

**Minutes**  
**FRPR meeting, May 7, 2020, 1:00 p.m.**  
**via Zoom**

Members attending: Joe Harrington (Chair), Dale Urie, Larry Davidow, Patricia Gaston, Nils Gore, Chris Crandall

excused: Emma Scioli

Also attending: Chris Brown, Vice Provost for Faculty Development

Harrington thanked the members for their work this semester.

There were no additions or corrections to the minutes of the March 19, 2020 meeting, which were therefore approved.

Harrington asked for questions regarding the “update from the chair,” sent to members with the agenda (see below). He mentioned that the final report from Mike Williams, Chair of the Ad Hoc Cmte. on Core Goals Assessment, had been sent under separate cover. Davidow noted that it seemed as though the Committee is at an impasse. Harrington concurred, saying the members would need to be consulted as to whether they wished to continue with the plan they had adopted, to survey departments and units regarding all aspects of the Core, or do a “reset” of some kind.

The Committee then moved to the main order of business, a brainstorm session regarding possible policy proposals to improve the lot of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) at KU, as informed by a recent webinar sponsored by AACU & the Pullias Center at USC, as well as the research FRPR members had done regarding NTTF policies at KU and peer institutions. Harrington asked for input as to which of the latter seemed both useful and feasible?

Davidow pointed out that faculty governance at Penn State mentioned working with the university administration from the very beginning to accomplish key goals such as multi-year contracts; and a NTTF promotion committee staffed exclusively by NTT faculty members. Importance of titles for NTTF was also mentioned, esp. in relation to their applying for grants. Mentoring and orientation, by contrast, are departmental obligations.

Harrington thanked VP Brown for joining the meeting. The ad hoc “working group” on NTTF issues (composed of Brown, Urie, Amalia Monroe-Gulick, and Harrington) has not met in a long time. But at the most recent meeting, it was proposed to have a **deadline for notification of (non)renewal of contracts**. Brown had indicated he would float this idea with the deans. Brown reported that he had not been able to make much progress, with the New Budget Model and the coronavirus crisis preempting other priorities. However, the Committee on Standards and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure had been charged with figuring out where criteria

delineating the promotion process for Teaching Professors, multi-term Lecturers, and Professors of Practice should be located. Such policies currently do not exist. The Committee decided that this process should be separate from the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI, which deals with the process for tenure-track faculty and faculty-equivalent ranks. Work will go on over the summer to write up procedures to hold departments and schools to account to clarify expectations, criteria and processes for promotion in these categories of faculty. Ben Eggleston [Assoc. Dean for Administrative Affairs in CLAS] indicated that he would convene an ad hoc subcommittee of CCAPT to review department requests for promotions for multi-term NTTF and then send the decision for review to the VP's office.

Brown called Iowa State's policies the "gold standard": by making NTTF positions equivalent to tenure-track ranks, they could use existing standing committees to handle promotion reviews.

Harrington asked Brown's opinion on the idea of Teaching Professors' promotion committees' being composed solely of Teaching Professors. Brown thought there would be no objection from the Provost's Office, provided departments made promotion expectations clear. Crandall suggested that, were this approach to be adopted, it would preclude adopting the Iowa State model, since the standing committees are *not* composed of NTTF.

Harrington pointed out that the most common comments and suggestions from NTTF, both in FRPR's several surveys, as well as in the Pullias Center's, had to do with **compensation, predictability, and transparency**. While compensation is affected by a variety of factors and is the sole purview of administration, the other two issues might be places to intervene – that is, helping NTTF know what is going to happen with their careers and how it is going to happen. Brown concurred, citing the example of Lecturers' not knowing whether their departments would be able to re-hire them in the fall 2020 semester, given the coronavirus-induced budget crisis. How can they be expected to prepare courses for quality on-line delivery, if necessary, if they don't even know whether they'll be teaching at all? Harrington noted that Penn State faculty governance had urged their administration to compensate NTTF for mandatory development of remote and online course material.

Urie inquired as to how many people had been moved from Lecturer to Teaching Professor. Could Brown issue a directive to deans or chairs to do so? Brown: no, but he had encouraged them to move long-time instructors into multi-term contracts. We will know the results in the fall. Anecdotally, there is movement in the College; Business School is beginning to do this. Urie noted NTTF who have committed to building a career at KU have different needs than those who are trying to find tenure-track jobs; the policies might be different for each group. She noted that U of Oregon had a "career-track" to recognize this difference.

Brown noted that one of the committees the Provost will create to implement the "Jayhawks Rising" strategic plan will deal with Faculty Success. Brown said he would press to include members from NTTF on the committee and address NTTF issues through it.

Harrington asked whether switching a current instructor to the Teaching Professor track would

be prohibited by the hiring freeze. Brown said no, they have not denied any dean who has wanted to make that switch; but taking on Teaching Professors might necessitate schools' and units' releasing other instructors.

Brown departed for a meeting with the Provost. Harrington thanked Brown for attending; Brown thanked the Committee for its work on the issue. Harrington then asked for further ideas, in light of the discussion with the Vice Provost.

Crandall opined that governance will go nowhere unless aligned with the strategic plan (Jayhawks Rising). Gore noted that the schools he looked at had much better policies than KU. Harrington noted that UVA policy affirmed that, **for any instructor with six or more years' experience, there was "the continued expectation of employment."** Davidow offered that trying to integrate tenure-track and non-tenure-track promotion processes (a la Iowa State) would be very difficult, given different expectations and distributions of effort.

Gaston reported that, as a relative newcomer to the faculty, she has noted a pronounced lack of transparency with regards to NTTF policies (among other things), particularly for non-tenured faculty themselves. Harrington noted the related issue of the intelligibility of those policies.

