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Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Policy
2/24/2009
Submitted by: Jean-Paul Carton/Faculty Welfare Committee

Motion:

To insert the following into the Faculty Handbook:

214.01 Lecturers

The appointment and promotion of Lecturers at Georgia Southern University are based upon the experience and academic background of the candidate as well as the instructional needs in the position. The designation applies to assignments that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professorial rank but that involves primarily teaching. Additional duties may be assigned, including academic advising and working with tenure-track faculty in course and curriculum development. All provisions of Board of Regents’ Policy 803.08 shall apply to these positions.

214.01.01 Appointments

An initial appointment to a Lecturer position is for a one-year period. Subsequently, renewal is on a year-to-year basis dependent not only on performance, but also on the programmatic needs and financial exigencies of the University and its units. In no case will the service as lecturer or senior lecturer imply any claim upon tenure. However, lecturers and senior lecturers who have satisfactorily served full-time for the entire previous academic year shall have the presumption of reappointment for the
subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as provided in Section 209.

214.01.02 Evaluations and Promotion

Every lecturer and senior lecturer shall have an annual review conducted along the same schedule as individuals in the professorial ranks. Since these positions have no expectations for scholarship, the review shall focus on teaching and service. In addition to the annual review, a comprehensive review shall take place during the third year. This review shall be conducted by a special committee charged by the department chair. As BOR policy (803.08) is that retention of a lecturer after the sixth year requires demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution, progress toward these goals shall be the focus of this review.

For continued appointment and possible promotion to Senior Lecturer, another comprehensive review shall take place during the sixth year. This review shall again be conducted by a special committee charged by the department chair. Promotion to Senior Lecturer shall carry the same monetary increase in salary as promotion to Associate Professor. The department chair will make a recommendation to the dean based upon the committee’s recommendation. In turn, the dean will make a recommendation to the provost.

After the sixth year or promotion, a further major review will take place each five years. The intent of this review is to focus on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, to provide development opportunities, and to recognize, reward, and enhance faculty performance.

For any major review, the candidate will submit a dossier for consideration that must include the following:

• A cover letter that describes what the candidate has accomplished and what there is about the quality of the candidate’s work and expertise that warrants retention and promotion;
• A vita which summarizes biographical, personal, and professional data

• Materials that document instructional excellence by means of, but not limited to, the following:
  o Material from classes, such as syllabi, exams, student papers, etc.;
  o Comments from peers who have collaborated with the lecturer;
  o Student evaluations and/or interviews; and
  o Letters of commendation from students, faculty peers, or external colleagues

• Material to document professional service and professional growth and development.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer, noteworthy achievement in one of these areas is required.

Any additional requirements for departmental input or constitution of the review committee should be adopted by the individual college and department.

214.01.03 Appeal

The candidate for promotion or retention beyond the sixth year may appeal a negative decision, except in the case of programmatic changes or financial exigency. The appeal must be based on the perception of significant omissions or commissions in the review process, impermissible bias in the review, or procedural errors that precluded an objective, fair review. The appeal must be to the next level of review. The responsible administrator at the appeal level shall convene a committee to review the appeal and make a recommendation. If the decision on appeal is to support the promotion or retention, the review process shall continue through the remaining review levels as if the decision from which the appeal was filed had been positive. If the decision on appeal is against the applicant, a further appeal may be filed. The process of appeals may continue until a final decision by the President.
Rationale:

Lecturers and senior lecturers are permitted by the BOR and are now beginning to be used in small numbers in certain areas of the University. Currently, there are no specific University policies in the handbook regarding the status of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, and expectations for reappointment or promotion to Senior Lecturer other than the statement in the BOR Handbook.

SEC Response:

The motion was defeated, but the Faculty Welfare Committee is free to reintroduce it once they've taken care of some of the questions that were raised.

Senate Response:

Patricia Humphrey (COST) read that the Faculty Welfare Committee recommendation for inserting language into the Faculty Handbook as Section 214.01 titled Lecturers.

The full motion can be found at MOTION: "Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Policy. This being a committee recommendation, it did not require a second.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator opened the floor for discussion.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) renewed his objection to creating a class of faculty defined in the Faculty Handbook as having no expectations for scholarship.

Pat Humphrey (COST) said she understood Flynn’s point, but stressed that the impetus for doing this is lecturers have been on campus for a couple of years. In fact, the first lecturers hired will be in year three next year, and there is currently no specific language in the Faculty Handbook that addresses lecturers or their possible retention or promotion after year six. If they are to go through a year three review, we need to have a policy now.
Richard Flynn (CLASS) said reiterated that he was still concerned and furthermore saw this category as a threat to tenure itself. He stressed that the senate should seriously consider putting this kind of language in the Faculty Handbook and creating a limitable category of faculty. He argued that the fact that we have lecturers is no reason to promote the fact by giving it our imprint in the Faculty Handbook.

Kent Murray (CLASS) said he had heard discussion about an appellate process to the different levels. He asked if Lecturers have access to the Faculty Grievance Committee?

