

1998

AY 1997/1998 FS meetings minutes: 1997-12-10 [Special Meeting]

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 1997/1998 FS meetings minutes: 1997-12-10 [Special Meeting]" (1998). *Faculty Senate Archives*. Paper 9.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/9

This Agenda/Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

University of South Florida Tampa Campus Library

USF Faculty Senate Archives

FS Minutes - 10 Dec 97

FACULTY SENATE SPECIAL MEETING

December 10, 1997

MINUTES

President Moore called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

This special meeting was called to specifically address the topic of tenure and promotion and the changes proposed that have been generated by the Provost's office. President Moore reviewed the guidelines for the Senators to use in conducting their group discussions. After this meeting, the material will be taken to the SEC who will refine it and provide feedback to the Senators next semester. President Moore emphasized that this is not the time to act on any of these proposed changes, but to take the time to think about them and make suggestions for improvements. The Senators then dispersed into five small discussion groups based upon the following proposed changes:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Group A: | Chris Ponticelli (Group Leader)
Institutional Guideline for Tenure and Promotion
Review of Progress Toward Tenure |
| Group B: | Julian Dwornik (Group Leader)
Tenure at the Time of Hire
Lengthening the Probationary Period |
| Group C: | Ann Cranston-Gingras (Group Leader)
Defining Institutional Norms
Exceptions to the Standard Probationary Period |
| Group D: | Sara Mandell (Group Leader)
Faculty Review Board |
| Group E: | Louis Bowers (Group Leader)
Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership
External Letters for Tenure and Promotion
Applications |

LARGE GROUP DISCUSSIONS

After spending 45 minutes in small group discussions, the group leaders presented their group's comments and recommendations.

Group A: Chris Ponticelli (Group Leader)

1. Institutional Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Provost's Proposed Change:

Tenure and promotion in the professorial ranks will be granted only to persons of significant achievement, especially in teaching and scholarship. As a minimum standard for tenure and/or promotion, there must be evidence of strong performance in both teaching and scholarship and outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. In addition, other contributions to the University will be considered. In individual cases where it is demonstrated that there has been meritorious professional service through which the faculty member has achieved distinction in the profession, such service may also receive significant weight.

There was concern from some group members about service having such low consideration and being devalued. Some discussion was on having the teaching, research and service components to carry equal weight and that an outstanding be required in one of the areas. A possible language change would occur if we adapt the two-tiered system of teaching and research, with service being a minor component.

Discussion was held regarding the existing procedure for review by the department chair and peer review in the annual evaluation of every faculty member and adding to that a midterm review at the college or department level (vs. the presented proposal). Various viewpoints were debated, and no clear consensus on this issue was evident from the Senators present. It was agreed that the information obtained at this meeting on each issue be incorporated with the proposed changes from the Provost's office to be forwarded to the SEC. The SEC, in turn, will refine these recommendations and bring them back to the full Faculty Senate.

2. Review of Progress Toward Tenure

Provost's Proposed Changes:

The Regents have called for a comprehensive review of progress toward tenure during the probationary period, ordinarily no later than the third year of service. The following procedure is proposed:

For those faculty appointed with the full probationary term it is proposed that during the first year of the probationary period, the pre-tenure review will be conducted by the unit's tenure and promotion committee and the department chairperson or other appropriate administrator. During the second year of the probationary period, the pre-tenure review will in addition include the college or college/campus tenure and promotion committee and the college campus dean. During the third year, the review of progress toward tenure will in addition include the Provost. In subsequent probationary years, the dean will determine the review bodies to be involved at the college campus level. All reviews shall address the performance of annual assignments including teaching, research/creative activity, and service occurring during the preceding tenure-earning years of employment.

If an individual is credited with tenure-earning service at the time of initial appointment, the initial review of progress toward tenure at the provost's level will be conducted at the approximate midpoint of the probationary period.

The consensus of the small group was to simplify the process by:

- a. First year - review of candidate should be done only by the chair, because it is a person's first year and it is not necessary to go beyond that
- b. Second year - department T & P committee and the chair do a formal T & P evaluation
- c. Third year - Since it takes a few years to get things moving, a T&P evaluation should be made at the department and the college level. The college level evaluation should either be by the dean and/or the college T & P committee. If an additional level of going to the Provost's office is to be incorporated, then some questions to be answered include: What would the role of the Provost's office be, how would the person be evaluated, how long would the process take, and, what type of feedback would be received?

d. After the third year, the group felt that it was a moot point to do any other T & P evaluation beyond the annual review; the faculty member should be given the time to do what needs to be done.

e. When a faculty member is hired with time served, this group would like to see the mid-point review for that person not go to the Provost's level, but to stop at the college level. The rationale for this was that junior faculty should be evaluated by those who are experts in the candidate's field, which is the department and then its college. To go beyond that would be counterproductive to the candidate, as well as expecting the Provost's office to know everyone's specialty.

