

Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee October 17, 2012

Members Present: Matt Arterburn, Cynthia Waskowiak, Carol Vogel, Bill Roach, Gordon McQuere, Lisa Jones, David Sollars, Nancy Tate, Jalen Lowry, Pat Munzer, Richard Martin

Discussion:

Gordon talked about the latest draft from the Definitions Sub-Committee and the areas with which we're not yet comfortable. The first is the category of people without credentials who do everything and the other is the group of faculty who mostly teach but don't do enough research to get tenure. We discussed impact on budgets and positions if we granted tenure without research. Lisa requested faculty feedback on this idea. In the committee, there's a strong feeling that at minimum, a continuing education component is needed if faculty aren't required to do research so they stay current in their area. At another school, faculty who don't research are required to present at conferences each semester.

Someone suggested we have two broad categories of ranked and non-ranked faculty instead of more detailed definitions. That could be a challenge as adjuncts (non-ranked) might have some rights of ranked faculty. We discussed the difference between part-time and adjuncts as far as hiring, benefits, resources, and assignments, as well as HLC requirements. There's a national trend of fewer tenure-eligible faculty teaching at colleges, as well as a trend of community colleges giving adjuncts benefits. We'll have Donna Lacey compile a list of the number of hours taught by adjuncts for our information.

Next, Nancy discussed the R&R Sub-Committee's meeting on Oct. 12. So far, the sub-committee has tackled most of the "easier" issues. They will now begin work on faculty load, which is expected to take several meetings to revise. Nancy highlighted a few topics from the last meeting. They kept the language vague for outside employment to give Deans discretion. On the Sweet Summer Sabbatical section, they added flexibility to dates and considered a report requirement. The VPAA office has guidelines for this, which are easier to change, so they will decide what is needed in the handbook and what's left to the guidelines.

Nepotism is not addressed in WU policy other than in supervisory roles. We will add a conflict of interest statement for major grant awards to the nepotism clause so that it applies to all committees like search, P&T, grants, etc, any time monetary or personal gain can result from the decision.

In other areas like grades and student evaluations, the sub-committee simply tightened the language or cleaned it to reflect current practices like online versus paper forms. Some members are concerned that student evaluations are not done fairly. We should look at the big picture, comments, and trends when using evaluations for faculty, not simply the numbers.

Decisions:

- We will get faculty feedback on granting tenure without a research requirement.
- We'll get information on adjuncts from Donna Lacey.
- The Definitions Sub-Committee will continue to work through categories.
- We'll expand the Nepotism policy.

Next Meeting: Oct. 31 at noon, Shawnee room