

Agenda for October 3, 2005 Faculty Committee Meeting

3:30 pm, 312 PIO

1. Inequitable pay increments for administration, faculty (tenured and nontenured) and staff.
Since the faculty council is merely advisory to the President and the administration does not report to the faculty, this is merely a statistical analysis and fact finding mission, to advise the President should there be ways that pay adjustments could be more carefully targeted to achieve desired outcomes for the administration and to chastise faculty when that is determined to be necessary.
2. Failure to provide teaching release when the release has been paid for by a grant or contract. Cumbersome grant/contract administration procedures. Faculty survey seeking input, ideas for improvement of the process.
3. Tenure track flexibility for parents with newborn children.
4. Discrimination in the tenure process.
5. Statistics regarding the long term trend towards use of non-tenure track faculty to generate student credit hours need to be obtained and provided to the faculty council.
6. Voting rights of staff and non-tenure track faculty etc. See caption from Bob Darcy:
 - a. I am concerned that 34% of our faculty are non-tenure track and that proportion seems to be growing (Clinical, Research). I am concerned with their excellence, their pay, their rights. We need to bring this into the open. Are one third of our faculty 'staff?' In what sense? Who do we represent? Should we extend university wide voting rights to those specified in section 1.7.5 (page 108) of the Faculty Handbook? Who are these and how do we or anyone else tell them from those under 1.7.6 and 1.7.7? I have asked the Provost and will continue to bring this up. But any action or recommendation will have to come from your Committee.
7. Further changes to Appendix D as suggested by John Thornton:
 - a. I think the committee should consider how to reconcile the changes recommended by the Faculty Council and favored by the Provost, in section 1.14.4 of the April 25, 2005 version of The Policy Statement, with other sections of The Policy Statement. Using the Dispute resolution procedure rather than the termination procedures to resolve contested termination actions is in direct contradiction to several sections of The Policy Statement and in my opinion will cause problems if a faculty member ever wishes to contest a recommended termination.
I will ask John Thornton (with this email) to write up a cogent two page summary of the reasons for the change and circulate it to each committee member at our meeting on Tuesday 9/27 for perusal and bringing forth of a correction statement at the subsequent meeting in October.