

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – December 7, 2021

Senators Present: Hisham Al-Bataineh, Bart Ballard, Travis Braidwood, Lucy Camacho, Jieming Chen, Michael Cherry, Steven Chumbley, Steven Corbett, Zhaoqi Fan, Jeff Glick, James Glusing, Anders Greenspan, Kelly Hall, Michael Houf, Patricia Huskin, Dongwook Kim, Robert Kowalsky, Sarah Lucas, Tanner Machado, Richard Miller, Mais Nijim, Larry Peel, William Procasky, Christine Radcliff, Alexander Sanchez-Behar, Hui Shen, Daniella Varela, Maria Velez-Hernandez, Teresa Young

Senators Absent: Ammar Bhandari, Mauro Castro, Manuel Flores, David Hicks, Kendra Huff, Lifford McLaughlan, Kyle Milsap, Kathleen Rees, Nick Sciullo, Velda Soydas

This meeting of the Faculty Senate was held through Zoom due to COVID-19 social distancing requirements. It was decided that this meeting not be recorded so that candid discussion could take place regarding the proposed changes to the Promotion and Tenure policy.

I. Call to Order and Quorum Call.

At 3:31 p.m. President Chen asked the secretary, Christine Radcliff, if enough members were present for a quorum. Senator Radcliff replied in the affirmative.

II. Presentations

a) President Mark Hussey

President Hussey thanked everyone for a productive Fall semester. He was glad to see the excitement of students on campus.

TAMU System Tuition Reimbursement for Job-Related Doctoral Program

President Hussey announced that the TAMU System will be starting a program that will cover the cost of tuition and fees for any full-time employee who wishes to pursue a doctoral degree at any TAMU System university. An employee must be employed at TAMUK for a minimum of two long semesters to qualify for this program. The program will be re-evaluated in 2024, but even if they choose to discontinue the program in 2024, all current participants will be able to continue for the full six years. More information will be sent out after the holiday break.

Return COVID testing for Spring 2022

President Hussey said that as of now the plan is to have all returning faculty, staff and students test for COVID in the same manner that we did for the Fall 2021 semester.

b) Provost Lou Reinisch

Provost Reinisch echoed President Hussey's statement of thanks for a successful semester.

Proposed changes to tenure and promotion

He went on to thank the faculty senate for voting on the tenure and promotion proposed changes and said that all of the approved changes will be added to the faculty handbook this Spring. He announced that Hoggie Days will be in person. There will be one day of activities and all of the other information will be available online.

Mid-term grades

Provost Reinisch wanted to remind everyone that there is a policy that says it is mandatory that faculty turn in mid-term grades.

Final Grades

Provost Reinisch asked that faculty not wait until the deadline to enter final grades for this semester. After yesterday's server crash all of JNet is running on a single server. Too many people attempting to put in grades close to the deadline time could crash the system again. If you have the opportunity, please try and enter your final grades over the weekend.

III. Approval of Minutes from November 2021 Faculty Senate Meetings.

President Chen asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 2, 2021 meeting; Senator Huskin moved and Senator Glick seconded. Minutes were approved.

President Chen asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 9, 2021 special faculty senate meeting; Senator Houf moved and Senator Miller seconded. Minutes were approved.

President Chen asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 16, 2021 special faculty senate meeting; Senator Velez-Hernandez moved and Senator Glusing seconded. Minutes were approved.

IV. Report of Officers

a) Senate President Chen

Meeting with Provost Reinisch – November 11, 2021

There has been a rumor about eliminating minor programs, but the Provost stated that this was not happening. The goal is to have all programs have healthy growth. President Chen informed the Provost that the faculty senate was holding special meetings to officially vote on the proposed changes to tenure and promotion. During this discussion President Chen also asked what the process is for the approval of motions from the faculty senate, as there are still a few items that were proposed from the last faculty senate that are awaiting action or discussion from the Provost. Provost Reinisch apologized for his slow response on those remaining issues and promised to be more prompt moving forward.

Results of the voting on proposed changes to tenure and promotion

President Chen informed the senate that he submitted the official voting results to Provost Reinisch yesterday.

V. Old Business

a) Results of voting on Promotion and Tenure Proposed Changes *(see handout)*

The results document was shared with the faculty senate. It was asked what happens to the items that did not pass in voting? It was also asked about what the agenda is for external evaluations from the Provosts' perspective? President Chen said he would ask about this in his next meeting with President Hussey and Provost Reinisch.

