Adjunct Faculty Committee Minutes
September 21, 2012

AFC members present: Webb, Dorman, Eixmann, Huebner, Eaton, Proff, Okere, Conroy
Minutes drafted by Proff and Okere

Meeting called to order at 2:01.
Minutes of the 8/31 meeting (distributed for review via email on 9/7) were approved.

Information and announcements
- Presidential Awards PPS 6.11 revisions
  - Evaluation instrument - a new matrix will be used across all Presidential Awards. Categories in the matrix include: Sustained Commitment, Internal/External Recognitions, Excellence or Impact of Activity
  - A narrative summary of significance of accomplishments has been added to application requirements
  - A new title for Runners-up is also being considered
- VPEM Heintze has been invited to the 9/26 Senate meeting to address calendar issues, e.g. final exam schedule. Please forward any questions to AFC Chair you would like introduced in the discussion.
- President Trauth and the Provost would like faculty feedback on the enforcement of the tobacco policy. AFC members were charged with polling adjuncts re: what level of enforcement do we feel the university should apply?

Items in progress
- Collection of department/school policies update
  Received thus far, 18 of 39
  Is on the agenda of the 10/4 Council of Chairs meeting - Conroy has been asked to address the chairs re: collection of departmental adjunct-related written policies. The email reminder to the chairs discussed in the 8/31 minutes will be delayed until after this meeting.
- Part-time Faculty Awards
  At the 9/5 PAAG meeting, the President and the Provost were amenable to the request for a part-time faculty teaching award. The Provost directed the AFC to draft a policy for the award process to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for endorsement, and then to the Associate Provost. Volunteers are needed for this task force. Target date for the draft policy is 10/19. Jana Proff, Donald Huebner, and Glynda Betros with Michel Conroy, ex officio, will serve on the Award Task Force. This award will be similar to the Online Teaching Award, which awards $2500 to the winner and two $1250 awards to the runners-up.
- Homepage link and adjunct faculty URL
  Diana Harrell, Director of Marketing, has given verbal approval for the creation of this link. A task force will be formed to develop the content.
  Conroy will be the point of contact for now, and Jana Proff will be the GATO manager. AFC members are asked to poll their constituencies to ask for ideas regarding the site’s content. The following content was suggested: service opportunities, HR benefits, parking policy, FAQ. The idea to produce an annual report of adjunct faculty accomplishments (following the compilation of annual performance evaluations) was proposed instead of a newsletter.
- Update on reduced parking fee salary limit data, Sherry Ross. RTA These data will be available soon.
- Update from Debra Feakes on core curriculum revision impact on adjunct and graduate student teaching assignments was distributed via email. No additional information on this item.
2012-13 committee goals
Committee goal suggestions. The committee consensus was that the current committee projects are appropriate at this time and no additional goals were identified.

New Business
- The Senate has been asked to identify an adjunct faculty member to serve on the screening committee for the Director of Faculty Development position. This will be an internal hire. The Senate has agreed to have the AFC make this recommendation. Donald Huebner volunteered to serve on this committee.

- Other
  - Evaluation weighting, Dorman. The committee discussed research expectations for adjunct faculty across the represented departments. It was decided that merit policies should be discussed at the upcoming liaison meeting in October to determine how departments are handling research for adjunct faculty. (See below.*)

  - Department meeting attendance
    Comment received from adjunct faculty member: “Several departments do not allow adjunct faculty to vote or even attend departmental faculty meetings. Addressing this issue and seeing if the AFC can do anything to create a campus policy to include all adjuncts in regular faculty meetings would be a great next step in the process.” Faculty members are encouraged to review and discuss the newly revised faculty voter definition (found in the Faculty Constitution) with their faculty senator and/or AFC representative.

October 19 meeting planning
The AFC Liaisons have been invited to our next meeting (10/19) and it will be held in Alkek 105 at 2:00. Seeking input on the meeting format.
- Conroy will request an updated adjunct faculty list in preparation for 10/19 meeting

Proposed meeting format
- Introduction
- Review the purpose of the committee and clarify any confusion regarding the committee’s purpose.
- Faculty liaison introductions.
  - Poll liaisons for their departments’ goals for the committee.
- Introduce projects the committee is currently working on and identify opportunities for others to contribute.
  - Teaching award policy (Proff)
  - Merit policy and discussion on how merit decisions are made in departments (Dorman)
  - Adjunct faculty committee webpage and liaisons’ ideas for content (Webb)
- Departmental policies for adjunct faculty collection (Conroy)

Meeting was adjourned at 3:10.

*New Business discussion item, Dorman
I believe that an area of great concern to many adjunct faculty, and one that we might be able to make progress in crafting some University wide policy, or at least recommended best practice, is in the area of performance evaluation weighting. Below is a copy of the mathematics department’s new MPT policy where non tenure track faculty can request to have their weights changed. I would like to propose a discussion of this topic at the next adjunct faculty meeting.
1.1 Determination of Weighting Phase

1.1.1 Faculty are evaluated in three areas: teaching, research, and service. Normally, teaching and research will each be weighted 40% and service will be weighted 20% when calculating merit raises based on points earned in each category. However, circumstances may arise under which tenured faculty or faculty not on the tenure-track may request alternate weightings be given to the three areas of evaluation. Faculty wishing to be considered for an alternate weighting system should request a meeting with the chair to discuss their desired changes. Any agreed upon changes will not be effective until after the next review cycle. Exceptions can be made in special circumstances, such as when a faculty member’s teaching load changes between the Spring and Fall semesters during one calendar year. Alterations within the current review cycle cannot be requested as a means of retrospectively improving merit and performance results. Any weightings are subject to the following guidelines:

1.1.1.1 Tenure-track faculty must maintain a 40-40-20 weighting until tenure is achieved.

1.1.1.2 Research:

1.1.1.2.1 Lecturers who are hired into positions that do not have any research requirements, may request a research weighting of less than 40%, with a 10% lower bound. Research and scholarly activity expectations for a 10% weighting can be met by staying current in the field.

1.1.1.2.2 Tenured faculty must have a research weighting no lower than 20%. Faculty receiving more than 3 workload credits for research must have a research weighting no lower than 40%.

1.1.1.3 Teaching:

1.1.1.3.1 Faculty teaching 3 or more courses or teaching two courses if at least one is a doctoral course must have a teaching weighting no lower than 40%. In no case should any faculty member’s teaching weighting be less than 25%.

1.1.1.3.2 Faculty teaching more than 3 undergraduate courses may request a teaching weighting greater than 40%.

1.1.1.4 Service

1.1.1.4.1 Faculty members at the rank of Senior Lecturer and above must have a service weighting no less than 20%.

1.1.1.4.2 The maximum weighting for service is 40%.