

## Special Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – November 9, 2021

**Senators Present:** 27

**Senators Absent:** 11

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. New Business**

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

**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.

Senator Glick moved to approve and Senator Kowalsky seconded.

Discussion began with a mention that in Fall 2020 the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources had one committee. It was mentioned that a majority of universities already link promotion and tenure. It was said that the President and Provost don't want to approve ones that are not linked. Another comment was made that linking them could be perceived as handcuffing ourselves when there have been special circumstances before for having them separate. The question was asked what this will do to faculty who are currently tenured at the assistant professor rank. The comment was also made that in the College of Engineering faculty have to go up for both the first time.

Senator Glick called the vote and Senator Miller seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 13 yes, 7 no, and 3 abstaining.

**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.*

Senator Kowalsky moved to approve and Senator Radcliff seconded.

During discussion it was mentioned that is a benefit for the faculty member going up for tenure. It was also mentioned that this would be more work at the committee level and for the deans, but it would be worth it. A concern was voiced that it might be hard to arrange these meetings when there is such a short time between approval levels.

Senator Huff called the vote and Senator Kowalsky seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 14 yes, 6 no, and 3 abstaining.

**Proposed Change #8:** *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.*

Senator Huskin moved to approve and Senator Miller seconded.

During discussion the concern arose about adding people from other departments. It was asked if this is just for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate or for promotion from associate to full? It was confirmed that yes, this also applies to promotion from associate to full.

Senator Glick called the vote and Senator Houf seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 11 yes, 8 no, and 5 abstaining. Secretary Radcliff asked if the vote count was too close to accept as a passed motion since she was not sure if the abstentions did or did not count with the no votes. After deliberation and referencing Robert's Rules of Order a motion was made by Senator Hall and seconded by Senator Glick to reconsider the motion for another vote.

Senator Machado called the vote and Senator Glick seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 17 yes, 9 no, and 1 abstaining.

Senator Houf moved to table proposed changes nine through twelve until later in the meeting. Senator Miller seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**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.*

Senator Houf moved to approve and Senator Miller seconded.

During discussion it was pointed out that this was a sticking point with AOP1 in the previous senate. There was also a comment that this would put a burden on committees in regard to pool size. Would 10 in the pool be better than 8? It was asked how conflict of interest is defined: spouse, close relationship, if a person feels they can not be objectionable? It was also asked if recusal is an option and who would determine that? Some background from previous committee members was given that University Administration is wanting to have a single committee to remove the possibility of tough versus easy committees. Another concern was voiced that it is burdensome to appoint many committees, but having a single committee could also lead to the committee comparing cases person to person. The comment was made to remind the senators that President Hussey makes the final decision on appeals cases. It was asked how long the appeals cases tend to last? A response was given that they could last a couple of days, and that cases take precedence over teaching classes. One senator mentioned that last year they were on one advisory committee and four appeals committees and that it was tough.

Senator Hall called the vote and Senator Varella seconded. The motion passed with a vote count of 14 yes, 7 no and 3 abstaining.

Since the meeting was approaching 5pm Senator Houf moved to have an additional a special meeting should be called for next week to finish voting on the proposed changes. The motion was seconded by Senator Miller.

It was announced that the meeting would occur Tuesday November 16<sup>th</sup> at 3pm via zoom.

**III. Announcements**

- a. No announcements were made.

**IV. Adjournment**

At 5:09pm a motion to adjourn was made by Senator Miller, the motion was seconded by Senator Huskin, motion was passed.

**Respectfully Submitted,**

Christine Radcliff  
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2021-2022

### **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).