Group B: Julian Dwornik (Group Leader)

3. Tenure at the Time of Hire

Provost's Proposed Changes:

The Regents have asked universities to formalize the process for recommending the award of tenure at the time of hire. The following procedures are proposed:

In determining the award of tenure at the time of hire, the guiding principle will be to follow departmental and college, or campus procedures. Specifically, there must be review of tenure eligibility at all levels. Approval must be obtained from the Provost's Office prior to making an offer that includes tenure without a probationary period. The Provost must receive the following information by September 1st in order to prepare the materials for consideration at the November Board of Regents meeting:

- *written statement(s) of review of tenure eligibility at all levels (dean, chair, department/ campus faculty)--these reviews must occur prior to a request to the Provost to make such an offer, although written statements may follow approval*
- *candidate's vita*
- *official starting date for the position*
- *copy of the letter of offer, which has explicit mention of the tenure offer*
- *copy of the acceptance letter*
- *brief statement on the unique achievements of the employee which support the basis for tenure.*

It was the consensus of this small group that the guidelines should provide ample opportunity for departmental review of tenure offers to administrators and others at the time of hire comparable to that of tenure-track academic candidates. The second point was the issue of the timing for the process of approval of tenure offers, coordination of department, dean, provost, etc. If a time period is spelled out in the guidelines with regard to the dean and provost's recommendations on the tenure offers at the time of hire, these time lines may have some negative impact on the opportunity to get a worthy candidate. Currently, the proposal is that the dean and provost have until September 1 to make a final decision. This late date causes the department a necessary delay in hiring, which may cause worthy candidates to withdraw their applications. An earlier date is needed in order to have a decision for the candidate before the beginning of the academic year.

4. Lengthening the Probationary Period

Provost's Proposed Changes:

Lengthened probationary periods have been adopted by a number of universities including major land grant universities (e.g., Michigan State), distinguished research universities (e.g., Stanford), and numerous professional schools of business and medicine. The rationale is that the lengthened probationary period provides a more reliable basis for predicting sustained productivity in teaching, research, and service and thus enables a more rigorous judgment on the award of tenure. Further, it has been argued that the shorter term does not provide a faculty member with sufficient time in which to build a record of accomplishment that merits an award of tenure given rising standards for faculty performance, the lengthening of journal reviews and publication cycles, and the increased emphasis being

placed on teaching and curricular innovation. The lengthened time is also reported to be viewed positively by women faculty members whose tenure years often coincide with childbearing years.

The Deans feel that the benefits to both the institution and to individual faculty warrant giving the most serious consideration to lengthening the probationary period at USF to at least _____ years.

Since this issue is currently being collectively bargained, it could not be addressed at this time.

Group C: Ann Cranston-Gingras (Group Leader)

5. Defining Institutional Norms

Provost's Proposed Changes:

It would be desirable to establish institutional norms for candidacy for Associate Professor and Professor and for the tenure judgement. Decisions on tenure and promotion prior to these expected times should be considered "early decisions." Early decisions should be identified and justified as such at every review level. Truly exceptional performance should be required for a favorable early decision. Further, external reviewers should be advised of the University's expectations for a favorable early decision.

The group felt that discussions regarding institutional norms and early decisions should be separate issues, except for those individuals with special circumstances. For tenure, norms should be established as requirements subject to exception because the group felt the tenure norms were different from the promotion norms. For promotion, the norms should serve as general guidelines, but not as minimal requirements. To reflect this recommendation, the language under "e" on page 7 was changed to read: "As a general guideline, promotion to the rank of Professor is considered after 5 years of service at the rank of Associate Professor." The word "required" was removed from the original statement.

