**General Faculty Council**

**University of Virginia**

**MINUTES**

Wednesday, December 5, 2018

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

Byrd-Morris Room of Harrison Institute

Meeting with University Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Maïté Brandt-Pearce

*Council Members in Attendance*: Keith Weimer, Sarah Ware, Diane Whaley, Ed Murphy, Ibby Roberts, Hope Kelly, Ben Doherty, Esther Poveda, Yuri Urbanovich

*Council Members Not in Attendance:* Derick Williams, John Gaskins, Chris Gist, Simonetta Liuti, Michele Madison, Gabrielle (Posy) Marzani-Nissen, Barbara Millar, Vladimir Mitkin, Angela Piñeros-Fernandez, Janet Warren

*Guests*: Maïté Brandt-Pearce, John O’Brien, Laura, Serbulea, Jeanine Braithwaite, Karen James, Sarah New, Leslie Ashbrook, Kathryn Boudouris, Melinda Baumann, Kristin Glover

*\*Misspellings likely due to legibility of names as written on attendance sheet*

**Call to Order**: 12:05 p.m.

**Agenda Topics**

1. Introductions
	1. Round table introductions including all present
	2. John O’Brien, Faculty Guide – jobrien@virginia.edu
2. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Response to Report on Implementation of PROV-0004: Employment of Academic General Faculty

A lengthy response to the report on the policy impact report and discussion around associated issues was conducted with guest, Vice Provost Maïté Brandt-Pearce

* 1. Expressed desire to engage and establish relationship with general faculty to support our goals and careers – open to meeting with individuals and groups
	2. Described meeting with policy team regarding Report on Implementation of PROV-0004 and sharing report with Academic Associate Deans (feedback from deans is incomplete at this point)
	3. Noted that school policies should be updated and made available via the web – suggested it was general faculty’s role to ensure the accuracy of this information
	4. Discussed review process of school policies developed in conjunction with PROV-0004. Unknown whether general faculty were included in school level policy development.
	5. Provost’s Office stance on removing tracks – No
	6. Provost’s Office stance on loosening parameters of tracks – No

Expressed preference to maintain tracks as-is and be flexible individually. Continued on with idea that actual numbers were likely small for those impacted and that additional tracks may suggest additional positions that should be filled.

* 1. Discussion of language regarding promotion – Provost’s Office agrees that additional language is needed but at this time it is unknown what direction it will take.
	2. Discussion of “grandfathering” approach for some appointments – including past criterion for promotion in conjunction with current evaluation processes
		1. May require IAS data to guide policy development for those impacted
		2. Faculty members present put forward issues with lack of communication and trust with deans regarding this
	3. One-year Contract Concerns
		1. Expressed need to capture/differentiate truly one-year appointments as opposed to longer term positions
		2. Not clear whether Provost’s Office could actually stop rather than discourage more than three consecutive one-year contracts for an individual
		3. Recognized need for improved language regarding reasonable and unreasonable use of one-year appointments to guide deans, etc.
	4. Provost’s Office views issues regarding notice of non-renewal to be an issue of culture and external constraints, without a policy solution as class evaluations and budgets must come before those decisions are reached.
		1. General faculty members discussed particular harm to international faculty who need renewal notice to maintain visas – expectation will be to work with the impression that you need to find a job elsewhere after one year to stay within the United States.
	5. Lecturer/Professor Ranks
		1. Discussion of problematic nature of “Professor of Practice”
		2. Provost’s Office stance on language that would stipulate *same work – same title* – No, Views that this would generate more problems
		3. Further, not confident that the numbers impacted warrant a policy change
	6. Discussion of what constitutes scholarship for teaching faculty. Supported language that reflects exclusively scholarship of teaching but inclusive of scholarship within the field as needed to maintain relevance within domain
	7. Provost’s Office finds recommendation for external review to be too restrictive
1. Law Librarians Concerns
	1. Need for policy that supports system for promotion – this group is not covered by current policy
	2. Discussion of adding fourth track for librarians not embraced by school leadership
	3. Noted that PRS system is somewhat broken with inclusion of post-docs and insufficient policy parameters
2. Bylaws Update

Review of bylaws completed, proposed changes will be fully discussed in January meeting

**Adjourned**: 1:30 p.m.

**Next Meeting**: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 from 12 – 1:30 p.m., Alderman Library

Submit agenda items to Chair, Keith Weimer