



MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 15, 2006
DODD HALL AUDITORIUM
3:35 P.M.

I. **Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2006-07 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, November 15, 2006. Faculty Senate President James Cobbe presided.

The following members attended the Senate meeting:

J. Ahlquist, M. Allen, P. Aluffi, T. Baker, A. Bathke, G. Blakely, B. Bower, F. Bunea, G. Burnett, J. Cao, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, V. Costa, L. deHaven-Smith, V. Dobrosavljevic, I. Eberstein, L. Edwards, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, M. Frank, J. Gathegi, K. Gelabert, J. Geringer, P. Gilmer, N. Greenbaum, M. Hartline, L. Hawkes, P. Hensel, L. Hogan, D. Houle, J. James, L. Keller, A. Kercheval, A. Lan, S. Lewis, S. Losh, N. Mazza, C. McCann, R. Miles, J. Milligan, M. Mondello, D. Moore, A. Mullis, P. O'Sullivan, A. Payer, R. Pekurny, D. Pompper, T. Ratliffe, D. Rice, R. Roberts, J. Scholz, J. Sickinger, J. Sobanjo, G. Tyson, C. Upchurch, Y. Wang, T. Welsh, J. Whyte, J. Wulff.

The following members were absent. Alternates are listed in parenthesis:

D. Abood, T. Adams, E. Aldrovandi, V. R-Auzenne, G. Bates, S. Beckman (**D. Seaton**), J. Bowers, D. Cartes, M. Childs, P. Coats, C. Connerly, J. Dodge, M. Fernandez, S. Fiorito (**C. Readdick**), C. Greek, K. Harris, J. Hellweg (**C. Ward**), R. Herrera, C. Holmes, E. Hull, D. Kangas, A. Koschnik, W. Landing, T. Lee, W. Leparulo, T. Logan, C. Madsen (**A. Hodges**), T. Matherly, R. Morris (**A. Opel**), K. Myers, R. Neuman, J. O'Rourke, A. Plant, F. Rodriguez, J. Standley, N. Trafford, J. Turner, E. Walker, N. Warren, S. Wood (**S. Southerland**).

II. **Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the October 18, 2006 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. **Approval of the Agenda**

Charles Raspberry is not able to attend today. The agenda was approved as amended.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, D. Moore

Since the most recent Faculty Senate meeting, in October, the Senate's Steering Committee has met five times, including a meeting on Friday, October 20, with President Wetherell and Provost Abele and a meeting last week with Nils Hasselmo, a former president of the AAU and currently a consultant whom the provost has contracted to advise on Pathways.

As you know from the e-mail that Melissa Crawford, Faculty Senate Coordinator, has circulated earlier this week, one matter we have continued to discuss is the report from the Senate's committee on non-tenure-track faculty, following up to the discussion at our September Senate meeting. You have received a revised report from the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee, which the full committee has approved. It reflects many detailed comments and other input received from throughout the University, and represents a number of compromises drafted largely by a subcommittee consisting of Bob Clark, Ted Baker, Jim Brooks, Ike Eberstein, Jim Cobbe, and Myra Hurt. The nature of this report is that the Senate itself cannot implement any of the recommendations without prior action by the University's Board of Trustees; if the Senate accepts the report, it will represent suggested guidelines to the administration for changes to be proposed to the Board of Trustees. You will see that we are also bringing forward, today, a revised proposal involving the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.

At our October 20 meeting with the president and provost, we discussed the CLAST and learned about the Collegiate Learning Assessment, a critical thinking test that 350 FSU undergraduates will take next spring; other institutions involved in this pilot program include Ohio State and U.T.-Austin. Budget allocations are to go out, in full, soon, and in the context of asking about Pathways funding we discussed the importance of having long-range planning that would help us to integrate cluster hiring into existing structures. We also discussed possible follow-ups to this fall's President's Retreat, which had brought together selected undergraduates, faculty and staff members and administrators to focus on Pathways. Topics also included the status of PECO and other construction funding; the Pappas group and mission differentiation among the state's 11 public universities; the status of the search for a new library director and of library funding; and the reception that the Senate's report on non-tenure track faculty has generated.

At our October 25 meeting we had a lengthy discussion with Nancy Marcus, Dean of Graduate Studies, and with Bruce Stiftel, who has agreed to serve as an Associate Dean in her office. Dean Marcus described the continuing challenge of establishing meaningful enrollment targets and said the ones for the coming year would go out soon, prescribing an increase of approximately 2 per cent on average. In the context of discussing Pathways, Dean Marcus described the impetus for that initiative as being the recent NRC report "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," rather than simply a desire to become members of AAU. We discussed the importance of having the search for new Pathways proposals to be as inclusive as possible of the entire university; Dean Marcus

serves on the executive committee overseeing Pathways, as does Professor Jayne Standley, our steering committee's vice chair. Dean Marcus also described two new sources of funding on the immediate horizon, one involving need-based assistance for graduate students' tuition and the other, smaller one involving some merit-based assistance. Moreover, she raised the question of whether the Senate might want its Graduate Policy Committee to draft a statement of the university's philosophy regarding graduate education; the Steering Committee agreed that the GPC would be the appropriate source for such a statement on philosophy.

Associate Dean Stiffler described the new "Fellows Mentoring Initiative," whose purpose is to enhance graduate student advising and career preparation. (This new program operates alongside the Preparing Future Faculty, or "PFF" program, which is now a part of the Office of Graduate Studies.) He explained that among the almost 100 current Fellows, many are in "non-duty positions" and therefore have far fewer opportunities for ongoing, substantive contact, through their Fellowships, with faculty members. Dean Marcus acknowledged the need to coordinate this new mentoring program with existing relationships between graduate students and their major professors.

George Bates, chair of the Graduate Policy Committee, attended our November 1 meeting, at which he reported that a subcommittee is preparing a report on doctoral directive status. Having attended the most recent meeting of the Council of Deans, Senate president Jim Cobbe described work that the company AY Solutions is doing on an on-line graduate recruitment and admissions website; Business and Social Work will participate in a pilot version. He also described the attempt to come up with a way of determining mean GRE scores for all currently enrolled FSU students who had taken it during a given cycle. We also discussed the proposal for joining the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and modified our recommendation to the Senate, as you have seen in its new version; we acknowledged the work of David Yancey toward improving the on-line Faculty Vita Management application on which he has been working; and we agreed to meet with Dr. Nils Hasselmo, the former president of the AAU.

That meeting occurred at lunchtime on the following Tuesday, one slot in his very full three-day agenda that also included conversations with the Council of Deans and several individual deans as well as higher level administrators, and tours of several specific academic facilities, including the Mag Lab. Senate president Jim Cobbe asked him to elaborate on what Florida State should be doing to increase its quality and the perceptions of its quality; on what roles faculty can play; and on any subtle criteria that we might have been overlooking. Hasselmo emphasized that the AAU has tended to be driven by considerations of national, competitive funding and therefore has been weighted toward the sciences. Its orientation has continued to emphasize institutions that are "very competitive in terms of the sciences," he said, adding that two original members, Catholic University and Clark University, had withdrawn from membership. Florida State is "very much in the mode of an AAU university," he said, but he also acknowledged how painful the necessary reconfiguring, reallocating of funds can be, and he used the expression "invigorating agony." In that context we discussed the

distinction between funding in general and incremental funds, and we recommended that he encourage the administration to state explicitly to the faculty as well as to the general public that incremental funds, rather than funds in general, will go to the Pathways projects. When we asked about the way our library might affect our chances of getting into the AAU, he said the AAU has no explicit indicators on library size; we responded by asking him to emphasize to the administration the importance of making the library a budget priority, apart from any attempt to gain access to AAU. Hasselmo mentioned, and later repeated, how impressed he is with what Florida State provides in undergraduate education.

