

October 24th, 2022
Business Meeting Minutes

Via Teams

In attendance: President Maxwell, Secretary Killman, Past-President Luna, President-Elect Allen, Senators Comer, Loftis, Manginelli, Reames, SSmith, Null, Isbell, Turner, Hasan, Smith-Andrews, Brachey, Fornehed, Park, Upole, Meadows, Spears, Weathers, Lee, Mullen, Hajdik, Langford, Burch, TSmith, Alley, Mills, Craven, Witcher, Winkle, Adams, Rajabali, Hutson, Canfield, Sisk, O'Conner, Pickering, Shipley, Howard, Crockett, Hermann-Turner, Rand, Ojo, Allcott, Fennewald, Liu

Guests: Senior Associate Provost Mark Stephens

Absent: Senators Duncan, Swartling, Frye, Ding

Call to Order:

President Maxwell called the meeting to order at 3:35pm. Motion to approve the agenda as presented by Senator Smith-Andrews second Senator Mills. Agenda vote passed unanimously. First order of business, Senior Associate Provost to discuss promotion policy 206.

Topic: Policy 206

Comments: Dr. Stephens

Thank Senator Luna for assisting in putting the committee together. Recognize members who have worked since first of march - Senators Null, Meadows and Fornehed and Tom Timmerman and Doug Talbert. Revision of policy 206 began in March, 2022. Had 3 goals: 1. Bring Policy 206 and procedures and forms into alignment with recently revised policy 205 – Faculty tenure. 2. Incorporate tenured instructors and lecturers into policy 206. 3. Simplify and clarify existing policy. A lot of changes are editorial but a few are more noteworthy changes: provide a clearer definition of peers. define the role of faculty (3b page 2 of clean copy). Note the ranks and statement included related to who is a peer. Wanted to address prior service credit, which must be negotiated at time of hire and is included in the contract. Prior service credit toward tenure is also considered for promotion unless clearly stated otherwise. Promotion criteria – pivotal role that faculty peers have in the evaluation process. All full-time faculty members are expected to engage in all the areas of responsibility but not at the same level or degree. Peers have primary responsibility for evaluating the quality of faculty performance relative to appointment to or promotion in academic rank. Last major change is deleting the old appeal to faculty affairs and made the appeal process the same as the tenure policy.

Question:

Related to change in the appeals process and the faculty affairs committee...can you explain the reasoning behind taking the faculty affairs committee out of the appeals process for tenure and promotion?

Answer:

Took the appeal procedure from the tenure committee and tried to align with that. Wanted to make sure the processes were matched up. Cannot address how it was changed in policy 205.

Question:

Is this finalized already or is that part of why you are here today?

Answer:

That's partly why I'm here today. In all likelihood if we were to go with different one, it might bring us back to the tenure policy later. The 2 should align very closely.

Comment:

There is a movement trying to get that appeal process back into the tenure policy.

Discussion continued related to the appeals process being moved from faculty affairs committee with faculty wanting to know why. The purpose of faculty affairs committee is in majority of hearing appeals related to tenure and/or promotion. Maybe tenure policy should align to this policy and leave it with faculty affairs.

Question:

Why is the doctor of juris prudence degree not considered a terminal degree? Is there an external force that defines those for us?

Answer:

In some disciplines there are accrediting bodies that make those distinctions, but that has been the understanding going forward, really not a change, just wanted to make it obvious.

Discussion continued related to juris prudence being a terminal degree. TTU can hire JDs as instructors and adjuncts but not tenure-track faculty. Some schools in the state do hire JDs on tenure-track. The committee will look into it further.

Question:

Issue of people getting tenure before promotion...have there been any discussions on your committees to clarify this?

Answer:

Going forward, not likely cases of people being tenured without going up for promotion.

Comment:

Policy doesn't say faculty can't get tenure without promotion. Tenure tends to look forward and promotion is more so what you've done. Cases of faculty being marketable even if they don't have 5 years in rank. Consequences of vote on promotion not as severe as on tenure.

Question:

Can someone who is not promotable to associate get tenure? It's an area of uncertainty. There has been a lot of discussion.

Answer:

COVID has created situation where timing for some might be somewhat changed.

Discussion continued related to policy 206 with consideration about the faculty affairs committee as well as criteria for judging people based on the rank that they are going to. Accomplishment or potential to achieve was also considered. Potential is much more toward tenure than promotion. When someone is tenured, they will have the opportunity to perform and attain higher ranks. Some departments have internal requirements for promotion and additional for tenure, but not all. Colleges can supersede the university policy with higher standards/requirements, not lower. Policy 206 does not

address new hires. Administrators are hired with tenure and rank of professor and dossier is reviewed by the department that will tenure them. There needs to be some language in some policy related to these type hires/appointments.

Tenure and have different criteria for tenure and promotion. Tenure vs associate professor. In dept chairs meeting it was made clear that Provost believes in promotion to associate and tenure to be the same criteria. Promotion involves different ranks at different levels. Promoting early can cause an issue related to tenure. Tenure and promotion for assistant to associate are consistent. Tenure goes to the board. Combining tenure and promotion is a conversation to have with the Provost and the President.

Tenure is based on promise, promotion is based on accomplishment. Not the same but could happen at the same time.

Question:

Hired as associate and now seeking tenure, are requirements for tenure the same as if they had come in as assistant?

Answer:

It seems to me that tenure requirements would be the same for someone who was hired as associate and someone hired as assistant.

Question:

Is the tenure policy currently under review?

Answer:

No, it's not up for review for another 2 or 3 years. Should come up in 2024.

Comment:

Today's discussion has been very helpful.

President Maxwell: Thank you for this very productive discussion. We appreciate being included.

Should we include additional guests to the meeting next week with the President? Provost Bruce? CFO Stinson?

Question:

What would we want to accomplish if we were to invite Dr. Stinson next week?

Answer:

Could pose the questions to the President or to the CFO.

Comment:

When we met at breakfast with the Trustees the notion of no confidence was at least discussed. Giving opportunity that accomplishes nothing is a waste of time.

Discussion continued related to who should be invited to the next meeting. Points were made that we've been given access to the audit, so isn't it our turn to respond? And to whom do we want to respond? The president. The proper interface for senators was the breakfast, as comments were heard throughout the day. Conversations from the breakfast with the Trustees were discussed and shared. HR

should be looking after employees. How does one paint a wall the wings up way in order to get a raise? This is a time for us to dialogue with the President. Chair Harper has offered to attend the meeting. Have to be careful and strategic going forward. Questions about leadership and faith in leadership are questions that audit will never address. We are on the verge of distrust in leadership/administration. The failures in this case are the CFO and the head of HR. The buck stops at the President. What is his plan to address the universities lack of confidence in the CFO? We are no longer under audit, so some previous questions that President Oldham deferred can be asked now. Questions will go out to senate tomorrow for review. Senators are encouraged to submit questions for the President. We will send them on to the President. Let's insist that the questions are taken in order and not skip over/around. President Maxwell will ask the questions.

Such Other Matters

None

Motion to Adjourn by Senator Rand and the meeting ended at 5:20pm.

Respectfully submitted by Christy Killman