

## **Review and Planning Committee Minutes, October 9, 2002**

Meeting began at 3:35 p.m

**Present:** Allen, Geffert (chair), Hamlin, Johnson (student member), May, Odell, Paddleford, Robinson, Solid, Umbanhowar, Wojick

### **MINUTES**

A motion to approve the minutes from the Oct. 2 meeting was heard and the minutes were approved.

### **VOTING FRANCHISE FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY**

Geffert passed out a memo from Odell describing her research in the archives into the question of voting franchise for temporary faculty. Odell reported that her sense of 3.I.B was to extend franchise as broadly as possible. Issue was tabled for later consideration

### **DISCUSSION OF GREENSHEETING PRINCIPLE TO SPLIT FAC MANUAL**

- Conversation began with discussion of Chair's draft proposal to ask for a vote of faculty approving or disapproving of principle of split into a contractual faculty manual and non-contractual handbook and quickly moved to the language of 00-01-9 RPC resolution to approve the split. This resolution did not pass in 00-01 but there was little discussion of it at Fac. Meeting perhaps owing to it coming up after 8 PM and a lack of comfort on the part of the President with the language, possibly reflecting concerns of the College Attorney with Part 3.I.B. of the resolution.
- After some discussion of what might/might not have been concerns with 3.I.B the committee returned to issue of how seek approval and options of (a) seeking general approval, (b) a more specific proposal modeled after 00-01-09 or (c) simply green-sheeting the entire split. Green-sheeting of entire split did not appeal to any committee members and so discussion focused on options a and b and how specific (or not) to be in proposal to faculty. In the end there was general approval to go with a less specific proposal seeking approval for the principle of a split but using some of the language of the 00-01-09 resolution to describe the split.
- We then got into a discussion of the current status of the split and the fact that there were now two versions of a split Manual and Handbook. One of these is posted on the web and the other (which was emailed to RPC members by Dean's office) was a version prepared by College attorneys. This latter had many wording changes and added phrases that May suggested represented large changes to intent of manual and needed to be discussed by RPC. Some of these were necessary legal changes (e.g. language about Family and Medical Leave) and others were more open-ended.
- Committee requested a list of changes that had been introduced by the attorneys so we could examine these directly. Question was then raised about what changes did and did

not need to be voted upon by faculty and this conversation concluded with a sense that not everything needed to be voted upon and that committee would have to be arbiter of this.

- After continued conversation which included wisdom of having College Attorney present at faculty meeting to answer questions about split, and a suggestion from D. Emery that RPC hire its own attorney to look through split, a subcommittee (Umbanhowar, Geffert, Robinson) was appointed to work on splitting table of contents of current manual as a first step in parsing the split into manual and handbook.

## **PROMOTION AND ROLE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE**

- Discussion of the role of administrative service in promotion began with a review of Section 4, VIIB of Faculty Manual which has been part of Manual for past 14 years. Investigation in the archives and the recollections of committee members suggested that intent of this section was to provide flexibility but not another separate category for review and was worded to retain the importance of teaching. How this section was to be interpreted was understood to be at the discretion of Departments to decide. This was in the context of very few Associate Professors serving as Chairs or in the Administration.
- Discussion then followed about what this meant in terms of the traditional percentage weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service and modifications of the classic 50:40:10 split off were suggested. Several committee members voiced strong opposition to these options and the idea of tenuring anyone for anything but in the classroom/lab teaching, and that there was a potential for setting up two tracks to promotion (teaching or administration) which was not seen as a good thing.
- Question was raised as to place of this language in Section 3 instead of Section 4 but its placement in the latter was confirmed. Discussion then moved to compensation for administrative service, the reasons for using faculty (esp. in relation to non-Chair positions) with the answer being that in many cases this arose out of desire of former Dean to encourage shared-governance as well as to provide a match to the administrative interests of some faculty. Cost savings may or may not also be an issue.
- Idea was raised that this is a problem only if Assoc. Professors are in this role and that a simple fix would be to require that an individual must have obtained rank of Full Professor to serve in administrative capacity (be it Chair or other). Concerns were raised about this in terms of difficulties in finding qualified people for these positions and that many Assoc. rank faculty have been doing an excellent job.
- Impact of admin. service on time to promotion was discussed and the need to balance faculty desires to serve against taking unfair advantage of faculty in terms of compensation (or lack thereof) for this service considered.

Our next meeting is devoted to subcommittee work and the next meeting of the whole will be Wednesday, Oct. 23 at 3:30 in Rolvaag 515.

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charles Umbanhowar Jr., Secretary