

UHD Faculty Senate

Minutes recorded by: Sandra Dahlberg
November 1, 2016; 2:30-4:03pm
Room A300

Attendance: Carolyn Ashe, Julio Canedo Soto, Luis Cedeno, Michael Connell, Travis Crone, Sandra Dahlberg, Michael Duncan, Trevor Hale, Jillian Hill, Pamela Hurley, Ruth Johnson, Robin Jose, Anne Kane, Stephanie Karas, Abigail Koenig (for Joan Wedes), Cynthia Lloyd, Kendra Mhoon, Creshema Murray, Mitsue Nakamura, JoAnn Pavletich, Anand Pore, Azar Rejaie, Jacqueline Sack, Benjamin Soibam, Edwin Tecarro, Michael Tobin, Hsiao-Ming Wang, Pat Williams, Keith Wright, Zhenyu Zhang.

Regrets: Karen Kaser
Absent: Clete Snell

Guests: Nell Sullivan, Professor of English; Ed Hugetz, Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; Susan Henney, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Call to Order: The Senate was called to order at 2:30pm by Senate President Dr. Carolyn Ashe.

Minutes of the Senate meeting on October 18, 2016 were approved.

Discussion of Academic Appointment Policies (PS 10.A.03)

Senate discussed the Academic Appointment Policies for tenured/tenure track faculty and for non-tenure track faculty, and Ashe will ensure that the Faculty Affairs Committee receives the feedback by November 4. Below are the substantive concerns of the Senate:

Appointment Policy for Non-Tenured Faculty (PS 10.A.03b)

Ashe presented comments she received from Angela Goins that asked the policy to address faculty development funds for non-tenured faculty, merit raises, and the 5/5 workload.

Canedo (re: 3.4.3.7) asked that FAC clarify the teaching load for Faculty-in-Residence, particularly whether teaching “up to two courses per semester” meant undergraduate or graduate courses, since graduate and undergraduate courses are compensated differently.

Koenig, Crone, Pavletich (3.4.3.3) What defines “Senior Lecturer”? Is the only eligibility requirement 3 years at UHD? Provide more specificity on senior lecturer including eligibility criteria. Some long-term lecturers wanted the title to reward more than just years of service at UHD.

Pavletich (3.4.3.5.1) Clinical faculty section as written suggests a promotion process (assistant to associate, for example) that is outside of the promotion process for tenured/tenure-track faculty, and

is concerned that this circumvents standard promotion processes if only the department chair recommends and grants promotion. There were concerns that these ranked positions undermined the tenured/tenure-track faculty. Hugetz noted that these clinical ranks are a tradition in the academy, especially in the fields of social work and psychology, and the promotions are just a way to recognize long-term appointments. Each department will need to establish criteria for the promotion of clinical faculty.

Kane noted that the repeated use of “temporary” was confusing and derogatory. She suggested using the term “Emergency Lecturer” instead.

Sullivan objected to the repeated use of “temporary” faculty, used even for senior lecturers, because it undermines any sense of security for lecturers and seems counterproductive to the intentions of the policy to clarify and stabilize lecturer appointments.

Canedo, Hale, Pavletich (3.4.3.6) regarding Visiting Faculty positions “cannot be converted to tenure-track positions,” asked FAC to clarify “converted.” Is the intent to say that the years served in a visiting position do not count as years of credit toward tenure, if the person is subsequently hired in a tenure-line position? Or, is this a reference to the budget line allocation of funding? In other words, would this be seen as prohibiting the university from converting the budget line from a non-tenure track line to a tenure-track line?

Kane (3.4.3.2) under duties, why is “grading” included; asked to remove “grading” as a duty UHD faculty are responsible for their own grading.

Kane, Rejaie, Canedo, Williams, (3.4.3.2) Concerns were also raised about including “course development” as a lecturer duty since course development is the purview of tenure-line faculty. Williams pointed out that if a lecturer does propose a course, it still has to follow the approval process of the curriculum policy (PS 3.A.12 Changes to Curricula, Courses, Program).

Rejaie, Dahlberg noted that there is no appointment provision for, or recognition of, formerly tenured faculty who have opted for a voluntary modification of employment (VMOE). Hugetz noted that he is working on the VMOE policy issue and will report back to Senate.

Kane, Pavletich, Dahlberg (3.4.2.1) Raised concerns about the wording for adjunct qualifications noting that this policy would greatly restrict adjunct hiring, and the ability of departments to staff sections, since many adjuncts have recently earned MAs (not PhDs) and do not yet “possess a strong record of teaching and/or professional experience.” This policy would change who we hire as adjuncts.

