

UHD Faculty Senate

Minutes recorded by: Sandra Dahlberg

October 3, 2017; 2:32-3:55 pm

Room A300

Senate: Carolyn Ashe, Susan Baker, Ray Cao, Luis Cedeno, Travis Crone, Sandra Dahlberg, David Epstein, Shannon Fowler, Trevor Hale, Ruth Johnson, Karen Kaser, Cynthia Lloyd, Paul Mandell, Kendra Mhoon, Creshema Murray, Mitsue Nakamura, Rebecca Quander, Vida Robertson, Jacqueline Sack, Rachna Sadana, Clete Snell, Benjamin Soibam, Nell Sullivan, Doug TeDuits, Michael Tobin, Hsiao-Ming Wang, Joan Wedes, Pat Williams, and Zehai Zhou

Regrets: Beverly Alford, Michael Duncan, Jillian Hill

Absent:

Guests: Juan Muñoz, President; Faiza Khoja, AVP AA; Jerry Johnson, AVP Research; Akif Uzman, Dean CST; Jerry Johnson, AVP Research; Pat Ensor, Dir. Library; Tyra Hessel, Ombuds; Volodymr Hrynkiv, MS; Jonathan Davis, GBMSC; Michelle Moosally, ENG; Paul Kintzele, ENG; Azar Rejaie, A & C; Susan Henney, SOS; Lucy Bowen, AA; Darlene Hodge, FS.

Call to Order: The Senate was called to order at 2:32pm by Senate President Trevor Hale.

Minutes

Minutes of the September 19, 2017 Senate meeting were approved.

Announcements

Hale reported that SCHs (paid and not paid) are up 0.4 percent, but that actual revenue figures will be forthcoming.

Hale said that there were logistical issues with the program (signupgenious) that he tried to use for subcommittee self-placement. New electronic requests will be forthcoming.

Hale and Wang attended the UFEC meeting on September 29. The system's senate leadership shared information about current funding levels and cycles.

Presentations

Shared Governance Policy Process Committee

Davis, representing the UHD Shared Governance Policy Process Committee, presented to the Senators the policy process flowchart that the committee prepared. The flowchart was created to provide a visual map of the policy process for all policy stakeholders. **See attached flowchart.** Moosally suggested that the Faculty Senate and UHD administration endorse the flowchart. The senators

supported this suggestion and Hale will have FSEC prepare language to present at the next Senate meeting. Moosally also suggested that the Shared Governance Policy Process Committee prepare prose that describes how changes can be made to the process. Most members of the SHGPP Committee were present (Davis, Baker, Dahlberg, Khoja), and they will work on this statement and distribute it.

Discussion of the Rank and Tenure Policy draft

As a result of the discussions at the September 19 Senate meeting, and in response to faculty questions, FSEC decided to devote the majority of this Senate meeting to the Rank and Tenure Policy now undergoing revision. Hale asked Henney, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, to provide an overview of the issues that guided the revisionary process, and she also provided a recap of FAC's actions last year (the 2016-2017 academic year). The main points FAC considered were:

- Adjusting the tenure clock and/or providing for family leave in cases of illness or the birth/adoption of children
- Whether or not to allow electronic voting in R & T, and/or electronic participation in R & T Deliberations
- Criteria by which promotions are considered at both the assistant to associate (and tenure) level, and at the associate to full level
- The optional use of R & T subcommittees
- A requirement that only full professors evaluate and vote on candidates for full professor
- A requirement that only full professors serve on the University R & T Committee

Henney noted that FAC held two town-hall meetings on the Rank and Tenure policy last year. She also said that at the end of the spring semester, FAC voted to send the policy forward to the Academic Affairs Council for consideration.

