

## Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee May 2, 2012

**Members Present:** Lisa Jones, Cynthia Waskowiak, Bill Roach, Matt Arterburn, Steve Angel, Mark Kauffman, Willie Dunlap, Gordon McQuere, Pat Munzer, Monica Scheibmeir, Carol Vogel, Randy Pembroke, Nancy Tate

### **Discussion**

#### **Gordon McQuere, Definitions Sub-Committee, presented a report:**

This sub-committee has met twice to draft definitions and categories for the committee's review. (See handout for details.) The sub-committee began by identifying categories; the number is open to debate. The intent is that some sections of the handbook will apply to certain categories and not others; each section will designate the categories that apply. For example, under the Grievance section, it will say "This section applicable to categories G and H." The sub-committee suggested definitions for a few general terms. These are all open to change with committee input and some may require a Bylaw or other change as well. Specifically, Lisa will work on a definition for "faculty" (means people who teach, has no other legal meaning or handbook rights).

The committee then discussed each of the categories. For all categories, there are issues with equivalencies when designating teaching loads. These vary by departments and require flexibility with changing department needs. A policy on equivalency may be needed. Another overarching concern with several categories is establishing guidelines to avoid claims of default tenure. This is to be fair to WU and to faculty.

Discussion of specific categories:

- **B – Senior Adjunct Faculty/Affiliated Faculty:** The name of this category is open to suggestions. These are professionals needed on an on-going basis. This category is needed because Lecturer positions require more approval than Adjunct positions. The committee should consider how, or whether, to allow individuals to have multiple identities (like secretary and Adjunct), when determining benefits. Carol notes the current policy is that Adjuncts are not benefit eligible, which a .5 employee is eligible for prorated benefits. Gordon clarified that .75 teaching is per semester.
- **C & D – Lecturer and Senior Lecturer:** The difference between these categories is status and compensation. In some departments, individuals are currently differently than in this draft. The sub-committee has a desire to reflect current practices, while considering what's appropriate and fair. Committee members suggested adding a description to each category, using an equated load for teaching requirements, and having flexibility in requiring service or research or providing opportunities for each. Lab/research space and resources should also be considered. Gordon clarified that research requirement would be an assignment, not faculty choice, as the requirements

vary with department needs. Default tenure, its prevalence, and whether exceptions should be allowed in certain circumstances were a big concern with this category.

Randy suggested someone could draft a chart of all variables in each category so we could consider whether we want to account for all potential combinations. There was some consensus that the same title could have several combinations of variables and all positions would be in the same category.

The School of Law uses “Distinguished” as part of titles; Jalen will find out the parameters for this use.

- **E – Librarian:** Randy’s sub-committee will address Librarians’ desire for tenure opportunities.
- **F – Visiting Faculty:** Randy suggested we avoid using ‘visiting’ for more than six years of employment to avoid default tenure; we should consider time limits for this category.
- **G & H – Tenure-track and Tenured Faculty:** The ranks listed in these two categories will remain as currently defined. Instructor might be limited to those ‘ABD’, or those individuals should be in the Lecturer category so the tenure clock doesn’t start. Randy’s sub-committee will address this. There will be separate contracts for tenure and non-tenure positions; currently, the contracts are the same, which adds confusion and creates legal issues.

Next, we discussed assignments. Currently, these are generally used casually, although some are needed for accreditation; we should decide if they should be used as honorific or rank. We added ‘distinguished’ to the list. We talked about using only certain titles in certain categories, the need for ranks in certain categories, and a hierarchy regarding equated loads and changing duties within categories.

Decisions:

- The Definitions Sub-Committee will continue to meet to refine the categories and definitions as reflected by committee suggestions. Lisa will assist with the definition of “Faculty”.
- The Rights and Responsibilities Sub-Committee will work on an equivalency policy as part of their tasks throughout this revision process.
- Randy will present the summary of his sub-committee’s first meeting at the next committee meeting.

**Next Meeting: May 16, 2012, Noon, Lincoln Room**