

Commission on Faculty Affairs

May 3, 2019

9:00 – 12:00 Noon

130 E Burruss Hall

In Attendance: J. Finney, M. McGrath, B. Hicok, M. Agah, M. Paretto, J. Spotila, R. Sebek, J. Hawdon, G. Daniel, T. Schenk, M. Abbas, Z. Mackey, R. Blythe

Absent: L. Brogdon, J. Ogorzalek (for GSA)

Guests: M. Lewis, E. Plummer

1. Approval of agenda B. Hicok

Meeting called to order at 09:00 a.m.

2. Approval of April 19, 2019 minutes B. Hicok

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. P & T revisions to the Faculty Handbook B. Hicok

Initial discussion focused on paragraph 3 of section 3.4, regarding promotion and tenure. Paragraph 3 outlined procedures concerning P&T deliberation and confidentiality/integrity of the review process.

J. Spotila noted the importance of controlling conversations/interactions concerning the review process between the college-level committee and the department-level committee. One possibility is specifying the channeling of communication between these different level committees through a specific party (e.g., the Dean). In this scenario, the college-level committee could only obtain information/documents from the department-level committee via the Dean.

Otherwise, noting that content and/or results of the review can only take place between committee members serving on the *same* committee, as noted by G. Daniel.

Next, discussion focused on paragraph 6 of section 3.4.2.1, which concerns extension of the tenure clock. Is there a formal process for revoking a tenure clock extension?

Next, the discussion moved to section 3.4.3 paragraph 2, which limits service considered for P&T to be restricted to four-year American colleges or universities. B. Hicok asked whether this wording was appropriate.

Next, the discussion focused on the first paragraph of section 3.4.4 concerning general expectations for P&T. After a brief confirmation of wording used, the discussion moved to section 3.4.4.4 regarding candidate notification.

Following the discussion concerning section 3.4.4.4, the discussion moved to section 3.4.5.2, which was initiated with a reading by J. Finney. Section 3.4.5.2 concerns appeals of a P&T decision and had been a section of significant discussion throughout the revision process (as noted by B. Hicok).

Subsequently, the discussion moved to the sub-sections focusing on a negative P&T decision at each the department-, college-, and university-levels.

Next, the discussion moved to the grounds on which a faculty member can appeal a P&T decision. As noted by R. Blythe and others, there is a very narrow window of what is appealable and it centers on the process of P&T review.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 4. Faculty Workload Equity | B. Hicok/E. Plummer |
| This topic was not covered. | |
| 5. Other business | B. Hicok |
| No other business was presented. | |
| 6. Adjourn | B. Hicok |
| The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. | |