

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

9 December 2021 Zoom

We have quorum and meeting called to order at 11:01a

Special guest: Provost Hu

Provost acknowledges
VP Marissa Pagnatarro
Assoc Prov Elizabeth Weeks

Since lockdown we reacted with online in Spring/Summer
More options incl. hybrid/instructional modality in Fall
All efforts appreciated

Pandemic has created additional work (new types of teaching)
Fac/staff w/ childcare /family duties have experienced additional challenges

Provost has 3 items for discussion:

1. Covid related fac P&T
2. Promotion review COI. Some URC cttee have ambiguity in COI
3. Guidelines for P&T. Generally excellent. Last yr 1 case slight maj for promo with neg votes from college up. Even though maj vote was neg

Marisa: considered impact of covid on teaching and research, P&T and would like discussion/feedback

Provost:

(1) Tenure extension. 152 requests/approvals. Also available next year, so faculty arriving by Fall 2020 can request. Lecturers etc. with appointment term limit will also be eligible to request extension. Interest in another (2nd) extension is of interest from faculty - but unclear if this would get USG approval.

Some college surveys show some faculty have increased research output (~1/3), some say no impact (~1/3) and some have neg. impact (~1/3). How to apply longer term requests in an equitable year is an open question.

2 yr delay in promo = 2 yr salary delay. Other delays (e.g. family reasons) could mean long time in rank which might be perceived negatively if not explained in CV.

Prof Hill asked for clarification in years

1 yr extension available from Apr-Now (by Apr 2021 extension was avail for 1 yr)
And will run until June 2022.

But if you want a 2 yr extension, this needs presidential and USG approval (not guaranteed)

Prof Taha: what about lecturers?

Prof Weeks: Non TT who have time-in-rank limit should have eligibility for extension

Prof Hill: Has admin considered extension to post tenure review?

Provost: We have not. USG has working gp on this issue. CCRC faculty member (didn't catch the name) is a member of cttee. Awaiting feedback from the group. (Prof Weeks: would need USG approval).

Prof Dwivedi: is extension mandatory?

Provost: Moving forward on-schedule is fine. Going up early is another issue (standard required for only 4 yrs in rank is higher).

Prof Weeks: Faculty can ask for extension but not take it

Prof Hill: Annual evals. UC discussed supplying letter of context. Have Deans discussed this to advise dept. heads? esp. as covid (e.g. herd immunity) could be a long issue in US.

Prof Weeks: We have been meeting with Deans and are discussing this as are admin within units. This includes other non-covid impacts. Some discussion about including a generic statement from School/College in evals to acknowledge covid impacts even if not declared by faculty member. Also discussions have extended to how to consider teaching evals and CTL have issued advice to unit heads.

Prof Hill: Then good advice is to liaise with unit heads as they have some discretion on how to deal with this.

(2) COIs relating to P&T

How are external letters evaluated depending on COI, can faculty with COI vote on subject? Do co-authors/close collaborators vote/not vote?

Prof Hill: How have conversations gone with other Provosts?

Provost: Michigan requires external letters are from people defined at arm's length (all promo letters). This is as above (no co-author/collaborator) but includes Mentorship (e.g. postdoc advisor is not arm's length). Their letters can be considered but do not contribute to the minimum number of letters. Co-authors of reports (and similar; invitation to join working group etc.) can be exempted the co-author rule (as it is a positive indicator of standing). Dean can solicit pre-approval for such letter writers.

Prof Taha: If faculty feels they have a COI can they refuse to write/vote.

Provost: candidate identifies COI for exclusion (ext. letters). Within a dept. ruling out faculty is not common practice.

Prof Hill: Arm's length is applied at dept. And higher (college/uni)?

Provost: We may need to identify scenarios to clarify this

Prof. St. Pierre: Have we gathered peer institutes' practices more generally?

Prof Weeks: good idea, but not done yet. Our guidelines put the onus on the voter to recuse - and this is up for discussion. Recommend to disclose COI to chair (e.g. of Uni level voting cttee). But this is not yet in guidelines.

