

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes December 7, 2021

Senators Present: Hisham A. 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

Proposed changes to tenure and promotion

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 discuss 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 Bylaws Committee- No Report~~
- c) Election Committee
We are finishing up the apportionment formula for Spring 2022 elections. We have

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 grades 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 fins c. 0.003 Tw T* [(af)2mre1 (o)-2 (r i)10 (f)-4 0.0

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 f(-)atQ1m the candidat's lit and2d from the dea, Abstain

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 rename

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 against