At our subsequent meeting, on November 8, we discussed Mr. Hasselmo's visit and the danger of letting demonstrable strengths that the university already has deteriorate. We also heard from President Cobbe about a study on productivity that Institutional Research had completed relatively recently, and we discussed referring a faculty member's complaint to the Professional Relations Committee.

V. Report of Standing Committees

a. Undergraduate Policy Committee, S. Lewis

I have only one informational item to report from the Undergraduate Policy Committee. At its meeting last week, the UPC approved ECO 4431: Applied Economic Forecasting as meeting the Computer Skills Competency requirement, effective Spring, 2007.

VI. Old Business

a. Progress Report: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Committee Report, B. Clark

(See addendum 1.) The differences between the documents are 1). To make sure there is a complete series of promotions for those who do not have terminal degrees 2) That the Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor can be for those with E&G funding only if matching funding is necessary 3) The classifications with "Professor" in the title should be appointed and promoted through the criteria of an academic department and 4) We confined the recommendation about full participation in governance to the top two ranks with the word "Professor" in them.

A brief discussion for clarification on a few points occurred. It was reported that the committee did not expect to make any further substantive changes to its report, but that there were still a few minor typographical corrections and editorial changes needed to produce a clean report. A final version will be distributed before the December 6 meeting of the senate, with the intent that at the December meeting the senate will vote on a motion to accept the report in its entirety and forward it to the administration with the recommendation that a new faculty classification system, consistent with the report's recommendations, be developed.

- b. Proposal to Join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, J. Cobbe

The Steering Committee moves that:

“The Florida State University Faculty Senate accepts the invitation to join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, and authorizes the Steering Committee to designate the Senate’s COIA representative; that representative will normally be the University’s Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, provided that individual is (a) willing to serve as COIA representative, and (b) eligible to be a member of the Faculty Senate.”

J. Beckham, the University's NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative, spoke to the motion at the chair's invitation. **The motion passed**, and J. Cobbe congratulated Professor Beckham on his new appointment as COIA representative, thanked him for his willingness to serve, and warned him that the senate will expect an annual report.

VII. New Business

There were no items of new business.

VIII. University Welfare

- a. Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito

Good afternoon! This should be a short report.

Volunteers are distributing printed supplements on changes in our collective bargaining agreement for 2006-07. The printed supplement also includes the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) on the new paid parental leave benefit. If you do not already have a copy, a volunteer should get one to you soon.

Two bargaining sessions have been held for 2007-10 contract changes. Ground rules have been agreed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on winter holidays similar to those of recent years has been signed. We’ve also agreed to purge the “faculty mini-Gordon rule” requiring at least 900 words in the faculty members’ report on sabbatical or professional development leave activities (Article 22). Discussions have begun on a more substantive issue, non-reappointment or non-renewal for non-tenured faculty (Article 12), affecting both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Most of our deliberations thus far have concerned appropriate and inappropriate reasons for failing to renew appointments and adequate notice. Our next session is tomorrow at 3pm in Room 2401 of UCC. Bargaining sessions are open to the public and Faculty Senators are most welcome to attend.

A "Provost Consultation" (Article 2) was held in which minority hiring policy, merit implementation, and reporting on raises were among the issues discussed. As you probably know, we have posted information on raises implemented through last month at the www.uff-fsu.org web site.

A facilitation meeting (Article 20) is scheduled for Friday to discuss questions about implementation of the October 1 across-the-board raises (Article 23), following up on an issue reported last month. A second facilitation meeting, also scheduled for Friday, will address merit implementation in a particular department.

You're invited! The UFF-FSU Chapter is hosting a luncheon featuring President Wetherell on Tuesday, November 28th at 12:30pm in Room 203 Student Services Building (SSB). The UFF-FSU Chapter is providing a catered hot lunch, and all faculty are encouraged to attend. Of course the President can talk about whatever he chooses, but we have asked him to address the Pathways initiative and its implications for current faculty and other matters of concern to faculty. Please plan to attend and encourage your colleagues to do so as well.

I'll be glad to take questions if time permits. Thank you.

IX. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers

There were no announcements by Dean and Other Administrative Officers.

X. Announcements by Provost Abele

Provost Abele was not in attendance.

XI. Announcements by President Wetherell

President Wetherell was not in attendance.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.



Melissa Crawford
Faculty Senate Coordinator

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE
SUB-COMMITTEE ON
NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Revised
November 11, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Principles	1
Data Sources.....	2
Observations and Conclusions.....	2
Committee Membership.....	3
Recommendations.....	4
Appendix A: Terms of Reference for ad hoc committee on non-tenure track faculty.....	8
Appendix B: Non-Tenure Track C&G Research Faculty: Recommendations for Restructuring	9
Appendix C: Recommended Faculty Position Titles	13
Appendix D: Florida State University Faculty by Tenure Type and Unit.....	14
Appendix E: Proportion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty	15
Appendix F: NTTF Position Titles – Current Appointments.....	16
Appendix G: Faculty by Employing Unit	17
Appendix H: NTT Faculty by Employment Class	18
Appendix I: Faculty Appointments by Gender.....	19
Appendix J: Faculty Appointments by Race	20
Appendix K: Some existing policies on non-tenure-track faculty.....	21
Appendix L: Summary of Job Satisfaction Survey	28
Appendix M: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Survey Comments	33

Introduction

The rapid rise in the proportion of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) at the Florida State University and other institutions of higher education has brought increased attention to both the working conditions of the individuals in these positions and their impact on the institution. In October 2005 the Faculty Senate Steering Committee created an *ad hoc* sub-committee to explore demographic data, position functions, opportunities and standards for advancement, and participation in governance of NTTF. Further, the sub-committee was requested to make recommendations to the Senate about the working conditions and impact on the institution of the NTTF positions (Appendix A). The sub-committee created to study these issues consisted of equal numbers of tenure-track and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. Many of the recommendations that follow are in significant agreement with the recommendations prepared by a committee convened in 2005 by the FSU Office of Research (Appendix B) for Contract and Grant (C&G) positions.

The sub-committee has conducted a demographic examination of faculty positions determining college (or other unit), department, job code, employment class, tenure status, full-time equivalent, highest degree, gender, ethnic origin, and assignment (from the PARS Report). The sub-committee also conducted an anonymous job satisfaction survey of all NTTF. Materials drawn from these studies are presented in the appendices.

Purpose

The Florida Board of Governors has delegated personnel functions to the Board of Trustees of each university; therefore decisions concerning the faculty classification scheme are within the purview of the Florida State University Board of Trustees. This report sets out principles and recommendations that the committee commends to the Senate and the University administration. The approval of this report by the Senate would be a recommendation to the administration of the University. The administration, in turn, would present an implementation plan to the Board of Trustees for approval. If a new faculty classification system is adopted by the Board of Trustees, then the responsibility would return to the Senate, which could take up the implementation of recommendations that fall within its purview (e.g., participation in University governance, graduate faculty status, graduate directive status, the definition of “general faculty”, etc.). Changes related to personnel in the faculty Collective Bargaining Unit will be subject to collective bargaining.

Principles

The following principles have guided the work of the *ad hoc* sub-committee:

1. The University should stay true to the FSU Constitution’s vision of a tenured faculty and seek to maximize the ratio of tenured and tenure-accruing faculty to NTT faculty, recognizing the different needs and traditions of different Colleges, notably professional colleges such as Medicine;
2. The important contributions of NTT faculty to the work of Florida State University must be recognized;

3. The rights (continuing contracts, opportunities for promotion and merit-based salary increases, participation in University governance, etc.) and responsibilities of NTT faculty need to be explicitly defined;
4. The work of NTT faculty must be significantly different from that of tenure-track faculty (TTF) and the use of NTT faculty lines in academic units should be limited to activities that cannot be performed by TTF;
5. The classification codes and working titles for NTTF positions must present a consistent system, communicate to the broad academic community (at FSU and elsewhere) that the NTTF member is in a faculty role, and identify the predominant duties of the individual; and
6. The recommendations of the committee should lay out a clear model for an implementation plan, but not attempt to specify every detail.

