

## General Faculty Council

**Minutes: Wednesday, February 2, 2022**  
**12:00 pm – 1:30 pm**

In attendance: Joe Fore, Julie May, Ed Murphy, Laura Serbulea, Amanda Flora, Esperanza Gorriz, Diane Whaley, Sharon Kelley, Nathaniel Ratliff, Bonnie Hagerman, Troy Dunaway, Zaida Villanueva, Tisha Hayes, Terri Yost, Victor Luftig, Derek Williams, Meredith Hayden, Bryn Seabrook, Judy Thomas, Jelena Samonina.

GFC Chair, Joe Fore called the meeting to order.

### **1. Approve Minutes**

Minutes were approved (April 6, 2022).

### **2. Announcements**

### **3. Guest Presentation: Sue Kirk, Chair, UVa Faculty Senate**

*The Cavalier Daily* – the title did not capture the reality of the conversation with the provost.

Some faculty expressed concern that there has not yet been a search for a new provost or appoint Dean Baucom as Interim. The President is hesitant to bring in someone new in the light of the pandemic and someone who is not familiar with UVa. People think there should have been a more formal search for the position. Ms. Kirk encourages people to read the *Cavalier Daily* article, which is taken entirely from the recording. President Ryan feels this was a “one-off” situation and is not setting a precedent in terms of procedure.

There were two discussions about who represents the faculty. One GFC member is aware of someone being hired for two classes and then they took on a third class and they ran into an issue with Medicaid and could not teach a third course. It appears that no one represents Wage Faculty – AAUP- not accorded any rights. The wide-spread perception is that Wage Faculty is someone who has a full-time job elsewhere and they don’t need a salary or benefits. This is not true as many teach as Wage Faculty to get their foot in the door/experience.

Has there been prior discussion about Wage Faculty within GFC? One member said that yes – in terms of the AAUP.

It is important that we know the number of Wage Faculty and have solicited this information.

Ms. Kirk sees a narrow window in terms of initiating any movement because of the anticipated change in the appointees to the Board of Visitors.

One member suggests that if there is anticipation that Wage Faculty will be re-hired, they should look to General Faculty to fill those positions. The same pay rate applies to General Faculty – it is the same as Wage Faculty.

One member suggests that demographic data is included – for equity purposes.

Ms. Kirk then posed the question, “Why do we have a Faculty Senate AND a General Faculty Council?” Ms. Kirk is a General Faculty member and is chair of the Faculty Senate. The General Faculty Council was originated because women were not allowed to join the original Faculty Senate. They asked for their own council – to champion pay and benefits for women faculty. She started to look at other charters from other schools and apart from William and Mary, the Faculty Senates include both tenure-track and general faculty. To merge committees, things would have to change significantly.

One GFC member is concerned about the multiple committees – try to invite people to meetings, and they are going to several manifestations. There is a concern that we duplicate efforts and spend a great deal of time to get people treated equally. Having two groups undermines this. The member agrees that the two committees should be folded together and GFC become a standing committee. It will make the faculty body stronger.

One noted that in their school that General Faculty are never elected for membership on Faculty Senate and other positions.

One pointed to the inequity between GFC and Faculty Senate – agree that there should be one body. However, General Faculty are not treated the same. We would have to be very thoughtful in how we constitute people if we were to combine into one group – from an equity standpoint. It would not be wise to combine and then the voice/participation of General Faculty be silenced.

One member asked if it is worth it to attempt combining the committees. It would require buy-in. There is now understanding that there is a two-tiered governance structure (male/female). We should not begin unless there is support.

One member stated that no one from the library is represented.

Another member asked about who has the authority – as opposed to being Ex-Officio (show up but no vote). We should put in a proposal to be a voting member. They believe that the discussion about merging is based upon how GFC has addressed inequities. All for one voice but they don’t want to lose the voice – we will forget what got us here. What is the quality of faculty life at peer institutions? This is not just about representation but about how they do business – believes that there is a structure in place that needs to be

side-stepped to get anything done. Not sure if the Faculty Senate is structured in a way to address General Faculty concerns.

GFC – Next steps: If anyone is interested in pursuing the topics of Wage Faculty representation OR Committee merger, please contact Chair.

#### **4. Regular Reports**

A. Chair's Report - none

B. Officer and Committees

The chair discussed the movement toward organizing the spring election.

C. Communications - none

D. UVA Diversity Council

E. Mentoring Network

The chair solicited help with mentoring.

#### **5. New Business**

A. PROV-004 30-day Review and Committee Response

Focus on unresolved issues. Provost requested feedback.

II. A. Titles – (current titles are for internal use) Schools should have policies for determining titles and about titles being used outside the University. One noted that faculty are treated differently and may have two different titles for people who have the same responsibility. They should be uniform. The term “General Faculty” does not mean anything outside of the university. Perhaps it could be deleted – as PROV 29 has the same language (except “may”).

One member asked about the periodic review of school-specific policies. The provost reviewed policy in A&S without notifying anyone or asking for any feedback.

In some places for General Faculty – there are no resources for research and promotion – so it should be about superior performance but not be tripling your load. The policies are equitable, but the interpretation is not. The policy gives people a leg to stand on – for example – allocation of time. People were concerned about effort allocation and promotion. One thinks the PROV 004 policy should not include the exceeding minimum requirements passage – how do we define minimum? The default is to go to the position description. It is included in the Annual Report.

Discussion was then directed to teaching tracks and scholarship requirements. What kinds of scholarship? There was discussion about schools describing the nature of scholarship they require. Service to the University – does this include the community or profession? The chances of it changing are slim – as we haven't focused on this.

Anticipated next steps: write up notes and send on to Maite by the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Meeting adjourned at 1:32 pm

Next meeting: March 2, 2022 - 12 – 1:30, Zoom Meeting