

Minutes of the March 24, 2022 meeting of the Governance Council

Item 1: Minutes of the previous meeting

Approved unanimously.

Item 2: Proposed Handbook changes regarding Promotion and Tenure and Innovation and Entrepreneurship

There is some confusion about the added language “generating new knowledge” in the introduction.

The changes do seem to reflect the discussion from our last meeting.

The “roles on advisory boards” should be listed more as service. The communication to the board could be scholarship, but the act of being on the board is not a form of communication. The language should be communication with the board.

A concern was raised with the “Document your Innovation and Entrepreneurship”

It was unclear what this document was for and some of the lists like new textbooks or new courses and student evaluations do not fit. This part is unclear about what it is referring to. Is it only entrepreneurship courses or all of the course? Or just the part that is innovative? This supporting document is vague and unclear. This document is meant more to be a guide for a portfolio, but it already includes a lot of material that is in the Faculty Handbook already. A document like this needs to be much more focused on just I&E content.

We should hold the “Document your Innovation and Entrepreneurship ” document. It was suggested that if we approve the Handbook language, it is not an endorsement of the other documents included.

Senator Quam made a motion to approve. Senator Smadi seconded.

The Council approved an edited version of the Handbook language unanimously.

Item 3: Update on P&S rank only faculty taskforce.

P&S staff can be given a title if they are also teaching a course. The mission of the taskforce was to suggest a consistent set of titles for these staff. There are about 100 people on campus who are in this position. 50 are lecturer/senior lecturers, approximately 40 are adjuncts, less than 10 are assistant teaching professors.

At our peer institutions, only half give titles and there is not a clear set of titles at those institutions.

The suggestion was to provide 2 titles: lecturer or adjunct. It would be capped at 30% of their work and departments can choose. There would not be an advancement path because the advancement is based on their main job.

We do not have to give a title, but it does give value to the person teaching.

Do we need two titles? Some of it is the history of people who already have the adjunct title.

It is noted that term faculty can go up for advancement even if they are not an FTE.

Affiliate was suggested, but that title is only external people.

We need to be clear that the advancement language does not apply to P&S staff that have these titles.

If there are two titles, the distinctions between them will be a problem.

We have not talked to P&S Council yet, but that will happen soon.

An alternative is to use a title like instructor that does not require the carve out for advancement. This was the consensus of the Council.

Item 4: By-Laws about Virtual Meetings

The group examined the rules from other institutions and have some suggested best practices.

Is this too much detail (relative to our bylaws)?

The Faculty Senate meeting is supposed to be with everyone in the room. Do we need to put that stricture on it?

The overall sentiment is that whoever is in the meeting is fully participating. If they cannot vote on their device they should not count for a quorum.

Should cameras on be required? That makes it clear that people are engaged.

One person viewed the cameras on as a distraction to the speaker.

It was suggested that having the camera is a minimum standard for professionalism to be involved in the meeting.

A question was raised about people who have workplace accommodations that would prevent them from attending. The university does not have to provide an accommodation for this service and the person should find a substitute.

A suggestion was made to make sure we have someone designated to monitor the chat to make sure points of order are monitored. A suggestion was that it was the president-elect.

There is nothing in Robert's Rules for voting and does not have much information about running the meeting.

It was noted that the rules should also be included for Council meetings.