Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes:

September 27, 2017

Present: Andrea Seielstad (Chair), Maher Qumsiyeh, Laura Leming, Rebecca Wells, Corinne Daprano, Mary Ellen Dillon, Deo Eustace, Kevin Kelly, Carolyn Phelps (Ex Officio), Kathy Webb

Absent: Suki Kwon, Caroline Merithew

1. Minutes of September 20, 2017 FAC meeting were approved with three changes.
   a. Item 4: Change “lecturers were teaching faculty” to “lecturers are teaching faculty”
   b. Item 5: Chance “Another nomenclature” to “other nomenclatures”

2. Andrea reached out to Mark Mastay and they are gathering info about lecturers as part of the merit review process. Here is Mark’s response
   a. First, we have polled department chairs about how they evaluate non-TT faculty members. Second, Richard Stock has recently hosted Faculty Focus Groups for non-TT and TT faculty members, and we will receive his report the week of Oct. 9. Third, following Richard's FFG report, and based in part on it, we will conduct an online survey of non-TT and TT faculty to give them a chance to tell us about their perspectives on the merit process. Following that survey, we will compile all of the information gained, and write a report and recommendation to Provost Benson (target submission date ~ Dec. 15). From our work so far, it is quite clear that expectations and performance reviews are very different for lecturers/non-TT faculty in various departments. I will carry your question to the Committee in our meeting this Thursday so that we can perhaps give it some special focus. Let me do that and get back to you.

3. Information coming from this committee will be useful for us. Since they are sending a survey maybe we should try and add any of our questions to the survey. Will include TT and NTT. What do we want to include
   a. opportunities for professional development
   b. are there articulated rights and responsibilities for lecturers in your department - voting, participation
   c. propose different titles to see what people prefer

4. Provost office can supply much of the information we requested - from the Sept. 20 minutes.
   Notes from this week’s meetings are in CAPS.
   a. Number of base budget funded NTT positions (in comparison with TT positions and clinical faculty) and the distribution of those positions across Units and Departments - PROVOST OFFICE CAN SUPPLY
   b. Number of temporary and number of emergency lecturer positions per academic year - NOT SURE, THIS WOULD BE DIFFICULT, INFO IN FACULTY LINES REPORT BUT NOT IN A DATABASE, POSITIONS SHIFT, WOULD TAKE TIME, CAN ONLY DO ONE YEAR, PROVOST’S OFFICE WILL WORK ON GATHERING THIS INFORMATION.
   c. Profile of the demographic characteristics of lecturers - YES, CAN SUPPLY
d. Distribution and average of the number of years of service at UD by current lecturers—YES, CAN SUPPLY

e. Current processes for selection and review of lecturers, the use of three-year letters of appointment, and the different benefits, rights, and responsibilities afforded to lecturers by Units or Departments - THIS VARIES WITH DEPARTMENTS, DIFFICULT FOR PROVOST, CHECK WITH THE DEANS FOR THIS INFORMATION

f. Frequency with which a position may transition back and forth between lecturer and adjunct - DIFFICULT

g. Teaching load and other expectations for lecturers across different Units and Departments - VARIES, DIFFICULT

5. Provost office will supply the information indicated above

6. Will ask Deans for overall number of base funded lecturers (N positions), how many of received multiple year appointment letters in the last 2 years. Also, do the units and departments have bylaws or practices relevant to lecturer rights and responsibilities? Often things like voting rights and curricular discussions may address lecturers. We will ask for this information.

7. While the data is being collected we can address our other issues - the 100% and outside employment policies

8. Faculty Board is considering having the Faculty Association meeting centered around the issue of lecturers - maybe this is a better venue for soliciting thoughts about lecturer titles

9. Between now and next time this agenda items is before us should we look for more examples (beyond what Andrea found in today’s agenda). Andrea, Becky and Corinne indicated they would look for some other examples

10. Becky indicated she would be interested in working on our questions for the survey with Corinne and Mary Ellen

11. 100% practice will be our agenda item for next meeting.

Respectfully submitted: Kathy Webb