

MINUTES

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
Monday March 5, 2-3:15pm
University Center, room 218

Members Present: Beauvais Lyons (Chair), Basil Antar, Jennifer Beals, Muammer Cetingok, Julia Malia, Gary Ubben, John Wodarski.

Members Absent: Molly Royse, Neal Shover, Joanne Hall,

Guest: Susan Martin

1. Approval of the Minutes of February 5, 2007. Approved by consensus.

2. Report from the Committee Chair

B. Lyons noted that the proposed policy on Joint Appointments in Chapter 4 for the Faculty Handbook will be presented for a first reading for the Faculty Senate meeting today.

He noted that he has received concern from one department regarding the reappointment process for their department head. As we work to uphold the process this year he advised that the Faculty Affairs Committee look at ways the hand book policy might be improved next year.

He noted that he is receiving links from about four departments with their bylaws and will post a document to the committee and the Faculty Senate web site in several weeks. He will ask the Senators today to work to get all other bylaws posted on department web sites, with links sent to Faculty Affairs.

3. Discussion of Items Proposed MFE and Handbook Changes with Susan Martin. Below are notes (with comments in red) from the February 21st meeting B. Lyons held with S. Martin and (in blue) at the Faculty Affairs meeting.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MANUAL FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

S. Martin said she will discuss these proposed “outreach” changes with Provost Holub. B. Lyons indicated that the principle of outreach is already integrated into the Faculty Handbook, and that these changes bring the manual in line with the Handbook. See Handbook: 2.21 “Importance of Scholarship”, 2.22 “Teaching”, 2.23 “Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity” which all reference outreach.

After consultation with the Provost, and as a result of discussion with the committee, it was decided that the issues presented here need to be addressed between the Outreach Council and the Provost before coming back too the committee.

Approved by Faculty Affairs on October 23, 2006

B. Lyons and J. Malia met with L. Champion to seek ways to better integrating outreach objectives into the Manual for Faculty Evaluation. The proposed changes are:

- B, 2, new b any statements from administrators, community collaborators or peer reviews regarding engagement in outreach teaching. OK

- new alphabetical list from c-h.
- C, 2 add a new first sentence: Research and Scholarship of discovery, application and integration are all recognized. **Not OK as they could be conflictual.**
- C, 3 add a new first sentence: Creative activities that involve discovery, application and integration are all recognized. **Not OK as they could be conflictual.**
- C, 5 add: “outreach and community engagement,” before identify new patents in parenthesis. **Not OK**
- D, 2, c Change “Professional Service” to “Professional Activities in Service to the Public” **Not OK.**
- D, 2, c, I change to: Service, outreach and community engagement for public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses his/her professional expertise. **Not OK.**

Issues Raised in the Ombudperson’s Report and Discussed at the October and November Faculty Affairs Committee meetings:

- a) request that all department bylaws shall be posted on the web, preferably in pdf format. **Susan said she will put this issue on the next Dean’s Council meeting, and thought that it would be good if Beauvais could communicate this request via the Senate list server (sent 2-22-2007). Susan will put this on the agenda for the Dean’s Council.**
- b) work with Vice-Provost Susan Martin to ensure the Manual for Faculty Evaluation has explicit procedures for the sharing of P & T reports with candidates and subsequent responses and/or correction of inaccuracies in these reports. Consistent with the Ombudpersons’ report, we recommend that every written report (by the department head, dean, and faculty review committees at the department and college level) be shared with the faculty member within 24 hours of its completion, including the faculty review committee vote. This procedure should include a time limit by which the faculty member can respond in writing, in order for this document to be added to the dossier before it goes to the next level. Further, explicit procedures should be developed for the correction of inaccurate facts in these reports prior to their review at the next level (recommendation 2). **Susan recently sent a memo to the Deans regarding the importance of timely notification of the addition of new materials in the dossier and the right of a faculty member to address any responses or to correct any inaccuracies. Susan will look at the text of the MFE in part I, section B to see if improvements can be made. Susan handed out a draft of language (for section III.C.c) regarding the role of the Dean in initiating communications regarding dossier insertions. She will also work on language for a notification of faculty at the Provost’s level. The committee felt these proposed additions looked good. Julia asked if there will also be procedures for notification at the Chancellor’s level? Susan said that the Provost level will be last substantive review. Draft language will be sent from S. Martin to B. Lyons for presentation at the May Faculty Senate meeting.**
- c) develop an exit interview process for all faculty who leave the university (recommendation

3). Provost Holub is working with the Deans on developing a template for conducting exit interviews with all tenure track or tenured faculty who chose to leave the university before retirement. Exit interviews will be conducted at the college level, and not by HR. Susan will share the interview template with Faculty Affairs. Susan distributed a document distributed to the deans, asking for information on all retention cases, and to develop an exit interview process that addresses a set of potential concerns. The interviews will help to inform an annual report. M. Cetingok asked if the exit interview could be conducted by someone other than the Dean, especially in small colleges. S. Martin said that in some cases the Provost office might conduct the exit interviews. There was some discussion of partner/spousal hiring in relation to retention.