6. Exceptions to the Standard Probationary Period

Provost's Proposed Changes:

Ordinarily, a faculty member in a tenure-earning position will either be awarded tenure at the end of the probationary period or be given notice that further employment will not be offered. However, exceptions to the tenure clock may be considered in some circumstances. A faculty member in a tenure earning position may request in writing to be appointed temporarily to a non-tenure earning position without loss of salary or benefits (1) to care for the employee's child following birth or placement for adoption or foster care (includes step, foster, legal ward, or other child for whom the employee stands in place of a parent); (2) to care for the employee's spouse, child, household member, or parent (includes the biological parent of an employee or an individual who stands in loco parentis or stood in loco parentis to an employee when the employee was a child) when that individual experiences a serious health condition; or (3) for a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the employee's job even with a reasonable accommodation. The request must be made in writing and approved by the chair/director of the department/school, dean, and Provost. Following the period of appointment to a non-tenure earning position, the faculty member will return to the tenure earning position without qualification and the tenure clock will resume.

The group raised the question about what other unique, time-limited circumstances a person might have, such as being called to work at the National Science Institute for a year or two, or if someone's spouse had a unique one-year opportunity and that person would like an extension in order to accompany the spouse.

Group D: Sara Mandell (Group Leader)

7. Faculty Review Board

Provost's Proposed Changes:

It is proposed that the University establish a Faculty Review Board (FRB) to assist in the review of tenure and/or promotion (TAP) applications. The Board would consist of six non- administrative, tenured full professors selected by the Faculty Senate. The FRB will review cases upon request by the candidate or the Provost. The review will occur only after completion of all department/college campus TAP processes and discussion of the case by the dean and provost. The FRB will review the referred TAP application and interview the candidate; the FRB may interview other relative parties in the process. Following its review, the FRB will inform the provost and faculty member in writing of its findings and recommendation. All recommendations from the FRB will be advisory to the Provost.

Overall, the group felt that a Faculty Review Board (FRB) is a good idea with certain changes to be made. The following recommendations were made by this group to the proposed changes: A Faculty Review Board (FRB) will be established to conduct the review of contested tenure and promotion (TAP) applications. The Board would consist of a representative from each college, said representative to be non- administrative and a tenured full professor nominated and elected by the Faculty Senate to serve on staggered, three-year terms. The review will occur only after completion of all department/college/campus TAP processes. The FRB will review the referred TAP application and interview the candidate and, if necessary, other relevant parties. This review should be a part of a Step 1 grievance whenever applicable with the Board serving as the Step 1 hearing officer. Following its review, the FRB will inform the provost and faculty member in writing of its findings and recommendations. Recommendations from the Review Board will be binding on the Provost."

It was later recommended by the Senators that the word "binding" not be used in this context since this board would be acting in an advisory capacity; therefore, it is not appropriate.

Senator Mandell indicated that the FRB should not operate in an advisory capacity to the Provost, but rather as a Step 1 hearing officer. These persons would be tenured full professors with the highest degree in their fields who would be hearing the case. If the board is advisory to the Provost after the he has already turned down the candidate, there would be no other reason for the candidate to come before this Board, rather the candidate is sent back to the person(s) who turned he/she down in the first place. Since tenure and promotion is given by the President of the university and the BOR, there is a higher evaluation than that of the review board. This board would consist of non- administrative faculty to function as a faculty committee. In this manner, the final decision would be made by the President and not by the Provost.

Discussion was held regarding the right of the candidate to know why people voted the way they did on their tenure and promotion decisions, especially the Provost's decision.

Provost Tighe explained the reason for having a Faculty Review Board. In difficult cases where there is a split decision, it is an effort to get a fuller, faculty perspective on the issue. It can also give the faculty member an opportunity to have broader input from faculty in an advisory capacity rather than just those who were originally involved in the difference, per se.

Discussion was held as to whether or not to have this additional board. It was suggested that there could be an institutional process whereby the Provost could call upon a committee selected by the Senate as he sees fit. That is, an institutionalized committee that would be "on call" to assist the Provost in making a final decision in the few difficult cases that do arise. Another suggestion was made to keep the FRB as a grievance process to work in consultation with the Provost on split decision cases. The general discussion of the Senators was to let the Provost set up this board to function in an ad hoc capacity to advise him with the few difficult cases he receives. It would be comprised of senior faculty taken from across the university who would bring a broader perspective to the decision.

