

Adjunct Faculty Committee Minutes for 2/10/2012

Members present: Conroy, Okere, Smith, Eixmann, Mora, Ross, Blades-Wiese, Eaton, Huebner, Dorman, McVey, Stewart, Ligon, Webb, Proff, Kirchofer, Wilburn
Guests: Keltner, Keefe

Meeting called to order at approximately 4:20 due to the evacuation of JCK in response to an emergency alert.

Announcements:

1. Senator Debra Feakes – While still outside the building (due to a building evacuation), the Chair of the Faculty Senate welcomed the committee members and thanked them for their service.
2. Once back in the senate meeting room, all committee members introduced themselves providing information about their positions and colleges.

Committee agenda items:

1. Committee structure. The committee is made up of two representatives and two alternates from each academic college. Members were appointed by the Faculty Senate from the pool of constituents who had expressed a strong interest in serving. The regular membership term is two years. For the first year, half of the member and alternate appointments will be for one year so that terms will be staggered. Alternates and interested constituents are welcome at the meetings.
2. Goals. Overall goals for the committee were discussed. Short term goals were identified and will be accomplished by the next meeting:
 - a. A representative of each college will establish a means of communication with colleagues. (Email list, TRACS site)
 - b. Information will be gathered from colleagues based on themes/comments submitted to committee members as areas of concern including Level of Participation in Shared Governance, (including curriculum resources), Compensation and Workload, Retention, Advancement Recognition, and Appreciation.
 - c. Sherri Mora will work with committee members via a TRACS site to create a standard set of questions to be utilized to gather information, and will share the list with committee members.
 - d. Information will be gathered from each department on the number of lecturers and faculty who are paid by the course.
 - e. The Faculty Senate will identify and contact individuals to act as liaisons for those departments that do not have representation on the committee.

Discussion items:

1. Several suggestions were offered for renaming the committee. Without support, the item was tabled for future discussion.
2. The PAAG agenda item from 2/8/2012 on Managing Growth was reviewed. According to the Texas Public Higher Education Almanac, Texas State has 50.9% tenured and tenure track faculty members, placing it fifth among the eight universities classified as Emerging Research Institutions.
3. It was decided that subcommittees were not needed at this time.
4. Date of next meeting: April 13, 2012 in room 3:30-4:30 in JCK Room 880.

Adjourned at 5:10.

Minutes recorded by Sue Williams.

Adjunct Faculty Committee Minutes for 4/13/2012

Minutes recorded by Campbell

Members present: Conroy, Eixmann, Ross, Smith, Campbell, Kovar, Webb, Ligon, Eaton, Okere, Dorman, Banta, Wilburn, Huebner, Betros, McVey

Meeting called to order at approximately 3:30 by Conroy

Announcements:

1. Provost's comments on the possibility of Development Leave for non tenure-track faculty – a strong positive reaction was voiced by committee members in terms of this being a valuable opportunity for course and research development. Conroy commented that according to the enabling legislation up to 6% of university faculty could be on leave at any one time. A suggestion was made that the committee be proactive in suggesting revisions to current policy to accommodate inclusion of adjunct faculty – McVey and Okere tasked with this. Career ladder for non tenure-track faculty (non tenure-track faculty moving into tenure-track positions) has also recently been mentioned by the Provost.
2. Committee Charge statement from Faculty Senate presented

Committee agenda items:

1. Previous minutes (2/10) up for approval (Webb seconded) and unanimously approved.
2. Discussion on committee title tabled
3. A secretary, Suzy Okere, was self-nominated, seconded (Campbell) and unanimously approved.
4. A vice chair, Walter Dorman, was self-nominated, seconded (Huebner) and unanimously approved.
5. One more liaison needed from CLAS in College of Education.
6. Lecturers listed as staff – some lecturers with additional capacities (such as advising) are listed as staff, a call to be thorough and include these folks when communicating with constituents.

Discussion items:

