

Faculty Senate  
March 21, 2013  
3:00pm-5:00pm

Present: Hawley Almstedt, Laurel Burks, Elizabeth Drummond, Richard Fox, Paul Harris, George Hess, Karen Huchting, Mladen Milicevic, Katherine Noon, Judy Park, John Parrish, Jennifer Pate, Ralph Quinones, Robert Rovetti, Gregory Ruzzin, Tim Shanahan, Carl Urbinati., Thomas White and Amy Woodson-Boulton.

Excused: Sean D'Evelyn, Michele Hammers, Omar Es-Said, Diane Meyer, Patricia Oliver, Marta Sanchez, and Sue Scheibler.

Moment of Silence

Motion to approve February 28, 2013 minutes  
11 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions

### **Clinical Faculty Report**

Presenters: John Dorsey, Professor of Civil Engineering & Environmental Science and Chair of Special Committee on Clinical Faculty and Todd Shoppe, Assistant Clinical Professor, Department of Health and Human Sciences

- We are presenting a new final draft of the committee's final report. The Clinical Faculty Committee believes the report has captured the important issues related to term faculty. The group will have another meeting next week to review the proposed handbook changes. The draft handbook language presented will provide a starting point for the revision. The committee recommends the implementation of as many of the recommendations as possible while the handbook is being amended. The major recommendations from the committee's report were discussed.

### Major Recommendations

- 1) Define the categories of Term Faculty. Senior Instructor should be made a promotional level from Instructor; Visiting Professors should be given appointment ranks; Clinical professors should be clearly defined; and a Research Faculty position should be defined and added.
- 2) Hiring and promotion includes department faculty, chairs in hiring decisions for Clinical Faculty. Appointments should be made in conjunction with faculty, chair; must meet objectives of program; experience recognized as applicable towards promotion.
- 3) Develop an annual FSR process through the Provost's Office tailored for clinical faculty. Recommend including Instructors and Visiting Professors in this process.
- 4) Faculty Service Reports should be sent to term faculty who submit them to Department Chairs.

- 5) Develop promotion policy and procedures. A new Faculty Handbook section has been proposed for addition related to the promotion of Clinical Faculty. A recommendation for promotion comes from Department Faculty, Chair, and Pre-Tenure Review Committee to the Dean, then from the Dean to the Provost.
- 6) Encourage Term Faculty to engage in governance. Amend handbook language to encourage (but not obligate) term faculty to engage in governance (but not obligated) at the department and university levels except for issues on tenure.
- 7) Allow clinical faculty to be considered for summer session teaching. Clinical Faculty have special skills & knowledge that could be taught during summer sessions.
- 8) Allow term faculty to apply for travel funds. This promotes professional development, directly benefiting students and other faculty.
- 9) Allow term faculty to be eligible for LMU grants and technology programs. This will directly benefit students and other faculty joining research programs; encourage interdisciplinary projects.
- 10) Arrange for representation of term faculty on the Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate should add two representatives for Clinical Faculty similar to the protocols for Professional Librarians.
- 11) Include term faculty in all faculty social events. All full time faculty should be equally valued and recognized through social events.
- 12) Include term faculty in all communications to university faculty. All full time faculty should receive communications from the administration except for matters pertaining to rank & tenure.

## **Discussion**

- How do these positions originate?  
-In some schools Deans are inventing the positions without looking at the needs of the departments. I suggest positions originate in departments and be connected to departmental needs.
- Clinical Faculty provide unique contributions to university. I would like to ask for a stronger statement on hiring, and request that a standardized search procedure be implemented.
- Recruiting and hiring policies vary across the university. The current Clinical Faculty hiring practice is closer to the process for hiring Visiting Professors.
- The BCLA Council of Chairs drafted and endorsed a regularized hiring process that is closer to that of the hiring of tenure track faculty.
- Clinical Faculty hiring needs to be much more parallel to the tenure line process. Any departure from this process should need to be justified. There should not be a faster hiring track implemented if not endorsed by the department.

- There is complexity to tenure line hires and it is an arduous process that involves working with Intercultural Affairs looking at mission and diversity. Many of these term faculty are long term hires and the university values should guide the process.
- I have a concern with current latitude for a single individual to make hiring decisions and support the greater departmental role in this process.
- I question if a national search process is feasible for departments who do a lot of hiring. It is important that departments have input on this issue.
- There are no resources for hiring Clinical Faculty such as advertising and interviewing. The definitions are much improved; however we need to keep in mind that the current Clinical Faculty on campus may not meet the definitions that we are suggesting for the Faculty Handbook.
- Who budgets for the interviewing costs? Will the deans provide funds for Clinical Faculty hiring?  
-The Deans Office generally provides for this; however there are also cases where departments are paying for these costs.
- The idea here is for the hiring process to be closer to that of tenure line hires, but not exactly the same. I believe a half-way point is what is being suggested.
- I have concerns about issues related to the teacher-scholar model. The Faculty Senate endorsed the teacher-scholar model and feel we do not want to institutionalize a group of research faculty who do not teach and instructors who do not do research.
- I'm in opposition to the new Research Faculty position and feel these individuals may better fit in the affiliated faculty category.
- There is a resource issue and departments often do not know if a visiting professor will be returning to the department even as late as July in some cases.
- It would be useful to have a definition of why we need these positions and examples of the instances when we would make these hires. The more specific we are in our definitions the less flexible we become.
- Clinical Faculty teaching loads and any specific obligations such as directing programs are specified in the contracts. Visiting Professors may feel obligated to participate in governance and feel they may not be reappointed if they do not.