Pat Humphrey (COST) stated that as long as lecturers are employed as faculty members, she would say yes. Marc Cyr agreed that anybody that comes under the BOR designation of faculty has access.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) wondered whether Lecturers will be able to run for Senate or any other University position.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator stated that Jean-Paul Carton had raised the issue about clarifying eligibility for the Senate in the Bylaws. Senate eligibility has been clarified in the minutes, but hasn’t actually been put it in the Bylaws and added that lecturers would be adding a complicating factor to any language covering eligibility. Cyr then asked the Provost whether lecturers considered temporary faculty.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) said she thought the way that the policy had been written and the that lecturers are employed on a year-to-year basis may have some bearing on a decision about whether they could members of the Faculty Senate.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator said he would have to check with Lee Davis.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) said that the intent when someone is hired as a lecturer is that, unless poor performance on that person’s part is noted or unless there something happens within the department, like the financial exigency noted in the policy, lecturers
would be rehired for the next year, but the University is only allowed to hire them on a year-to-year basis because they are not on a tenure-track line.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked how current long-term non-tenure track individuals (who are eligible for Senate and have served as officers) are different from Lecturers. Linda Bleicken (Provost) said that was an interesting point. Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator added that non-tenure track individuals were a grandfathered category.

Michael Moore (COE) said that rationale could also be used for tenure-track faculty who are also year-to-year until they get tenure, and validated Flynn’s point in that we are creating a very different kind of caste, and added that the expectations for those who are tenure-track and do run for Faculty Senate are different.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked about the sixth year review, and what constitutes professional service and professional growth and development and how that differs from scholarship, at least, professional growth and development, how that will be documented, and why give a salary increase equivalent to that given to an associate professor to someone who hasn’t had to meet the criteria for promotion to associate professor.

Pat Humphrey (COST) said the criteria for promotion and the provision for the sixth year review is from the Board of Regents. The criteria include excellence in teaching and exemplary value to the university. Exactly what that constitutes is left up to the colleges and departments. The committee decided that the raise sounded reasonable since lecturers are eligible for only one such raise in their career.

Pat Walker (CLASS) had questions about sixth-year review and questioned whether there was a presumption of tenure.

Pat Humphrey (COST) said the language comes from the Board of Regents, adding that it could be de facto tenure after year six, but the policies that we already have in place say that faculty are to be given a full year’s notice after two years.
Pat Walker (CLASS) asked if this was a replacement for having tenure-track positions and tenure positions.

Pat Humphrey (COST) said she couldn’t speak to the decision to employ people as lecturers, adding that lecturers are used extensively throughout the University System. Linda Bleicken (Provost) said one of the reasons that hiring lecturers had to do with the number of temporary faculty that we have and the tenuous nature of a temporary appointment. Hiring lecturers would provide a little bit more security for an individual hired to be primarily a teacher and addresses the Board of Regents concern about employing long-term temps.

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked if there would be any course load requirements for senior lecturers and if those requirements would be different from temporary faculty or if they would match the course load requirements of tenured faculty.

Patricia Price (CLASS) also wanted to know what the teaching load would be in light of the requirement for professional development. She stated she was concerned about the welfare of students and the welfare of instruction.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator pointed out two separate issues were being discussed: Lecturers are already employed. They are not, however, covered in the Handbook. We don’t have language to deal with their BOR category. We don’t have language to deal with them. Opposing the lecturer position is a separate issue. Voting not to cover people who are already faculty members at Georgia Southern because we don’t like their job category is a separate issue.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) stated the senate does not need to approve language for a category that we don’t approve of either. He argued that hiring a group with implied tenure could jeopardize everyone’s tenure.

Jim McMillan (CHHS) had two comments: 1) Lecturers teach four, maybe five classes, and free tenure-track people from teaching so they have more time for scholarship. 2) Accrediting agencies may limit the number of non-tenure-track faculty.
Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator said BOR Policy calls for no more than 10 percent lecturers, but it does not set a limit on temporary instructors. Pat Walker (CLASS) requested that the Faculty Welfare committee define the difference in the duties and expectations for senior lecturers as opposed to tenure-track faculty and define the course loads that this.

Pat Humphrey (COST) said Lecturers have the same 15-hour workload as any tenure track person. The main difference between a lecturer and a temporary instructor is that lecturers do have service and professional development expectations. She was not sure that duties could quantified in a faculty handbook type situation, and added that the faculty handbook does not define the difference between assistant professor and associate professor, except in requirements for promotion.

Pat Walker (CLASS) said she thought these things need to be defined.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator asked Pat Walker if she would like to see the motion go back to the committee for clarification.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked about making a motion.

March Cyr (CLASS) indicated that defeating the current motion would send it back to committee, who could modify it and later reintroduce the motion.

Jim McMillan (CHHS) called the question.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator asked for a voice vote, then a show of hands. The motion was defeated, but the Faculty Welfare Committee is free to reintroduce it once they’ve taken care of some of the questions that were raised.