

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes: Tuesday, 11-8-16
11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m., Whitewater 120

Present: Tonya Breymier, Denise Dallmer, Chera LaForge (recorder), Sue McFadden, Daron Olson, Litao “Lee” Zhong, Laverne Nishihara (chair)

Absent: Justin Carroll

Guest (Open Meeting): Roberta Roswell

- 1) Minutes of Tues., 10-25-16
 - a) No comments; minutes approved.

- 2) Open meeting to discuss proposed revisions to the Lecturer Policy:
 - a) Proposed revisions to IU East Lecturer Policy—in Box folder and emailed to Senate
 - i) Diane Baker, Ange Cooksey, and Jerry Wilde were consulted in order to get feedback from current and recent chairs of the Lecturer Long-Term Contract Review (LLTCR) Committee.
 - ii) The proposed revisions were reviewed on a line-by-line basis.
 - (1) Addition on page 1, section I: Discussion of overlap. Maintaining excellence in teaching is important and there is some redundancy in the new additions, though the second paragraph focuses on IU East, while the first paragraph focuses on the IU system (Zhong, Roswell, Olson). There was a discussion of whether or not excellence in teaching is essential after the initial promotion to senior lecturer and if excellence should be used in this early language. There was also a discussion of the phrase “maintaining currency” (Olson).
 - (2) Page 1: There was discussion of the terminology of “immediate supervisor” (Olson), as not all academic units has a dean and immediate supervisor can mean chairs in HSS, for instance
 - (3) Page 2, Section II, point 3: Commitment to professional development in the discipline is not described in detail elsewhere in the policy (Roswell). It is mentioned in the teaching section (Olson).
 - (4) Page 3: The length of the narrative was questioned in an email by Baker (current LLTCR chair). The standards for teaching excellence are identical between tenure track and lecturers, so shouldn’t the pages be equal to make a similar case? (Breymier). Roswell noted that service responsibilities will

- generally be less, so the overall length of the narrative in service may be shorter.
- (5) Additions from P&T Guidelines: in emails, Wilde and Cooksey recommended that, for clarity and consistency, the LLTCR mimic the guidelines from P&T. Having more direction is a good thing and clear direction is a good thing (Roswell).
 - (6) Service Section: Some Schools do not have specific service guidelines, so the policy may be unclear here. Does FAC need to come up with a service policy to help guide the schools? The LLTCR looks at how convincing the narrative is and whether or not the supervisor's letter is consistent with that narrative.
 - (7) Nishihara asked whether to add basic advice on eDossier. FAC favors adding sections of basic advice from P&T guidelines so that lecturers have clear standards on how to submit. Do not include the sections on research.