

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – November 2, 2021

Senators Present: Hisham Al-Bataineh, Bart Ballard, Travis Braidwood, Lucy Camacho, Mauro Castro, Jieming Chen, Michael Cherry, Steven Corbett, Zhaoqi Fan, Manuel Flores, Jeff Glick, James Glusing, Anders Greenspan, Kelly Hall, David Hicks, Michael Houf, Kendra Huff, Patricia Huskin, Dongwook Kim, Robert Kowalsky, Sarah Lucas, Tanner Machado, Lifford McLauchlan, Richard Miller, Kyle Milsap, Larry Peel, William Procasky, Christine Radcliff, Kathleen Rees, Alexander Sanchez-Behar, Nick Sciallo, Hui Shen, Velda Soydas, Daniella Varela, Maria Velez-Hernandez

Senators Absent: Ammar Bhandari, Steven Chumbley, Mais Nijim, Teresa Young

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 3:47 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 shared information on the legislative session. The university received increased funding of \$1.5 million over the biennium. This funding is designated for areas like the Citrus Center, small school support, etc. TAMUK also received \$45 million for deferred maintenance. The university will be hiring an engineering firm to review the health and safety of our facilities. He also announced that work will begin on a new campus master plan in the spring.

b) Provost Lou Reinisch

Provost Reinisch shared that the George Floyd Symposium went well. He said it was really good for the students to see and hear from alumni and what they have achieved. He also said that there is a plan to go forward with a yearly symposium on social justice. He reported that the vaccine incentive that President Hussey mentioned last month as been postponed and will be reconsidered in the Spring semester. Lastly, he wanted to inform everyone about some changes to the budget timeline. According to current plans, In the spring requests will be due to department chairs by early February and to the Provost by mid-February.

c) JabCollab presentation by Jernigan Library (see handout)

Mrs. Elizabeth Goode, Cataloging/Metadata Librarian from the Jernigan Library presented on JavCollab. JavCollab is a research networking tool built on semantic web technologies that is designed to enable discovery and collaboration among researchers. Each faculty member at TAMUK would have an academic profile page which will include contact information, research interests, publications list, funded grant information, teaching activities and more. All information will be obtained from the faculty members vita, and the library will be responsible for keeping all faculty profiles up to date. Our main goal in the Library with JavCollab is to provide to campus a tool that will foster connection, collaboration and communication across all disciplines.

III. Approval of Minutes from October 5, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting.

President Chen then asked for a motion to approve the minutes; Senator Miller moved and Senator Hall seconded. Minutes were approved.

IV. Report of Officers

a) Senate President Chen

Texas Council of Faculty Senates meeting report

President Chen reported on the annual TCFS meeting that he and President Elect Machado attended. During the TCFS meeting they were asked to report on the accomplishments and issues at TAMUK. For accomplishments they reported on the initiatives the campus is working on for diversity and inclusion, the results of the University capital campaign, and campus infrastructure. For issues they reported our decline in enrollment and our concerns with salary stagnation and compression.

Faculty Handbook Review update

President Chen reported that he received the Provosts response on the handbook changes that were proposed by the 2020-21 Faculty Handbook Committee and has forwarded it on to the committee.

Monthly meeting with President Hussey and Provost Reinisch

President Chen reported that this meeting focused on discussion about the proposed promotion and tenure changes. He said that Provost Reinisch was appreciative of the fact that the Faculty Senate is re-visiting the proposal and will proceed to have a vote on it. He also expressed desire to have a dialog on any concerns that some faculty senators may have about the proposal.

V. Old Business

No old business is pending at this time

VI. Standing Committee Reports

a) Committee on Committees – No report

- b) **Resolutions and By-Laws Committee** – No Report
- c) **Election Committee** – No Report

VII. Reports from Committees Reporting to the Senate

- a) **Administrator Evaluation Committee** – No Report
- b) **Annual Faculty Lecture Committee** – No Report
- c) **Faculty Benefits Committee**

Senator Miller reported that the committee is still waiting for a response from administration regarding issues for retirees such as email accounts and an FAQ website for retiree benefits.