Data Sources

Demographic data were extracted from the FSU OMNI system. The data were drawn on four occasions as the required data were defined and as errors or incomplete data were identified. (Note: System managers were aware of many of the shortcomings of the data-base and these problems were identified as either being created when data were ported from the previous system to OMNI, data that have not been systematically collected and entered, or routine delays in updating data. A working database like OMNI is never static and provides only “snapshots” of faculty data.) There were significant differences in the number of faculty identified each time the data were collected. The data extracted on March 20, 2006 have been used for this study and appears to be the most complete and accurate data available. Any errors that remain are not significant to the conclusions drawn below.

Observations and Conclusions

While there are varied and complex reasons for the continuation of NTTF positions, the University should endeavor to create and fill as many tenure-track faculty (TTF) positions as possible. Broad assignments of NTTF across teaching, research, and service only weaken the role of tenure-track faculty. NTTF positions should be reserved for assignments that are unlike those of tenure-track faculty.

The position titles used for NTTF have very broad and overlapping job descriptions. This has led to a situation where it is not clear which position title should be used for an appointment. Further, titles like “Assistant In _____” do not communicate to the academic community either that the individual is in a faculty role or what the duties of the position include.

The position classification system for NTTF must be revised to create a meaningful and consistent structure. Many of the previous position titles need to be phased out by not being used for new appointments. Where there would be a disadvantage to an individual faculty member being moved to a new position title, that individual should be able to choose to be “grandfathered” in the existing position.

Some individuals who have been appointed to NTTF positions do not have faculty duties and more properly belong in an A&P classification. While the A&P classifications may need to be adjusted to provide solutions to the problems previously solved by appointing individuals to a faculty classification, the sub-committee has not considered the structure of the A&P system of appointments.

While many NTTF positions are connected to colleges and departments, it has not always been clear to the individual in that position that she or he has a connection with an academic department or the rights and responsibilities that accompany that connection. Some NTTF have been given the opportunity to participate in faculty governance while others have not.

Committee Membership

This document was prepared by the Faculty Senate Sub-Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. The committee members include:

Last Name	First Name	College	Department
Baker	Ted	A&S	Comp. Science
Brooks	Jim	A&S	Physics
Clark	Bob	Education	Child. Ed...
Clendinning	David	University Libraries	
Coxwell-Teague	Deborah	A&S	English
Eberstein	Ike	Social Sciences	Sociology
Halvorson	Sandra	Panama City	Communications
Hodges	Anne	Music	Arts Admin.
Outlaw	Bill	A&S	Biological Sc.
Hurt	Myra	Medicine	Bio-Medical Sciences
Stoecklin	Sara	Panama City	Computer Science
Thomas	Ron	Center for Teaching and Learning	

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Recommendation 1: The faculty of the Florida State University (the University) place great value on the contributions to the University and its programs made by non-tenure-track faculty. These contributions need to be recognized and rewarded appropriately.

Recommendation 2: The University should conduct an audit of all NTTF positions to determine which do not perform faculty functions, make arrangements to move these individuals into appropriate A&P positions, and monitor the appropriateness of the classification of new faculty appointments. The office responsible for monitoring faculty appointments should be adequately staffed to carry out these responsibilities.

Recommendation 3: The University should limit the use of NTTF positions in academic units to important roles that cannot be carried out by tenure-track faculty who work in teaching, research, and service. Each academic dean should be required to propose a limit on the proportion of faculty in the unit who can be in NTTF positions and provide a written justification for using these positions rather than tenure-track positions.

Recommendation 4: The University should establish a limited number of “title series”, each with three or four ranks and clear criteria for promotion through the ranks. Each NTTF “title series” would exist within a context of exactly one of the following areas: Teaching, Research, or Service.

Recommendation 5: Every NTTF member assigned to the teaching series must have an academic department or college (a college if there are no departments). It is this academic unit that will determine criteria for initial appointment, promotion (similar to the requirements for tenure-track faculty), consider the promotion of individuals (must include peer review), be responsible for an annual assignment of responsibilities, conduct the annual evaluation, and make recommendations for pay increases and other benefits. In the case of a NTTF member appointed to one of the research or service series, but not assigned to an academic department or college, the responsibilities listed above will be set by the employing unit. An NTTF member may be assigned to a working title series of the type “_____ professor” (e.g., “clinical associate professor” or “assistant research professor”) only if appointed through the process of an academic department or college and subject to evaluation, promotion, and continuing appointment by that department or college.

Recommendation 6: One series of position codes will be used for NTTF in each of the instructional, research, and support areas and additional working titles will be provided in each series to identify the work of the individual faculty member. These working titles must clearly indicate the predominant work of the position and are to be created by the University administration.

Recommendation 7: There should be one series of NTTF position codes in the teaching area. These position codes should be restricted to those individuals whose primary duties are instruction. Units may select an appropriate working title series from Table 2. Positions at the second through fourth levels, with the word ‘professor’ in the working title, require a terminal degree or equivalent significant experience or accomplishments appropriate to the discipline and modifier (working title).

Recommendation 8: There should be one series of NTTF position codes in the research area. These position codes should be limited to those individuals whose primary duties are conducting research. Further, it is expected that, with the exception of the Research Associate position, these positions will be limited to individuals appointed on Contract and Grant funding or Education and General (E&G) funds that are part of a matching agreement for external funding. Units may select an appropriate working title series from Table 2. Positions at the second through fourth levels, with the word ‘professor’ in the working title, require a terminal degree or equivalent significant experience or accomplishments appropriate to the discipline and modifier (working title).

Recommendation 9: There should be one series of position codes and four series of NTTF working titles in the support area. These positions may be in academic departments or support units. These position titles should be limited to those individuals whose primary duties are the support of academic activities. Numerical suffixes have been added, where necessary, to provide a minimum of three ranks within the series. Units may select an appropriate working title series from Table 2.

Recommendation 10: All NTTF should, after a period of time-in-rank with satisfactory annual evaluations, be provided a level of job security (through multi-year “rolling” contracts similar to those in use at Florida Gulf Coast University) and an opportunity to participate in University governance. The following table 1 identifies the level of security and level of participation in faculty governance by rank.

Teaching Series	Research Series	Service Series	Contract	Full Part in Univ. Gov.
Instructional Faculty I	Research Faculty I	Support Faculty I	Annual	No
Instructional Faculty II	Research Faculty II	Support Faculty II	Annual	No
Instructional Faculty III	Research Faculty III	Support Faculty III	Three-Year, rolling ³	2
Instructional Faculty IV	Research Faculty IV	Support Faculty IV	Five-Year, rolling ³	2

Table 1 – NTTF Appointment Categories

Instruction			
Instructional Faculty I	Instructional Faculty II	Instructional Faculty III	Instructional Faculty IV
Instructor	Instructor II	Instructor III	Instructor IV
Instructor	Teaching Assistant Professor ¹	Teaching Associate Professor ¹	Teaching Professor ¹
Legal Writing Instructor	Legal Writing Assistant Professor ¹	Legal Writing Associate Professor ¹	Legal Writing Professor ¹
Clinical Instructor	Clinical Assistant Professor ¹	Clinical Associate Professor ¹	Clinical Professor ¹
Research			
Research Faculty I	Research Faculty II	Research Faculty III	Research Faculty IV
Research Associate	Assistant Scientist	Associate Scientist	Scientist
Research Associate	Assistant Research Engineer	Associate Research Engineer	Research Engineer
Research Associate	Research Assistant Professor ¹	Research Associate Professor ¹	Research Professor ¹
Service			
Support Faculty I	Support Faculty II	Support Faculty III	Support Faculty IV
Assistant Curator		Associate Curator	Curator
Instructional Specialist I		Instructional Specialist II	Instructional Specialist III
Coordinator/Director I		Coordinator/Director II	Coordinator/Director III
Instructor Librarian	Asst. Univ. Librarian	Assoc. Univ. Librarian	University Librarian

Table 2 – NTF Working Titles

¹ Individuals appointed to these working titles must be selected, appointed, evaluated, and promoted according to departmental or college (if there are no departments) procedures and standards.

