

Minutes
Faculty Handbook Committee
Friday, Oct 15, 2010
2:00 – 3:00, Wingo 214

Present: Lance Grahn (Provost), John Parrack (Chair), Francie Bolter, Mary Mosley, Mike Schaefer, Susan Moss-Logan, Katherine Larson, Lynn Burley (ex officio), Diane Newton (ex-officio),

Three guests representing different colleges attended: Jeffry Jarvis (CFA), Barbara Williams (CHBS), Debbie Barnes(CE)

I. Approval of Minutes. Minutes from Oct 1 2010 were approved by unanimous vote.

II. Today's Business. Faculty Rank for Term Appointments (non-tenure track).

Parrack opened the meeting with a statement of the goal of this meeting: start a discussion about Term Appointments (Non-Tenure Track-NTT) across the campus. Grahn made it clear that he appreciates this extended discussion because the compromise the FHC developed last year caused concern in some colleges when it went to the Faculty Senate for approval. Parrack stated a secondary goal was to correct a misunderstanding of how FHC works; we want to open the FHC up and make clear that it is an open discussion where diverse voices are heard. Finally, a reiteration of that the goal today is to brainstorm, not make recommendations.

Williams: CHBS needs multiple faculty tracks, and not be limited to tenure track only. Lots of nursing departments have ranks all the way to professor that are not tenured. Some schools have separate criteria for each college. The CHBS needs flexibility, and faculty ranks with titles and potential to advance from Assistant Professor through Full Professor without tenure would help her college.

Barnes: CE has lots of clinical instructors II and there is no where for them to advance; she would like to see a system that allowed them to achieve higher rank.

Jarvis: CFA has lots of folks that work in "doing", such as music education. They have tenure track ranks in CFA, but would be good to have clinical instructors in areas of music education.

Williams: comes back with it seems like for advancement UCA faculty are forced to go through tenure. Some faculty don't want to go on to tenure. UAMS faculty can choose tenure or tenure track, but they can advance to full professor without tenure.

Moss Logan: summarizes what Williams says as follows as a way to see if we understand: for CHBS it would be best if faculty were in three tracks- tenure track instructors, a NTT professor track (that might not have terminal degree), and a tenure-track professor track that does traditional research with a PhD.

Williams: Reminds us that they have folks in CHBS that don't want tenure-track. She returns to flexibility and the importance of not having all faculty be tenure-track.

Bolter: makes clear that all departments want non-tenure lines for flexibility.

Grahn: states that UCA has about 550 full time permanent faculty; the break down of how many are tenured or tenure-track is not clear.

Burley: says its 75% tenure/tenure-track as an AAUP goal.

Jarvis: asks if the difference is that the term appointments need a different time clock for advancement than the 6 year clock of tenure. A general discussion follows that makes the following points about tenure

- important to design this from the perspective of the position separate from the person
- if faculty are filling roles of professor, then why should they not have tenure
- need to keep in mind the standard academic freedom argument for tenure

Jarvis: the reality is that if he has to cut positions, it is going to be very difficult for him to do it with Full Professors. Faculty in term appointments know they are more susceptible to being cut.

Moss-Logan: makes point that non-tenure faculty do feel more exposed to getting fired and they don't have as much academic freedom and thus don't speak as freely as tenured faculty.

Williams: comes back to a PhD that does not want tenure, but wants to advance thru ranks. Wonders why we stick to this model of only advancing through professor ranks when tenured.

Jarvis: if we craft a policy of diverse faculty ranks how do we communicate it to the faculty. It becomes very nuanced to distinguish between the different ranks, and will we risk confusion.

Larson: reminds us that Don Bradley argues for keeping it simple. Asks about the titles, specifically is it the title of Professor that is important in the CHBS, and that what they need is a rank with a title Professor, and with the potential to advance, but that is really more like the instructor/lecturer rank

in other colleges in terms of being non-tenure track? Williams responds, basically yes.

Jarvis: draws attention to the graphic brought in for the meeting, noting the purple box outlining the track we call traditional, the orange box (middle ranks) which we call Term appointments (NTT lecturer/clinical instructor/laboratory instructor I and II, etc), and then a green box with part-time faculty (without rank). Jarvis asks if we should consider another box, between the purple and orange for professor ranks without time limits for tenure, apply when you are ready. A general discussion continues on this idea.

Grahn: a concern would be that it creates two faculties, the research faculty and the teaching faculty.

Grahn: after some discussion, points out we need to be careful about thinking that fiscal exigency should be the touchpoint, because the reality is that it has almost never been used to eliminate tenured positions. Asks if we have the orange box, then why have the purple box. Who would chose the purple box?

General discussion on the difference between the ranks in the purple box and the orange box. Larson points out that in the CNSM our purple box are hired to fill research gaps in the department, and we want them working hard on research to gain tenure. We don't really want to do away with the time clock or make it an individual's choice to enter the purple box from the orange box. We decide the areas of expertise represented in the purple box as a whole faculty, not as individuals.

Grahn: notes the orange box has one to two in terms of advancement and asks, is it an issue of adding a third step? Or is it adding a third step and changing the name. What is the core issue: the label or the number of advancements? Are we at the point that we separate handbooks for each college?

Barnes: The clinical pool of applicants is stronger in CE; their clinical folks do not have terminal degree.

Parrack: Brings up the issue of title protection and notes there is title protection; the other side of the coin is whether titles have meanings? What about advancement? Is there a way to create a third category in the orange box that could move into the purple box. What is more important in CHBS, title or third level?

Williams: both are important. It is a recruitment disadvantage to only offer instructor. She will do some more thinking, on this. She does not think her faculty feel that it is a academic freedom issue.

General discussion on the merits of defining criteria, how difficult it is , how the handbook is trying to be ambiguous so that departments set criteria.

In response to questions that arose earlier in the meeting about the number of tenure/tenure track faculty and number of non-tenure track, Grahn provided the data to clarify future discussions. They are presented below for the last year they were available, 2009.

Full Time Faculty at UCA in 2009

Faculty classification	Number at UCA	% of total
Tenured	198	38.5
Tenure Track	149	29.17
Non Tenure Track	165	32.2
Total	512	