I. Faculty Senate Committees

Barry Gibson made it plain that any action taken by a FS committee has to come through the entire Faculty Senate first. FS committee chairs and/or members cannot negotiate directly with the administration. Dr. Eaton is very firm in her wish for all information and decisions to flow through the chain of command. Any FS committee member that proceeds on his or her own without the prior approval of the entire Faculty Senate will be considered to be acting on his or her own, and the consequences may be less than desirable.

II. Faculty Senate Tenure and Portfolio Revision Committee (FSTPRC) – progress report

Michael Flota, who was the chair of the FSTPRC last year, presented in lieu of Eduardo Divo, who is this year’s chair but was unable to attend.

The rest of the meeting consisted of a lively discussion of the proposal for revision of the Tenure and Promotion process. The basic outline of the proposal was presented, but there are quite a few details that need to be filled in. The highlights of the proposal at this point are:
a. Each faculty member will choose a mentor from his or her department, to be approved by the department chair
b. The departmental committee will consist of the mentor, another member of the department, and a member of the college-wide tenure and portfolio committee
c. The departmental committee will interview the candidate, review the candidate’s CV, and can request any documentation they wish.
d. If the committee decides that the candidate is ready to apply, the tenured faculty members of the candidate’s department will vote on whether the candidate should be allowed to proceed with his or her application
e. The committee decision (in letter format) and the vote results will then go to the department chair, who will review everything and write his or her own letter
f. The candidate’s CV and the departmental and chair letters will go to the college-wide committee
g. The candidate will still need to have documentation of all of his or her activities, but the documentation will not be presented to the college-wide committee unless they request further documentation
h. The candidate will be able to choose whether to focus on service or professional development/pedagogy in addition to teaching
i. It is likely that portfolios, documentation, etc. will soon be presented in electronic format, rather than paper format

Concerns that were expressed during the discussion included (but were not limited to):

a. In very small departments, the departmental voting could be problematic
b. If a chair is applying for promotion, how is that handled?
c. The timeline is unclear
d. How does a brand new faculty member know who to request as a mentor?

e. What if your department doesn’t like you personally?

f. Is this logistically possible?

g. Is this better, or just new?

h. The service/pedagogy/professional development section is unclear

The motion was made and seconded that for now, the process should move forward rather than being tabled completely. The motion carried. More detail on the process will be presented at the January Faculty Senate meeting. Barry stated that this will be Faculty Senate’s main focus for the remainder of this academic year, and workshops to hammer out the details might be a good idea. All agreed that the process will have to be finalized with detail in place and a smooth presentation ready before this is sent to the administration.

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held Wednesday, January 11, 2012, at 2:00 pm, in 110/102.

Respectfully submitted,

Rachel Owens

Faculty Senate Secretary