

## FHRC AGENDA Tuesday, October 13<sup>th</sup> 2015

1. Approval of minutes from September 1, 2015

### OLD BUSINESS

2. Distribution of class roster and/or classroom notes on behalf of an outside company/organization.  
(Penny Groves / Chris Craig)

Comment regarding creation of intellectual property:

Faculty Handbook: Appendix A; Missouri State University – Creation of intellectual Property Policy. VI.2.b

The University has ownership, or the right to obtain ownership by assignment, of copyright in:  
*(vi) For cases not covered by VI.2.B.2.B.(i)-(v), ownership and exclusive rights to license for course materials created by an individual will reside with the creator except as follows: For course content developed for a course for which the usual practice is to share such course content among two or more instructors (e.g., for multi-section laboratory courses), the creator will maintain ownership of the copyright but the University will retain a license for its use within the University.*

Question: Does this suggest that the University retains rights to a lecture because it was prepared and delivered using university resources?

Question: Is there wording to the effect (Faculty Handbook: 4.5.1.3 Course Policy Statement) which states only registered students should be in classroom?

3. Per course faculty teaching load policy: Discussion point: increase the maximum number of hours a per course faculty member can teach from the current 12 credit hours during any twelve month period to 15 credit hours. (Chris Craig / Frank Enhellig)

Faculty Handbook: 4.5.1.1 Teaching Loads: Workloads for tenure-track faculty

Included in first paragraph, currently reads:

*Accordingly, average departmental Teaching loads for full-time research-active faculty should approximate 18 equated hours per academic year, and no faculty should be expected to teach more than 24 equated hours per academic year. Annual Teaching loads should typically be 24 equated hours per academic year for full-time Instructors with normal service loads, and up to 30 equated hours per academic year for full-time instructors with little or no Service expectation. Teaching assignments for Clinical and Research faculty will vary depending on details of their contracts.*

Faculty Handbook: 3.5.8 Per Course Faculty

*A per course faculty member is appointed on a semester basis and may teach no more than twelve credit hours during any 12-month period. Employment terminates automatically at the end of the appointment period. A per course faculty member who has any other type of employment at Missouri State University is also subject to an overall limitation of 1000-hours over any 12-month period and should contact the Office of Human Resources for clarification of restrictions.*

## NEW BUSINESS

4. Faculty Sabbatical Leave: How much external funding and from what sources would be permissible during sabbatical leave. (Chris Craig & Frank Enhellig)

Faculty Handbook: 7.2.1 Sabbatical Leave for Faculty

Included in first paragraph: Currently reads:

*Faculty are encouraged to apply for external grants to supplement their funding. Their sabbatical pay will not be decreased if they secure such funding, except, however, that faculty cannot receive more than one hundred per cent of their twelve-month equivalent salary while on sabbatical. Funds provided for travel, housing, and other living expenses are not considered to be "Salary".*

Question remains: "From what sources would be permissible during the leave".

## UPCOMING BUSINESS:

Rich Biagioni, Chair of the Academic Personnel Review Commission, has submitted to the FHRC issues related to Chapters 12 and 13 of the Faculty Handbook.

His opening comments to the FHRC are included here. Note: a five page supporting document submitted by Dr. Biagioni is planned to be distributed prior to its discussion. The delay in discussion is in part because of an ongoing appeal issue related to chapter 13.

Dr. Biagioni wrote: *Last spring, I found myself on (and as Chair of) the Academic Personnel Review Commission, and we dealt with a couple of difficult cases over the spring and summer. It was apparent that there were some issues with some of the processes as currently described in the Handbook. I will have to shoulder some of the blame for the deficiencies: I was chairing FHRC when the last major revision was completed, and we were working in the dark when it came to the Chapters 12 and 13 issues - none of us had any experience with the processes, and attempts to solicit feedback from the campus community were mostly met with dead silence. So, I have attached a document that highlights some of the concerns that were raised, and on behalf of last year's APRC, I request that the issues be considered by the FHRC.*

### **Chapter 12 issues:**

- 1) 12.3.3. APRC Annual Report to Faculty Senate & 12.3.6. Notification to Parties Involved (Role of the Provost),
- 2) 12.3.8. APRC Recommendations (Provost receiving report & parties agreement on recommendations),
- 3) 12.3.9. Right to Initiate Formal Review Process (*"What is the status of the process should the faculty member not submit any notification? Does that indicate that the faculty member has accepted the APRC report and recommendations? Can the faculty member restart the process based on the same grievances?"*)
- 4) 12.4.1.1. University Hearing Committee (replacements)
- 5) 12.4.1.2. University Hearing Panel (five-membered UHP, selection of alternates, orientation sessions for members)
- 6) 12.4.6. Report (*"Note that this report does go to the Provost. It should probably also go to the administrator against whom the grievance was filed."*)

**Chapter 13 issues:**

*"A few issues related to Chapter 13 were covered with Chapter 12 issues. The key issue of concern specific to Chapter 13 involves what appears to be a requirement that the President be present as a participant in any PPRP where dismissal is considered as a sanction. The first section shown here, from Chapter 12, is provided to show the contrast in language between the two chapters."*

FYI:

Professor Kurt Heinlein submitted to the FHRC a proposed change regarding Greenwood Laboratory School credit course fee waivers. Below is his proposal. At this point, his proposal is first being addressed by the benefits committee. After review, the FHRC may be asked to revisit this proposal. (Chris Craig):

Dr. Heinlein has been informed. Here is Dr. Heinlein's proposal:

**Current Policy**

6.5.3. Greenwood Laboratory School Full-time regular faculty who are eligible for the credit course fee waivers as described above may apply one-half of the total annual undergraduate credit hour benefit to their eligible dependent children who attend Greenwood Laboratory School toward payment of required student fees.

**Proposed Change**

6.5.3. Greenwood Laboratory School Full-time regular faculty who are eligible for the credit course fee waivers as described above may apply one-half of the 15 total annual undergraduate credit hour benefit to an eligible dependent child who attends Greenwood Laboratory School toward payment of required student fees. The other half of the 15 fee waiver hours may be extended if two or more eligible dependent children are enrolled at Greenwood.

**Reasoning**

*As a MSU Professor and parent with two children in Greenwood, no waiver benefit is extended to our second enrolled child. At the end of each year I am left with 7.5 credit waiver hours that have been left unused, which could be extend to our second child. The additional tuition provides a distinct hardship on two children Greenwood/MSU families.*

*During our 4 years at Greenwood, I have witnessed several wonderful university families withdrawal their children from Greenwood because of this issue. One family has now left the university altogether and relocated to a position elsewhere. I'm sure there are others I'm unaware of. Adjusting the policy to allow the additional 7.5 hours to be extended to a second child could aid in faculty recruitment and retention, and would certainly ease the financial burden upon our faculty with multiple children. My family is also in a position where we are having to consider moving our children to another school, despite our satisfaction with Greenwood.*

*I would argue also that, while the limitation of 7.5 hours to one child may have been put in place for fiscal conservation, that it may actually be costing the university more money. For example, in just the three families that I know of that left- retaining them at Greenwood (and consequent tuition dollars paid) would have far exceeded any funds MSU conserved by not extending the offering the additional 7.5 hours to additional children.*