Minutes:

Jeff B. moved to approve the minutes. Jeff M. seconded the motion

Old Business:

1. Update on the Blue Revision Process

Andy reported that there appears to be some progress, but the group has not done much work on this because of other more pressing matters facing the Faculty Senate. Andy said Chris Fallen is suggesting it may be better to break the project down in parts and address those smaller parts of the Blue Book Revision. Andy suggested his reluctance to volunteer this Committee to take on the revision of a section. It was discussed that it may be better to just have a certain committee member designated to helping with that process. There was no further discussion on this topic.

2. Faculty Overload Benefit Rate

Andy reported that when faculty teach overloads they are compensated at a different rate than adjunct faculty. Reviewing this is an effort to better balance that. Andy reported that he will have a discussion with Faculty Alliance and check with UAA and UAS to see if there is a similar problem and how they are looking at.

3. How to Bring Issues to the Faculty Senate?

Last meeting Jeff May asked about the process by which faculty can bring issues in front of this FAC committee or the larger Faculty Senate. Andy asked Chris Fallen of Faculty Senate for clarification of the

process. Chris responded to Andy with an answer by email. We reviewed that email as a group. The email is attached to these minutes. (See email correspondence from Chris Fallen to Andy Anger, Sept. 27, 2016).

- It is a fairly informal process. All faculty are welcome to contact Orion Lawlor or Chris Fallen directly and that information/concern can be forwarded to the appropriate committee. The most formal method is the contact their elected representative who can then bring the issue to the attention of the Senate. The admin committee discusses the issues brought to them and that committee may assign the issue to an appropriate committee who will develop a recommendation and get that back to the Faculty Senate.

New Business

1. Revisions to Academic Program Review

Background:

At the last Faculty Senate meeting the Curriculum Affairs Committee(CAC) presented for discussion some proposed revisions to the current Program Review process description. This was meant to clarify the process and to make the policy actually matches the practice. Those suggested revisions are attached to these minutes. (See "Suggested Revisions to Program Review" - suggested language changes in BOLD). During this Faculty Senate meeting Sine Anahita suggested that the process be amended to increase the notion of shared governance by including greater faculty input, increasing transparency in the process, and allowing the programs under review to have a voice in the process. The CAC asked for some suggested language, and Sine volunteered the FAC to assist in coming up with some proposed language.

During this meeting Sine reviewed her suggestions with us. (See attached suggestions document by S. Anahita). Generally, Sine recommends these meetings and this process be open to faculty and that faculty of the program being reviewed be actually invited to that meeting. To Sine the problem is that the current process doesn't involve faculty early in the process where their input would be most valuable to the process. Sine also suggested that faculty members be allowed to elect their own representative on that review committee rather than have a faculty representative being selected by the Dean.

Paul Layer clarified that these changes were meant for Special Program Review and not the standard program reviews that occur on a regular basis.

We appeared to reach consensus that the process needs to be revised to allow more faculty involvement, but we also reached consensus to not suggest changes to the time order of the process currently proposed as spelled out in that document.

There was agreement that Sine will start by working up a new draft of that process that includes language for greater faculty involvement and earlier in the process. That language will be emailed to the members of the FAC to review and make suggestions. When we finalize and come to agreement on that language, the FAC members agreed that Sine can be the FAC Committee member to take this language back to and work with the Curriculum Affairs Committee who is ultimately in charge of these revisions.

2. Discussion of Adjunct Faculty Issues

Sine presented some of the issues and concerns with adjunct needs in a document she created. That document is attached to these minutes (See Adjunct Faculty Discussion Notes by S. Anahita). Sine reviewed the problems and reviewed several possible solutions.

Paul Layer discussed how many of these issues are part of contractual terms of the CBA for adjuncts. Perhaps some of these issues are not under Faculty Senate purview and authority and are really union issues that should be addressed through the CBA. In response, Sine said that maybe the role of Faculty Senate is to urge the administration to better recognize adjunct needs and show support for the adjuncts.

Andy encouraged us to develop a draft Faculty Senate resolution to bring forward to the larger Faculty Senate that, if approved, could go forward from the Faculty Senate as a support document that the adjuncts could take with them into the next round of CBA negotiations.

Sine will draft the proposed resolutions and forward them to us before our next FAC meeting and to invite the union president to our next FAC meeting to discuss whether they are in support of the proposed resolution.

3. Peer Review and Promotion for Term Faculty

peer review and promotion for term faculty

Jeff Benowitz wants to change the name for term faculty, as “term” has negative connotations and is actually incorrect, as many term faculty are long time faculty members with career positions. The name constantly reminds of an “at-will status”, which erodes morale. This “at-will-status” applies to all faculty, but a subset is singled out. Jeff suggests non-tenure track or NTT faculty.

The university wide committee is not composed of NTT peers, as they are currently ineligible to serve. Tenure track faculty do-not understand NTT files when reviewing them because they have different job responsibilities. The lack of true peer review has led to conflicts in the past, with qualified NTT candidates being denied promotion. Additional, by banning NTT faculty from this committee we are limiting service opportunities for NTT faculty, where ironically service is required for promotion.

(See the handout by Jeff B. for potential solutions.) Another solution is for the peer unit to review files, and then a director decides on promotion. Or a shared committee with half tenure track faculty and half NTT. Perhaps a peer unit with representatives from all three types of term, e.g. service, research, teaching.

Question from Andy: Does UNAC support the changes? Jeff, yes, they do now. Took some discussion.

Paul: MAU process is the purview of the Faculty Senate, so if the process is not correct, then it is a Senate issue. Paul says to come up with a policy and present it to the Senate.

Jeff: Blue Book revision process is not efficient for changing the promotion process for NTT faculty. UNAC CBA negotiators know the issue and are working on it within the current bargaining process.

UNAC CBA trumps the Blue Book, so changes must be made in all documents.

Next meeting time: November 9, 2:15-3:15