1. Should committee TRACS site include all adjuncts in the role of “guest”? It was decided that any adjunct wishing to join the site as a guest could do so, and that it is committee members' responsibility to guide those adjuncts to Valerie, who will manage adding people to the TRACS site. All adjuncts will, however, be listed under their College TRACS site.
2. Survey Questions (Sherri Mora absent) – Conroy opened discussions by asking if we were measuring perceptions, or policies and practices. There was consensus that it was practices that were to be researched. There was a discussion of whether the first two questions of the survey would be useful. Issues that came up when considering this: defining “work load,” the aegis of departmental vs. University-wide PPS. Would it help to have all information in one place – or would this shake up/ disturb order in departments/schools? Differences between lectureship and senior lectureship, what constitutes scholarly work/service work? Are there written policies that lay out departmental procedures for hiring adjunct (if so, what are they)? The role of personnel committees in evaluation; what is role of this committee, and where do we want to focus our energies? Ultimately, discussion of the questions was tabled until next meeting.
3. It was suggested by Conroy to focus on a couple of targeted tasks: she suggested development leave and ways in which the Presidential Awards would best serve to bring recognition to adjunct faculty. Rebecca Eaton volunteered to set up a forum on TRACS for a discussion of Presidential Awards.
4. Should we expand number/time of meetings? It was agreed that meetings will now be held monthly and will be two hours in duration to be more productive.
5. In response to Beth Wuest's query re: faculty development opportunities for adjuncts: Could workshops for tenure-track faculty be opened up to adjuncts as well? More access to webinars – meetings posted through development office? To have Senior Lecturers mentor other adjuncts (this would count as service). It was decided to keep asking for more input.
6. Date of next meeting. Friday May 18, 2012, 2:00-4:00 in JCK Room 880.

Adjourned at 4:32.

Adjunct Faculty Committee Minutes for 5/18/2012
Minutes recorded by Okere

Members present: (M=member, A=alternate)

Conroy, Eixmann (M), Campbell (M), Okere (M), Mora (M), Smith (M), Dorman (M), McVey (A), Banta (M), Betros (A), Booker, Keltner

Meeting called to order at 2:00 by Conroy

Agenda Items

1. Previous meeting minutes (4/13) were unanimously approved.

2. Announcements and Information:

A. Conroy: If members cannot attend adjunct faculty committee meeting, please arrange for an alternate instead of Valerie arranging for an alternate to attend.

B. Conroy: reviewed Faculty Senate leadership

Chair: Barbara Melzer (Health Professions)

Vice chair: Michel Conroy (Fine Arts and Communication)

Secretary: Gwynne Ash (Education)

C. Conroy: The President has no strong opinion on adjunct faculty gaining eligibility for developmental leave: there needs to be a broader conversation about it.

3. RTA Items

A. Report on possible developmental leave policy for adjunct faculty (McVey). McVey asked how much support there is within the adjunct faculty committee for adjunct faculty gaining eligibility for developmental leave. No dissenting views were voiced. McVey reviewed the policy with committee, and his rationale for pursuing developmental leave for adjunct faculty. Conroy reviewed the current developmental leave process. Members voiced a concern that there might be resistance from tenured faculty and that going on developmental leave could raise concern for job security for adjunct faculty upon return. Would there be a provision that would guarantee the adjunct faculty member's position upon completion of developmental leave? Conroy identified the Provost's reasons for supporting adjunct faculty developmental leave: retention of good adjunct faculty, curriculum development/improvement, retention of students. Discussion identified that the focus of the developmental leave proposal should be placed upon the benefit to students/university. A member suggested compiling a list of adjunct faculty accomplishments. Liaisons could be charged with collecting the info about adjunct faculty accomplishments. **Deadline** for obtaining a list of adjunct faculty accomplishments is the **September meeting**. Upon completion of discussion, the committee is still in agreement that the committee is supportive of moving forward with proposal. If anyone has input or questions, please forward them to McVey and Okere. Conroy will determine if an adjunct faculty link could be created from the university homepage.

B. Survey questions (Mora) – please post that information to TRACS site folder 'Survey Questions Report'. Anonymous responses should be obtained if possible.

C. Department/school Policies – Conroy will send letter to Chairs to obtain department/school policies. Items to be added regarding policies:

1. Definition of adjunct faculty
2. If there is no policy please indicate that.

Deadline for obtaining policies: **September meeting**

D. Presidential awards – The committee discussed: would University be able to fund additional awards? There was consensus support for opening another category for non-tenure track faculty at the Presidential level if the University would be able to fund it.

E. Development opportunity suggestions:

- A member commented that new tenure-track faculty have a series of teaching workshops they have to attend – could the adjuncts also attend those workshops?
- A member suggested it may be helpful to have a discussion about how to help faculty prepare for the implementation of the outcome measures for core curriculum courses.

4. New business

- A member suggested we talk about specific needs of ‘per course’ faculty, i.e. parking, introduction to TRACS etc. Campbell will initiate the research on parking issues.

