

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Handbook Committee on February 2, 2017, at 9:30 a.m. in the Slovak Room of Grasselli Library.

Present: Ruth Connell (chair), Jeff Johansen (secretary), Roy Day, Karen Gygli, Paul Lauritzen, and Dianne Taylor.

The committee began by discussing the proposal submitted to the committee by Pam Mason for clinical faculty. Before considering her proposal we discussed some of the issues. One question we asked was: "Why don't we just create a path to tenure for clinical faculty?" This would eliminate many of the problems inherent in the proposal. It was suggested that clinical faculty did not want tenure. It was also suggested that the administration does not want to grant them tenure. There was also a feeling among some committee members that tenure is desirable even when faculty do not feel they need it or when the administration does not want to grant it. We have to let faculty collaborators go after 3 years (if they are not tenured). We wondered if some of the justification for the push to have clinical faculty was that the administration wanted untenured faculty that they could more easily terminate, for example if the budgets become tighter.

These were the questions we would like addressed in the rationale for clinical faculty. We feel that Pam Mason should address these questions before moving forward with the proposal.

- 1) Substantive teaching responsibilities are listed for the clinical faculty. What does this mean? What teaching loads are considered to be substantive?
- 2) What is meant by program development and institutional capacity building?
- 3) Why can't this class of faculty, if they are mostly teaching, have a different route to tenure?
- 4) Why not revise tenure guidelines that could accommodate these kinds of positions (revise research requirements)? This could be handled in departmental tenure guidelines.
- 5) If some departments do not want to do this (i.e. it will not be required), is the decision to be based on a vote of the faculty in the department or just the discretion of the chair.
- 6) There is nothing in the proposal that states how these clinical faculty will be evaluated for decisions regarding raises or reappointment.
- 7) In the appointment process, is the whole departmental faculty involved in the search? Will there be national or regional searches? In the proposal only three faculty are involved in the search. Why this limit?
- 8) What protections for academic freedom will be in place for these untenured faculty?
- 9) It seems the intent of the proposal that only the department chair and the dean will be involved in the reappointment process. What is the justification for this limit?
- 10) Is part of the rationale that we want to be able to not renew their contract? If so, this should be stated clearly in the rationale document.
- 11) What are the legal protections for the university should they decide to terminate the appointments?
- 12) Will these clinical faculty be subject to disciplinary and grievance processes and procedures that apply to full-time tenurable/tenured faculty, e.g. sexual harassment, grievance, Faculty Board of Review, etc.
- 13) Why is the limit of percent clinical faculty 20% in the university, rather than 20% within a single department?

We briefly discussed the Parental leave policy as an appendix in the Faculty Handbook. We felt this policy should be in the body of the handbook.

Colleen Trembl (university counsel) will talk to us next week at the administration's request. We will meet at 9:15 a.m. to approve the minutes before our meeting at 9:30 with Ms. Trembl

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.