- ² Individuals with annual contracts will be considered “temporary” appointments and should be entitled to participate in discussions related to the governance of their department, college, and University. They may participate in departmental or college governance if this participation is supported by departmental or college by-laws, but they are not entitled to vote within the University faculty governance process. Those individuals who have earned three- or five-year contracts (Levels III and IV) will be considered “continuing” faculty and may participate in department, college, and University governance if they are appointed to one of the “_____ professor” series (e.g. “Clinical Associate Professor” or “Research Professor”). As noted above, these individuals must be selected, appointed, evaluated, and promoted according to departmental or college procedures and standards.
- ³ Three- and five-year contracts for those individuals appointed to C&G lines would be limited by available grant funds or “bridge funding” as recommended by the FSU Office of Research.

Recommendation 11: The “non-tenure-track” designator should be changed to “career track” to recognize the important and continuing contributions of these individuals to the university.

Recommendation 12: Based upon the understanding of this sub-committee, the Collective Bargaining Agreement indicates that NTTF cannot be excluded from merit pay consideration and must be provided an equitable opportunity to earn merit salary increases along with tenured and tenure-accruing faculty. The University should notify each unit each year that NTTF must be eligible for consideration in the merit process.

Recommendation 13: The Graduate Policy Committee should consider allowing each academic department, with review and approval by the GPC, to set their own criteria for graduate teaching status and graduate directive status for individuals in the three highest ranks of each series in the instruction and research areas. These criteria should not be arbitrarily limited to tenure-track faculty as there are many highly qualified faculty in NTT categories. This will allow each department to justify any non-traditional approach to graduate status.

Recommendation 14: The only way an individual should be able to move from a NTT position to a tenure-track position would be to apply for the position in an open search. The transfer of credit toward tenure should be handled in the same manner it would be handled for an individual being hired from another institution.

Recommendation 15: Following the Board of Trustee’s approval of a revised personnel system for faculty appointments, the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate should appoint a constitutional revision committee to reconcile the Florida State University Constitution with the personnel system and these recommendations.

Appendix A: Terms of Reference for ad hoc committee on non-tenure track faculty

During the past several years the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate has been concerned with those on our faculty that are serving the institution on non-tenure track contracts. Therefore we determined to establish an *ad hoc* committee to study this issue.

An *ad hoc* committee will be appointed to consider all those faculty at FSU who are not in tenure track positions regardless of their assigned responsibilities or FTE and provide the following:

- 1) demographic data regarding the precise number of such persons working at FSU and the extent of their involvement at FSU.
- 2) an analysis of these positions by how they function within each department or unit, i.e., as teachers, by serving research functions, or by doing other duties necessary to the overall mission of the institution.
- 3) An analysis of the opportunities and standards for advancement, the career structure, and recognition of merit and achievement for non-tenure track faculty.

We already have a good start on this assignment in that we received a report from a special committee formed by the Office of Research addressing non-tenured research faculty positions. The steering committee, on behalf of the ad hoc committee, will also seek the cooperation of the central administration in respect to obtaining the data referred to in item 1) above; Dean of the Faculties Anne Rowe has already assured us of full cooperation by her office.

The committee will provide a report to the Steering Committee concerning the above with any recommendations the committee determines are appropriate. This could include, but is not necessarily limited to, recommendations concerning policy on the quantitative and qualitative balance between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, and policy on representation of non-tenure track faculty and their interests in governance structures at all levels.

The time line suggested by the Steering Committee is for the group to aim for an interim report to be presented to the Faculty Senate at its March 2006 meeting, indicating preliminary findings and the directions the committee is leaning toward; and a final report with conclusions and any recommendations requiring Faculty Senate action to be presented to the Faculty Senate early in the Fall, 2006.

Professor Bob Clark of the College of Education has agreed to chair the committee, and various persons are being invited to serve on it. The *ad hoc* committee will also have full power to co-opt additional members and to seek input from throughout the University community.

Appendix B: Non-Tenure Track C&G Research Faculty: Recommendations for Restructuring

FSU's aspiration to achieve eminent status among the nation's elite research universities rests on the faculty's ability to establish innovative and leading-edge programs in research/creative activities, as well as provide the teaching and service that compete successfully with the nation's best institutions. There are many critical factors that go into a successful equation including visionary and courageous administrative leadership, strong support services and resources, and a dynamic and interactive environment. Above all else, though, the faculty is the university's greatest asset. It is through their efforts and commitments to research/creative activity and teaching—where these efforts are breaking new ground and expanding the frontiers of knowledge—that the institution will develop a greatly enhanced reputation for excellence.

In recognition of their key role, it is imperative that faculty members are in the position where they can maximize their potential and take full advantage of their experience, expertise, talent, and interests. They must then be rewarded appropriately when they make significant contributions. A well-established system and set of procedures are in place that guide the recruitment, placement, evaluation, and rewarding of tenure-track faculty. There is also an established set of rules protecting tenure-track faculty from unfair treatment and insuring unimpeded freedom to pursue knowledge. For the most part, this longstanding and well-honed system has worked effectively in promoting the development and growth of tenure-track faculty and rewarding them for their successes.

A comparable but less elaborate system also exists for developing and protecting non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) members for contributions they make to the university and to the academic enterprise which also includes research, teaching and service. However, the position titles for NTTF are peculiar, having little or no meaning to the academic community outside of FSU. The absence of a recognizable title can be harmful to one's career. An important goal is to develop policies that further protect and support the NTTF who are paid on Contracts and Grants (C&G) so that they may have the same opportunity for professional development and career advancement. This will benefit the individual NTTF and benefit FSU in making us more competitive in recruiting and retention.

The FSU Office of Research has convened a group of faculty to review this situation as it pertains to NTTF involved in research. The following are several recommendations put forth by this group to address the non-tenure track research faculty:

A. Research Appointment Titles

Current, non-tenured track research appointments carry titles of: Research Associate, Associate In, Assistant In, Staff Physicist, Scholar/Scientist/Engineer, Associate Scholar Scientist/Engineer, and Assistant Scholar/Scientist/Engineer. While these titles are understood internally, it is important that any changes to titles are ones that are recognizable outside of our university. Further, they should denote a ladder-structure. As such, the following titles could be considered:

- Research Professor Ranks (Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor): This rank would be governed by the same promotion criteria and processes as the tenure track, with the only difference between the two series being teaching duties and no tenure required for Research Professors. They would be treated as full members of the academic departments in all other regards.
- Scholar/Scientist Ranks (Assistant Scholar/Scientist, Associate Scholar/Scientist and (Full) Scholar/Scientist): This series should be 25-75% research and 25-75% service to the institution, depending on individual circumstances. Hiring/firing, as well as the promotion, of these individuals would continue under current policies, which allow great autonomy to the hiring department or college as to numbers of Scholar/Scientists, job descriptions, etc. All other current practices would remain unchanged, e.g. it is anticipated that these individuals could continue to get courtesy appointments from academic departments, but they would typically not be considered full members of the academic department.
- Research Associate (Assistant in Research and Associate in Research): This series should be 0-25% research and 75-100% service to the institution. Hiring/firing as well as the promotion of these individuals would continue under current policies. All other current practices would remain unchanged.

