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| **General Faculty Council**  **Agenda** Wednesday, March 8, 2017 12:00 noon - 1:30 pm*Alderman Library Room 317, located on the 3rd floor Alderman Library*  1. Call to Order - John Alexander  2. Round-robin introductions – John Alexander, Stuart Berr, Maksim Bychkov, Ben Doherty, John Gaskins, Meredith Hayden, Kyle Haynes, Joanne Lannigan, Candace Lutzow-Felling, Gabrielle, “Posy’ Marzani, Edward Murphy, Kate Neff, Esther Poveda, Sarah Ware, Diane Whaley  3. Approval of minutes – Minutes were not introduced for approval.  4. Open Discussion of Draft Report on Impact of New NTTF Policies  The GFC Policy Committee sent an email to NTTF requesting examples of problems arising from the new policies. Comments sent to the Policy Committee were compiled into the document “Feedback on New NTTF Policies” (see attached). Sarah prepared a summary of the comments to identify themes and recurring problems, as well as pose solutions (see “March 2017 Comments Summary w Notes,” attached).  Esther elaborated on her comment on the three-year contract: Professors who have served three consecutive one-year contracts in multiple departments have been notified that they will not receive a new three-year appointment due to lack of funds for the pay raise associated with the new three-year appointment.  (Nonrenewal is based on Provost’s policy “Employment of Academic General Faculty Members (Tenure-Ineligible),” II and III C. “Initial Appointment Term.” <http://uvapolicy.virginia.edu/policy/PROV-004#Initial_Appointment_Term> ) For example, in Spanish, the faculty whose contracts have not been renewed are teaching courses that will continue to be offered, and are also doing coordinating work for the dept.; they are attending conferences outside UVA, and are doing leadership work in the teaching of Spanish. They’ve received excellent evaluations and the work that they do is still needed by the department.  This was an unintended consequence of the three-year policy. After some discussion about alternative policies, it was decided that Sarah will add a recommendation to her “Comments Summary that anyone who has had a three one-year contracts be granted three more, and that an expedited time frame be created for granting exceptions to the overall policy on NTTF  Esther noted that the long-term problem is that the university has these one-year positions carrying the expectation of a lower-salary, which creates instability, the opposite of the intention behind the NTTF policy.  It was decided that Sarah will ask the Provost to prohibit permanent one-year positions, there should be no continuous position/continuous need that is constantly staffed by one-year contracts. It was mentioned that there can be a need for a permanent substitute position in a department, but that should be created as a permanent flex position.  Esther stressed that we need to make clear that the same policy can have different effects on different departments and in different scenarios.  It was decided that Sarah would revise her comments Summary in advance of a meeting with the Provost’s Office on March 17.  Kyle discussed the example of Blandy Experimental Farm, whose research faculty also hold positions in the Department of Environmental Sciences Department. NTTF are being held to a higher standard than tenure-track faculty, thanks to the Arts and Sciences interpretation of the Provost’s policy. (A&S draft policy p. 7—see below--is more stringent than the Provost’s policy, and the standards are higher for general faculty than for tenure track.) If tenure track faculty are rated as “good” in their annual performance evaluations, there will be remedial actions. They won’t be fired, but be moved into teaching or elsewhere. NTTF must receive an evaluation of “very good.” On the other hand, according to the draft policy, if no-tenure track faculty are rated as “good” in their annual performance evaluations, they will not be renewed.  This discrepancy will affect recruitment and retention of NTTF faculty.  Candace noted that if the standard for NTTF is very good or excellent, that really exceeds expectations, and doesn’t reflect job descriptions or match well with the current performance evaluation system. Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory/Excellent would be a more realistic standard  The Spanish Department was also told “Don’t go up for ECE: you need a review of excellent!” ECE will go away after this policy, but people hired before it, need to know how to proceed.  Sarah will add a paragraph to her “comments Summary” making it clear that wording in the Provost’s policy, intending to reinstate the protections of ECE, are being used by schools in ways that destroy ECE. There are misunderstandings in ways that the Provost’s policies are being implemented.  Posy emphasized that this example shows why we need to see all the school policies; to see if there are misunderstandings and inconsistencies/problems.  Ben suggested specific changes to Sarah’s summary that would better reflect law library’s position. Law librarians are fighting to be included in the general faculty academic policy. (In January, Dean Goluboff stated that all future hires of librarians at the law school would be as University Staff.) But the Provost’s policy is being applied inconsistently: for example, the University Library—administratively separate from the Law Library--is hiring their Head of Special Collections as academic general faculty. Most law librarians will be doing more teaching and research than the Head of Special Collections will be. And general faculty in the School of Continuing and Professional Studies have been permitted to have 25% of their work devoted to teaching while retaining the position of teaching faculty with academic rank!  Ben proposed the following revisions to Sarah’s “Comment Summary:”   1. Under tracking system: “we recognize that a balance…” “Schools bending and even breaking categories…” Add sentence “Different schools are going to apply policies in different ways.” Ben thinks inconsistency is actually hurting law librarians.   Posy suggested “An exception would be libraries throughout the schools who have hired librarians…” The Law Library would be one exception. Physicians in Student Health should be treated similarly.  It was noted that the School of Health Sciences has positions that don’t fit the established tracks of teaching, research, and practice. Do the tracks apply to the School of Medicine?  Diane stated that the GFC should make a statement that physicians and librarians should be faculty regardless of school or unit to which they report.   1. “A number of other groups do not fit easily…research librarians who teach” amend to “law school librarians who teach.” 2. “These faculty and other similar…” add “or excluded from the ranks of faculty.”   None of the departmental policies have been approved. We need the provost to have the GFC and General Faculty Policy Committee review these school based policies in draft form so they can catch the inconsistencies and address them.  The next draft of Sarah’s summary will be circulated.  *Regular Reports*  • Elections - Ed Murphy / Sarah Wells – Michael Slon sent an email to all general faculty members. The only representative area for which we don’t have a candidate for is A&S. We need a candidate from A&S, and we also need bylaws updates to go on the ballot. Ed is still working on getting software set up. Question came up of where Student Health falls. Student Health falls under Students Affairs. Many years ago we eliminated Students Affairs as a separate category for representation and rolled it into Administration. Are student health professionals better represented under Administration or Health Professionals? We have left it under Administration this year. That means someone from Student Health couldn’t stand for election unless they hold a joint appointment.  We could change the bylaws to give them their own seat. They are a very small unit. We eliminated Student Affairs because the number of faculty was small and we couldn’t get anyone to run.  6. Discussion:  • Planning for Presidential Search— The Presidential Search Committee has two people designated to do outreach. The GFC will invite them to join us at our next meeting.  It was noted that Mimi Riley, Chair of the Faculty Senate, is a general faculty member and is on the Presidential Search Committee  *Meeting adjourns.* |
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