

**Minutes from the General Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Wednesday, September 8, 2010**  
12:00 noon – 1:30 p.m.  
Newcomb Hall Board Room

**Representatives Present** – Ryan Carter, Anne Ingram, Barbara Kessler, Aaron Laushway, Catherine Leslie, Teresa Lockard (Chair-Elect), Peter Norton, Bethany Nowviskie, Ricky Patterson, Wendy Sue Sewack, Jeff Sitler, Colleen Smith, Steven Lewis Warner

**Representatives Absent** – Casandra Blassingame, Penny Bowles, Addeane Caelleigh, Denise Karaoli, Pam MacIntyre, Barbara Millar (Chair), Kathryn Reid, Michael C. Smith

*Preliminaries*

1. 12:00      **Gathering of members**
2. 12:10      **Call to Order**

Terry Lockard, Chair-Elect, welcomed the members, and acknowledged that she would be conducting the meeting in Barbara Millar's absence, who was in China. Council members introduced themselves.

*Business*

3. 12:10      The GFC acknowledged the importance of the progress and example set by the University, in terms of its academic general faculty. The question becomes, how do we help schools keep up with the progress and example set by the University, in terms of academic general faculty?

Peter Norton stated that a good job was done with the academic faculty, with substantial accomplishments, thank to Executive Vice President and Provost Arthur Garson Jr. This should be considered only the first step. Schools need to keep up with this work. To accomplish this, the Engineering School established a school-level committee. They utilized a school email list to invite people to join the group. It currently includes 20% of the non-tenure track faculty within the School of Engineering. The committee members are motivated people who want positive change for everyone. The committee's purpose is to monitor the *"Recommended Practices in the Employment of Academic Non-Tenure-Track Faculty at the University of Virginia – Faculty Senate Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Final Report dated May 28, 2009"*. This document is a tremendous tool. The outcome of this discussion was to encourage all schools and departments to consider establishing their own committees like the School of Engineering.

The Administrative & Professional faculty has parallel issues than those the report addresses.

Discussion ensued about communication through email lists. Check the Collab site. There is a list for every group. The site will explain how the email lists work.

Terry Lockard reminded the council that the topic of AP faculty next steps is appropriate for the GFC to discuss. So what are our next steps?

Terry – this is an appropriate thing for this council. How best to proceed? As a GFC, we can write a letter (two different forms with the same information) to AP faculty and academic research faculty. We will append the document to the letter. The letter's purpose will be to 1) remind the teaching and research faculty that the report exists, and 2) to let AP faculty know that a working group has been established to review issues of AP faculty, and that General Faculty not on the GFC are welcome to participate on that committee. Terry Lockard will draft the letter to AP faculty, and Peter Norton will draft the letter to Academic non-tenure track faculty.

We should keep this topic on the GFC agenda periodically so it doesn't wash away.

#### 4. 12:25      **Other Business**

- Diversity Council Meeting – Terry Lockard (September)
  - Terry Lockard acknowledged that the meeting was not until next week, and that she would be attending in Barbara Millar's absence. The report would be made at the October meeting.
- President's Day of Dialogue Terry Lockard
  - Terry Lockard stated that she was placed on the planning committee for the President's Day of Dialogue, which will occur on September 24<sup>th</sup>. It was exciting that the GFC was asked to be at the able for the planning of this event. The committee has had one meeting so far. The day will focus on asking what kind of an ethical or caring community are we? The day will include discussion topics and break out sessions. There will be resources available in the sessions and also be a resource fair and art component. Lunch will be available from 12:00 p.m. until 2:00 p.m. and everyone is encouraged to come to lunch. From this day will spur other events. Gwyneth West will be chairing the program. The University administration acknowledges that this event was spurred by the slaying of Yardley Love, and wants everyone who has a vested interest in safety and who can add something to this event to attend. The planning committee has been asked to encourage attendance. Council members commended President Sullivan on taking this step. Discussion ensued.

Terry Lockard asked the GFC to send her names of potential facilitators to recommend for this event. The workshops are being

developed. Those participating in this event are taking a pledge to be part of the community.

- Next meeting location – Terry Lockard
  - Barbara extended an invitation for the October meeting of the GFC to occur at The Darden School. It would include lunch. Jeff Sitler will look into Clark Hall as an alternative. The GFC could make Darden work, but it isn't preferred by the majority of the group.