VI. Standing Committee Reports

a) Committee on Committees – No report

b) Resolutions and By-Laws Committee – No Report

c) Election Committee

We are finishing up the apportionment formula for Spring 2022 elections. We have agreed on a timeline for elections, which should have them completed before spring break if everything stays on track.

VII. Reports from Committees Reporting to the Senate

a) Administrator Evaluation Committee

The committee had a good response to the poll that was sent out in mid-November to all senators.

b) Annual Faculty Lecture Committee – No Report

c) Faculty Benefits Committee

Senator Miller reported he has received a response from Provost Reinisch on the motion for a Distinguished Professor rank. The Provost asked for more data to be collected from other System campuses.

d) Faculty Evaluation Committee – No Report

e) Faculty Handbook Committee

It was asked what the process is for changing the faculty handbook? Will the changes be made by this committee? President Chen said that he will ask the Provost these questions at their next meeting.

f) Piper Award Committee

It was reported that there will be a new call for nominations in February 2022.

g) Policy Revision Committee – No Report

h) Ad-Hoc Committee on Anti-Racism and Social Justice - No Report

VIII. New Business

a) Proposal to review the end date for Student Rating of Instruction

The current closing date is after finals is completed. It was mentioned that leaving the date as is could lead to revenge based on a students' final grade. It has been proposed to move the end date to the last class day before exams. It was mentioned that OIR is responsible for administering SRI's. It was proposed that students wouldn't be able to receive their final grade until they fill out the SRI, or if the student chose to not fill one out they would have to wait to get their grades after the final exam and the SRI is closed.

The motion was proposed that SRI completion date and time be moved to the last day of class.

It was mentioned to ask OIR if the SRI could be individualized by student? For example if a student received a grade of "F" for plagiarism, or stopped attending class in October, could they be removed from the list of students who could fill out an SRI for that class?

b) Lab Assistant and T-A hiring

It was mentioned that departments are unable to hire lab assistants and T-A's until after September 1st, which makes it hard on faculty because classes start one to two weeks before then. It was asked why the semester could not start closer to September 1st to make this process easier?

IX. Announcements

a) No announcements were made.

X. Adjournment

At 4:52 pm a motion to adjourn was made by Senator Miller, the motion was seconded by Senator Velez-Hernandez, motion was passed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Radcliff
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2021-2022

November 2021 Faculty Senate vote on Tenure and Promotion Change Proposal

A. Questions and Voting Results

Q1. That the major review (i.e., the mid-tenure track comprehensive review) be moved to the Fall semester of the 4th year from the Spring semester of the fourth year. That the 5th year annual performance review be moved to the Fall of the 5th year to provide timely feedback to the candidate.

For: 27; Against: 2; Abstain: 3

Q2. That each tenure track member will undergo annual performance reviews for continuation in the Spring semester of their 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years and the Fall semester of their 5th year of actual and accredited service.

For: 25; Against: 3; Abstain: 1

Q3. That in the Fall semester of the 4th year of the actual and accredited service, all tenure track faculty members shall receive a comprehensive review to determine progress toward meeting all tenure requirements in the tenure track appointment. (and subsequent 4...)

For: 25; Against: 2; Abstain: 0

Q4. Tenure and Promotion Timeline for New Faculty

Not voted on. Only presented as a visual representation for proposed changes Q2 and Q3

Q5. That faculty members are allowed to add materials to their portfolios during the review process. The submission date should be noted on all materials submitted after the deadline. Materials allowed to be added must pertain to research or scholarly activity, such as acceptance notice of a manuscript for publication; acceptance of a proposal for a conference presentation; or funding of a grant proposal. These documents, once submitted, will not be added to the e-portfolio, but rather, added as supplementary document(s) hyper-linked to the e-portfolio, with appropriate notation(s).

For: 24; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Q6. That tenure shall be linked to promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.

That tenure is included with promotion from assistant professor to associate professor. Any candidate for promotion from assistant to associate professor will be considered in a single evaluation for "promotion and tenure" and the two items will not be considered separately

For: 13; Against: 7; Abstain: 3

Q7. That: the dean and provost respectively shall have a one-on-one meeting with each candidate prior to making their recommendation on tenure and promotion. Additionally, the candidate is entitled to separate meetings, up to 10 minutes long, with the department chair, the department committee and the college committee. If a request is not made by the candidate, the department chair, the department committee and the college committee can request to meet with the candidate for up to 10 minutes before making their recommendation.

