

Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee May 1, 2013

Members Present: Lisa Jones, Cynthia Waskowiak, Bill Roach, Jalen Lowry, Gordon McQuere, Nancy Tate, Matt Arterburn, Carol Vogel, Richard Martin, David Sollars

Discussion:

We discussed how proposals we approved should proceed to Faculty Affairs for discussion. We decided that Faculty Affairs or Faculty Senate should have a member appointed to our Committee. This person could attend and give input from the Faculty Affairs/Senate perspective and can be responsible for taking approved proposals forward. Bill will contact them to get a member appointed.

Gordon presented the most recent version of definitions from his sub-committee. He noted a few areas needing input from the Committee. The first is whether Voting Faculty should include visiting faculty. Second, the Librarian category needs some work; he's waiting for the librarians' proposal as they might request a tenure option. Next, Category C, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, needs a better title. Lastly, the School of Law has a separate list of categories. The sub-committee debated working them into the definitions but decided the definitions are more user-friendly to keep them separate as they have a lot of exceptions.

Further, Gordon explained that "appointment" grants legal contract rights while "assignment" is more "at-will", meaning at the VPAA's discretion. There's a need for this because there's no current mechanism to "un residence" someone. He referenced a former faculty member that was still qualified to teach but was no longer entitled to benefits of being "faculty in residence."

He next explained that the sub-committee simplified the equivalency policy and clarified that it is a mechanism solely for hiring someone without a Ph.D. to a tenure-track position. The individual must still meet all standards, they merely lack a credential. The policy includes approval by the home department as faculty need a voice in that type of decision as it's their prerogative to review credentials of hires.

The Committee then discussed a couple areas in more depth that Gordon noted needed some input. For Category C, Gordon explained there are three levels to give an opportunity for advancement. The Committee suggested a couple different titles, like Lecturer, Associate Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. We don't want it to be parallel to a tenure track, so someone else suggested Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Distinguished Lecturer. It was noted that "Distinguished" is a type of assignment so it might be confusing. Someone suggested leaving it to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer so the promotion could represent a show of appreciation and recognition of hard work, the intent of adding this category.

David mentioned new AACSB accreditation guidelines that could have an impact on this category. The guidelines require the School of Business to have a certain percentage of each of four types of faculty, with all types required to do research. Currently, Category C specifies there is no research requirement, so as to prevent default tenure.

The Committee discussed adding another category called "Research Lecturer" with language identical to Category C with the addition that research is required as "specified by an accrediting body." We want to be clear that Lecturers and Senior Lecturers (Category C) can do research voluntarily but it will not make them a Research Lecturer. That is by contract and the percentage of time in research is determined by the department's accrediting body, *not* by the department.

Then, the Committee decided that visiting faculty should not be permitted to vote, although they can attend Voting Faculty (formerly General Faculty) meetings. The School of Law has some faculty

who are called “Visiting” who have been employed for many years. Jalen will check to see if the SOL is okay with visiting faculty not voting. If not, we will need to re-examine this language. Someone clarified that faculty can each vote in their own departments, this merely refers to the body, General Faculty, which we’ve proposed to re-name for clarity’s sake as Voting Faculty. This will require a By-Law edit.

Finally, we discussed a few brief housekeeping issues. Gordon will reorder the list of categories so that tenure is “A”. We need to include language that WIT is not included as they have their own handbook. Lisa will look at the By-Laws to see if the Board of Regents should approve the candidate hired under the Equivalency policy. The current contract language about Board approval for employees refers to the budget. Last, the items we’ve approved should go forward to Faculty Affairs. In the fall, we will have faculty forums to discuss some items.

Decisions:

- We need a Faculty Affairs/Senate representative to serve on the committee. That person will carry approved proposals forward. Bill is contacting them about a representative.
- SOL has separate appointment categories to reflect their unique situations.
- The Committee approved the Equivalency policy except that Lisa is checking to see if Board of Regents’ approval is necessary.
- We added a Research Lecturer category where an accrediting body requires research, and left Category C with two titles: Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.
- Visiting faculty are not permitted to vote in General Faculty meetings, but can attend.
- General Faculty, the governing body, is renamed Voting Faculty.

Next Meeting: May 15 at noon, Shawnee Room