

Fall 2022 Full CT Caucus Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, 18 October 2022 3:30 pm
Submitted by Josh Enszer, CT Caucus Secretary

Members of the executive board introduced themselves throughout the hour.

1) Executive Committee Updates

The exec board met with Provost Laura Carlson on August 9 to introduce themselves and to share the variety of roles (and workloads!) that CT faculty take on at the university, the history of the trajectory of CT faculty, and the things the Caucus does.

CT faculty play a significant role on two ad hoc committees presently - one reviewing class sizes, enrollment caps, and workload impact, and another looking into how faculty are presented on UD websites (to see if they align with the CT Commission report from 2015). The committees are working on their charges, but there is nothing new to report (please refer back to last semester's [minutes](#) for the last updates).

The Welcome/Welcome Back social was held on September 23 this year. Staff at the Commons provided a tour of their newly-reopened space in Pearson as well as the studios where classes can be conducted/recorded with live support from Academic Technology Services.

We are in the process of creating a Canvas site specific to CT faculty, a more internalized/private space to share resources and provide discussion forms for things specific to CT faculty. This is meant to compliment our public-facing Caucus website.

2) Winter Dossier Challenge + Dossier Prep Mentors

Since the Caucus tries to offer a dossier workshop every other fall, there is not one this year. Instead this winter the CT Caucus is partnering with the UD Faculty Achievement Program to provide a light structure to support CT faculty working on their promotion or peer review dossiers. Over the month of January, there will be a weekly check-in (first is in-person, rest are over Zoom) and theme (1- setting your goals, 2- teaching, 3-service, 4-scholarship). This will help faculty structure their time regularly and help with accountability. This is also appropriate for 2- and 4- year reviews, not just promotion dossiers! An interest survey will be shared in November.

Jennifer Saylor and Dana Veron joined us to share resources related to the UD Faculty Achievement Program (you cannot make me write that as an acronym, I can't do it) also offers other services, including small group mentoring, work-life balance workshops, other "write-on-site" peer productivity models, and more long-term promotion and appraisal preparation. Kickoff sessions are typically in person, with remaining sessions online or hybrid. (No online recordings are taken so that faculty can feel free to speak freely.) You can see more details on their [website](#). You can also email with interest,

questions, and/or comments to facultyachievement@udel.edu.

The Caucus continues to maintain a Dossier Prep Mentor network for those interested in connecting with someone who has recently successfully gone up for promotion. We are grateful to those willing to serve in this capacity! You can see the most recent list of mentors [here](#). If you've been recently promoted and want to be added to our list, please contact a member of the exec board.

3) **GUR Ad hoc Committee**

We polled those in attendance at today's meeting about their familiarity with GUR and whether or not they have applied. Over half (16/31) said they were not familiar, and 23/31 said they did not apply (primarily because they did not know about the GUR or they did not think they would be successful).

The ad hoc committee of Victor Perez, Ryan Pohlig, and Meghan Dabkowski has completed their work related to [General University Research \(GUR\) grants](#). We are grateful for the time and energy they put into this effort.

The committee had several goals, including investigating the role the GUR program plays in funding CT faculty, determining any trends in the application and acceptance rates of CT faculty, increasing awareness among all CT faculty about this program, and to helping to understand the language of the call, possibly highlighting potential strengths and weaknesses in applications.

The committee asked for several pieces of data from the Research Office, including the rates of applications and acceptances broken down by position (tenured/tenure-track/continuing-track), rank, college/department, and other demographics; scores on applications; amounts of funding awarded. They did not receive all of this information, but they did get some. In lieu of learning more about scores, the published rubric for assessing proposals has changed in recent years to no longer penalize CT faculty of any rank - it used to be designed in such a way that capped CT rubric scores to a lower possible maximum than T/TT scores - so in theory CT faculty should now be as eligible for this award as TT faculty.

In the years 2019-2022, there were 130 total applications to this program, with 36 (28%) awarded. Eleven applications came from CT faculty, with 3 (27%) awarded, while 65 applications came from TT faculty with 29 (45%) awarded. Tenured faculty accounted for 51 applications and 3 (6%) awards. Viewed another way, of the 36 awards, 3 (8.3%) went to CT faculty, and another 3 (8.3%) went to tenured faculty, while 29 (80.5%) were awarded to TT faculty. (In both sets of numbers here, data regarding temporary faculty are omitted, which is why the numbers don't sum to 100% when they should.) The committee points out that both applications and awards have a plurality coming from English, so perhaps we can look to their department to see how this opportunity is promoted.

