

"After discussion, it was decided not to form a subcommittee to draft a new resolution, but to note that there is a discrepancy in dates in the original resolution (is the NCAA News article actually dated February 12 or March 12, 2001?), and that any references to specific sports should be removed. In addition, there was a question as to whether Faculty Affairs is the proper Council to deal with this issue, since the Faculty Council on Student Affairs is charged with responsibility for student athletics. With these notes, the document was referred back to the SEC to continue it on their agenda and decide whether it still needs action and, if so, by whom."

Lecturer Status Report

Chip Haley congratulated the Lecturer Status Subcommittee set up last year (Jim Riley, Haley, Ia Dubois, Lisa Coutu, Bob Holzworth, and Barbara Krieger-Brockett) on completing their work, and introduced Ia Dubois (Chair) to report on the subcommittee's work.

Dubois said the Committee took up three questions in reviewing the status of Lecturers:

- Are any Code changes needed to ensure Lecturers' full participation in faculty governance?
- Are there any injustices to Lecturers that need to be corrected?
- How should Lecturers be considered for promotion?

Lecturers are treated differently from department to department across the University, said Dubois - the subcommittee wants to provide Lecturers a clear written description of their status at the time of hiring, and ensure that this description is clearly reflected in the Code. Lecturers are members of the faculty and should be treated as such; mentors should be provided to them; terms for contracts (which, for Senior Lecturers, should be for a minimum of three years) should be clarified.

The University has three parallel categories of faculty:

- Tenure Track faculty
- Research faculty
- Lecturer faculty

The subcommittee wants to create a Lecturer track that gives incentive and the possibility of promotion within the Lecturer track. Promotion to Senior Lecturer should be based on excellence in teaching, development of courses, and scholarly publication. Adding a Principal Lecturer track will give Senior Lecturers incentive and possibility to grow. Criteria should include excellence in teaching, teaching awards, TA coordination, and national or international distinctions or contributions in their fields. Outside references should be included in the promotion packet for Principal Lecturers. Promotion should be eligible for discussion every year.

Lecturers should be eligible for Distinguished Teaching awards, faculty fellowships, research support, and sabbatical leave. Fulltime Lecturers should be eligible to serve as Faculty Senators and Chairs of Faculty Councils. (Haley reported that this last point passed at the last Faculty Senate meeting, making fulltime Lecturers eligible as voting faculty.)

Haley identified some possible "hot buttons" which may be stumbling blocks in the legislative process:

- The definition of a fulltime Lecturer as one who works 50% time or more.
- The minimum contract term of three years for Senior Lecturers.
- The introduction of a third rank, Principal Lecturer.

These are structural changes in the way the University does business, and could be controversial.

- 3 -

Not every Lecturer will want to pursue this promotional track, said Dubois, but it should be available for Senior Lecturers who qualify for promotion to this new title (which is different from the rank that goes with tenure).

Kate O'Neill asked whether the creation of the third Lecturer classification would mean an automatic increase in salary for those who are promoted. Steve Olswang said yes, it would mean a 7.5% increase in addition to the title.

Haley commented that the subcommittee could either tone down the proposal, or expand it (e.g., five-year contracts for Lecturers instead of the proposed three). Are there other items that should be discussed?

Daniel Luchtel suggested naming the Lecturers Associate, Assistant, and Full, to parallel the professorial titles. The subcommittee considered this, said Olswang, but rejected it for strictly semantic reasons.

Carol Green wondered if the Senate will balk at the re-definition of fulltime status for Lecturers. Olswang agreed that this may be the most difficult issue, but that Lecturers who have established continuity should be allowed the vote, which is what the re-definition of fulltime is all about.

Kate O'Neill complimented the subcommittee on their work, and commented that this is the right thing to do. The University is using more and more non-tenure track teachers, she said. It is important to give them continuity. Ia Dubois added that Lecturers at times feel intellectually discriminated against - this legislation will go a long way toward eliminating that.

Haley polled the Council for their endorsement of the statement. It was moved, seconded, and passed to endorse the statement of principle regarding the status of Lecturers and move it forward through the legislative process. The next step is drafting the actual code changes to the Faculty Code, after which Council will approve code and send it to the Senate Executive Committee for addition to the agendas for the spring meetings.

Haley announced that Debra Friedman will speak to FCFA about strategic planning at the February 7 meeting. O'Neill said the Chapter 24 subcommittee expects to present revised language for Chapter 24, and will report on the email survey of the faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*