Non-tenure track research professor positions should be phased into the FSU system. There will be no automatic appointments to a research professor position for those in existing research positions. The research professor ranks will be filled gradually via reclassification of our “best and brightest” Scholar/Scientists and via outside recruitment searches launched cooperatively by the research unit and the appropriate academic department. Appointments would be subject to approval by the academic departments. It is important to note that the use of these appointment titles would not be made mandatory and will be used at the discretion of the departments. It is also important to note that these ranks are intended for faculty who are C&G paid. Although outside this committee’s purview, we recognize the importance of establishing guidelines for the proportional number of tenure-track faculty at FSU. This is essential for the preservation of tenure. This is an issue that will require further faculty and administrative review.

B. Three Classification System of Research Professors

The three-classification system (Assistant, Associate, Full) would be regarded as a career-level framework, with appropriate policies and procedures for appointment, review, and promotion. The creation of positions within this system, advertising for qualified candidates, selection and appointment procedures, review, promotion and termination would be under well-defined procedures administered through academic units by the Dean of the Faculties and further subject to the policies, rules, and procedures of the Campus Affirmative Action Plan.

Qualifications for Classification

The qualification for each of the three research professor classifications are comparable to those set forth for regular members of the faculty.

Typically a candidate for the rank of *Research Assistant Professor* would have to have completed the terminal degree in his or her discipline and, in some fields, have at least one year of successful postdoctoral research experience. A person at this level would be fully capable of original, independent research work. An individual with the rank of Research Assistant Professor would serve one year contracts, with annual review required.

A person at the level of *Research Associate Professor* would have begun to establish a national reputation through published work and would typically have responsibility for carrying out independently, as principal investigator, projects of his or her own devising. Normally, a person should have achieved a minimum of three years of successful research as reflected in published work in refereed sources before attaining or being appointed to the rank of Research Associate Professor. An individual with the rank of Research Associate Professor would receive a three-year contract, with review required at the end of the cycle.

An individual with the rank of *Research Professor* would have shown a career of continued growth in scholarship which has brought a national or international reputation as a first-class researcher who has made substantial contributions to his or her discipline. Holders of this rank will receive 5-year contracts, with review required at the end of the cycle. Recognizably, there may be times when an individual promoted to this rank may be funded by grants which will expire before the end of the contract. This situation could require bridge support, which will be discussed later.

The normal time in rank to be considered for promotion is five years of service at the current rank. Any individual in any of the above ranks will be given one year's notice prior to the expiration and non-renewal of their contracts, following the first year of successful employment.

Separate titles should be used for those individuals with lesser qualifications who are assigned to research jobs which are routine and supervised but call for qualifications and responsibilities greater than those of staff technicians.

C. Departmental Affiliation

NTTF research professors should be formally affiliated with academic departments. Departments would make the hiring and promotional decisions using identical procedures with the only differences being tenure and teaching duties.

Most of the decision making will be done by those individual departments who participate, while trying to keep all NTTF research professors on same playing field as tenure track faculty.

D. "Bridge" Support

A current void exists for NTTF who are at the end of a grant and have not yet begun their next grant. As the policy is currently written, those individuals are not provided options for alternative employment. It is recommended that there should be "bridge" or temporary support available, possibly from the Office of Research and partnering with a dean, to provide this support. The support would not be automatic and would be considered at the request of the NTTF member's Dean.

E. Space Allocation

Research Non-Tenure Track Faculty positions carry with them the allocation of physical infrastructure. At a minimum, this should include office space, and, in many cases, it could include access to research facilities or assignment of laboratory space. An explicit policy should be set in place about the lines of authority to allocate such space, as well as provision for review of such allocations.


In summary, it is not until we begin to look at the structure of NTTF positions that we can compete nationally for the best and brightest individuals. This can be accomplished with policy revisions that can be implemented immediately and without jeopardizing the strength and security of the tenure faculty status. By implementing policies similar to those at the nation's finest institutions, FSU can continue its climb in stature as one of the country's finest research universities.

Note: Multi-year contracts and the minimum notice of non-renewal as stated above are subject to collective bargaining. The provision for promotion, but ineligibility for tenure for research professors, may also be subject to collective bargaining.

Document prepared by a special committee formed by the Office of Research to address non-tenure track faculty positions at FSU. Committee members include:

Professor David Balkwill
Professor Greg Boebinger
Professor Rob Contreras (Chair)
Professor Isaac Eberstein
Professor Tim Moerland
Professor and Dean of Faculties Anne Rowe

Appendix C: Recommended Faculty Position Titles




Appendix D: Florida State University Faculty by Tenure Type and Unit

Unit	Unit Name	All Fac	TTF	NTTF	%NTTF
APPS	Acad & Professional Pgm Svcs	15	1	14	93.3
AS	College of Arts & Sciences	580	427	153	26.4
BUS	College of Business	112	87	25	22.3
CCES	Ctr for Civic Edu & Service	1	0	1	100.0
COM	College of Communication	52	33	19	36.5
CRIM	College of Criminology	29	16	13	44.8
CSIT	Computational Sci & Info Tech	10	5	5	50.0
EDU	College of Education	141	90	51	36.2
ENG	College of Engineering	74	48	26	35.1
GRAD	Graduate Studies	3	1	2	66.7
HOUS	University Housing	1	0	1	100.0
HUM	College of Human Sciences	51	35	16	31.4
INFO	College of Information	29	22	7	24.1
INTL	International Programs	6	0	6	100.0
ISPA	Inst for Sci & Public Affairs	47	1	46	97.9
LAW	College of Law	54	31	23	42.6
LSI	Learning Systems Institute	65	11	54	83.1
MAG	Natl High Magnetic Field Lab	54	4	50	92.6
MED	College of Medicine	56	24	32	57.1
MPTV	Schl of Motion Pic TV & RA	16	3	13	81.3
MUS	College of Music	89	83	6	6.7
NUR	School of Nursing	26	14	12	46.2
PCC	Panama City Campus	30	2	28	93.3
PRES	Office of the President	2	1	1	50.0
PROV	Office of the Provost	10	7	3	30.0
RING	Ringling Ctr for Cultural Arts	3	0	3	100.0
RSCH	Office of Research	21	1	20	95.2
SCC	Student Counseling Center	2	1	1	50.0
SOC	College of Social Sciences	125	104	21	16.8
STDS	Dean of Students	3	0	3	100.0
STRZ	Strozier Library	36	0	36	100.0
SWK	College of Social Work	35	19	16	45.7
UNGD	Undergraduate Studies	2	2	0	0.0
VATD	Coll Vis Arts, Theatre & Dance	97	75	22	22.7


Column Totals	1878	1148	730
Percent of Total		61.1	38.9

TTF = Tenure Track Faculty
 NTTF = Non-tenure Track Faculty
 % NTTF = NTTF as percent of all faculty


Appendix E: Proportion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty



Appendix F NTTF Position Titles – Current Appointments




Appendix G Faculty by Employing Unit





Appendix H NTT Faculty by Employment Class



NTT Faculty by Employment Class



Appendix I Faculty Appointments by Gender



Appendix J Faculty Appointments by Race



Appendix K: Some existing policies on non-tenure-track faculty

The following documents specify policies, rules, or other constraints that affect the hiring, classification, and treatment of non-tenure-track faculty members at FSU. For each document, there is a mechanism for amendment.