5. 12:40      Other Business

*Committees*

6. 12:45      **Committee Reports**

- Policy – Peter Norton, Chair  
This committee has not met since chairs committee meeting at Darden. In preparation for the chairs committee meeting, policy members conferred by email. The policy committee wants to make sure that it is part of the process of reviewing Faculty Senate policy. Peter asked fellow members to let him know if there is something that they should be talking about. Bill Keene, former GFC Chair is on the Faculty Senate's policy committee. Bob Bloodgood is interested in having GFC representatives be a part of this committee. We will need to verify this.
- Communications – Aaron Laushway and Steve Warner, Co-Chairs  
This committee plans to spotlight non-tenure track faculty. Feel free to recommend someone. We will write a newsletter article about them. We see this as a very positive thing. The committee wants to draw people to the website. Additionally, we will plan a Meet President Sullivan for the General Faculty to learn more about her. The Alec Horniman event was highly successful, so the committee plans to repeat that model during this year.
- Data Management – Ricky Patterson  
The goal of this committee will be to get membership lists updated more regularly.
- Bylaws – Wendy Sewack, Chair  
Wendy will be identifying areas within the Bylaws that need to be updated. She will also be sending an email to the GFC reminding them of the attendance policy.
- Elections – Jeff Sitler, Chair  
Jeff circulated a handout that described how to run an election. Ryan Carter offered to assist Jeff with this committee.

Terry Lockard noted that it was acceptable to have people on the committees who are not on the GFC. However, the majority of the committee should be council members..

7. 1:30      Adjournment

Next meeting: Wednesday, October 13, 2010  
Location: TBA

**Recommended Practices in the  
Employment of Academic Non-Tenure-Track Faculty  
at the  
University of Virginia**  
Faculty Senate Task Force on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty  
Final Report of May 28, 2009

## **1. Introduction**

The University's pursuit of academic excellence requires a climate of collegiality and teamwork that fosters the best efforts of all of its faculty. However, a recent survey of the academic faculty by the Faculty Senate showed that many members of the academic non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) in all schools face significant obstacles that interfere with their abilities to function effectively. Many of these problems stem from informal practices, often at the department level, that compromise collegiality by creating distinctions between tenure-eligible faculty and NTTF that have no basis in University policy. In effect they tend to make NTTF less than full citizens of their departments (for example, by limiting their participation in departmental governance). The Faculty Senate has responded to this problem by forming a Task Force on Academic Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, composed of NTTF and tenured faculty members. The Task Force has developed a list of "recommended practices" (detailed below) for deans and department chairs to promote academic excellence by fostering equity and harmony in the workplace.

## **2. Background**

### **2.1 The Faculty Survey**

A spring 2008 survey of the faculty by the Faculty Senate (posted at <http://www.virginia.edu/facultysenate/documents.html>) revealed dissatisfaction among NTTF (referred to as "General Faculty" in the survey report) in response to the following statements (p. 39):

- "My research is valued by my department"
- "My participation in department governance is valued and encouraged"
- "Support for personal academic priorities"
- "Support of career development"
- "Fairness of the review and promotion process"

According to the survey (p. 40), "Tenure-ineligible Assistant professors clearly prioritize *Transparent administrative policies* (by >24% over other choices)." The survey continues (p. 40): "Comments regarding General faculty reflect a widespread disregard across the University toward General faculty, a lack of inclusion in department governance, and no set review or promotion policies. Many consider their positions terminal, despite holding the position for many years, with no opportunity for advancement. This does not encourage high performance. Most schools do not give teaching awards to General faculty, which is demoralizing given the proportion of teaching performed by them. General faculty fear retribution if they say the wrong thing. In addition, women are grossly overrepresented in the General faculty and underrepresented in tenure-track positions. Clearly, General faculty feel marginalized in their roles at UVA." The survey recommends the development of "written policies for General

faculty regarding administrative policies, including their role in department governance, annual review and performance evaluation, promotion criteria, and reasonable expectation of continued employment.”

## ***2.2 General Considerations***

The employment of NTTF at the University of Virginia is governed by the Provost’s Policy on the Employment of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (<[https://etg07.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id='HRM-003'](https://etg07.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id='HRM-003'>)>). Relative to tenure eligible faculty, NTTF have distinct responsibilities and roles within the University, and they are governed by distinct employment policies. Differences between tenure track faculty and NTTF of equal rank should be defined in writing by appropriate units of the University.

Whereas tenure-eligible faculty are expected to contribute to the University in the three major areas of teaching, research, and service, contributions by NTTF are typically concentrated primarily in one or two of these areas. This distinction does not imply that NTTF are “part time”; typically an NTTF member’s obligations within a given area of responsibility are proportionately greater than would be the case for tenure-eligible faculty. “Full time” and “part time” designations are determined by University Human Resources, and usage within schools and departments should accord with HR designations.