The question was asked about what happens when items that are sent to the Provost have not received no response. It was mentioned that those items need to go back to the faculty senate. It was also mentioned that a mechanism to work with the Provost on these issues would be useful to establish.

- d) **Faculty Evaluation Committee**

Senator Machado reported that the committee will be sending out a poll to solicit feedback on the types of questions that should be asked about Vice Presidents and their areas of responsibility. He said the committee would be meeting next week to discuss questions about Deans and Department Chairs.

- e) **Faculty Handbook Committee**

Senator Sciuлло reported that the committee does not agree with the Provost having to review any changes before they are presented to the senate. He also said they are aware of the many spelling and grammar errors and will start working on correcting those. He said that the committee just received Provost Reinisch's response to the proposed handbook changes from the previous committee and will review them soon. He also said that the committee is not clear on the method for the process of Provost Reinisch's responses.

- f) **Piper Award Committee** – No Report
- g) **Policy Revision Committee** – No Report
- h) **Ad-Hoc Committee on Anti-Racism and Social Justice** - No Report

VIII. New Business

- a) **Tenure and Promotion Change Proposal voting** (*see attached*)

It was decided to move forward with voting on each proposed change individually.

Proposed Change #1: *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.*

Senator Miller moved to approve and Senator Houf seconded.

Discussion began with a reminder that we have to be careful about which changes affect only the handbook and which ones might involve AOP1 or System Policy. It was mentioned that the time seems to be short between the 3rd and 4th year reviews, but there is more time between the 4th year review and tenure and promotion. It was mentioned that the 4th year review still needs to be separate from the major review for merit and other considerations. A reminder was given that these reviews are for continuance not annual reviews. Senators were also reminded that the 4th year review is in lieu of the annual review for that year.

Senator Glick called the vote and Senator Flores seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 27 yes, 2 no, and 3 abstaining.

Proposed Change #2: *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.*

Senator Kowalsky moved to approve and Senator Radcliff seconded.

During discussion it was mentioned that this does not align with AOP1 section 3.1.2 and System policy. If the 2nd yr is moved to spring you miss the December 15th deadline.

Senator Hall called the vote and Senator Glick seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 25 yes, 3 no, and 1 abstaining.

Proposed Change #3: *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...)*

Senator Miller called the vote and Senator Houf seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 25 yes, 2 no, and no abstentions.

Proposed Change #5: *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).*

Senator Kowalsky moved to approve and Senator Hall seconded.

During discussion the question was asked why this is limited to only being able to add materials relating to research or scholarship? The response was that those categories are the only ones where there is a time lag for notification of acceptance. It was also asked if there is a timestamp when new information is added? The answer is yes, since TAMUK is using an e-portfolio. The question was also asked what happens if someone adds materials during the time the e-portfolio is open, but committee members reviewed the e-portfolio already? It was mentioned that allowing people to add materials creates an inconsistency in the data that the various reviewers have access to. It was also mentioned that the Provost makes the final decision and that all previous reviews are just advisory.

Senator Glick called the vote and Senator Hall seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Since the meeting had already gone past 5pm President Chen asked if a special meeting should be called for next week to continue voting on the proposed changes. He asked Senator Radcliff to please send out a poll by email the next day to find out what time would work best for everyone.

IX. Announcements

a) No announcements were made.

X. Adjournment

At 5:29pm a motion to adjourn was made by Senator Huff, the motion was seconded by Senator Peel, motion was passed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Radcliff
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2021-2022

What
is

JavCollab



Websites to check out:

JavCollab <http://10.11.141.128:8080/vivo/>

(JavCollab is only viewable on campus at this time)

<https://scholars.library.tamu.edu/vivo/> **Scholars@TAMU**

<https://vivo.brown.edu/> **Researchers@Brown**

QR code and link for Poll!



