

**University Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Minutes: September 7, 2015**  
**Monroe 213: 3pm**

**Committee members in attendance:** Courtney Clayton (COE); Eric Gable (Chair; CAS); Ken Machande (COB); Hilary Stebbins (Secretary; CAS)

1. This was the inaugural meeting of UFAC for the year. We began by introducing new members.
2. During the 2014 – 2015 academic year the UFAC had composed a motion (with intent to submit to UFC at the beginning of the 2015 – 2016 academic year) regarding language in the faculty handbook (2.6.3) that “one at-large member [of UFAC] shall be from the renewable term or adjunct faculty ranks.” While the goal of this is laudable, the reality of finding someone who fits these criteria and is willing to do this service on a consistent basis is low. John Morello suggested that we remove the requirement that a faculty member be either adjunct or on a renewable tract and instead make it clear that adjunct/renewable tract faculty are eligible to run for the at-large position. We simply need to make sure that UFC makes this clear when they send out calls for nominations to all faculty. The current UFAC members voted to forward this motion (below) to the UFC for consideration.
3. We discussed other possible agenda items for the year that the UFAC may need to address. Continuing from last year’s discussion one suggestion was to revisit the merit evaluation system, especially regarding the link between peer evaluation, merit evaluation, and merit pay. We need to devise a way to reach out to UFC (a motion? a memo?) and ultimately to the faculty regarding soliciting thoughts on the merit evaluation system.
4. We discussed the suggestion/requirement that search committees for faculty positions include at least one minority/diverse member and that this seems to be defined by racial/ethnic diversity. Anecdotally, the concern is that this may be placing a service burden on a specific population of our faculty/staff. Eric, as chair, volunteered to contact HR to evaluate whether this is a mandate and, if so, if it’s coming from a state level or rather if it’s an interpretation of a state rule made by Mary Washington. If it’s the later then we may want to discuss reaching out to the faculty regarding whether the definition of “diverse” and “minority” could be broadened beyond that of race/ethnicity.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 pm.

Submitted by: Hilary E. Stebbins

**Motion from the University Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**Revision of Section 2.6.3 of the Faculty Handbook**

**Motion:** To revise section 2.6.3 of the University Faculty Handbook as follows, with crossed-out wording to be deleted, and underlined wording to be added.

**2.6.3 University Faculty Affairs Committee** The committee consists of six full-time faculty members with a minimum of three years’ affiliation with the University at the commencement of service: one representative from each College and three elected from the faculty at-large. Members representing each college shall be tenured or tenure-track. ~~One at large member shall be from the renewable term or adjunct faculty ranks as described in sections 3.3 and 3.5 of this Handbook.~~ Faculty from the renewable term ranks are eligible candidates for an at-large position (see Handbook section 3.3.1), and are encouraged to seek nomination. The committee’s duties are to ...

**Effective Date:** Immediately upon approval by the University Faculty Council.

**Rationale:**

The University Faculty Affairs Committee offers this motion as part of its duty under section 6.2.3.5 of the Handbook to:

Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council action concerning University-level policies on continuing and adjunct faculty welfare and formulate and present to the University Faculty Council recommendations concerning workload distribution, academic leave, compensation, and employee benefits.

In the past 2 years (2014, 2015), the University Faculty Organization Committee has been unable to recruit nominees to run for election to the at-large position on the University Faculty Affairs Committee reserved for a member “from the renewable term or adjunct faculty ranks.” **There is currently a vacancy on the UFAC that the UFOC feels could be filled if the proposed motion is approved and an election held in September 2015.** At its March 26, 2015 meeting, the UFOC decided to ask the UFAC to consider this issue and propose a solution.

In researching this issue, the UFAC found that according to section 3.5 of the Faculty Handbook, appointments at the rank of adjunct instructor are for one academic semester, but terms of service on University standing committees are for three years. For this reason, it is not practical or reasonable for a member from the adjunct ranks to be eligible for election to the UFAC. Therefore, the proposed motion deletes any reference to “adjunct faculty” from section 2.6.3 of the Handbook.

The UFAC further found that according to section 3.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook, faculty serving on renewable term appointments (RTA) “are eligible to serve on any faculty committees except those that specifically require tenure and/or senior academic rank for membership.” Additionally the UFAC learned that currently 23 UMW faculty are on renewable term contracts, with 12 of those serving in the Athletics, Health, and Physical Education Department. Given these low numbers and the demanding workload and lower pay of RTA faculty, the proposed motion deletes the requirement to reserve a position on the UFAC for an RTA faculty member, while still encouraging them to seek nomination.