1. *The FSU Constitution* - <http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/constitution.html> - may be amended by 2/3 vote of the Senate plus majority vote of the faculty eligible for election to the Senate.
2. *The General Faculty Bargaining Unit Definition* (see full text below) - may be modified by the Public Employees Relations Commission (PERC).
3. *The UFF-FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)*- <http://www.uff-fsu.org/cbac/UFF%20Agreement.pdf> – may be modified by mutual agreement of the UFF and the FSU Board of Trustees.
4. *FSU policies* - may be modified by the President or delegated authority.

In the past, there were also statutory provisions and Board of Regents policies that were relevant. However, after the reorganization of the SUS under the Board of Governors and local boards of trustees, it seems personnel matters are now delegated to the universities.

A. FSU Constitution

It seems clear that the intent of the FSU constitution was to forbid the employment of any non-tenured faculty members for more than six years, and to provide permanent status for non-faculty members of the professional staff.

It defines the General Faculty as follows:

The General Faculty shall consist of those persons holding the academic rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor in one of the colleges, schools, or other academic units of the University, and of those members of the Professional Staff to whom the President assigns an academic rank.[Article II, Section A]

It distinguishes members of the General Faculty from Members of the Professional Staff, who are entitled to annual recommendation for reappointment (like tenure), as follows:

Those persons holding academic appointments within The Florida State University, but not within a college or school, and those persons within a college or school holding academic appointments whose responsibilities do not include teaching, shall be considered members of the Professional Staff. Members of the Professional Staff having appropriate qualifications and responsibilities shall be assigned faculty rank by the President of the University on recommendation of their administrative officers for the purpose of membership in the General Faculty.

Members of the Professional Staff shall enjoy the assurance of annual recommendation for reappointment in accordance with the provisions of the Florida Statutes and the regulations of the Board of Regents.[Article VII]

The Constitution sometimes uses the defined term “General Faculty” and sometimes uses just the word “faculty”. This permits two interpretations of most references to “faculty”:

1. If “faculty” means the same thing as “General Faculty”, then the Constitution has nothing to say about non-tenure-track faculty members other than Instructors.
2. On the other hand, there is an intentional distinction in usage, the term “faculty” should be interpreted more inclusively, e.g.,

faculty: the teaching and administrative staff and those members of the administration having academic rank in an educational institution. [Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary]

Under the latter interpretation, several provisions of the Constitution would apply to non-tenure-track members of the faculty, including the prohibition against continued employment for more than seven years:

- (1) No person employed after 1965 may remain in the service of the University as a nonpermanent member of the faculty of any college, school, or other academic unit in any rank or combination of ranks for a total of more than seven years, except that faculty whose service began before September 1972 may count four additional years in the Instructor or Acting Assistant Professor ranks as probationary. Persons holding an administrative or service role will normally hold a courtesy rank in an academic unit and shall not be subject to the rule during such service unless the academic unit grants a regular tenure-earning appointment. When the administrative or service function is ended, the person shall receive, upon request, a tenure-earning appointment in an academic unit.*
- (2) Not later than the end of the sixth year of service (or the tenth in the case of the above exceptions), the Departmental Chairperson, or equivalent, in consultation with the dean of his or her college or school, shall either nominate the faculty member for tenure or arrange to terminate his or her service at the end of the seventh year (or the eleventh, in the case of the above exceptions). In every case, the faculty member shall be notified in writing of this recommendation by the dean.*
- (3) Only time spent in the rank of Assistant Professor and above shall be construed as tenure-earning time.*
- Assistant Professors and Instructors shall be considered ineligible for tenure or for reappointment beyond a seven-year maximum. .[Article VI B.7]*

Regardless of the interpretations of “faculty”, it is clear the Constitution does not recognize non-tenure-track faculty members in ranks other than Instructor as being eligible to serve as Senators.

Besides the ambiguity and potential inconsistency with current practice as to the reappointment of non-tenured faculty for more than seven years, the FSU Constitution contains several other inconsistencies, including references to the Board of Regents.

B. Bargaining Unit Definition

All faculty members in the following position classifications holding regular, visiting, provisional, research, affiliate, or joint appointments are included in the bargaining unit:

9001 - Professor
9002 - Associate Professor
9003 - Assistant Professor
9004 - Instructor
9005 - Lecturer
9006 - Graduate Research Professor
9007 - Distinguished Service Professor
9009 - Eminent Scholar
9053 - University Librarian
9054 - Associate University Librarian
9055 - Assistant University Librarian
9056 - Instructor Librarian
9115 - Coordinator
9120 - Associate in _____
9121 - Assistant in _____
9126 - Program Director
9150 - Curator
9151 - Associate Curator
9152 - Assistant Curator
9153 - Staff Physicist
9160 - Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
9161 - Associate Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
9162 - Assistant Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
9166 - Research Associate
9173 - Counselor/Advisor
9178 - Instructional Specialist
9334 - Specialist, Computer Research
9433 - Specialist, Music

Together with chairpersons (Administrative Code: C1) in the following colleges and schools:

*College of Arts and Sciences
College of Business
College of Communication
College of Engineering
College of Social Sciences
School of Visual Arts and Dance*

And employees in the above classifications with the following administrative titles: Associate Chair (C2), Assistant Chair (C3), Coordinator (N1); Program Director (G1), Associate Program Director (G2), Assistant Program Director (G3), Department Head (H1), Associate Department Head (H2), Assistant Department Head (H3), and Counselor/Advisor (B1).

Excluded:

Department Chairs in departments not specifically included above, employees in the included classifications with administrative titles not specifically included above, Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and all other administrators above them, Administrative & Professional employees not specifically included, employees of the College of Law and College of Medicine, employees serving as members of the University Board of Trustees, managerial employees, confidential employees, and all other employees.[Appendix A]

C. Collective Bargaining Agreement

The CBA applies only to the faculty members specified above, notably excluding the College of Law and the College of Medicine. For those employees to which the CBA applies, it defines “faculty member” to be any member of the bargaining unit:

“faculty member” means a member of the bargaining unit [Article 32]

Since the CBA defines “faculty member” to be any member of the bargaining unit, nearly all of the CBA pertains to both tenure and non-tenure track faculty members. For example, all the provisions regarding annual evaluation and duty assignment apply to all members of the bargaining unit. These include the requirement for each department/unit to have written criteria and procedures for:

Annual evaluation [10.3 (a)]

Promotion [14.2 (b)]

Merit-based salary increases [10.1 (b) and 23.4]

All of the faculty, including non-tenure-track, are eligible for the same across-the-board, promotion, and departmental merit salary increases. An exception is made for C&G-funded positions, if the terms of the contract or grant do not permit the increase. (However, note that 23.2 (b) seems to require that a person on C&G money cannot be given a salary increase except according to one of the provisions of Article 23.)

There is also a requirement that “faculty members eligible for promotion shall be appraised annually in writing of their progress toward promotion” [14.2 (e)(1)], and that annual duty assignments “provide equitable opportunities, in relation to other faculty members in the same department/unit, to meet the required criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases”. [9.3 (d)].

For other examples, see: the provisions of Article 8 on recruitment, dual compensation, etc.; the provisions of Article 9 on working hours, instructional technology, etc.; the provisions of Article 18 on rights to inventions and works; the provisions of Article 24 on benefits. All are stated as applying to “faculty members”, which means they apply to non-tenure-track as well as tenure-track faculty members.

There are just few sections of the CBA that deal specifically with tenure, including how tenure is earned and the privileges that go with tenure, mainly in Article 15 [Tenure].

The following are some of the provisions that seem to bear most directly on the classification of non-tenure-track faculty members and some other issues that seem to be of concern to the non-tenure-track faculty.

1. Creation of new non-tenure-track position classifications

(1) The Board may create new position classifications with job duties including the creation, dissemination, or presentation of knowledge only after negotiations with the UFF to determine the nature and necessity of the new position classification and whether it will be designated within or outside the bargaining unit.