Pavletich (3.4.3.9.1) asked that the terms of appointment be clarified for the graduate teaching assistants.

Non-substantive comments or editing suggestions (Non-tenure track faculty policy):

- Remove 2.3 from policy since the policy focuses on non-tenure track faculty
- Remove 4.2 from policy since the policy focuses on non-tenure track faculty

--Ensure consistency of wording throughout policy (e.g. "appointment" vs. "hired.")

Appointments Policy for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (PS 10.A.03a)

Kane, Dahlberg, Pavletich, Rejaie, Crone, Sullivan (3.5.1.1) asked that the Distinguished Professor be removed from the policy. It does not belong in the appointment policy since one cannot be hired in as a distinguished professor. Objections were raised that the award process identified is the rank and tenure process, which would require all nominees for distinguished professor to prepare the equivalent of a promotion file and have that file evaluated by the departmental rank and tenure committees; this process is extremely burdensome to potential candidates and their departments given only one person would receive the award university-wide. The workload of rank and tenure is balanced by the expectation that most candidates for tenure/promotion are successful. It was also noted that last year Senate had rejected this provision. Dahlberg noted that the policy calls it an "honor." The honorific title of emeritus is addressed through a separate policy (PS 10.A.10). A distinguished professor honor should be addressed either in a separate policy or through faculty awards. Sullivan noted that distinguished professor is a competitive award using arbitrary criteria that not everyone can earn, even if they are more than qualified. Another concern was that the funding attached to distinguished professor seems excessive, especially when faculty raises are not regular.

Kane, Crone, Rejaie (3.4.1.4) expressed concern that there is not enough information about the requirements for full professor, and concerns that the length of time has been minimized. In Senate discussion several others noted that the rank of full professor should reward demonstrated excellence over time, with a pattern of excellence across the three evaluative areas, and not just be an issue of time. The language seems so loose that it would encourage inequitable and arbitrary applications.

Non-substantive comments or editing suggestions (Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Policy):

--Remove 2.3 from policy that focuses on tenured/tenure-track faculty

Resolution from Oct 18 Senate Meeting

Pavletich introduced the resolution below to address concerns about the explosion of non-tenure-track faculty positions that can be seen as a threat to tenure. Pavletich moved and Hill seconded to consider the resolution.

Connell moved and Hill seconded to create two resolutions, one for each policy (tenure/tenure-track and non-tenure-track). The Senate unanimously approved the motion to create two resolutions.

Henney asked if the Appointments Policies were the proper place for these resolutions, and where will this be located in the policies? Williams said that the resolution for tenured/tenure-track faculty belongs in the Rank and Tenure Policy (PS 10.A.01). Pavletich responded that the intention is to demonstrate the university's commitment to tenure in a way similar to the Commitment to Diversity statement that appears in both of the appointment policies as section 3.1.

The below resolution for the tenured/tenure-track appointment policy was unanimously approved.

Proposed Faculty Senate Resolution for
Policy Revisions to P.S. 10.A.03 for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

Whereas the system of tenure is the primary means by which faculty are assured the freedom and support to perform research, creative activities, service, and teaching to the best of their abilities,

Whereas UHD has experienced intensive but uneven growth in the numbers and types of faculty positions sought by the institution,

Whereas the proposed policy revisions to P.S. 10.A.03 significantly expands the types of faculty positions the institution may seek,

Whereas the proposed policy currently includes commitment statements that address diversity, quality appointments, and following established procedures,

The UHD Faculty Senate hereby resolves that the proposed revisions to P.S. 10.A.03 include a clear statement that affirms this institution's commitment to the system of tenure.

The below resolution for the non-tenured/tenure-track appointment policy was approved by a majority of the Senate (22 approved, 1 opposed, 1 abstained)

Proposed Faculty Senate Resolution for
Policy Revisions to P.S. 10.A.03 for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Whereas the system of tenure is the primary means by which faculty are assured the freedom and support to perform research, creative activities, service, and teaching to the best of their abilities,

Whereas UHD has experienced intensive but uneven growth in the numbers and types of faculty positions sought by the institution,

Whereas the proposed policy revisions to P.S. 10.A.03 significantly expands the types of faculty positions the institution may seek,

Whereas the proposed policy currently includes commitment statements that address diversity, quality appointments, and following established procedures,

The UHD Faculty Senate hereby resolves that the Faculty Affairs Committee affirm the position on career paths for long-term non-tenure-track faculty.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:03pm.

The next Senate meeting is on November 15, 2016.