

Faculty Handbook Committee
Minutes—December 2, 2011

Dr. Burley called the meeting to order at 11:05.

PRESENT: Francie Bolter, Lynn Burley (Chair), Lance Grahn (Provost), Katherine Larson, John Parrack, Mike Scoles, Diane Newton (ex-officio), Patty Phelps, Janet Wilson (ex-officio)

GUEST: Peter Mehl ABSENT: Don Bradley, Katie Henry,

I. Minutes from October 28, 2011. Bolter/Larson moved to approve the minutes. Bolter/Scoles moved to strike one confusing sentence with the result of unanimous approval.

II. Medical, Parental, and Military Family Leave. The committee discussed the “Draft of the New Policy” for *Medical, Parental, and Military Family Leave* submitted by Peter Mehl, making sure everyone understood the policy. The committee considered some editing comments from Bolter and others that clarify the policy and use language consistent with the current handbook. Bolter/Phelps moved to approve with revisions added to clarify. Approval was unanimous.

III. Advancement vs. Promotion. The committee first discussed questions Larson had on the Advancement application; Larson will finish the update needed to modernize the Application for Advancement. Francie Bolter presented her edits to Chap. 3 of the Faculty Handbook, specifically 3-14 #3 and #4, the preamble on 3-24, and 3-25 C. The following edits were made by the committee on the preamble on page 3-24:

VII. Procedure for Advancement of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Providing programmatic needs justify continuation of the position, during the sixth year of continuous service as a lecturer/clinical instructor/laboratory instructor I, a faculty member is eligible to be considered for advancement to level II. Further, providing programmatic needs justify continuation of the position, during the sixth year of continuous service as a lecturer/clinical instructor/laboratory instructor II, a faculty member is eligible to be considered for advancement to Senior lecturer/clinical instructor/laboratory instructor.

Discussion continued on 3-25 C, specifically the following passage:

The department chair will recommend a process for formation of an advancement committee, subject to approval by the college dean. The department chair will appoint a committee following consultation with departmental faculty that will have three to five faculty and, when possible, include a combination of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty.

The committee was concerned that the formation of the advancement committee was not clear, did not mirror the process used for promotion, and did not present a clear role for departmental faculty. The committee discussed ways to standardize the formation of the Advancement Committee and found the placement of the language explaining committee formation to be out of place in a section that basically was written as a set of steps for the Advancement candidate. The range of different types of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty that would be applying for advancement (i.e., library faculty, lecturers in academic departments) made it difficult to craft language that included all. Bolter will continue to work on edits.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.