(2) All new position classifications with job duties including a substantial teaching or research component shall be designated within the bargaining unit.[1.2(a)]

2. Commitment to a tenured faculty

The Board agrees that it is in the best interests of the University, the faculty, and the students to maximize the ratio of tenured and tenure-accruing E&G appointments to the number of non-tenure-accruing E&G appointments, among those appointments including significant teaching responsibilities.[8.3]

3. Restriction on adjunct appointments

Adjuncts shall be employed only when faculty are not available for assignment. Such appointment is for one academic term at a time and is ordinarily paid on a per course basis or, in cases of non-instructional appointments, on a per activity basis. Adjunct appointments may not be for more than 50% of the time throughout an academic year or full-time for more than twenty-six weeks of an academic year. The use of adjuncts shall, upon the request of the UFF Chapter representatives, be a subject of consultation under the provisions of Article 2.[8.3 (3)]

4. Notice of non-reappointment

(a) All faculty members, except those described in (b)(1) and (c) below are entitled to the following written notice that they will not be offered further appointment:

(1) For faculty members in their first two (2) years of continuous University service, one semester (or its equivalent, 19.5 weeks, for faculty members appointed for more than an academic year);

(2) For faculty members with two (2) or more years of continuous University service, one year; or

(3) For faculty members who are on “soft money”, e.g., contracts and grants, sponsored research funds, and grants and donations trust funds, who had five (5) or more years of continuous University service as of June 30, 1991, one year.

...

(e) A faculty member who is entitled to written notice of non-reappointment in accordance with the provisions of Section 12.2 who receives written notice that the will not be offered further appointment shall be entitled, upon written request within twenty (20) days following receipt of such notice, to a written statement of the basis for the decision not to reappoint.

Of course, there is more. Section 12.4 then requires the University to make a reasonable effort to find other employment for the individual if the reason was one of a list of reasons, which appear to cover the usual reasons for non-renewal that might loosely be called “lay off”. The subject of layoff is covered in more detail, in Article 13 (Layoff and Recall).

5. Right to vote

This article applies to all bargaining unit members. It does not specify how faculty members are selected to serve as representatives, in places where it requires that the faculty be represented, and it does not specifically address the Faculty Senate, because the UFF did not want to interfere with the existing Senate system. In particular, the CBA left to the Senate to decide who votes for senators and who can serve as a senator.

However, the CBA does appear to require that all bargaining unit members be allowed to vote on certain issues, including departmental bylaws:

The faculty members of each department/unit, by majority vote, shall establish bylaws, which must pass Administrative review. ..[26.5(a)].

The same appears to be true for evaluation criteria and procedures:

The faculty of each department/unit shall develop and maintain specific written criteria and procedures by which to evaluate faculty members consistent with the criteria specified in Sections 10.2 and 10.3 and subject to the approval of the unit’s dean. [10.4 (a)]

...

These criteria and procedures, and any revisions thereof, shall be recommended by a secret ballot vote of a majority of the faculty members in the department/unit.[10.4 (b)(3)]

...

Subsequent revisions may be initiated by a majority vote of at least a quorum of the faculty members subject to evaluation or upon the initiative of the department/unit administrator. [10.4(b)(4)]

D. FSU Personnel Policies

As with the CBA, many FSU policies apply to all employees. The following specifically apply to non-tenure-track faculty members:

1. *Promotion Procedures for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty* - <http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/forms/nonregfac06.pdf>
2. *Minimum Requirements for Promotion “Assistant in” to “Associate in” - to “Research Associate”* - <http://www.fsu.edu/~dof/promoreqs.htm>.
3. *Under the terms of the CBA, written promotion criteria and procedures need to be defined for all faculty positions. Therefore, where there are none defined by the University they must be defined by the department/unit. Apparently, this requirement of the CBA remains to be implemented by many departments/units.*
4. *Faculty Position Code Descriptions* - <http://www.hr.fsu.edu/index.cfm?page=JobGroupManagement&pp=FAC> (click on code to see description), for example for Research Associate:

DESCRIPTION: Responsible to a Chair or other appropriate administrator of a State university. Responsible for defining problem areas within the functional area to which assigned. Outlines research programs and projects, analyzes statistical and other data, and provides appropriate recommendations to address and eliminate problem areas. May be assigned teaching duties.

**** Examples listed are not an all inclusive list of duties and tasks. MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS: Master's degree from an accredited institution with demonstrated record of academic research achievement, or professional qualifications in the field of specialization above those which would be equivalent to the highest degree. Must meet university criteria for appointment to the rank of Research Associate.*


5. *College of Medicine Faculty Handbook* – This document is not accessible on-line except from inside the COM’s intra-net. The faculty of the COM is outside the faculty bargaining unit, and so this appears to be the only document that applies to that faculty.

Appendix L Summary of Job Satisfaction Survey


Survey Information

- Conducted via web 3/17/06 – 3/31/06
- Five Likert-scale questions with comment fields, two free response questions
- Survey invitation sent via email to 684 non-tenure track faculty
- 219 respondents = 32 percent

Respondent Job Classes



Respondent Academic Units




Overall Responses


1. *I feel secure in my position.*
2. *My assignment of responsibilities clearly identifies the tasks I am expected to carry out.*
3. *I am considered a peer by tenure-track faculty in my area.*
4. *I have clear standards for promotion and opportunities to work toward promotion.*
5. *I would leave FSU for a tenure-track position elsewhere.*

SURVEY ITEMS and FACULTY RESPONSES		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals
1. Security	#	44	71	32	45	25	217
	%	20	33	15	20	12	*
2. AOR	#	72	86	27	23	11	219
	%	33	39	12	11	5	*
3. Peer	#	23	54	64	46	32	219
	%	11	25	29	21	15	*
4. Promotion	#	23	24	39	61	71	218
	%	11	11	18	28	32	*
5. Leave FSU	#	41	46	55	40	37	219
	%	19	21	25	18	17	*


1. I feel secure in my position.




2. My assignment of responsibilities clearly identifies the tasks I am expected to carry out.




3. I am considered a peer by tenure-track faculty in my area.



4. I have clear standards for promotion and opportunities to work toward promotion.



5. I would leave FSU for a tenure-track position elsewhere.



Appendix M Non-Tenure Track Faculty Survey Comments

The sub-committee takes a strong stand on the importance of protecting the anonymity of those individuals who responded to the survey, but also finds that the comments communicate the strong feelings of many of our NTTF colleagues. The comments of some individuals were specific enough to allow their identification. We have taken the following steps to both protect anonymity and provide a flavor of the responses in each section of the survey:

- words or phrases that could identify an individual have been replaced by a generic word or phrase enclosed in square brackets and
- a limited number of comments have been selected in each section to communicate the flavor of the comments as a whole.

1. I feel secure in my position.

Total comments n = 109

Representative Comments

- 12-month soft money with an uncertain funding climate and no support from the university does not make me feel secure.
- The position is dependent on outside grant.
- I sign a three month contract
- I feel secure as long as I do not complain about the unfair treatment or other inequities. I do not feel threatened by budget cuts or performance related issues - just those in charge.
- I see people around me let go without detectable reason
- While I've been on the faculty for over 20 years, I still do not feel secure in my position.
- Faculty in the **(name of unit)** are sometimes moved about with little or no warning. Sometimes it appears to be in retribution for something the person has said or done....
- I feel secure for the current year, but there is no guarantee of employment for the next year.
- As long as the current administration is in place, I feel secure. However, I am aware that my position is an at-will appointment.
- That security is limited to my own ability to raise funds to support both my position and all positions for my staff.
- I am doing a good job, so I feel secure for now.
- I hold an Administrative position as the **(name of position)**. As such, I perform duties not desired by others and they are reluctant to get rid of me. I also do a very good job.