d) Work with the Office of the Provost to help ensure department heads and faculty mentors have the benefit of professional development (recommendation 3). No particular action is planned, though holding an annual reception and workshop for faculty in their second year with their mentors could have retention benefits. This was a topic at the heads meeting. B. Lyons encouraged the Provost office to establish mechanism that involves faculty mentors as well as heads.

e) Work with the Office of the Provost to monitor the reappointment process for department heads (recommendation 3). S. Martin expressed concern about the implementation of the current policy (1.4.6) as it can foster adversarial relationships between Deans and faculty. B. Lyons stated that if annual evaluations of heads was conducted well, Dean would have the information they need to make a reappointment recommendation to the department faculty. In consultation with the deans, S. Martin will propose a change to the heads reappointment process that she feels will be more constructive. S. Martin has information from one college that that the dean has sent out a call for comments before the recommendation has been authored. She expressed concern that this is in violation of the handbook, and hopes as will look to change the handbook language next year to make it more consultative.

f) Work with the Human Resources Department to clarify the policy preventing UT employees from pursuing a PhD in the field in which they are teaching. (recommendation 4). Susan will call Kathy Greenberg to get more information about this issue. She shares this concern. Susan has emailed K. Greenberg on this, but has not heard back.

g) Work with the Office of the Provost to review the Department Head's Manual to ensure faculty members be given an opportunity to share their perspectives concerning problems in job performance prior to enactment of changes in duties (recommendation 5). This is a faculty development issue. As faculty responsibilities evolve, the institution needs to offer support for faculty. No particular plan was discussed to address this issue.

h) Work with the Office of the Provost to establish policy to ensure written agreements between faculty and administrators are honored, even after the administrator leaves. (recommendation 6). Provost Holub is advocating that all such written agreements should have five-year sunsets, or be under review after a five-year period. This will serve to address this issue in the future. B. Lyons mentioned that it would be good to note this in the Dept. Heads Manual or on the Provost's web site.

j) Work with the Office of the Provost to ensure that criteria for rank in the Faculty Handbook and department bylaws are the primary and enduring basis for measuring faculty performance, and that if changes to these criteria are to be used, that faculty members are brought into the process of setting these performance goals (recommendation 7.1). The

criteria in the handbook was approved by the Faculty Senate. Department bylaws criteria for rank are approved by the faculty as well. Julia said that some faculty feel the criteria for assessment are vary too widely by year or department. J. Wodarki felt that merit raises are often a moving target. S. Martin and B. Lyons stressed the importance of department bylaws and the handbook criteria in performance by rank.

k) Work with Vice-Provost Martin to discuss ways that faculty are not penalized for interdisciplinary activities beyond the scope of their home discipline (recommendation 7.2). Beauvais suggests that MFE Appendix D include a section for Interdisciplinary Research/Scholarship and Creative Activity. Susan will look at this before the March 5th meeting. This matter will be postponed to next year.

l) Review the Faculty Handbook to determine if more specific limits should be prescribed regarding the rank of faculty on personnel committees (recommendation 7.3). Beauvais will place this on the agenda for Faculty Affairs for next year. OK.

m) Discuss with Vice-Provost Martin what can be done if retention review reports and tenure votes are not in accord with one another (recommendation 7.4). This is a difficult issue for which it is hard to envision a policy solution. Faculty and Heads/Directors should be expected to be honest in producing retention review judgments. This matter will be postponed to the April meeting.

n) Discuss with Vice-Provost Martin whether the Manual for Faculty Evaluation needs to have more explicit instructions for Department Heads regarding the role of annual goals and workload percentages in guiding performance rankings. (recommendation 7.5). Beauvais recommends that the Provost form a Workload Task Force to look at this issue across the campus. B. Lyons will communicate this concern to the Provost.

Issues Raised Regarding Tenure Time-Line discussed at Feb. 19 Senate Executive Committee Meeting regarding Feb. 14th Memo to Deans, Directors and Department Heads. Should this policy (as written below) be reflected in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation or the Faculty Handbook? Does Board Policy address this issue?

- Faculty hired on the tenure track as assistant professors will be granted the full probationary period of seven years with tenure consideration in the sixth year. (The wording in the offer letter states that we will consider the person “no later than year X” with X = 6th year.) Faculty hired on the tenure track at other ranks who have not previously earned tenure will receive the same probationary period.
- In cases of extraordinary accomplishment, individuals will be able to present themselves for tenure consideration prior to the sixth year with the approval of the department head and after the head’s consultation with the tenured faculty of the unit and with the dean. Only faculty demonstrating outstanding achievement in research, teaching, and service will be recommended for early consideration.
- Those candidates not receiving favorable consideration during an early tenure review will have the opportunity to present themselves again for tenure within the terms of the offer letter (i.e., the last opportunity will be in the T&P cycle of year six, see above).

In response to concerns expressed at the Feb. 19 Senate Executive meeting, Susan agrees that the last sentence in the second paragraph should be changed to “Only faculty demonstrating

outstanding achievement for expectations at rank will be recommended for early consideration.” She will look at the Handbook and consider the addition of a paragraph on early review of tenure in Chapter 3. This matter will be on the agenda of Faculty Affairs in 2007-2008. This matter will be postponed to the April meeting for lack of time.

6. Adjournment at 3:28pm

NEXT MEETING: Monday April 2, 2007, 2pm, UC 218.