February 21, 2008

TO: Provost’s Council

FROM: Judith M. Bowman
Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies

SUBJ: Provost’s Council Agenda for Tuesday, February 26, 2008

The Provost’s Council will meet on Tuesday, February 26 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. The following agenda items will be discussed.

1. Approval of the February 12 minutes (see attachment, p. 1-3)

2. Evaluation of Deans (see attachments: letter and current question banks, p. 4-7; instrument used for evaluation of associate dean, p. 8-10)

3. Faculty Senate Issue 2006/7-5, Revisions to Procedures for Promotion and Award of Tenure (see attachments: recommendation from the Faculty Senate, p. 11-22; issues and recommendations from ad hoc committee, p. 23-41)

4. Proposed Revisions to Undergraduate Continuance Regulations (see attachment, p. 42-44)

5. Summer School Offerings
The Provost’s Council met on Tuesday, February 12, 2008 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. Those present were Carol Simpson, Osman Akan, Nancy Bagranoff, Andrew Balas, Nancy Cooley, Chandra de Silva, Bill Drewry, Bill Graves, Phil Langlais, Ginny O’Herron, Chris Platsoucas, and Charles Wilson. The following agenda items were discussed.

1. The February 12 minutes were approved.

2. Evaluation of Deans

   Council members discussed the policy on evaluation of deans and the section of the policy calling for a review of the dean every three years by the full-time faculty in the college. They reviewed the questions used in past evaluations, the instrument used by the College of Business and Public Administration for the evaluation of the associate dean, and questions proposed by Bill Graves to be included in the University’s Quality of Life survey that is being developed. The deans noted that the policy does not include information about the duties of the deans and felt that faculty may not understand the role and responsibilities of the dean.

   Carol Simpson stated that the evaluation of deans by the full-time faculty will take place this spring. She will draft a set of questions for the evaluation for review by the deans.

3. Faculty Senate Issue 2006/7-5, Revisions to Procedures for Promotion and Award of Tenure

   Carol Simpson noted that there have been numerous changes to the policies on promotion and tenure during the last several years and that the policies are confusing. Thus, an ad hoc committee consisting of Nancy Bagranoff, Judy Bowman and Bill Drewry reformatted the policies to separate process from criteria and make the policies less confusing.

   Council members discussed the revisions proposed by the ad hoc committee, the addition of clinical faculty ranks from Andrew Balas, and revisions that have been recommended by the Faculty Senate. They approved the most recent revisions proposed by the Senate, which specify that the chair will consult with the dean on the list of external reviewers prior to initiating the review process and state that all members of departmental, college, and the University committee should vote yes or no.
Council members discussed section III.E.4 of the policy on tenure, which deals with shortening the probationary period in exceptional cases. They felt that the practice has been different and suggested the following revision.

The probationary period for tenure may be shortened in the case of exceptional merit and performance. It is the sense of the Board of Visitors that this procedure be followed only in the case of demonstrably exceptional faculty members. and that such early award of tenure be exceedingly rare.

Council members noted that the tenure policy currently reads that faculty who apply early for tenure and are rejected are allowed to apply again. The policy needs to be clear on this point so faculty know what they are facing. Carol Simpson asked the deans to look at the sections on early tenure and how the policy fits in each college.

Regarding the addition of clinical faculty ranks to the promotion policy, Carol Simpson asked the other deans to review the language to be sure it works for each college.

The two policies with all proposed revisions will be distributed to Committee F of the Faculty Senate, department chairs, the college promotion and tenure committees, and the University promotion and tenure committee for review. They will be asked to submit any input to Academic Affairs within three weeks. The comments will be consolidated and distributed to the faculty at large. Following review and input from the faculty, the comments will be brought back to the Provost’s Council for discussion and ultimately forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

Carol Simpson noted that there are issues related to joint appointments. She indicated that she will ask a small group to begin working on a separate document to deal with joint appointments. This document could be incorporated in the promotion and tenure policies or be an addendum.

4. Proposed Revisions to Undergraduate Continuance Regulations

Carol Simpson informed Council members that proposed revisions to the undergraduate continuance regulations have been forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review. The revisions allow students a third semester before suspension would occur. It is hoped that the revised policy will be implemented at the end of this semester.

5. Proposed Changes to the Student Disciplinary Policies and Procedures

Carol Simpson noted that the Office of Student Affairs has proposed changes to the student disciplinary policies and procedures. One of the changes
involves the revocation of the degree. A copy of the proposed changes will be sent to the deans.

6. Summer School Offerings

Discussion of this issue was deferred until the next meeting.