Davidow raised the issue of precisely when NTTF should be given notice as to whether their contracts would be renewed; for instance, some institutions guarantee **three months' minimum notice, in writing**. Why not at KU? Gaston contrasted NTTF's short notice with the very long lead-time for tenure-track faculty's teaching assignments. Urie suggested FRPR's recommending a policy that assures NTTF of "expectation of continued employment" after 6 years.

Crandall expressed skepticism about policies related to NTTF that are not in FSRR; if admin owns the policy, it does not require cooperation of faculty governance. He recommended **placing policies regarding NTTF in FSRR** (which will also help with transparency). Gore concurred, noting that contingent faculty are becoming the majority of the faculty. Harrington added that, if academic freedom is to exist in future, it will have to continue for NTTF; and over half of KU's student credit hours are produced by NTTF.

Davidow pointed out that there are no uniform University-wide guidelines regarding clinical professors, unclassified academic staff, etc. Harrington noted that that fact raises the question of the relation between University, school, and department policies. Perhaps the Vice Provost cannot mandate policy for all three, but the Chancellor could. But doing so would infringe upon the autonomy of the several units (and possibly peer review and faculty governance). Urie pointed out that **converting more full-time lecturer lines to Teaching Professorships** would solve many of the other problems cited in the survey of NTTF (e.g., expectation of continued employment, advance notice of teaching assignments, offices, transparent expectations, etc.). Crandall noted that deans and chairs like short-term contracts because it affords them flexibility. As a way to eliminate that incentive, perhaps multi-year contracts could be offered in

exchange for lower salaries, making short-term contracts more expensive annually; this is something the Provost could do on her own. Gore added that the New Budget Model contains many such (dis)incentives.

Davidow suggested working with CTE to organize mentorships and specific programs geared specifically to the needs of NTTF. Urie reported that CTE is inclusive, and they have programs geared toward NTTF that TTF have wanted to take, as well. But if you are on a short-term or part-time contract, you're not going to participate. Gaston thought such programs could be publicized more widely. Crandall suggested that CTE might be willing to prepare a supporting document, even a couple of paragraphs, in favor of multi-term contracts as a means to improve undergraduate education.

Davidow said **minimum advance notification** for short-term instructors should also be a priority, in addition to **converting more lines to multi-term contracts**.

Urie also suggested the committee recommend **enforcing the mandate that all units submit their Faculty Evaluation Plans**, if they have not done so already.

Harrington thanked everyone for their service, and for their input; it will be very useful as the working group moves forward.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted 5/27/2020

Joe Harrington

## Update from Chair

- 1.) Core Goals Evaluation Ad-Hoc Committee.** The Chair, Mike Williams, has submitted a final report to this Committee and to UCCC: it is attached under separate cover.
- 2.) FSRR VII. 5 Amendment: Appeals from Dismissal of Tenured Faculty.** University Senate President Suzanne Valdez expressed considerable concern about some of the language in the proposed amendment we sent them. This is fortunate, since most of the objectionable language came straight from the FRB procedures that are currently in effect. Suzanne and others recommended including dismissal prior to expiration of term contracts in the same category as dismissal of tenured faculty, in this policy. In the end, FacEx moved, and the Senate passed, a version of the scaled-down 2012 amendment, which is basically a short paragraph from the Faculty Handbook. But they also established an ad-hoc committee to work over the summer to consider a more detailed version (or at least to suggest changes to the FRB procedures).
- 3.) “Professional Standards of Conduct.”** There has been considerable pushback from University Senate about the vagueness of some of the language in these guidelines and concern for how they might be used. University Ombuds DA Graham, whose office originated the document, agreed to form an ad hoc committee to revise the guidelines; I’ve agreed to serve as Faculty Senate representative on the committee. Ellen is in the process of scheduling our first meeting, probably later this month.
- 4.) “Know Your Rights” brochure.** After some rewriting and additions, FacEx approved the “Know Your Rights” brochure/flyer we recommended. The document is already up on the [Governance website](#). A link will be included with the upcoming Governance newsletter; and plans are afoot to send a printable version to all faculty. In the meantime, please forward the link as widely as possible. The flyer is especially important for non-tenure-track faculty, as it deals with Appeals from Administrative Actions – which is currently the only type of FRB appeal available to them.
- 5.) FRB Procedures for Appeals of Administrative Actions.** FRB revised the procedures to conform to the changes made to FSRR VII. The procedures were approved by the Senate and await administrative approval.
- 6.) Budget.** We were asked to envision a role for Governance in budgetary decision-making, and we haven’t really addressed the issue since early in the fall semester, and, what with the addition of new charges to our docket; the coronavirus crisis and resultant budget deficits;

changes in leadership; and general uncertainty on how to proceed, we haven't taken it up again. Obviously, this is a Rapidly Evolving Situation. In my final report, I will try to emphasize the importance of FacEx' attention to this matter over the summer and the importance of continually militating for some kind of faculty participation in the actual decision-making process.

**7.) Awaiting Administrative Action.** In addition to the items mentioned above, the following policies, which FRPR had a hand in crafting and the Faculty Senate approved, have not, to my knowledge, been approved or rejected by the Provost:

- Faculty Control of Curriculum statement (amendment to Faculty Code).
- Increase of time limit for Appeals from Administrative Actions to 30 days.
- Term Limits for Interim and Acting Administrators.

Faculty Senate President Shawn Alexander will be meeting with Provost Bichelmeyer on Monday at 11, so hopefully I will have up-to-the-minute updates for our meeting at 1.