

Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee September 19, 2012

Members Present: Richard Martin, Matt Arterburn, Cynthia Waskowiak, Carol Vogel, Bill Roach, Pat Munzer, Gordon McQuere, Monica Scheibmeir, Lisa Jones, David Sollars

Discussion:

We began by discussing a recap of the “road show.” The first topic was about community based “teachers”, who are called “preceptors” in nursing and “clinical instructors” in Allied Health. They are also used in education and athletic training, among others. These individuals supervise students during internships, including performance evaluations. They are not Washburn employees and “volunteer” for their role as part of their job responsibilities. They count that time as teaching experience for accreditation or licensing. We do not have a consistent category for them or address them in the handbook.

In the past, these individuals had some benefits, like use of the library and pool. Some library tools are only accessible online, beyond public access, which made this a desirable benefit for them. They would like access to some of our employee/student databases and to the Angel community portal for ease of student communication and material availability. We appreciate all of their efforts, and there are many benefits to WU, including potential recruitment to faculty positions. It is also important we address this as some competitors pay preceptors. The SAS is able to give continuing education credits in some areas, but nursing is not.

Being able to give some benefits is seen as “in-kind” payment. Particularly for the individuals in health care, supervision is time consuming and intense, which can detract from their other job opportunities. They do it to help make an educated workforce, personal fulfillment, and generally help at their jobs. We would like to give them some benefits to make them feel appreciated and welcome. There is some difficulty with granting library access for non-employees, but if we could do that or some access through Angel (a locked, manageable system), it would be nice. We should be aware that some are driven by status and some title or connection to WU might be worth more to them than access.

The Definitions Sub-Committee will address this, as there are some issues to work through. There is potential liability, based on how they are named or given benefits. We should also be conscious of how they are counted as faculty for statistical purposes, like the faculty-student ratio. We do not want to misrepresent ourselves. They could be called “Affiliated teachers” or something similar.

The next topic was the librarians’ wish for preference over other library staff. Librarians are the individuals with some credentials. They do not want tenure, but would like ranks (assistant, associate, librarian), similar to desired lecturer ranks. Lisa cautioned against using “ranks”, instead letting departments make titles within themselves, and only using “rank” in the classic sense with professor.

The Definitions Sub-Committee will address the librarian issue, as well as the lecturer issue. In the SOB, they require lecturers to do research, so if we go with the current draft the Dean will need to change titles or duties. Now, lecturers have duties similar to professors, but professors have a Ph.D. In Allied health, they need lecturers to do service, as they want them to be part of the community and to spread out duties. Other departments echoed this desire and need.

Finally, we discussed Randy's comments on the "road show" that he'd emailed in his absence. About half of the topics presented by his P&T Sub-Committee had mixed comments, while there was general agreement about the other half. Some controversial areas might require voting within a department, then up through general faculty. That way everyone will get the chance to weigh in and vote; some areas will just simply not be easily agreeable to all.

In the SOL's meeting, faculty liked the six year probation process and having promotion tied to tenure, but liked their current elaborate tenure process with yearly reviews. Other schools conduct one early review, around year three. Most faculty are serious about the tenure process because of the potential embarrassment of being denied, but a few submit sloppy applications at the early review. A few schools may look at the content and ignore the disorganization, but most expect coherence, as professors should be articulate.

We give faculty lots of guidance on the tenure process, but there are some issues in the arts. It might be possible to give examples in the handbook of scholarly activity that qualifies for tenure, like pedagogical research. We discussed whether tenure is possible without research and whether great teaching is possible without being active in one's area.

Decisions:

- Carol will email the committee her questions and suggested edits to the handbook. We will discuss them at the next meeting and decide what to address and how.
- The Definitions Sub-Committee will meet to flesh out some of the issues presented at this meeting. They will report the meeting after next.
- They will address Librarians, Lecturers, and the community based teachers.
- Lisa will start a Word version of the handbook that tracks some of Carol's suggested edits for us to use.

Next Meeting: October 3, Shawnee Room