5. Upcoming meeting dates: JCK 880

June 15th: 2-4PM

July 13th: 2-4 PM

Meeting Adjourned: 3:50

Adjunct Faculty Committee Minutes for 6/15/2012

Minutes recorded by Okere

Member present: (M=member, A=alternate)

Eixmann (M), Ross (M), Nolan (M), Okere (M), Proff (M), Mora (M), Smith (M), Banta (M), Betros (A), Conroy

Guest speaker: Debra Feakes

Meeting called to order at 2:00 by Conroy

Agenda Items

1. Previous meeting minutes (5/18) unanimously approved

2. Core Curriculum Revisions, Feakes

Feakes thanked all of the Adjunct Faculty Committee members for serving on the committee. The general education core curriculum document from the undergraduate catalog was distributed. The Coordinating Board wants all Universities to reduce the general education core curriculum requirements to 42 hours (Texas State currently has 46 hours). Core objectives have been identified, and the critical thinking skills and communications objectives must be assessed in all core courses. A list of the foundational component areas and the objectives they need to meet was provided. History and Political Science are legislatively mandated – they cannot be removed from the core curriculum. None of the core curriculum components want to leave the core curriculum, and there are several that want to be added to the core. The implementation date is 2014. One member voiced concern that if Science labs are removed from the core curriculum, graduate students' jobs could be in jeopardy as graduate students teach those labs. The administration has indicated that revisions to the core are not expected to impact faculty or graduate student lines. Feakes will confirm that language and its implications for per course faculty. [See Attachment A (GEC Information) for the handouts provided to the committee.]

3. RTA Items

A. Adjunct Faculty Awards: Feakes reviewed the Presidential Awards process. The Faculty Senate suggested that it would be easier for a separate adjunct faculty award to be instituted rather than adding an adjunct faculty level to each of the Presidential Awards. The committee discussed the possibility of a new teaching award for per course faculty. Conroy will report this discussion to the Senate.

B. Electronic newsletter: Conroy reviewed the reasoning for the newsletter – to highlight the achievements of adjunct faculty, contributing to a discussion of possible developmental leave for adjunct faculty. The Faculty Senate suggested that an Adjunct Faculty tab could be created in the 'Faculty and Staff' menu on the University homepage. Discussion included the addition of specific links relevant for adjuncts, and in particular, per course faculty – i.e. benefits, parking etc. It was also

suggested that adjunct faculty nominate colleagues to be featured on the University homepage banner.

C. Advocacy on behalf of per course faculty

Parking: Feakes reviewed the requirements for reduced parking: those with a 100% appointment, and <25K salary are eligible for reduced parking. The 25K limit has not changed for quite some time. These requirements exclude per course faculty as they are not a 100% appointment. Department chairs are instructed to pay parking fees for per course faculty and faculty whose appointments are 50% or less. Feakes will clarify whether paying for parking is at the chair's discretion or not. These two guidelines exclude those who have 51-75% appointments - since they are not 100% appointments and they are not a 50% or less appointment. The focus of the discussion remained on the 51%-75% appointment faculty. Discussion included ideas about the best proposal, such as changing the salary limit, semester-long passes, a standard reduced rate for per course faculty, or simply removing the 100% appointment language. Feakes suggested looking at faculty senate salary data to see what % of faculty salaries fall below proposed salary limits (i.e. 30K, 40K) to determine how many faculty this would impact. The implications for staff would have to be examined as well, as any new proposal would apply to both faculty and staff. Sherry Ross will look at faculty salary data and report how many faculty would be impacted by changing the salary limit.

Additional parking item: One member voiced a concern that the verbiage of the email regarding parking permits excludes adjunct faculty. The committee will closely review the language in this year's email regarding parking permits.

D. Collection of department/school policies

Received thus far:

- Agriculture
- Biology
- Communication Studies
- Criminal Justice
- Engineering Technology
- English
- Health & Human Performance
- History
- Marketing

The committee decided the deadline to obtain these policies is **August 20th**.

E. TRACS forum on possible Development Leave policy for adjunct faculty
Committee members were reminded to contribute to the forum discussion.

F. Survey responses, upload to TRACS

If you have collected responses, please post them to TRACS site. Although we are now directly collecting the policies from the Chairs, the information will still be useful if it is already collected.

G. Development opportunity suggestions

The following have been forwarded to Beth Wuest:

- Webinar access
- Training/mentoring sessions for adjunct faculty by Senior Lecturers
- Include adjunct faculty in orientation teaching workshops.

- One member indicated that including adjunct faculty in orientation teaching workshops will be extremely important in the future as core curriculum courses, which will require specific assessments, are taught by per course faculty.

4. New Business

A member voiced a concern that per course faculty don't have the same representation as faculty with $\geq 50\%$ appointments. (Faculty voters are 50% or more.) The committee suggested that this may be a departmental issue rather than an adjunct faculty committee issue.

A member asked for clarification: can adjunct faculty members who are not committee members/alternates/liaisons attend meetings and provide input/voice concerns. The committee agreed that the meetings are open meetings and adjunct faculty can attend and provide input.

5. Next meeting date **August 31st 3 – 5 PM, JCK 880**. Unless we hear otherwise from Conroy, the July meeting is cancelled.

6. Adjournment