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Request for Information

SHORT TITLE:
(Please provide a short descriptive title.)
Definitions of Starting Points in Salary Positions

QUESTION(s):
(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)
Question:
Will the Faculty Welfare Committee’s subcommittee assigned to write the policy for faculty promotions also define the minimum requirements for employing (as opposed to promoting) faculty in tenure-track and non-tenure track positions?

RATIONALE(s):
(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

As a result of consolidation, the university finds itself with multiple tracks of faculty positions which render inconsistencies in the minimum qualifications required to acquire full-time roles. The three different tracks at Georgia Southern are as follows: Tenure-track full-time lines ranging from assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Non-tenure track full-time lines ranging from instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor. Non-tenure track lecturer lines, ranging from lecturer, senior lecturer and principal lecturer. Consequently, many faculty members hold similar credentials but different positions. The conversion of limited-term faculty to permanent lecturer positions adds a layer to such inconsistencies, which can eventually lead to more inconsistency and therefore inequity as faculty apply for promotions. Consider the clauses in existing policy manuals: Although section 311 of Georgia Southern’s faculty handbook outlines qualifications for promotion, the handbook does not articulate minimum qualifications for initial employment as an instructor or assistant professor. Neither do USG policies articulate a specific description of the starting point for any of the above faculty lines. USG Policy Manual Section 8.3.1.2 (Minimum Qualifications for Employment) outline credentials “at all academic ranks” as follows: Consistency with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACCOC)’s requirements for institutional accreditation Evidence of ability as a teacher Evidence of activity as a scholar and ability in all other duties assigned Successful experience (which will necessarily be waived for those just entering the academic profession who meet all other requirements) Desirable personal qualities judged on the basis of the personal interview, complete biographical data and recommendations The above listed criteria are understandably general, with the most salient qualification being the first--alignment with SACSCOC requirements. The SACSCOC Faculty Credentials Guidelines clarify standard 6.2a of the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation as follows: “When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines: a) Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).” However, these guidelines do not differentiate between an instructor, a lecturer or an assistant professor. The absence of specific criteria in our governing bodies’ policy manuals exacerbates the absence of clarity in our own faculty handbook. In order
for the university to move forward with a consistent, fair procedure for faculty professional advancement, it stands to reason that the institution begin with a clear, concrete set of criteria for each starting point—instructor, associate professor and lecturer—followed by a clarification of the already-existing policies and procedures for advancement.
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SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION

11/18/2019

Response: Approved

Executive Committee Response:
Follow up on RFI titled "Definitions of Starting Points in Salary Positions" Question: Will the Faculty Welfare Committee’s subcommittee assigned to write the policy for faculty promotions also define the minimum requirements for employing (as opposed to promoting) faculty in tenure-track and non-tenure track positions? Initial Response: Provost Carl Reiber appointed the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) to create guidelines for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty evaluations. A subcommittee (NTT Subcommittee) within the FWC has been formed to address this task. At present, the NTT Subcommittee is not reviewing the policy for promotions for faculty in tenure-track positions. The policies for tenure-track promotion are in place at all levels and the FWC has not been asked to address them. The NTT subcommittee has been
tasked with creating a pathway for promotion for NTT faculty where these pathways do not exist and to make clearer the distinction between the various non-tenure track positions used throughout the university. The NTT Subcommittee has begun their review by: 1. Reviewing the Georgia Board of Regents guidelines for non-tenure track faculty which are set out in Section 8.3.8, Non-Tenure Track Personnel, in the Board of Regents Manual. 2. Review of Section 315 of the Faculty Handbook, Non-Tenure Track Appointments. 3. Reaching out to other institutions that utilize non-tenure track positions to see how they are used, the pathways for promotion, and any linkages between different types of non tenure track positions. Currently data has been gathered for the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, and one out-of-state university, Kent State. 4. Diana Cone will ask Provost Reiber to request job duty-specific information from the supervisors of NTT faculty so the NTT subcommittee can ascertain the differences in how NTT faculty are used between departments and colleges. The review of existing policy on NTT faculty combined with information requested in items 3 and 4 above will allow the NTT Subcommittee to begin laying the groundwork for policy with respect to the pathways for promotion for the various NTT positions. Crafting these policies will take time and will likely not be completed before March of 2020. Further, and more responsive to the specific question asked, the NTT Subcommittee’s work should produce a policy reflective of how NTT positions are being used across the university and should provide a basis for creating a common definition for each of the NTT positions in use with clear indications of the criteria that should be applied to determine the appropriate NTT position for a new hire. It should be noted, however, that individual departments will determine their own minimum requirements for each position based on discipline-specific needs. It is anticipated that departmental minimum requirements will exceed BOR and college minimum requirements. 11/18/2019 Request for Information - 2019-11-11T10_04_30