

Faculty Issues, Dec. 1 meeting

Absent: Kevin Ayers, Vince Hazleton, Mary Lalone, Bob Sheehy, Andrea Stanaland

Guest: Joey Sword, Dir. of Human Resources

The meeting began at 3:30 with a discussion of leave policies. Joey Sword was asked for an overview of the current policies, differences (if any) between federal, state and university policies, and explanation of the relationship of the Family and Medical Leave Act to other forms of leave. Following her clear and succinct explanation and answers, it appeared to be the case that not only is there no absence of policy but that any current confusion is likely to be cleared up by the current work of Ms Sword and other members of Human Resources on rewriting the policy description. Although it was agreed by those of us present that the language in this section of the FTR handbook (pp. 42 and 40a) is not clear, it was felt that any attempt to revise or rewrite the handbook at this time was inappropriate. When the Human Resources revision is complete and returns to the FI committee, it may then be appropriate to recommend replacing the language of the handbook with a goal of clarifying the language, as opposed to changing or modifying the policy.

The committee then approved the minutes from Nov. 10.

Item #3 on the agenda concerned the objective regarding the Intellectual Property Committee (#9). Kim indicated that she would like to be the liaison to the IPC; this was unanimously approved. She also indicated that they have not met yet this year, so we are not behind with respect to that objective.

Kim had prepared a table correlating our work this semester with our objectives. With respect to objective 1, it was felt that it might be beneficial to invite Debbie Templeton to attend a meeting next semester. Although the FI committee was asked to develop a policy for the use of additional faculty salary funds, there may be a plan that already exists. Further information would be beneficial. Some discussion ensued as to whether all of objective #2 had been met – this question will be revisited in the future.

With respect to objective 6, there was some question as to why it was an objective. The recorder hypothesized that it may have been a carry-over from the semester of the swine flu, when faculty were advised to be prepared with online back-up systems for teaching their courses. Kim indicated that she will consult with Joe to determine the reason for this objective.

More information is needed before objective 7 can be addressed – Bill Kennan will be contacted.

No work has been done on objective 8. Two objectives were informally added to our goals: a discussion of the 14-week calendar, particularly with respect to the fall semester and the timing of the only break; and the right of retired faculty to take courses at the university. This issue had been brought up on Oct. 6 by Bob Sheehy and although we all agreed then that it was worth pursuing, we have not yet returned to it. Following are my notes from that meeting:

“Dr. Sheehy brought up the question of extending the right to take a course on campus each semester to emeritus faculty. There was some discussion about whether this should be extended to all retired faculty, rather than just emeritus. Although this might appear to be a significant expansion, it was observed that many retired faculty continue to teach part-time and would therefore already have the right to take a course, if they so desired. The committee may decide to make a recommendation on this, as there did not appear to be any major disagreement with the concept.”

It was agreed to include this in our list of things to do next semester.

As it was then 4:50 p.m., the meeting adjourned.