Several senators were surprised that the policy was forwarded to AAC since faculty, certainly at the May 2 Senate meeting, were told that the work on the policy would continue in the fall semester (now), and because there was a great deal of resistance to implementing a full-on-fulls practice here at UHD. Sullivan pointed out that FAC is proposing full-on-full R & T subcommittees of 5 full professors, but most departments (8 of 13) do not have 5 full professors in them. Even if, as the policy proposes, departments that do not have 5 full professors use full professors from other departments in their college, there are still not enough full professors to provide sufficient coverage. For instance, CHSS has 15 full professors for 4 academic departments. (See attached list.) Sullivan added that this practice will not address concerns about *quid pro quo* because outside full professors will lack the disciplinary expertise and could be overly swayed by department fulls in ways that more informed associate professors in the department would not be. She also expressed concern that this substantially increases the workload for full professors at a time when all faculty, including fulls, are overworked. Rejaie also noted that retirements deplete the number of full professors in a department and in a college, and that until we have more full professors the move to fulls-on-fulls seems premature. Sullivan, who was voicing concerns from English faculty, said that until we have more full professors we should leave the policy as is, and allow associates to vote on full professor portfolios.

In response to Hale's assertion that other institutions have only fulls voting on fulls, several senators noted that UHD is not a Tier 1/Research 1 university. We are primarily a teaching institution and our policies should support and reflect the actual UHD environment now.

Sullivan expressed concern about the full-on-full provision establishing a back-door to changing the Appointment of Department Chair's Policy (PS 10.A.17) so that only full professors could serve as department chairs. [The Chair's Policy is currently slated for revision.]

Several senators expressed concerns that the fulls procedures would increase the number of grievances if there was limited disciplinary input. Baker said that she had received a number of emails from faculty who were angry that this policy was before AAC when faculty had been told it was not ready for an AAC vote, and that many faculty were against the full-on-full provisions.

Crone said that the language regarding recusals on subcommittees needs to be clearer as does the language on abstentions. Specifically, Crone wanted to know how recusals and abstentions could impact voting on promotion files.

Kintzele suggested that we keep our present Rank and Tenure process, but change it so that the votes of full professors have more weight (on portfolios for full professor) than the votes of associate professors.

Murray wanted to know why FAC proposed changes to the University Rank & Tenure Committee so that only full professors served on that committee. Henney replied that the change was made to provide consistency with the full-on-full provision as University Rank & Tenure reviews faculty moving from associate to full professor.

Moosally expressed concern about the lack of consistency the subcommittees would provide for junior faculty from year to year since the subcommittee provision could mean that junior faculty could be evaluated by different senior faculty at each evaluation stage (2nd year, 4th year, tenure) and she was worried that the subcommittee provision doesn't provide a framework to ensure junior faculty are consistently and fairly evaluated across time.

TeDuits asked if 3.5.1.1. comes from the UH System (SAM) and what legal counsel said about the provision that only one parent (if both worked at UHD) could take the parental leave since the FMLA allows parents to split the leave time. He also said the policy does not clearly distinguish between parental leave time and the tenure clock time. Crone wanted to know if we could stop the clock for both parents under existing law, and if we could, why not allow that option for both parents at UHD. Hale suggested that we ask legal about the parameters of leave and stop-the-clock options. TeDuits suggested that we draft the question beforehand. Hale said that FSEC would draft the question, and asked TeDuits to assist FSEC in that process.

Fowler wanted more information about the process for obtaining outside evaluations for a tenure or promotion file, and who would have access to external letters included in the file. Sadana and Ashe

wanted language in the policy that disallowed the insertion of materials or letters into the file without the candidate's knowledge or permission.

This was a lively discussion and Hale reminded senators that this is not the last chance to review and comment on the Rank and Tenure policy. J. Johnson reminded senators of the policy process flowchart and reiterated that this should not be the last time the policy is discussed. He also suggested that faculty contact their AAC representatives with comments or feedback. Hale announced that the Rank & Tenure policy is on AAC's agenda for the next meeting.

Old Business

Hale reviewed the "Administrative Adjustments" that were presented at the last Senate meeting on the year's Senate Agenda. He would like the Senate to vote on the items, perhaps individually. Since time was short and questions were raised about the objectives behind these items, Fowler moved to table the discussion and Robertson seconded the motion. The issue will be addressed at the next Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm.

The next Senate meeting is on October 17, 2017.