(3)

Faculty promotion consideration: a scenario

Recommend promotion?	PTU	College	URC	TOTAL
Yes	16	3	3	22
No	15	5	5	26
% Negative	48%	63%	63%	54%

Plausible example

According to current rules this get promotion

Provost: total votes cast are of majority neg

Idea is to promote discussion, not seeking a particular outcome

If it's 'just' promo, it only causes delay; if it's tenure too then there is a possibility to instead hire a stronger faculty.

Prof Taha: Could adjust college/URC size (to 6)

Prof Hill: Doesn't this vary by college?

Assoc Prov: Yes

Prof Grey: How to we as a committee proceed and address this with our faculty?

Prof Hill: Can look at peer and aspirational universities' practices and potentially revise guidelines.

Provost: is there faculty concern about difficulty to overturn slim majorities?

Prof St Pierre: Yes, but how common is it?

Prof Taha: I believe Provost should have power of veto

Provost (explaining process) : PTU (y/n) -> College (y/n) -> Dean (y/n) -> PTU (y/n) -> Provost signs to declare process was followed. He can urge President to decline, but this denies faculty appeal. President has final approval.

Increase in size of faculty, means URC has structure (life sci, soc sci, prof appl. studies).

Consistency is checked in the Provost's office.

Could allow a Provost vote, potentially coupled to URC.

Prof St. Pierre: PTU should have higher weight. But need to be responsible in acquainting themselves with P&T criteria.

Prof Weeks: Other Unis have a non-dept. Member on College/Dept(sorry didn't catch which?) committee

Provost could supply additional review.

Prof St. Pierre: Familiarity of guidelines should be urged by dept. Heads.

Prof. Pagnatarro: important for PTU head to address in letter why there were negative votes so that next step in the voting chain has context.

Prof. Dwiveldi: Are there specific instructions to this committee?

Provost: To consider ways to best deal with marginal cases.

Prof. Hill: We will include this in the agenda going forward (from Jan) to have robust discussion, and prepare for the meeting in Spring.

Provost (and VP leave)

Topic of revised doc on appointment/promo of Lecturer track

Prof Hill: Move lecturer topic up the agenda

Prof Huber: Lecturer doc has expanded voting on appt. And then parallels TT template.

Prof Santesso: for promo, I recall we added Assoc Prof to vote on Princ. Lect

Prof Huber: but was not approved at subcommittee level.

Prof Hill: Now back with this committee to vote

Prof Taha/Huber: Discussion on timing, which has implications on the criteria lecturers choose to be evaluated by during transition between documents.

Prof Santesso: Concerns about process. Sub com had agreed to add Assoc Prof, but there were also changes on senior lecturers voting on principal lecturers.

Prof Huber: We were asked to be consistent (from Sarah Covert)

Prof Santesso: Most consistent seems to be lecturer promo is by all TT fac and those on lec track at rank at or above. (as per 2017 doc)

Prof Huber: If you have suggestion, share opinions and copy me and we will study all rules and come back in Jan with suggestions.

Prof Hill: Prof Weeks and I will look at alignment of docs too.
January committee will be scheduled later in the month and in time to feed into other uni committees (e.g. exec).
Guidelines on which criteria lecturers use: currently they can use the old one (but would default to new).

Prof Santesso: Valuable to standardize processes on inclusion for votes on certain tracks.

Prof St Pierre: Some value in polling faculty more widely about how we think things should be done

Prof Harding: There are some initiatives/working groups ongoing

Prof Hill: Agree that faculty surveys would be valuable.

Prof Weeks/St Pierre: this is a national conversation.

Prof Huber: please send amendments on the doc to me so I can prepare a revised document for the committee.

Prof Hill: please also include me and Prof Weeks. As we're running out of time we might conclude.

Business on recently passed resolutions

Prof Santesso: Great that resolutions were passed and urge this to be communicated to dept. Heads as it impacts P&T, evals.

Prof Weeks: We may still be in the presidential veto phase or extension for Presidential review (e.g. for feasibility/USG compliance).

Prof Hill: I will check on this with UC to see where we are in that process.

Adjourned at 12:15p