

**Faculty Rights, Privileges and Responsibilities (FRPR) Committee  
Actions FY2014**

**Core Curriculum and Academic Freedom**

Committee members reviewed the first charge that was given to them by FacEx:

Specific Charge

1. Gather information on the Core Curriculum course nomination, review, approval, and appeal processes. Consider how policies and procedures might facilitate implementation of the Core Curriculum while also ensuring that the Core is ideally compatible with academic freedom. Report findings and recommendations to FacEx.

The FRPR committee supports the goals of the Core Curriculum and the need for assessment. The committee, however, has serious reservations regarding the implementation of the core curriculum and how it could affect academic freedom, particularly if the content of a course and/or the specific method of assessing students is defined by individuals outside the discipline. The committee believes that a faculty member, or in some cases a committee of faculty members within the discipline, should determine the content of a specific course and the methods of assessment, not a committee outside the discipline. Whatever changes in courses or curricula might be required as a product of such longitudinal assessment should be made at the level where the expertise for the content is. The way the process is now established gives the appearance that the central administration, and by extension some other external agency, could determine the specific content of courses, and the allowed method of assessment. We believe the implementation of the Core Curriculum will be better enabled and will be more compatible with academic freedom if the institutional goals remain high level goals, and if methods of assessment are left solely to the discretion of the faculty members responsible for the course. As such, we strongly encourage the administration to strike references in the core curriculum which mandate forms of assessment, such as requiring a supermajority of grading for any specific outcome or objective. Additionally, we believe that the university should be broadly accepting of alternative means of assessment to meet specific goals (e.g., several courses rather than one specific course), with the understanding that the faculty responsible for the course(s) are also responsible for defining assessment metrics and providing sufficient evidence that institutional goals are met.

After a discussion of the Core Curriculum, members emphasized that it is important to add a right to the Faculty Code indicating that the content of a course, definition of course assignments, and course assessment should be determined by the faculty member who is teaching the course.

Specific Charge:

2. Gather information on KU's Intellectual Property Policy as it relates to faculty and the patenting of inventions, including issues such as transparency and consulting. Report any issues, findings, and/or recommendations to FacEx.

After much discussion, committee members agreed that there were a number of issues that need to be addressed:

1. In resolving this issue, there are three parties' interests that must be considered: (1) faculty/students, (2) university, and (3) outside companies/corporations/industries.
2. Is there a distinction made between faculty (and RAs) hired before 1986 and those hired after 1986?

3. Should the University have a claim to a faculty member's work if the work was done during a time when the faculty member was not being paid by the university (e.g., during the summer) and not using any university resources?
4. Is there a distinction made between faculty who produce certain profitable items (e.g., textbooks) and faculty who produce inventions?

Andrew Torrance is chairing an ad hoc committee on Intellectual Property and Consulting. This committee will propose a new policy. Hopefully, a new policy will address the concerns that the FRPR committee and other faculty have. Laura will contact Andrew and report what his committee has developed.

Specific Charge 3:

Be prepared to revisit the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

### **Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct**

The FRPR committee worked for 2 years on researching faculty codes at other universities and drafting a new code, which had not been updated since 1971. The Faculty Senate approved the proposed code on May 3, 2012. It was sent to the Provost on September 6, 2012. FacEx received the Provost's edits in September, 2013. A few weeks ago, Jerry asked Chris Steadham, FacEx president, to send him a copy of the proposed code with the Provost's edits. Jerry passed out the code with the Provost's revisions. Jan indicated that Chris Steadham invited her to attend the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of FacEx where the code will be discussed. Committee members asked Jan to ensure that FacEx is aware of the fact that we would like to be given the code officially so that we may comment on it.

### **Freedom of Speech Update**

Jerry Mikkelson stated that other than the articles and letters to the editor in the Lawrence Journal World, he had no further information regarding Professor Guth and his situation. FRPR members reiterated their concern that freedom of speech should be protected.

### **Elevated IT Rights**

Jan and Amalia met with the Academic Computing and Electronic Communications (ACEC) Committee on March 13, 2014, and reviewed a proposal that Easan Selvan had written to address the faculty right that FRPR had proposed in 2012:

Faculty members have the right to maintain continuous administrator-level access to computers that are exclusively used by them and/or in the conduct of their research. For research and teaching purposes, faculty members also have a right to receive proper support from IT. Such rights may be challenged only under a circumstance where the security and privacy of others are significantly violated as a result of faculty action. In such cases, a proper committee represented by both IT and faculty members will evaluate the severity of the violation.

Jan distributed Easan's proposal. The committee was fine with the proposal but suggested that Jan send it to Professor Jay Lee and request his opinion since he was the main proponent of the new IT right.