

Faculty Issues meeting, March 15 2012

Absent: Candace, Joe, Laura and Kevin;

Present: Kim, Roann, Vince, Bob, Andrea, Jim (substituting for Teresa)

The meeting began at 3:30. Minutes were approved. We turned to the next item on the agenda – further discussion of the proposal to create a new promotion category for Special Purpose Faculty. Discussion was lively and focused, raising questions about the fact that there are different types of special purpose faculty, and that it may not be realistic to assume that one policy can meet the needs of all of these types. While this discussion was in process, another question was raised: Who has responsibility for decisions about promotion routes and new titles – the Provost? Kim will email the Provost to inform him that the issue has come up and to ask him what his position is and what effect a new policy would have on the promotion standards that already exist.

We then addressed the next item on the agenda. This objective asked us to review and recommend policies for covering classes when faculty are absent. Discussion reiterated some of the concerns voiced at our previous meeting, with a focus this week on the belief that it may not be desirable to propose a major revision of this section of the handbook. Vince emphasized the role of the syllabus in establishing policies and suggested that it might be sufficient to add a phrase saying that in the case of “substantial deviation” from planned meetings and use of time, the faculty should notify the Dean. It was also suggested that rather than saying that faculty should find their own replacements in the case of absence, they should arrange for “alternate instruction.” None of these ideas was promoted as a solution for voting. Kim and Roann agreed that prior to the next meeting, they will prepare some kind of written recommendation. Before leaving the item, a relevant point was made about contact hours: how are they defined for online classes and how does SACS define them?

Item 4 on the agenda concerned objective 8 and grievance procedures for contingent faculty. The question which arose here concerned the definition of contingent faculty at Radford (since the term is not used in the handbook). Are contingent faculty covered by the FTR handbook? If they are covered by the term faculty, then the current appeals and grievance policies apply to them. Thus: who is considered contingent? What was the reason behind this objective?

Kim asked for a substitute FI presenter at next week’s Senate meeting. Roann volunteered. She also noted that Bill Kennan may be coming to the next FI meeting (March 29<sup>th</sup>).

The meeting adjourned at 4:30.