Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee
July 18, 2012

Members Present: Cynthia Waskowiak, Lisa Jones, Nancy Tate, Bill Roach, David Sollars, Randy Pembrook, Jalen Lowry, Monica Scheibmeir

Discussion

There's been good work by all the sub-committees, so we discussed what's ready to be reviewed by faculty committees and the best way to present the information. Although we are not ready to give them documents, faculty have not been updated since we began. Nancy informed us that she's been posting the Committee minutes on the Academic Affairs page of the website, under University Initiatives.

The goal is to have faculty input and approval throughout the process to the finished product in the most efficient and transparent way. Some changes will require approval by faculty affairs, faculty senate, general faculty, and WU Board of Regents. At this point, we will float ideas to faculty for discussion purposes, as we have not made any concrete decisions.

The Committee had the following comments about presenting our work to faculty:

- It's better to offer smaller sections of the handbook for review throughout the process than only offering the entire edited handbook. It's hard to predict which areas will raise the most concerns from faculty perspective, so early input is helpful.
- We could put the working document online and send an email asking for comments. We could use a discussion board on Angel to avoid lots of emails, or to do a non-binding vote.
- Not all faculty engage online, so someone suggested open forums with our sub-committees or committee members attending meetings.
- Presentations at unit level-meetings seems best, as most faculty attend. We wondered if we need a meeting for each sub-committee or if materials should be sent beforehand.
- There's been the most work in the Definitions Sub-Committee. Although the Rights and Responsibilities Sub-Committee hasn't done much work, we decided that all sub-committees should give an update.
- There are lots of unresolved issues still with the Definitions Sub-Committee, particularly with Lecturer and which category applies to which section (e.g. renewal, grievance). Lisa thought maybe the R&R group would address categories, but it will stay with Definitions.
- The Lecturer situation is insecure for both the faculty (few rights at faculty level, no security like tenure) and the University (finances causing a possible shift to fewer tenured faculty). We will be careful to explain what we're doing, why, what's changed, and what applies. We want to be fair to all parties.

Decisions:

- Changes to the handbook will be in red for easy review.
- One or two people will edit the overall handbook for language consistency. (Nancy volunteered, and Carol and Harold Holden were also suggested).
- Each sub-committee chair will draft a two page summary of the sub-committee goals and tentative results thus far. It will be sent to faculty in advance of the meetings so they can discuss topics with the chairs.
- The Chairs (or suitable representative if conflict) will present at department meetings, emphasizing that no changes have yet been made. They will gather feedback to bring back to the Committee, and we will determine the areas that need further refinement.
- We will send faculty a brief update email that includes the link to the minutes and tells them that information and the presentations are coming soon.
- Cynthia will email the Deans to look at their department meetings schedule for possible openings for presentations.