

Commission on Faculty Affairs

September 28, 2018

10:30 – 12:00 Noon

130 E Burruss Hall

In Attendance: B. Hicok, J. Finney, G. Daniel, M. Abbas, T. Schenk, R. Sebek, M. Agah, J. Spotila, J. Ogorzalek (for GSA), R. Blythe, J. Hawdon

Absent: Z. Mackey, L. Brogdon, M. Paretti, M. McGrath

Guests: M. Lewis

Upcoming Meeting: October 12, 2018

- 1. Approval of agenda** **B. Hicok**

Meeting called to order at 10:30 a.m.

- 2. Approval of September 14, 2018 minutes** **B. Hicok**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

- 3. Initial read-through of P & T revision** **B. Hicok**

B. Hicok initiated the reading of the proposed P&T revision document drafted by the Faculty Handbook working group. B. Hicok informed the committee that the purpose of the initial read-through was to identify passages/issues that warrant further discussion by the group.

Section 3.4: Promotion and Tenure, page 1. “Participants may only vote once on a case.”

Section 3.4.2: Pre-tenure Probationary Period and Reviews of Progress Toward Promotion and/or Tenure; Pre-tenure Reviews subsection, page 3. “The promotion and tenure committee and the department head or chair meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and recommendations.” G. Daniel posed the question of whether or not this is generally only the department head and P&T committee chair?

Section 3.4.2: Pre-tenure Probationary Period and Reviews of Progress Toward Promotion and/or Tenure; review of progress toward

promotion to professor subsection, page 4. “The review required for faculty promoted and tenured during 2012-13...” T. Schenk asked why these dates were listed?

Section 3.4.2.1: Extending the Tenure Clock, page 4. J. Spotila pointed out that the phrase regarding the tenure clock extension is “automatically granted,” is misleading and should be altered. J. Finney noted that inserting “if requested” may be appropriate.

Section 3.4.2.1: Extending the Tenure Clock, page 4. T. Schenk pointed out that the passage regarding the discretionary basis for extending the tenure clock may be too limiting. As currently phrased, the passage states that “extraordinary professional circumstances not of the faculty member’s making may be acceptable justification for a probationary period extension,” while then going on to provide examples centered on start-up packages.” T. Schenk and others noted that there may be other reasons to include that would be more inclusive.

Section 3.4.3: Guidelines for the Calculation of Prior Service, page 5. T. Schenk posed the question of whether or not the following passage needs to specify “American college or university.” The passage states, “when calculating the period of time until mandatory tenure consideration, appropriate full-time service in another accredited four-year American college or university is credited toward probationary service at Virginia Tech only if the appointed faculty member requests such credit.”

Section 3.4.3: Guidelines for the Calculation of Prior Service, page 5. J. Spotila and others noted their concern of the lack of clarity concerning the defining of “credit” within aforementioned section.

Section 3.4.4: General Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure, page 6. M. Abbas, M. Agah, and others noted the possibility of explicitly stating that there is no different expectations between those faculty members going through the P&T process as non-mandatory versus mandatory.

Section 3.4.4: General Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure, page 6. Has legal counsel reviewed the passage covering integrity,

professional conduct, or ethics. Evaluation for promotion and/or tenure “should include consideration of the candidate’s integrity...”

Additionally, should there be a discussion as to what specifically this means?

4. Faculty Handbook working group: revision of promotion procedures for Instructor, Professors of Practice, Clinical Professors, and Collegiate Professors

B. Hicok/J. Finney

J. Finney initiated the conversation regarding the revision of promotion procedures for the groups noted above. J. Finney informed the committee that revising these procedures occurred to him during the P&T committee meetings last year, which reviewed ~90 cases. M. Agah pointed out that the committee needs to think about what collegiate faculty body will look like ten years from now, which would allow more appropriate expectations, etc. to be established. B. Hicok and others supported the idea, as well as the formation of a working group to address the issue. M. Agah asked whether an email could be sent out by B. Hicok describing a call of faculty interested in participating in the working group (**action item**; email follow-up).

5. Other business

B. Hicok

No other business was presented.

6. Adjourn

B. Hicok

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.