

FAC Minutes  
October 31, 2005

Attending: Laverne Nishihahra, Sue McFadden, Marcus Pomper, Sherry Rankin, Mike Foos, Ed FitzGerald

Agenda: Group agreed to focus on Lecturer policy and to make consistent the lecturer and clinical lecturer policies.

Concerns about current lecturer policy:

- brief narrative language gives little guidance. Concern expressed both in terms of guidance for the candidate as well as guidance for the reader.
- Specificity of what is to be included to document evidence of excellence in teaching is too limiting. Issues included limiting candidates' ability to document excellence in teaching, annual reviews may not document excellence overtime, and function of annual review and purpose of review for long term contract are distinct.
- Promotion and tenure is overburdened with present reviews of dossiers. To add lecturer reviews to that plate is a disservice to all.

Arguments voiced in opposition to the above concerns:

- Brief narrative leaves options open to candidates. Any page limit is artificial, arbitrary, and unnecessary. Candidates with Divisional guidance should decide the meaning of brief.
- Specificity of materials is limiting. The work/benefit ratio suggests a dossier is not warranted. Lecturer as rewarded with a long term contract. The additional effort to be granted such should reflect the reward. A brief narrative with materials previously submitted is volume enough.

Purpose of Long term contract policy:

- Gives security to appointees.
- Protects University from mediocre teaching.

What IUE is attempting to accomplish via its policy:

- Make lecturer positions attractive to qualified candidates.
- Protect academic freedom.
- Acknowledge lecturers as significant contributors to University mission.
- Provide sabbatical like leave.
- Provide mechanism for lecturers to be involved in faculty governance.
- Provide clarity and guidance to faculty and Administration.
- Ensure consistency in the treatment of all lecturers.
- Comply with UFC policy.