2. My assignment of responsibilities clearly identifies the tasks I am expected to carry out.

Total comments n = 66

Representative Comments

- My AOR always has to be corrected and then changes during the year without written notice.
- Very generic
- My assignment is not only vague, but when it changed in mid-year, I was ordered to back-date the change.
- I do not have an official assignment of responsibilities
- My AOR is a fabrication of responsibilities for about 30% of what I do. There are words on a piece of paper that satisfy the requirement of having an AOR.
- Occasionally, I've been surprised by an assignment that I'm expected to do that I haven't been expected to do in past years. They've been appropriate enough, but someone needs to tell about the change.
- Although they may be clearly stated, they are not clearly evaluated and I see that no matter how hard I work I will never be able to advance at FSU.

- I am sometimes unable to perform these tasks due to lack of support from the ... Administration.
- Yes, I have a clear set of goals for my area.
- Except that I have my own independent research program, my own grants, my own students, and I teach a graduate level course, and none of this was in my original "assignment of responsibilities".
- My assignment of responsibilities is very general and gives me enough latitude to do my job.
- The assignment of responsibilities is general rather than specific — as it should be since specifics can change depending on what is needed.
- My department Chairperson has always communicated very clearly my assignments and responsibilities and is always willing to discuss them with me.

3. I am considered a peer by tenure-track faculty in my area.

Total Comments n = 136

Representative Comments

- No, there are very clear lines drawn within my area....
- My department will not even place us in the faculty listing on our websites....
- Since I cannot serve on department committees, cannot vote in faculty meetings, cannot serve as dissertation chair or outside committee member, fellow faculty members view me as less than.
- Tenure and non-tenure are a world apart.
- Absolutely not. This is clearly displayed in faculty meetings, the manner in which decision are made, inclusion is talked about but when it comes down to being included it does not happen. Non tenure faculty are not respected for their skill and abilities. All decisions made at the college are for the benefit of the tenure and tenured earning faculty.
- Most (if not all) tenure track faculty in my department view the non-tenure track faculty as basic staff...here to meet their needs, rather than as a colleague that can contribute to their research and possibly collaborate.
- Some yes, some no. Most treat me as a technician, not as faculty.
- Accepted, but not the same
- Since I hold a Ph.D, some of my colleagues consider me a peer, others do not. But it is mostly negative.
- This really does not pertain to me since I am totally in an administrative capacity.
- We don't have tenure track faculty in my area.
- The faculty are surprisingly nice in this respect.
- Many tenure-track faculty have this attitude, some do not. I have always felt that this was their problem and a loss to them.
- Most people have treated me with respect.

4. I have clear standards for promotion and opportunities to work toward promotion.

Total comments n = 107

Representative Comments

- There is no plan for promotion in my position.
- No possibility for promotion or pay raise, as far as I know.
- According to my chair, my opportunities for promotion and / or raises are non-existent.
- If we have standards I have not idea what they are or even if such standards exist.
- NOT! On my first day, I was informed that no future pay increases (beyond State's annual chintzy 1%) nor promotion would ever occur. Honest, but demoralizing. Why even hope?
- Was lied to about the promotional criteria and then never presented any standards.

- I have no idea what to do towards a promotion.
- The only way I can go forward is to leave this university and go elsewhere.
- There are clear standards for promotion, but the opportunities to work towards them are afforded selectively within the organization.
- Absolutely NOT. Although I do a ton of service, lots of creative work, receive very high marks on teaching evaluations, and do extra work at every turn, the fact that I don't do research is frowned on by those that do.
- We have standards, but there is little to no guidance on how to assemble promotion folders and what items are the most important to the ... Administration.
- Standards are clear. Opportunities are made available to administrative favorites.
- As a 100% soft-money funded NTT faculty, there is no path to promotion, only the opportunity to continue to bring in grant funds and continue to work.

5. I would leave FSU for a tenure-track position elsewhere.

Total comments n = 95

Representative Comments

- I've been trying for two years, and would leave in a heart beat. As an FSU alum and life-long Seminole, I feel almost heart-broken that I have been made so bitter about this position. But clearly I can not stay here if I have any hope of establishing a career.
- Who wouldn't given the lack of respect and appreciation we receive.
- In a heart-beat. Only tenure guarantees academic freedom. Would marriage be the same if it was just a series of one year contracts?
- Except that I would rather not leave Tallahassee.
- very likely once my PhD is complete
- The only thing keeping me here is spouse's employment.
- The only thing keeping me at FSU is my age.
- I am very well compensated. It is not clear to me that I would command the same salary in a TT position at the bottom of the ladder.
- I would also leave FSU for a non-tenured track position elsewhere if the right opportunity presented itself.
- I would not leave solely for that reason.
- Not Applicable. Without a PhD, I would not be eligible for tenure track positions.
- Not interested in tenure track
- I love my job here—it does not matter very much to me that it is not tenure track. I do feel that my work and achievements warrant a tenure-track position, but I do not really fit well into any one department on campus.
- I'm too near retirement.
- I do not want to move from Tallahassee and my family. I'm staying here, even though I would love to have a tenure-track position.
- I am bound to Tallahassee and want to be a part of FSU. Tenure is more competitive than I am cut out to be
- No, I love my job

6. One thing I would change about my position, if I could, is:

Total comments n = 170

Representative Comments

- Clear standards for promotion and opportunities to work toward promotion
- If I could somehow increase the respect the position had, that's what I would change.
- The position to be considered for tenure.
- I would like to feel included.
- Salary.
- I would like to have the ability to have a voice in major decisions made regarding my program and position.
- Clear, defined process for advancement.
- I would like some support from the university. I generate overhead for the university at no cost to the school (my salary is entirely paid for by my own grants). I also generate salary money for other researchers. I feel I deserve the opportunity to work toward the goal of having the university support some of my time which I could then use as leverage to generate more grant money from external sources. I am also sick of receiving letters telling me when my new "termination date" is. This is demoralizing.
- Workload
- I really think that there needs to be more opportunity for advancement in the classification systems of the non-tenure track faculty. There should be at least 3, if not 4, rankings (not unlike the assistant, associate, and full professor ranking system).... It would give those who might need it a little more incentive than is currently built in to the job. One additional comment, is that non-tenure track faculty are not eligible for many (if any) of the awards for which tenure-track faculty are eligible, even though they may be doing the same tasks (e.g., teaching awards, peer recognition resulting in a distinguished faculty designation of some sort). I would recommend the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty in some of these awards where appropriate and the creation of other recognition titles (with salary rewards) as appropriate, too. This might also help improve the status of non-tenure track faculty in the minds of some tenure-track faculty.
- So far I enjoy everything about my position.
- Be included in service opportunities/committees, even faculty meetings in the Department
- The title...no one outside of the university understands what an "Assistant-In" or "Associate-In" does. People seem to think we stopped in mid-sentence. The general public assumes if you teach at a university you are a professor.
- I would very much like to be allowed by the University to have doctoral directive status.

7. The best thing about my position is:

Total Comments n= 176

Representative Comments

- Have health insurance and retirement
- Pleasant work environment
- It is a job, in my chosen field.
- I am happy to have a job.
- Not having to deal with the political issues associated with promotion and tenure.
- Flexibility.
- none
- Interaction with students.
- Working for the university
- The ability to work in a strongly R&D oriented environment.
- I am doing exactly the type of work I want to do.
- Academic freedom.

- It is not tenure track and I see very little politics. I can focus 100% of my energy on teaching which is why I am here
- Freedom to pursue the research I am interested in and time to do it.
- The opportunity to work with bright, interesting students who have the chance to make a difference in the world. Having a long Christmas break and all summer off (although I always do a significant amount of work during summer preparing for the fall semester).