May 12, 2015

**To: Darren Williams**

**From: Luciana Aronne. Chair of Non Tenure Track Subcommittee**

**Re: Annual Report**

**Members:** Aronne, Luciana; (Science) Dieteman, David (Business); Dudas, George (Engineering); Evans, Edward (Engineering); Gallagher, Sharon (H&SS); Olszewski, Peter (Science); Rangarajan, Sue (Business); Viebranz, Gary (H&SS); Young, Tia (Science).

**Overview:** Last year faculty council approved a motion to form a subcommittee for full time lecturers and instructors to investigate policies and procedures across all four schools.

**CHARGE 1:** This investigation will include annual reviews, renewal of contracts, workload, promotions and job expectations for full time lecturers and instructors. The goal is to compile a list of best practices from all of the schools and suggest some appropriate college-wide policies that will insure transparency and equity across the college with regards to the items in the investigation stated above.

**CHARGE 2:**  This charge was delegated to the subcommittee from faculty affairs. We were to look at extended review practices for FTM faculty. The subcommittee asked to follow up on Dr. Birx’s suggestion to develop a form of developmental review for FTM faculty, or standardize across all four schools the process of contract renewal.

**Summary**

At our first meeting, we compiled a wish list and later prioritized it so we could focus on what we felt was most important. Our top priority was policy and procedure along with how we are defined on this campus by Glenhill and our directors. We wanted to see how their definitions differed from how we view ourselves.

**CHARGE 1:**

This year the committee looked at policies that affected fixed term faculty. There were three policies we focused on: BCF 7, teaching mentors for new tenure track faculty, BCF 19, appointment and renewals lengths for FTM faculty and BCF 21, penn state behrend workload guidelines.

For BCF 7, the committee wanted to have new tenure track faculty replaced with full-time faculty so lecturers can be included in this policy. We also wanted to add the words scholarly activity along with research to accommodate requirements for lecturers.

For BCF 19, the revisions suggested by the committee included one year contracts be only for sabbatical replacements, an eventual contract of five years regardless of whether a lecturer is senior or not and a better description of what expectations are for lecturers considering it mentions a demotion for not meeting expectations. The idea behind these suggestions was that there cannot be expectations of lecturers to invest in the mission of this campus if Behrend is not willing to invest in them with longer contracts. With the new revamping of the general education program, we will need faculty who are stable and secure to meet the expectations of the new general education curriculum. There was also a suggestion to renew contracts on a rolling basis giving lecturers a year to know whether their contract is renewed or not. The last suggestion was made due to the fact that all faculty having five year contracts before Fall 2011 when this policy was drafted had their five year contracts reduced to three year contracts upon the next renewal. The committee requested that those who had those five year contracts have them reinstated.

For BCF 21, there was no mention of lecturers at all except for the standard teaching load assignment. The committee drafted a section to add to the policy that would be devoted specifically for lecturers. There was also a suggestion for lecturers being able to adjust the percentages of their contract to better fit their role at the college.

The committee presented the suggested revisions to these policies to faculty council on April 6th. The administration (Glenhill) has agreed to work with the chair of this committee (Luciana Aronne) on reviewing the policies and coming up with a reasonable compromise.

The subcommittee also wrote and emailed a set of questions to the directors of each of the schools on campus. The answers to these questions would then facilitate discussion when the chair and the representatives on the subcommittee from the school met with the director. The questions are listed at the end of this report. We have received answers from two of the four schools by email and obtained answers to the questions at the face to face meeting with the directors of the other two schools.

The directors agreed that they could do better by mentoring their lecturers and also doing a better job of communicating expectations as well as opportunities to help lecturers be successful here at Behrend. It was also mentioned that directors could do more to make clear the expectations of promotion. There is also acknowledgement of inequities with workloads and that number of students that a lecturer teaches can be a problem. All the directors agreed that there has to be better communication with their lecturers.

As far as perception and how we are viewed at all levels of the college, it is obvious that there is a disconnect between what Glenhill, the directors of each school and how we ourselves view the role of lecturers on this campus. This disconnect needs to be fixed and that can only occur if there is transparent communication between these three factions.

**CHARGE 2:**

After discussing the review process for each of the schools, it was determined that each school has its own method for renewal with no similarity at all. These differences range from a full review before each contract renewal, directors talking to the program chair, directors talking with faculty in the program along with the program chair or there may be no dialogue at all depending on the situation. One concern that the committee has is the use of the extended review as a means of deciding on contract renewals. The committee feels that since the goal of the extended review is to be developmental, the review should not decide whether a contract is renewed or not. Since this charge was delegated to us in December and we were already focusing on the policies; the task of trying to find a remedy to this situation will have to wait until next year.

Next year because Luciana Aronne will be chair of faculty council, Sharon Gallagher will be chair of this committee.

**Future Actions**

The goal of the subcommittee next year is to investigate workloads for lecturers, guidelines and requirements for promotion to senior lecturer and follow up on the charge delegated to us from faculty affairs.

Respectfully submitted,

Luciana Aronne

Questions for Directors

1. What is your view on the role of lecturers in your school?

2. What are the expectations you have for the lecturers in your school?

3. In what ways do you feel that your school supports lecturers in giving them a pathway for success here at Behrend? Do you feel that your school does a good job supporting lecturers?

4. Are there support systems or opportunities in place for lecturers? Are lecturers aware of these support systems and opportunities?

5. In what ways do you feel that your school could improve with regards to supporting lecturers?

6. Do you feel that your school is fair and equitable in terms of workload for lecturers? Do you feel that the current method used for distributing workload is fair to lecturers?

7. When looking at workloads, do you take into consideration number of students as well as contact hours? Are class preparations or new preparations also considered? Are significant changes to existing courses taken into account as well as the number of general education courses a lecturer teaches?

8. Do you feel that your school policy is clear on what is accepted as scholarly activity with regards to the lecturer position? Do you feel that lecturers are supported in attaining their scholarship goals?

9. Do you feel that your school policy is clear on what is expected for a lecturer to be promoted to senior lecturer?

10. Are you open to lecturers being able to change their percentages of their contracts based on their strengths? How do you feel would be a good way to facilitate this discussion with your lecturers?

11. How do you feel that you can help with regards to contract length and renewal?

12. If you could change something for the better for your lecturers, what would it be? Why do you feel this is an important change to make?