6 of 14

<https://forms.office.com/r/Ek0K3NB36S>

Proposed Change #1

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

The current major review is in the spring semester of the fourth year, allowing a faculty member two semesters (and two summers) to improve any shortcomings.

Proposed Change #2

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.

Current Faculty Handbook (pg. 18, B.5.3.5)

Each tenure track member will undergo annual performance reviews for tenure continuation in their 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th years of actual and credited service.

Proposed Change #3

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...)

Current Faculty Handbook (pg. 18, B.5.3.6)

In the 4th year, in lieu of the annual performance review, 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...)

Visual Representation for Proposed Changes #2 and #3

Tenure and Promotion Timeline for New Faculty Members

Service Credit	Academic Year 1			Academic Year 2			Academic Year 3			Academic Year 4			Academic Year 5			Academic Year 6
	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall
Hired with no service credit		1 st Year Review			2 nd Year Review			3 rd Year Review		4 th Year Major Review			5 th Year Review			Apply T&P
Hired with 1 year service		2 nd Year Review			3 rd Year Review		4 th Major Review			5 th Year Review			Apply T&P			
Hired with 2 year service		3 rd Year Review		4 th Year Major Review			5 th Year Review			Apply T&P						
Hired with 3 year service				5 th Year Review			Apply T&P									

Proposed Change #5

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 eportfolio, with appropriate notation(s).

Current Faculty Handbook

Faculty members are not allowed to add any materials to their portfolio if a deficit is brought to light by a review.

Proposed change #6

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

Throughout the Faculty Handbook, tenure and promotion are separate processes.

The separation of promotion and tenure extends into the appeal process.

Proposed change #7

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

Currently, the entire decision process is impersonal and made by reading through an e-portfolio.

Proposed change #8

Originally proposed wording

That if the tenure and/or promotion committee at the department level does not have enough members, the dean can consider appointing appropriate member(s) from other similar departments both inside and outside of the college. The appointing of additional member(s) will be made by the dean in consultation with department chair and the candidate. The chairs of the department and college committees should have the rank of a full professor.

Amended wording option from 2020-2021 faculty senate

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**.

Proposed change #9

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.

Proposed change #10

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.

Proposed change #11

Originally proposed wording

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

Amended wording option from 2020-2021 faculty senate

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.

Proposed change #12

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.

Proposed change #13

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

Advisory: 5 members plus 4 alternates

Hearing: 8 members plus 6 alternates

Separate committees formed for individual grievances

Proposed change #14

Originally proposed wording

That committee and alternate pool members are appointed by May 31 each year for the following academic year by the Faculty Senate. Overall membership should be roughly proportional to the number of faculty members in each college. Members serve only 1-year, but can be reappointed.

Amended wording option from 2020-2021 faculty senate

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**. Overall membership should be roughly proportional to the number of faculty members in each college. Members serve **3-year**, but can be reappointed.

Current Faculty Handbook

In the fall, Faculty Senate submits to the Provost's Office a list of 24 faculty from the different Colleges to form the pool from which the committees are formed. The term for which these faculty remain in the pool is three years.

Proposed change #15

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

Distinct Advisory and Hearing Committees are named for individual appeals

Proposed change #16

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.

Current Faculty Handbook

In the Advisory Committee each party is allowed two challenges

In the Hearing Committee, each side is allowed 3 challenges.

Proposed change #17

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

Current Faculty Handbook

Committee elects its Chair. Chair votes only in case of a tie.

Proposed change #18

That the committee report is sent to the president.

Current Faculty Handbook

Sent to the Provost

Proposed change #19

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)

Current Faculty Handbook

Currently there are separate processes and committees for promotion appeals and tenure appeals (University Appeals Committee and Faculty Grievance Committee respectively).