The experience of the Task Force’s NTTF members, from their service on the General Faculty Council and from their careers, indicates that most of the practices that account for NTTF dissatisfaction in the areas of governance and transparency are informal practices, especially at the departmental level. These often take the form of unwritten distinctions between NTTF and tenure-eligible faculty—distinctions with no basis in written policy. For example, some departments exclude full-time NTTF from departmental faculty meetings. Because important information is exchanged and the policies and aspirations of the department are formulated in faculty meetings, NTTF in these departments feel disenfranchised and cannot function effectively as a member of the faculty team. Similarly, some departments exclude NTTF from participating in Faculty Senate elections and some do not have explicit guidelines for promotion of NTTF. We view such distinctions between NTTF and tenure-eligible faculty as counterproductive to the University’s efforts to achieve excellence.

## **3. Recommended Practices**

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Academic NTTF believes that adherence to the following “recommended practices” would go far toward remedying the problems the survey revealed and thereby enhance the contributions of NTTF to the University’s achievements in research and instruction.

### ***3.1 Governance and Transparency***

3.1.a For transparency, departments and schools should put any distinctions they make between their NTTF and their tenure-eligible faculty in writing.

3.1.b Department policies governing NTTF should not limit the application of school policies; school policies should not limit the application of University policies. For

example, a University-level policy applying to a qualified NTTF member should not be abridged at the school or departmental levels.

3.1.c As full members of their schools' and departments' faculties, NTTF should be allowed and indeed encouraged to participate actively in all school and departmental faculty meetings. NTTF should have voices in applicable matters of school and department governance.

3.1.d NTTF should be allowed to vote in relevant matters of school and department governance, including policy formulation, recruitment, and hiring. However, NTTF may be excluded from voting on issues unrelated to their professional duties. For example, full-time NTT research faculty who neither teach nor advise graduate students might be excluded from voting in matters pertaining specifically to the curriculum, whereas fulltime NTT teaching faculty should be allowed to vote in such matters.

3.1.e NTTF should be allowed to serve on and chair appropriate school and department committees. However, NTTF would normally not serve on promotion and tenure committees for tenure-eligible faculty, NTTF who do not teach would normally not serve on curriculum committees, and NTTF who conduct no research would normally not serve on research committees.

3.1.f Under the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, all University faculty members holding "a full-time position as either academic faculty or academic general faculty" at or above the rank of Assistant Professor "shall be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate" ([http://www.virginia.edu/facultysenate/c\\_blaws.html](http://www.virginia.edu/facultysenate/c_blaws.html)). Consistent with this article, all qualified NTTF should be invited to nominate and vote for candidates for the Faculty Senate, and to seek nomination and run for seats on the Faculty Senate. Nomination and election processes should be open and inclusive of all eligible faculty members.

3.1.g A departmental faculty e-mail list should include all faculty members in the department.

### ***3.2 Employment (Hiring, Reviews, Promotions, and Employment Protections)***

3.2.a Qualified NTTF should be invited to apply for tenure-track positions in their department or school; due consideration should be given to such candidates' credentials and experience.

3.2.b NTTF should be reviewed annually. The results of department and school-level reviews should be reported to the faculty member reviewed.

3.2.c NTTF should have regular opportunities for promotion in rank comparable to those of their tenure-eligible counterparts. Departments and schools should have written criteria for promotion of NTTF.

3.2.d Though NTTF often have formal obligations to contribute to only one or two of the three major categories of faculty responsibilities (teaching, research, and service),

substantive contributions in other categories of responsibilities should be recognized and considered in performance evaluations and promotion reviews. For example, in the case of a NTTF member whose primary duties are in teaching and research, but who also advises undergraduates, such advising should be recognized.

3.2.e Departments and schools should not replace experienced NTTF with new hires merely to prevent them from earning Expectation of Continued Employment (ECE, defined in the Provost's Policy on the Employment of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty <[https://etg07.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id='HRM-003'](https://etg07.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id='HRM-003'>)>). Departments and schools should meet their long-term needs with long-term faculty members.

3.2.f When Academic NTTF are hired by the University without eligibility to be considered for the ECE, the term of employment should not exceed six years. If the term of said employment extends beyond six years, the position should be reconsidered with regard to eligibility for the ECE.

### **3.3 Allocation of Classes, Resources and Student Advisees**

3.3.a Tenure eligibility should not normally be a criterion in the assignment of classes to teaching faculty.

3.3.b Discretionary resources (e.g. support for travel to professional meetings) should be allocated to all faculty equitably and transparently.

3.3.c Infrastructure (e.g., allocation of laboratory space) should be allocated to all faculty on the basis of need and expected results.

3.3.d NTTF should be encouraged to advise graduate students and should be allowed to recruit graduate students on the same terms as their track-eligible counterparts.

3.3.e Graduate students advised by NTTF should have access to financial resources (TA's, fellowships, travel, etc.) on the same terms as those advised by tenure-eligible faculty.