

1) Final Minutes, Faculty Senate Meeting, October 22, 2010

2) President Byrd called the meeting to order at 12:15.

a) *Byrd, Gary (President), Browning, Leigh (Vice President), Ambrose, Bartlett, Bigham, Branson, Commissiong, Davis, Dursun-Kilic, Friske, Holliday, Issa, Landram, Lee, Parr-Scanlin, Pendleton, Rosa, Vizzini, and Wilson were present. Mark Scala was substitute for Theresa Trela, Mary Rausch was substitute for Linda Chenoweth.*

3) Dr. J. Patrick O'Brien addressed the Senate to answer questions.

a) *Q: There are a lot of requirements for publication for tenure and promotion without sufficient funding for travel and research. How can new faculty achieve sufficient publication? How can they know what is needed and how to get it?*
A: There is no way to have set standards for everyone. What we need are college and departmental standards that are clearly articulates. Not all have done this and we need to get those done. Those standards need to be internally and externally consistent. They need to be fair and clear. Faculty handbook outlines need for Excellent and Outstanding. As for funding, we will never have enough. We always have budget constraints but we have increased departmental budgets. So the departments allocate for travel out of the budget. We are giving more support for research, too. The sine qua non for tenure and promotion is still excellence in teaching. No matter what else you do, if you do not have excellent teaching, you will not get promoted or tenure. Our mission is teaching. Research is different by disciplines, so each discipline needs to judge its own. We also need to look at whole period under review, so if one person gets publication requirements in one year and does nothing else, might not get tenure. Tenure is looking at the future – what will that person contribute in the future. Promotion is a reward for past contributions. For the last three tenure cycles, four had two articles, rest had more. Those four had in addition five presentations, book chapters, or books. So with two referred articles, had much more research, too. Performance-based faculty substitutes juried exhibits for refereed articles.

b) *Q: Since some colleges and departments do not have explicit guidelines, recent hires do not know what to do. What allowance should be made for individuals who were hired with one set of expectations who now face different expectation? Should they be judged by the old standards since it takes a long time to shift research?*

A: People hired recently have more publications than earlier cycles, so they are adjusting. Earlier people got an extension (plus release time) so they could catch up to new expectations. One was successful, one was not. If WT is to improve, we need to raise standards but will allow time for adjustment to take place. The Board of Regents will not accept files with no peer-reviewed scholarship.

Standards will continue to go up as WT gets better. We will never reach an end-point.

- c) *Q: Tenured professors may have excellent research and good teaching. But formula may not show this. Can we change the formula?*
A: Evaluators need to do a good job of evaluating. It is not the formula's fault. It is the application. We need to have student evaluations comprise no more than 25 percent of teaching evaluation. We need a better way to evaluate teaching. Board of Regents say we must include student evaluations, but if we had better system of peer and administrator evaluation, students evaluations would not be so vital. Students can't tell if you know your field, for example.
- d) *Q: Can we know more about the process of tenure and promotion at levels above college? Do higher levels just look at process or do they re-judge contributions?*
A: He has a spreadsheet, includes votes at each level, can see if there was consistency across levels. He has columns for articles, presentations, etc., for all the categories. If there is a zero in referred journal articles, the person will not get tenure. Faculty must be gatekeepers. President should never have to turn someone down.
- e) *Q: Tenure and Promotion procedure talks about process, not about expectations. Faculty need to know more about what is expected. Is there a need to put more in Faculty Handbook about criteria/expectations?*
A: Should not be in Faculty Handbook because one set cannot apply to all faculty. We can say to refer to department and college criteria.
- f) *Q: Can faculty going up look at successful folders from previous years?*
A: Yes, that is all public information. We need an effective mentoring system. Some already have good systems, others do not. Senior faculty members should know most about what is needed for promotion and tenure.
- g) *Q: What if the rest of your department does not understand your discipline or its processes?*
A: You may need to educate your colleagues.
- h) *Q: How can such a diverse college as FAH have equivalencies across disciplines? Some end-products may take five years or one year or two weeks.*
A: This is a matter for the departments. Expectations have to be different across the disciplines. Where the product gets published matters, too. We have to allow for subjective evaluation.
- i) *Q: What happens when the chair does not take everything into consideration?*
A: That is why we have levels of evaluation. You can go see your dean and Provost.
- j) *Q: Where do we stand on standards? Some departments did this in 2008 but are still not approved.*
A: The Provost's Office is looking at them. Too many have the same weight for

everything. You need to give different weights to different disciplines and products. Revise and resubmit if necessary.

k) *Q: What do you see as Faculty Senate's role in making the tenure and promotion process work better?*

A: They have revised the processes. Now various groups need to make suggestions how to make it better. Faculty handbook committee also involved, as are department heads and deans. Senate is just one source for suggestions. Hopes that we don't try to start over – we need consistency. Just need tweaks now to make it work most smoothly. Need a consistent message to all incoming faculty.

- 4) Motion to approve minutes: motion to approve Commissiong, second by Wilson, approved.
- 5) Announcements: Remnant Trust roundtable November 18. Two visiting artists are coming in next week and staying until November 3. They will be lecturing in art history room, we can also go watch them work.
- 6) How many people are in tenure process and how many have been turned down and for what reason? Byrd will find out from Dr. Hallmark.
- 7) Discussion about departmental standards being available. We don't even know if our standards have been approved. Byrd – it needs to be easily available, all in one place.
- 8) Discussion about mentoring.
- 9) Faculty Senators see if they can find departmental standards and send them to President Byrd. One from each college will see if Dean has them. Vice President Browning is coordinating that.
- 10) Byrd reminded the group that he had asked senators to write down the tasks we could take on to improve tenure and promotion. Based on comments today, each senator needs to send Byrd a succinct statement of how Senate should proceed on the broad issue of Tenure and Promotion. We also need to consider the weight of each level of the process. Byrd will ask Provost more about that.
- 11) Adjourn at 1:30