Group E: Louis Bowers (Group Leader)

8. Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership

Provost's Proposed Changes:

When establishing Tenure and Promotion Committees, departments, schools, and colleges, whenever possible, should

adhere to the following criteria:

- a. *Membership on committees should be (s)elected from tenured faculty who have been at the University of South Florida for at least two years;*
- b. *Those eligible to elect committees should be department, school college, or campus members who hold tenure-track appointments.*
- c. *Terms of committee members ordinarily should not exceed three years with staggering of terms to provide committee continuity;*
- d. *Turnover of committee membership should be encouraged through restrictions on consecutive terms;*
- e. *Individuals serving on more than one advisory committee (e.g., department, school, college, or campus) should vote at only one level or in one capacity on any candidate underconsideration. Chairs who serve on college committees should vote as the chair of the department only.*

The small group's consensus was for the following changes to the proposed:

- a. Membership at USF for at least two years and tenured at USF. (Above was changed for clarification.)
- b. - d. okay as written
- e. Should replace the first sentence: Faculty members who have dual appointments shall vote at the first level of appointment only. (Above statement provides clarity with fewer words.)

Add (f) The Committee for promotion to full professor shall consist of full professors and associate professors, if necessary. (Promotion to full professor was covered under the first five guidelines.) (Senators felt the "if necessary" should be spelled out to say "if there are not sufficient full professors to fill the committee.")

9. External Letters for Tenure and Promotion Applications

Provost's Proposed Changes:

The department chair ordinarily will include in the tenure and promotion application packet a minimum of five letters from external referees who are expert in the individual's field or a related scholarly field, at least two of whom are chosen from a list of five or more referees suggested by the candidate and two of whom are chosen from a list of five or more referees suggested by the department chair and/or the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Such letters of reference should be in the candidate's file prior to the final recommendations by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. All solicited reference letters which are received must be included in the candidate's file. At a minimum, instructions to external referees should:

- (a) *include a curriculum vita,*
- (b) *offer the candidate's publications on request,*
- (c) *make an explicit statement of what the candidate is being considered for and whether or not the decision is mandatory with respect to tenure,*
- (d) *ask for comparisons to peers at similar stages of development,*
- (e) *ask for an assessment of the quality of major scholarship and, if appropriate, of teaching and professional service,*
- (f) *seek an explicit recommendation on the decision at hand,*
- (g) *include a sentence such as the following: "Under Florida Freedom of Information statute, candidates have access to such files;"*
- (h) *specify any special circumstance that may bear on the judgment at issue;*
- (i) *include a copy of the institution's and the unit's tenure and promotion criteria.*

The small group's consensus was for the following changes to the proposed:

The department chair ordinarily will include in the tenure and promotion application packet a minimum of five letters from external referees who are experts in the individual's field or a related scholarly field. The candidate

will identify five reviewers who will receive a packet; 3 must be returned.

- (a) okay
- (b) offer copies of the candidate's publications (Eliminates the outside reviewer having to request candidate's publications.)
- (c) make an explicit statement of what the candidate is being considered for (omit rest of sentence)
- (d) remove entirely (Comparisons would depend on standards at the evaluator's university.)
- (e) Take out "if appropriate of teaching and" (An outside reviewer would not be in a position to evaluate the candidate's teaching.)
- (f) Remove "explicit" from the sentence. (An explicit request would grant decision making power to the outside reviewer.)
- (g) Did not have time to address.
- (h) Did not have time to address.
- (i) standardized letter should be used throughout the university (Recommendation for a standardized letter was added by the group.)

Discussion was held regarding having something about a "one person, one vote" rule being added to the guidelines. That is, if a person is on the tenure and promotion committee within their department, they do not vote as a faculty member. They should vote once and only once on each candidate. However, Senator Banoob felt that faculty members should be allowed to vote more than once, particularly in small departments. No consensus among the Senators was reached at this time.

The "one person, one vote" rule should apply to chairs. A chair does not vote as a faculty member, but only as a chair. A person should be allowed to vote at the lowest appropriate position; that is, if you are a member of the tenure and promotion committee, you vote at that level, etc. It was felt that this would protect the candidate, as well as reducing the number of grievances being filed on the basis of people voting multiple times on one's credentials. There was disagreement in that some Senators felt if a person votes only once, this discourages continuity. Others felt that there is a difference between a chair's vote as a chair and as a faculty member.

Discussion was held as to the meaning of a scholarly field – total discipline, sub-discipline. External reviewers should be people who are familiar with the candidate's field of study.

President Moore encouraged Senators to submit their ideas in writing to the Faculty Senate Office. The information from this meeting will be put into a document that will be taken to the SEC for discussion at its meeting on January 14th. Eventually the materials will come back to the Faculty Senate at large to be reviewed for specific recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.



© *University of South Florida Library - Special Collections Department, 1998*



Last Modified