- The survey of Clinical Faculty showed a range of opinions on the option to participate in governance. The potential of going through a promotion process and completing FSR's may influence their decision to participate or not. An annual review process may be strange for a Visiting Professor who does not know if they will be returning the following year.
- I would like more specificity on who is eligible for travel funds and grants. Instructors for example, should not be eligible as their primary responsibility is teaching.
- What was the general opinion of clinical faculty related to the implementation of annual FSRs?  
-It was primarily positive and related to clarifying a path for promotion. Most indicated they wanted some sort of process and opportunity for promotion.
- There is a concern that resources are scarce and why should term faculty be eligible for grants and travel funds.
- Are Clinical Faculty currently included in the AMI pool? We need to be clear on the intention here.
- The Research Faculty category may be useful and I would like to see this maintained.

#### **Rank and Tenure Voting Issue**

- This agenda item is to address a discrepancy between the Resource Manual and the Faculty Handbook regarding the eligibility of first-year faculty to vote in tenure and promotion cases. We are fortunate that this discrepancy is a relatively minor one but we need a clear resolution.
- The Resource Manual (IV.A.2.a.ii) states that "Non-voting untenured faculty in the first year of their tenure-track appointment may attend and participate in the meeting, but do not vote." By contrast, the Faculty Handbook (I.S.8.d-e, p. 1, 39) states that "All full-time, active, non-terminal faculty make recommendations by anonymous written ballot on the applications ..." etc. This language was inadvertently omitted and not included in what the Faculty Handbook Committee recommended back to the Senate in its Spring 2012 report, nor included in what was recommended to the full faculty when changes to Handbook language were submitted for a faculty vote. Absent any action by the Senate, the current Faculty Handbook language, rather than the Resource Manual language, would be considered the controlling language.
- The conversation on this topic was contentious the first time around and we need to determine the best policy and resolution.

## Discussion

- It may be an assumption that new tenure track faculty are not familiar with the university. We have some individuals who have been on campus many years prior to beginning a tenure line position.
- Abstentions look bad on a Rank and Tenure application and may work against the candidate. This is one of the primary reasons we decided to exclude first year faculty.
- It is possible that the non-voting individuals could be asked to leave and never receive a ballot to vote. The idea of having first year faculty is to inform and prepare them for future experiences. They could be there for informational purposes and then leave prior to a vote.

Motion (jointly recommended by the Executive and Faculty Handbook and Academic Life Committee) to preserve the current Handbook language intact, and revise the Resource Manual to match the current Handbook language. Delete the phrase “except for untenured faculty in the first year of their tenure-track appointment.” Replace with a new sentence: “Because of their relative unfamiliarity with the candidates for tenure/promotion and/or the university more generally, some untenured faculty in the first year of their tenure-track appointment may prefer to abstain from voting, and are encouraged to do so if they wish.”

- I would prefer to simplify and delete all references to first year faculty not voting.

Friendly amendment to delete statement “Because of their relative unfamiliarity with the candidates for tenure/promotion and/or the university more generally, some untenured faculty in the first year of their tenure-track appointment may prefer to abstain from voting, and are encouraged to do so if they wish.”

**14 for 0 against 3 abstentions**

- If we decide to change the Resource Manual on this point now to meet the deadline for next year’s candidates, can we revisit this next year?  
-Yes, through the usual process (FHALC, Faculty Senate and full faculty vote if needed.)

**Motion 2:** Move to remove all references to first year faculty not voting from the Resource Manual.

**14 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions**

## Contingent Faculty Inquiry

**Motion 3:** We request that the Provost investigate the feasibility and advisability of providing LMU part-time faculty with the ability to purchase group health insurance through LMU and that he advise the Faculty Senate of his findings.

**15 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions**

## Discussion

- I believe this may lead to the discussion of benefits for part time staff as well which may turn out to become a large issue for Human Resources.

## **New Business**

- There is an issue surrounding the governance of the core and the idea of a Core Director. An academic administrator appointed to oversee the process runs counter to the principle to the idea of shared governance. The position description of the Core Director should have been brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion.
- A position description of the Core Director Position was reviewed by the executive and referred to the Governance Committee. The executive will share these concerns with the Provost.

Adjourned at 5:00pm

Submitted by: Jennifer Pate

Prepared by: Robert Houghtaling