Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluation Review Committee

Committee Meeting Minutes: October 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015
3:30pm-4:45pm WPN 275

Committee Members: Jeff Woods (Chair), Patricia Buford, Pamela Carr, Theresa Herrick, Shelia Jackson, Jim Musser, Jeremy Schwehm, V. Carole Smith, David Ward

Proceedings:

I. Administrative Faculty Focus Group Summary:
   - Departments should make formal recommendation for tenure and promotion through the department head
     - Felt this was a better procedure and better communicated through department head
     - Faculty and department heads should be on the same page as far as the recommendation goes
     - There are concerns in regards to faculty making recommendations of colleagues
     - Should we hold a vote, and would this be public?
     - Does department heads vote hold more weight than faculty members?
     - Who makes the ultimate call?
     - Should we do away with 5pt scale and go with 3pt scale?
   - Criteria needs to be established, this will clear up some things
   - Departments will establish guidelines for untenured faculty
   - Departments will establish their own criteria and then the Tenure and Promotion Committee will review and make changes
   - Concern about department heads and deans distributing merit raises from year to year merit amount pools
     - Rubrics and guidelines could be tied to merit pay
     - Could give higher % to faculty members who publish a book or receive a teaching award
     - Merit pay creates competition and can be viewed as toxic
     - Administration will give more input on this particular issue
     - What should be the initial steps? Is there a step that is more comfortable?
     - Could we give more awards to faculty? One per college for each academic year?
     - Should we focus on reaching 100% of CUPA before considering merit pay?

II. Academic Impressions Handbook Problems and Solutions:
   - New level of scholarship will be difficult
     - Will new faculty be hired for different standard?
     - Should we expect faculty with 30 years in and no publications produce a book?
Roll and scope - could have an issue with doctoral accreditation if we don’t raise scholarship from 10%-30% to 10%-40%

- This would allow 10% for people who need additional scholarship, but allows others to stay the same
- Need to better define scholarship, standards should be made clear
- What does 10% mean and is 90% enough?
- Department level should define what scholarship is
- Should we just have ratings and not weightings?
- Some professors may not have the resources that graduate professors have
- There is not incentive for increasing scholarship
- There has to be variability, some people can complete scholarship and some can be evaluated primarily as teachers

**Assessment Requirements**

- Cannot tie exact scores to student evaluations
- Professors should ask questions about their material and their assessment results
- It is not possible to teach today without considering assessment
- Assessment is more of a question of intention and quality
- It is a way for the Tenure and Promotion Committee to maintain standards and motivate faculty members
- The question is not, do you have student success? The question is, are you thinking about student success?

**Should each college have a Tenure and Promotion Committee, but have university wide check?**

- Survey revealed that most people want a University Tenure and Promotion Committee
- There needs to be a more defined 3rd year review and annual review should be tied to objective standards
- There should be immediate letters stating whether or not the professor will be recommended
- Department heads and deans should explain in detail their recommendation decision
- Criteria and standards need to be more defined
- Evaluations and 3rd year reviews should be more accurate and not inflated
- It is not fair to have faculty members in their 6th year with no clear understanding of their situation and standing, need paper trail
- Recommendations should be more uniform, everyone should use same scale to promote consistency

**Survey only reflected 46% of faculty population**

**Handbook is extension of contract**

- Handbook changes and updates will not affect faculty for 6 years
- Need to add examples to handbook in appendices
- What is most important and what pieces fit together best?
- Should general policies be removed from handbook? Should we have two separate sections?
Tenure and Promotion information should all be located in the same place
- No references in handbook
- Handbook should be available as an electronic document

III. Drafting Procedures:
- Initial draft - basic organizational
- Will request word process version of handbook
- First draft will be drafted by Dr. Jeff Woods
- If committee would like specific changes to the handbook they will email requests to Dr. Jeff Woods
- Side notes will be made in first draft
- Second step will involve the committee reviewing the document
- Once agreed upon Pat Chronister and Thomas Pennington will then review document
- Working draft will be sent to President, Vice President, Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate, and Faculty
- New survey will be generated to address controversial items and changes

IV. Meeting Schedule:
- Meetings will reconvene when first draft is completed