

Commission on Faculty Affairs

March 22, 2019

10:30 – 12:00 Noon

130 E Burruss Hall

In Attendance: J. Ogorzalek (for GSA), M. McGrath, T. Schenk, J. Finney, J. Hawdon, M. Abbas, B. Hicok, R. Sebek, Z. Mackey, G. Daniel, M. Agah

Absent: L. Brogdon, J. Spotila, R. Blythe, M. Paretto

Guests: M. Lewis, A. Covey (CAPFA Rep), Kira Dietz (University Libraries), K. DeBose (University Libraries)

- 1. Approval of agenda** **B. Hicok**

Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m.

- 2. Approval of Feb. 22 2019 minutes** **B. Hicok**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

- 3. Chapter 4 Faculty Handbook revisions: preliminary discussion** **R. Sebek**

Presentation on “continued appointment” and chapter 4 revisions given by K. Dietz and K. DeBose from University Libraries.

- 4. Collegiate Faculty: discussion of issues with the track** **B. Hicok**
a) Variability of faculty assignments

After describing his perception of Collegiate Faculty roles and responsibilities including the extreme variability, B. Hicok posed the question: do we need to change the language describing the responsibilities of Collegiate Faculty?

b) Need for written faculty assignments

Collegiate Faculty being assigned to numerous administrative duties is one problem, which raises the question of whether or not this is considered “service” under the description of the Collegiate Faculty track in the Faculty Handbook.

Z. Mackey noted that there needs to be a mechanism through which the Collegiate Faculty contract can be reviewed/alterd to compensate them for “time lost” (in terms of promotion), if the faculty member’s duties are deviating significantly from instruction/teaching. This was supported by B. Hicok and others.

c) Revision of description of track

Have we defined the Collegiate Faculty track well enough to be able to provide these individuals with a well-crafted, written description of their role and responsibilities when the individuals arrives (e.g., have we properly laid out a track for promotion)? Is the language that we currently have appropriate for the track and do only need to come up with a means to enforce it, or do we need to change this language and come up with the means to enforce the language?

As noted by M. McGrath, a comparison of the different descriptions of the various faculty tracks would be helpful. J. Finney responded that he had a summary chart (**action item**).

G. Daniel noted that he supports the overall concern, however he does not want to inhibit Collegiate Faculty members from taking administrative/leadership positions, if they are offered. Additionally, he pointed out that if these individuals take a leadership position, they should be evaluated for promotion based on their current role (i.e., the leadership/administrative role). However, M. Agah pointed out that regardless of how good the individual’s leadership/administrative work is, they were hired for instruction/teaching and cannot let other duties take them away from what they were hired to do.

J. Finney pointed out that what he is primarily concerned with is hiring a Collegiate Assistant or Associate Professor and assigning them to roles and responsibilities that make is impossible for them to get promoted. J. Finney went on to note that he doesn’t care what the assigned roles and responsibilities are for someone hired as a Collegiate Professor; whatever it takes to get the right person for the position.

B. Hicok stated that he is not concerned with people making choices on whether they want to pursue different roles and responsibilities,

which may interfere with their ability to get promotion. However, he is concerned with individuals being hired and their roles and responsibilities changing in ways that they do not want (i.e., no choice being made) that results in interfering with their ability to achieve promotion.

5. Other business

B. Hicok

No other business was presented.

6. Adjourn

B. Hicok

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.