Looking over the span of 2011-2022, we're only given the raw number of awards, so we have zero information about the number of applications and therefore success rates. Of the total 201 awards, 13 (6%) have gone to CT faculty, with another 57 (28%) going to tenured faculty. So far, the revision to the rubric to no longer penalize CT faculty has yet to have a significant effect on the proportion of awards going to them, but there has been a marked decrease in the proportion going to tenured faculty. There is a perception that the GUR privileges TT faculty, and indeed that proportion has increased in recent years.

The ad hoc committee makes several recommendations, including forming a group of CT mentors to guide others through the application process, encouraging CT faculty to promote this opportunity to other CT faculty in their departments, the Caucus encouraging CT faculty to apply regardless of rank, the designation of CT reps to socialize new CTs to the idea of applying for this grant, the CT Caucus requesting data updates from the Research Office regularly, and the CT Caucus advocating for CT representation on the review committee if there is no such representation already.

The exec board plans to do the following: 1) Add information about the GUR on our website under resources, 2) Add information on the GUR to our Canvas site when up and running, 3) Solicit successful GUR recipients to act as mentors or points of contact for those who are interested in applying, 4) Request that HR include the GUR program at onboarding events for CT faculty, 5) Forward application notice to Caucus when made available (deadline is usually February), 6) Announce at meetings as reminders until it has become internalized, and 7) Look at data going forward to see if there is any increase in applications and successful applications, given the new rubric and new awareness.

The full report is available [here](#). (You must access the document while logged into your UD credentials.)

4) **Updating Bylaws**

Over the years, our body has voted into Member-at-Large positions faculty at the Instructor ranks as well as Associate in Arts faculty, and the exec board can feel their absence when they are no longer members of caucus leadership. We propose updating our by-laws with language that says the exec board can appoint representation from these two populations in cases when there are none elected to the board. We are in the process of drafting appropriate language to amend our by-laws and hope to have this amendment voted on by the Caucus around the time of our spring meeting.

Any comments or suggestions should be directed to Jenny Lobasz (jlobasz@udel.edu).

5) **CT Job Search Ad Hoc Committee**

We have 50+ new CT faculty joining us at UD this year! There appears to be an increase in the number of hires and replacements we are making for CT faculty across the university. Several of us are serving on search committees this year and realizing there is not a centralized resource for hiring CT faculty. The Caucus exec board proposes pooling recommendations for job ads, interview questions, and other protocols - certainly recognizing that there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to this situation, but there is a lot of “reinventing the wheel” going on. How do we help explain what the Continuing Track is to outside candidates? How do we ensure that we are recruiting the best candidates for CT positions? Also, what information can we include on our public-facing CT Caucus website to support those looking for these positions?

Such a resource will be shared via our Canvas site - as all CT faculty will have access, they will be encouraged to share their materials as much as they can and we will work toward summarizing some potential sort of best practices.

Anyone interested in joining this ad hoc committee should contact Hannah Kim (hkim@udel.edu).

6) **Announcements**

The typical sequence of reviews and contract renewals for CT faculty was shared as a public service announcement. (This is nostalgically dubbed “the tooth diagram” because of a previous draft of this diagram that literally resembled a set of teeth, though today’s version looks a little more like sets of ascending stairs or boxes instead.) In short, unless another arrangement was negotiated prior to being hired, CT faculty are typically reviewed via a “full peer review” by their department’s Promotion & Tenure committee during years 2, 4, and 6 of employment, and contracts begin to grow in length after the third review. In year 8 (the second year of the three-year contract), the program’s chair or dean (as appropriate) makes the recommendation for a four-year contract, and in year 13 (final year of the four-year contract), another full peer review is made to begin a series of rolling five-year contracts. Then in theory there are peer evaluations and renewals every 5 years after that. (Contract renewal is separate from promotion. It may be convenient to apply to go up in rank at years 6 and 13 since you already have to put together materials for a full peer review, but timing varies with each individual.)

7) **Other business as brought up by those in attendance**

There was some discussion about how and why promotion and contract renewal is so explicitly decoupled for CT faculty (and also how these both are decoupled from salary increases!).

Everyone is encouraged to join the union as dues-paying members! Your first year of membership is free. Click the “Join Now” link [here!](#)