

FRPR meeting minutes 11.6.19
2 p.m., Governance Office, 33 Strong Hall

In attendance: Joe Harrington (Chair), Chris Crandall, Larry Davidow, Patricia Gaston, Emma Scioli, Dale Urie

Absent: Nils Gore

1. Introductions
2. Review of Accomplishments in **FY 2019**
 - a. **Charge 1** (change in language for standard of proof for filing an Appeal of administrative Action) was passed by Fac Sen & approved by Admin. **Charge 2** (the work with VP Chris Brown, OIRP, and HR to compile a “census” of NTTF) was completed. **Charge 3** (statement on conflict of interest in donations) approved, in revised form, by Uni Sen, further revised by GC, awaiting approval by SenEx. Effectively accomplishes FY 2020 Charge 1. **Charge 4** (approval process for Core goals): FRPR proposal not taken up by FacEx; “experimental” ad hoc cmte. appointed by FacEx and UCCC to undertake review of Core goals. **Charge 5** (survey re: Core): UCCC conducted this survey.
3. Discussion of Charges for **FY 2020**
 - a. **Charge 4.** “Report to FacEx by April 15, 2020, on the implementation of agreement between FRPR, UCCC Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and FacEx, regarding Procedures for altering Core Goals.”
 - i. Discussion: An ad hoc committee was established, in an agreement between FRPR, UCCC, FacEx, and the VP for Undergrad Studies, to review and assess the Core goals. This committee has only met once; we await further progress reports; the committee is “experimental” and may or may not be permanent. This committee was established in lieu of FRPR proposal to establish a permanent committee and process to reassess the Core goals as written. Ensuing discussion tended to support the idea that, given that faculty control the curriculum, and Faculty Senate stands in for the faculty, Faculty Senate should have a say in approving changes to the Core.
 - b. **Charge 5** (added Oct. 3). “Examine the distinction between instructor evaluations and course evaluations, and how they may be treated in certain contexts.” &c.
 - i. Discussion: Davidow shared that Pharmacy has both types; this charge may have sprung from an incident in PHARM where comments on an online evaluation form were critical of the *instructor* rather than the *course*. These were shared with a curriculum committee that was assessing the course only, thus violating the privacy of the instructor

(who was the only instructor of the course). Key issues to consider: who has access to these forms? Should we disentangle forms that evaluate the instructor and the course? How? And how should these forms be used in making decisions about changes to the course?

4. Discussion of the “Know Your Rights” Brochure (produced last year, per FY 20 charge 1 language: “develop materials to inform faculty of their rights under the current FSRRs”)
 - a. Advice in the original flyer was “not to pursue an appeal,” since the process held so many barriers to actually getting a hearing.
 - b. Once FRB rules were changed, requirements for appeal and standard of proof lowered, JH revised the flyer and solicited input
 - c. Input from group:
 - i. Under “what kind of actions can be appealed?” add some examples of each type beyond what is already there, for example “what factors other than performance” in bullet point 1
 - ii. Move up the section on “OK. So, what *are* my rights as a faculty member?” to earlier in the brochure
 - iii. Have a section at the end listing (and linking) resources for further information, such as KU Policy Library; FRB site; Governance office
 - iv. When this is sent out over email, there should be a reminder for faculty to store this document somewhere they can easily access it if need be.
 - d. Discussion ensued regarding the time allowed for filing appeals – 14 days from date of administrative action. Motion to amend Article V of FSRR to allow for 30 days. Seconded. Unanimously passed.

5. Discussion of **FY 20 charge 3**: “Work with administration to devise, define, and ensure a role for faculty governance in determining metrics and methods to be used in Unit Allocations under the New Budget Model.”
 - a. It was decided that a new charge is needed since the charge is now out of date. Unit Allocations have been announced in the New Budget Model without a defined role for faculty governance in the process.
 - b. Harrington will ask FacEx for a revised, updated charge.

6. Discussion of **FY 20 charge 4**: “In consultation with Vice Provost for Faculty Development, examine results of recent survey of non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) and draft any consequent policy recommendations.”
 - a. General discussion of how in our role we can help
 - b. Review of results of survey conducted last year by informal subcommittee with input from VP Chris Brown
 - c. Plans for moving forward with change
 - i. Find out which departments are doing consistent work on evaluating NTTF members
 - ii. Work with Chris Brown and his faculty Fellow to collect evaluation forms from departments that have them and establish a list of best practices.

- iii. Research policies re: NTTF at other institutions
 - 1. over email post-meeting: members of the committee agreed to take 2 peer institutions each and to gather information about their policies for NTTF members. Davidow supplied a rubric of policy areas that committee members will use to record information for comparison at the December meeting

No unfinished or new business. Meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Emma Scioli & Joe Harrington, 12.8.19