For: 14; Against: 6; Abstain: 3

Q8. That if the tenure and promotion committee at the department level does not have at least three voting members, the chair of the tenure and promotion committee can consider appointing appropriate members from other similar departments both inside and outside of the college. The appointing of additional members will be made by the chair of the tenure and promotion committee in consultation with the department chair and the candidate. The tenure and promotion committee chairs at the department and college levels should have at least the rank to which the candidate is applying.

For: 17; Against: 9; Abstain: 1

Q9. That using a standard template letter, the dean will request external letters of review of the candidates for tenure and promotion. The external reviewers will be provided the candidate's C.V. and the criteria for tenure and promotion.

For: 4; Against: 18; Abstain: 1

Q10. That at least three external letters should be in the portfolio. The dean's office will redact each letter so the author and institution are unknown.

For: 1; Against: 16; Abstain: 1

Q11. That the candidate should provide the names and contact information for four (4) possible external reviewers. The dean, in consultation with the chair of the department tenure and promotion committee, will pick two of the four and ask for letters of review. The dean should follow up with reminder letters.

For: 4; Against: 17; Abstain: 1

Q12. That the dean, in consultation with the chair, will pick three external reviewers. The candidate will have the right to eliminate one name. The dean will ask for reviews from two of the remaining two or three names. The dean should follow up with reminder letters. If three responses are not received, the dean will use either one or two of the remaining reviewers provided by the candidate. After all six requests are made (4 from the candidate's list and 2 from the dean's list), no additional requests need be made. The blinded review letters will be placed in the candidate's portfolio.

For: 0; Against: 13; Abstain: 0

Q13. That an Advisory Committee comprising one faculty member from each college (5).

That a Hearing Committee of 7 members comprising at least one faculty member from each college.

That an alternate pool of 8 members comprising at least one faculty member from each college.

That any committee member stepping off the Advisory or Hearing committee due to a conflict of interest or challenge becomes a member of the alternate pool. That any committee member who voted on the tenure or promotion being appealed at the department or college levels has a conflict of interest.

For: 14; Against: 7; Abstain: 3

Q14. That committee and alternate pool members are appointed by May 31 each year for the following academic year by the Faculty Senate President and Faculty Executive Committee, with the approval of the Faculty Senate. Overall membership should be roughly proportional to the number of faculty members in each college. Members serve one (1) year, but can be reappointed.

For: 21; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Q15. That the same Advisory Committee and Hearing committee (as described above) will consider all appeals, except for individuals replaced due to a conflict of interest.

For: 17; Against: 2; Abstain: 2

Q16. That Advisory Committee: 1 challenge allowed by each party, the appeals and the university.

Hearing Committee: 2 challenges allowed by each party, the appeals and the university.

For: 15; Against: 5; Abstain: 0

Q17. That Advisory and Hearing committees elect their Chairs (no change). That the chairs of both the Advisory Committee and Hearing Committees vote.

For: 7; Against: 14; Abstain: 1

Q18. That the committee report is sent to the president.

For: 23; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

Q19. That Tenure and Promotion appeals are submitted as one appeal, heard by the Advisory Committee and if recommended, the Hearing Committee. (Appeals concerning promotion to Full Professor are submitted to University Appeals Committee, as done now, but renamed the Promotion Appeals Committee.)

For: 23; Against: 0; Abstain: 0

B. Summary

Question 1 – 84.38% in favor

Question 2 – 86.21% in favor

Question 3 – 92.59% in favor

Question 4 – N/A

Question 5 – 100% in favor

Question 6 – 56.52% in favor

Question 7 – 60.87% in favor

Question 8 – 62.96% in favor

Question 9 [external reviews] – 78.26% Against

Question 10 [external reviews] – 88.89% Against

Question 11 [external reviews] – 77.27% Against

Question 12 [external reviews] – 100% Against

Question 13 – 58.33% in favor

Question 14 – 100% in favor

Question 15 – 80.95% in favor

Question 16 – 75% in favor

Question 17 – [Advisory/Hearing committees chairs vote] 63.64% in Against

Question 18 – 100% in favor

Question 19 – 100% in favor