12/05/14 Minutes – Adjunct Faculty Committee Meeting
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogswell</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Meeks</td>
<td>Sriraman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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Meeting called to order by V. Sriraman at 1:02 p.m.

1. Cleanup Items

   - Signup sheet from D. Feakes
     - January adjunct orientation signup for panels
   - Next adjunct open door dialogue
     - Friday, January 30, 2-4 p.m.
     - Alkek ITV rooms (104 or 105)
     - Provost & Associate Provost will be in attendance
   - AFC meetings for next semester
     - Maintain 1st Friday schedule
     - No meeting in January
     - February 6, 1-3 p.m.
     - March 6, 1-3 p.m.
     - April 3, 1-3 p.m.
     - May 1, 1-3 p.m.

   - Faculty committee was impressed by our standards and thanks us

2. Update from S. Mora, Merit Subcommittee

   - PPS 7.10
     - Trying to add language that would provide equity for performance review for tenured v. non-tenured faculty
     - One idea was to add a non-discrimination clause
       - Precedent at University of Utah—pretty comprehensive
       - Presented the idea at the last adjunct dialogue with D. Feakes
       - Response not particularly positive
       - D. Feakes redirected the effort to best practices
   - Last adjunct dialogue
D. Feakes was disconcerted that workload was being assigned differently per tenured and non-tenured faculty

- Should ideally be per-class, not dependent upon instructor
- B. Johnson pointed out that different schools/departments seem to have different cultures and practices

3. P. Gibson presented the research she has been doing into specific PPSs

- Many are not being followed
  - A. Meeks: What is the recourse if they aren’t followed?
    - A clear, safe grievance process is needed
    - Ombudsman may be able to help prevent adjunct vulnerability
    - Per-course faculty still most vulnerable
  - Is noncompliance due to malice or ignorance?
    - B. Johnson suggested providing a training session for chairs/directors
    - Lack of communication from deans to chairs causes problems and disparities
- P. Gibson: Who controls PPSs?
  - Faculty Senate makes recommendations
  - Faculty sometimes are involved at lower levels
  - Administration in charge of university-wide policy
- V. Sriraman: Next adjunct faculty dialogue will be a good opportunity to breach these topics since Provost and Associate Provost will be present

4. S. Bishop: Are we working on merit checklists for tenured v. non-tenured faculty?

- S. Mora: No, we are working on an overarching statement that says that non-tenure-track policies should mirror those for tenure-track and should be equitably applied
- Differences between expectations for tenured v. non-tenured faculty should be acknowledged
- “Wonder sentence” that would express these ideas and eliminate loopholes remains elusive

5. S. Bishop: Money for tenured v. non-tenured merit pay should be kept separate, not allowed to flow between pools.

- Not always true, depends upon department
• Best practice would be to separate
• P. Gibson will post her report about her startling findings from the PPSs she’s been researching
  o Available in folder “3 Fostering Development” on TRACS site
  o Relevant PPSs will be posted as well
  o Please review
• D. Feakes’ tenure as Faculty Fellow is our window
  o Current president and provost are amenable to change
  o B. Johnson brought up the issue of different departments receiving different treatment by the Provost

6. Merit subcommittee feels a bit unfocused/in need of clear direction

• W. David: What constitutes a “best practice”?
  o A. Marks: a suggestion
• Merge Best Practice and Merit subcommittees
  o W. David: Focus on (job) security, merit & performance evaluations, equity, workload, and representation
  o D. Feakes can present the recommendations to CAD & chairs
  o Next step: brainstorm with D. Feakes to see which PPSs can be worked on
• Could D. Feakes come to a subcommittee meeting to offer guidance?
  o V. Sriraman will send email
  o P. Gibson, A. Meeks, A. Meyer, G. Betros, D. Nolan, S. Mora all want to attend

7. S. Bishop: Is there any definition or commonality to the “Senior Lecturer” position?

• Not really
• Myriad representations of adjunct responsibilities
  o Different workloads per different chairs
  o Chairs need to be informed of PPS policies
    ▪ We should work toward a presentation for Deans & Chairs
    ▪ Best for D. Feakes to do the presentation for best reception

8. B. Johnson

• Should part of our effort be put toward representation on the Faculty Senate?
  o Right now only tenured faculty can take part
  o Could we have a non-voting member?
Good idea to couch this in terms of the university’s “research institution” goals

- Adjunct developmental leave issue
  - Chairs not being notified/spoken with first
  - Right now it’s just a signature, not an approval from chair
  - V. Sriraman: Revise the rubric


- Let G. Betros know if you have any worklife issues that you’d like addressed
- Child care during orientation sessions has been talked about
- Elder care?
- More publicity needed—testimonials?
- Bobcat Balance program has new pamphlets available in HR office
  - Put in faculty mailboxes
  - Are they bilingual?

10. Adjournment: 2:32 p.m.