GFC Minutes, April 13, 2016

**Proposed Revisions to Policy on Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

* Discussion centered around the “Summary of Outstanding Issues Regarding Proposed Revision of the Provost’s Policy on Employment of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty,” prepared by Bill Keene and Peter Norton.
* Bill and Peter performed a gap analysis of the existing policies and the revisions proposed by the Provost. They summarized the information they had, but are still hearing from people as to how they will be affected by the proposed revision.
* Mimi Riley, representing the Faculty Senate Policy Committee, and Kathryn Reid, representing GFC’s Policy Committee, are sifting through information to formulate a response to the Provost’s recommendation. A meeting with the Provost is planned for the next 2-3 weeks, but Mimi has a commitment from the Provost that his office won’t act until they hear the response.
* The Policy Committees are looking for a list of what non-tenure-track faculty can and can’t live without before starting negotiations with the Provost. We may ask for everything, but we want to know what we really need to have.
* It is troubling that a separate set of policy recommendations is being planned for Administrative and Professional Faculty. Experience has suggested that there needs to be a response and A&P faculty included in the policies for teaching and research faculty; otherwise, they may receive a worse set of conditions. Bill and Peter need a bullet list of points that can be shared with the Policy Committees. Perhaps there is a way to get a list of A&P faculty and solicit information. Keith will work with Kathryn to try and collect responses from A&P faculty as soon as possible. Jennifer pointed out that we need to move quickly so that we can influence the outcome and not merely react to it.
* Request for clarification about ECE (expectation of continuing employment):
  + ECE at least implied a long-term commitment to continuing employment that is absent in the Provost’s recommendations. However, it is applied differently in different schools. In some schools, it confers status, in others not. In some it is applied to all faculty, in others, not. So some faculty will be helped, and other hurt, by the proposed revisions.
  + Under ECE, there needed to be cause to terminate someone’s employment. The Provost seems to have taken that out of Evergreen.
  + The 2015 Task Force recommended an Evergreen that was very much like ECE, but routinized. You could use annual performance reviews as the basis for reappointment the third year, and it would be like ECE.
  + The recommendations from the March 10 meeting proposed annual reviews and a third year review, but no presumption of reappointment. There are two new benefits—after 3 years, not 6; and you have two years of notice before termination, not one. This isn’t “evergreen,” it’s “deciduous.” But the Provost points out that this ends the “up or out” provision of ECE, and many faculty want that.
  + We want a status that makes it clear that no one can be fired for no good reason; there must be cause.
  + Kathryn pointed out that from a faculty governance perspective it’s powerful if we say that we want a meaningful process similar to tenure-track faculty.
  + Jennifer cautioned that when we draft a response we need to separate promotion reviews from job security; the Provost’s office sees ECE as job security. Peter reminded us that ECE has intellectual freedom implications. We want to make sure non-tenure track faculty can’t be fired for expressing unpopular views.
  + Kathryn noted that a number of faculty who were denied ECE were reclassified as Lecturers, which meant that the University still had their teaching services, but could pay them significantly less.
* Discussion about phrase “positions that do not require a terminal degree:”
  + Policy isn’t about who is hired, but about how the position is defined; one can be a Lecturer without the Ph.D.
  + University wants flexibility to hire people who have outstanding qualifications in the field, but not necessarily terminal degree (ex., “Professor of Practice”).
  + We agreed to recommend that the number of appointments lacking the terminal degree be limited and confined to short-term appointments; hiring someone with the terminal degree indicates a long-term commitment to that person.
* Kathryn said that hopefully there will be a combined response from the GFC and Faculty Senate Policy committees; please send her comments or feedback on the Provost’s recommendations.
* We can share Bill and Peter’s document.
* Policy committees will send the documents out on the General Faculty list. They will hold an information session for general faculty in the near future.

**Bylaws Committee**

Never found a time to meet to revise the bylaws as agreed in previous meetings, but will do so soon.

**Elections**

A call was sent out, and we have five candidates for five positions. Voting will open April 25. We need to have the bylaws changed by that date.

**Communications Committee**

Held the Jeffersonian Dinner on March 20. Speaker was Dr. Martin Davidson from the Darden School—excellent talk on diversity.

**Joanne Hoagland, University Human Resources**

* Wanted to thank everyone for their participation in the latest Hoos Well challenge. Spouses participated as well, bringing total number of people to 9400.
* Several upcoming events:
  + Hoos Well Financial Session on April 20 from 11-12 in the Leonard Sandridge Auditorium.
  + Estate Planning and Taxes Workshop, April 22, time: TBA.
  + We Skate Night, April 23, 6:30, location: TBA. There will be refreshments, and the U.Va. Hockey and Figure Skating teams will be present. The first 50 people to attend get free admission; everyone else pays $8.