

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Campus Governance

9-20-2022

FAPAAC minutes 09/20/2022

Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fpa_affairs

Minutes for the Faculty and P&A Affairs Committee Meeting Sep 20, 2022

In attendance: Ray Bowman, Peter Bremer, Emily Bruce [chair], Brad Deane [took minutes], Dan Demetriou, Carrie Jepma, Athena Kildegaard, Elena Machkasova. The committee was visited for the second half of its meeting by Acting Dean Peh Ng and the four Division Chairs: Stacey Aronson, Jennifer Deane, Rachel Johnson, and Michelle Page.

- I. Approval of Minutes: Minutes for 8/30/22 were unanimously approved.
- II. Pre-visit discussion regarding term faculty.
 - A. Members briefly discussed several issues in preparation for the visit from the Dean and Division Chairs. The main issues centered around these topics
 1. Whether this time of financial stringency is appropriate to revisiting non-tenure track personnel policies. The committee tended to think this in fact a particularly good time since we are becoming more dependent on faculty in these positions. It may be, too, that temporary faculty could be groomed for future tenure-track positions if those become available, in which case now is a good time to clarify our policies.
 2. Whether the workload expectations can be clarified. Is the 24-credit hour requirement necessary, for instance, if it interferes with scheduling and forces potentially exploitative workloads? What about allowing term faculty latitude to work less than full time if they choose? How should expectations for various forms of service modify expectations for the workload of non-tt faculty? In general, the committee favored moving towards a system that is both more clear and more flexible.
 3. Whether evaluations of non-tt faculty can be standardized across campus, which would make those judgements more consistent and equitable.
 4. Whether the arguments for changes to employment policies for non-tt faculty should be grounded in morals, prudence, or cultural preference. Arguments for a system that will cost us money may have to be justified in terms of their return on investment and benefit to the campus.
 - B. In preparation for the visit, we reiterated that the purpose of this discussion was to address three central topics, the same we raised in the recommendations this committee made in June 2022
 1. Policies regarding multi-year contracts
 2. Policies allowing non-tt faculty a path to promotion
 3. Policies affecting workload
- III. Discussion with the Interim Dean/VCAA and four Division Chairs.
 - A. Visitors expressed in general terms their support for improving the employment conditions of non-tt faculty, and mentioned several steps they have already taken to that end. These include clarifying expectations, providing orientation resources for new faculty, arranging mentorships, providing equity raises to certain underpaid term faculty.
 - B. The Dean explained that there are complicated administrative and bookkeeping issues surrounding these positions. For instance, only three people on campus are technically "term faculty." She recalled some history involving the movement of typical expectations for non-tt faculty from 20 to 24 credit hours, noting that some have made different

arrangements. She said that only one discipline uses multi-year contracts. Regarding the path to promotion, she says this is something that she particularly wants to move forward on, but has been reluctant because anything we decide on this campus may be overridden by new policies determined centrally. She asked the committee to review a document recording an earlier effort by this committee to specify a path for promotion. We could revise it if necessary, endorse it, and send it up the chain to her for approval.

- C. There was little time for questions or discussion other than on points of clarification, but members of the committee asked whether this change could move us toward a more transparently and equitably applied set of standards. We also asked whether it might be possible to institute a “clinical tenure line” position, which would be teaching rather than research based. The Dean thought not, as those positions are centrally defined. Michelle Page added that they are usually given to people whose principal employment is with a clinic or other institution outside of the university.