

FRPR Third Meeting, 7 December, 2016, 10:30-11:30 AM; 2139 Learned Hall.

Attendance: Richard Hale (chair), Eugene Parker, Joe Harrington, Sean Seyer, Fran Devlin, Uma Outka, (Unable to attend: Dean Williams, Mary Banwart)

- 1. Motion to approve prior minutes (moved Devlin, Seconded Outka, unanimously approved)**

- 2. Review and Discussion of Individual Charges**

Specific Charge IV. Inclusion of a statement on conflict of interest

2.1) subcharge a: AAUP 1940 Statement of Principle on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Discussed section 6.1.2 in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR)

- Richard
 - The AAUP 1940 Statement of Principle on Academic Freedom and Tenure is still the official “statement” and thus is still an appropriate reference
 - The question before us is whether to also include recognition of the AAUP 1970 Interpretive Comments
- Sean
 - Is there anything in the 1970 interpretive statement with which we do not agree or which is inconsistent with KU principles and practices?
- Uma
 - The 1970 interpretive statements leave some aspects unresolved, but we are not in a position to improve the 1970 statement. It would seem time for AAUP to make a 2016 interpretive update.

After further discussion the general consensus of FRPR is that there is value in clarifying FSRR 6.1.2 that we endorse both the principles of the 1940 statement and the 1970 interpretation. The current language of FSRR 6.1.2 is:

6.1.2 Academic Freedom and Tenure Policy. These standards and procedures are adopted pursuant to and shall be construed in conformity with the policies of the Kansas Board of Regents concerning promotion, tenure, and non-reappointment. The University of Kansas subscribes to the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure and/or any amendments or revisions to that statement adopted by the Kansas Board of Regents.

2.1.1 FRPR recommends changing this to:

6.1.2 Academic Freedom and Tenure Policy. These standards and procedures are adopted pursuant to and shall be construed in conformity with the policies of the Kansas Board of Regents concerning promotion, tenure, and non-reappointment. The University of Kansas subscribes to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) **1940 Statement of**

Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments and/or any amendments or revisions to that statement adopted by the Kansas Board of Regents.

Moved: Harrington, Seconded Outka, unanimously approved.

2.2) subcharge c: AAUP 1975 Statement on Teaching Evaluation

Discussed section 7.4.2.1 in the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR)

- AAUP statements on evaluation of teaching are not currently referenced in the FSRR
- Sean
 - The AAUP statement places the responsibility for expectations and faculty evaluations on the department faculty, whereas the FSRR places them on the "University"
- Richard
 - The AAUP statement is out of date with broader assessment of student learning outcomes rather than just traditional teaching
 - Current KU practices in assessment generally do and always should go beyond simple teaching to also address student learning outcomes
- Uma
 - There is nothing in the current FSRR that explicitly states that faculty are responsible for peer teaching evaluations
- Sean
 - We may not want to directly reference the AAUP statement, but rather we may want to include its position that faculty are responsible for evaluating fellow faculty in the FSRR
- Joe
 - Shall we establish a subcommittee to draft specific language based on the AAUP statement for inclusion in FSRR?
- Richard
 - We also need to also look at the unit level standards for Promotion and Tenure guidance documents

After further discussion the general consensus of FRPR is that this topic should be tabled for further discussion, and that a subcommittee be formed to develop more tangible recommendations for action.

2.2.1 Richard moves to form subcommittee of Sean and Joe to evaluate current language in related FSRR documents to include but not be limited to FSRR 7.4.2.1, as well as guiding documents for unit level standards in promotion and tenure. Subcommittee members should individually review and subsequently discuss action for consideration by the larger body at the next meeting and to bring recommendations for action to the larger body. (Motion Hale, Second Outka, unanimous approval).

2.3) subcharge b: Faculty Dismissal

Discussed the AAUP 1958 Statement on Procedural Standard in Faculty Dismissal, as well as the FRB appeals procedure for Dismissal.

- Sean
 - There are two inclusions/versions of the “Hearing Procedures” in the policy manual. Which is the current accepted language?”
 - Joe: will check with policy library office
 - Does the reference to “unless legal considerations forbid, any suspension should be with pay” in the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings* align with similar statements in the Faculty Code?
 - after discussion, no
- Uma
 - The AAUP statement seems to have been drafted as a guide for institutions that did not already have a policy
- Sean
 - Current Hearing Procedures for Cases of the Dismissal of Tenured Faculty and of Dismissal Prior to the Expiration of Term Appointments do not include the AAUP’s reference to suspension during investigation only in cases of “immediate harm”
 - should we include a reference to that subject in the Faculty Code in the Hearing Procedures
- Joe
 - Administration currently favors cross-linking references to code when practical to better ensure compliance with current policies
- Oma
 - charge mentions determining inclusion of AAUP statements in other Locations. What other locations are likely relevant?
 - Richard: will mainly focus on the FSRR, likely section 6.8 Appeals and/or FSRR 7.3 which outlines FRB.

After further discussion the general consensus of FRPR is that this topic should be tabled for further discussion, and that a subcommittee be formed to develop more tangible recommendations for action.

2.3.1 Joe moves to form subcommittee of Eugene, Uma and Richard to evaluate current language in related FSRR documents to include but not be limited to FSRR 6.8 and FSRR 7.3, as well as the 1958 AAUP Statement. Subcommittee members should individually review and subsequently discuss action for consideration by the larger body at the next meeting and to bring recommendations for action to the larger body. (Motion Harrington, Second Seyer, unanimous approval).

2.4 Subsequent Committee action: Continue to review charge 4, subcharges b, c with respect to the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, and the Statement on Teaching Evaluation for further discussion at a meeting to be scheduled after the semester break. In particular, subcommittee members should individually review and subsequently discuss action for consideration by the larger body at the next meeting.

3. **Adjourn.** Next meeting to be scheduled in mid to late January, time and location TBD.