August 23, 2013

TO: Provost’s Council

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

SUBJ: Provost’s Council Agenda for Tuesday, August 27

The Provost’s Council will meet on Tuesday, August 27 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 July 25 minutes (see attachment, p. 1-2)

2. External Program Reviews (see attachments, p. 3-17)


4. Proposed Revisions to the Schedules for Faculty Seeking Tenure and for Faculty Seeking Tenure Mid-Year (see attachments, p. 46-49)

5. Concerns from the Faculty Senate on the Revised Calendar for Summer School (see attachments, p. 50-54)

6. Outside Employment Involving Teaching or Consulting for Another Institution for Administrative and Professional Faculty and Classified Employees (see attachment, p. 55)

7. Topics for discussion on September 10
   A. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Evaluation of Academic Deans
   B. Survey Form for the Evaluation of Deans
   C. Faculty Productivity Data and Workload Analysis

8. Announcements
   A. Nominations for University Professor designation are due to the chair on September 1.
   B. Nominations for the Eminent Scholar designation are due to the chair on September 15.
The Provost’s Council met on Tuesday, August 27 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. in the Board Room in Koch Hall. Those present were Carol Simpson (Chair), Oktay Baysal, Richardean Benjamin, Jane Bray, Andy Casiello, Paul Champagne, Chandra de Silva, Jeanie Kline, Brenda Lewis, Terri Mathews, Ginny O’Herron, Renee Olander, Brian Payne, Charles Wilson, and Gil Yochum. The following agenda items were discussed.

1. The July 25 minutes were approved.

2. External Program Reviews

   The agenda included information on the action plan for graduate program reviews for 2013-14 and the template for self-study reports. Brian Payne discussed possible questions to ask reviewers in the program review process. Several suggestions were made, including the addition of an item related to the needs of employers and a mechanism to solicit input from stakeholders. After the list of questions for reviewers is updated, the program review documents will be sent to the deans for distribution to department chairs and GPDs.

3. Proposed Revisions to the Policies on Tenure, Academic Rank and Criteria for Ranks, and Promotion in Rank

   Council members discussed proposed revisions to several policies related to tenure and promotion.

   A. Several of the changes to the tenure policy are editorial. More substantive changes are as follows.

   - Information has been added so that it is clear that candidates for tenure need to prepare the information to be sent to external reviewers.
   - The statement regarding additional documentation that may be added to the tenure portfolio in case of material developments has been revised to specify that the additional information may be added as long as the evaluation process has not been concluded.
   - Several dates that were specified in the review process have been changed to provide for a time period, such as within two weeks, rather than a specific date. By providing a time frame rather than a specific date, the language applies to candidates applying for tenure in the regular cycle as well as candidates applying for tenure mid-year.
   - The dates for faculty to correct any misinformation in their tenure files have been revised so that the date is prior to the date of the Provost’s decision regarding tenure.
Council members approved the revisions to the policy on Tenure with one member opposed. Paul Champagne agreed that the revisions could be forwarded to the Board of Visitors for approval without returning them to the Faculty Senate.

One revision to the tenure policy, which is a change to the language regarding early consideration for tenure, is still under consideration by the Faculty Senate. Council members discussed the revision and agreed that an additional change should be made to state that candidates may apply for tenure only once. Members felt that a candidate who is not successful in gaining tenure should be issued a terminal contract regardless of whether the candidate applied for early consideration for tenure. Judy Bowman will prepare the additional revision to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review.

B. Council members discussed the proposed revisions regarding promotion. There is currently one policy on Academic Rank and Promotion in Rank. The Faculty Senate proposed that the current policy be split into two separate policies, one on Academic Rank and Criteria for Ranks and the other on Promotion in Rank.

The changes to the new policy on Academic Rank and Criteria for Ranks are mostly editorial and consist of updating the language to make the policy clearer and more current. Details on the evaluation of lecturers and senior lecturers and promotion of lecturers have been removed from the policy, and a separate policy has been created.

Several of the changes to the new policy on Promotion in Rank are editorial. More substantive changes are as follows.

- Information has been added so that it is clear that candidates for promotion need to prepare the information to be sent to external reviewers.
- The statement regarding additional documentation that may be added to the promotion portfolio in case of material developments has been revised to specify that the additional information may be added as long as the evaluation process has not been concluded.
- The dates for faculty to correct any misinformation in their promotion files have been revised so that the date is prior to the date of the Provost’s decision regarding promotion.
- Language has been added regarding the process for promotion of research associate and assistant professors, which was not addressed in the current policy. The proposed process mirrors the tenure and promotion processes, which include the department, department chair, college promotion and tenure committee, dean, University promotion and tenure committee, and provost, as well as external reviews. In addition, a section has been added to address promotion of those
research faculty who only have appointments in one of the University-level research centers.

Council members approved the recommendation from the Faculty Senate to separate the current policy on Academic Rank and Promotion in Rank into two policies, one on Academic Rank and Criteria for Ranks and the other on Promotion in Rank. They also concurred with the proposed revisions to both policies. Paul Champagne agreed that the revisions could be forwarded to the Board of Visitors for approval without returning them to the Faculty Senate.

4. Proposed Revisions to the Schedules for Faculty Seeking Tenure and for Faculty Seeking Tenure Mid-Year

Council members discussed and approved the proposed revisions to the Schedules for Faculty Seeking Tenure and for Faculty Seeking Tenure Mid-Year. The changes are needed because of the revisions to the policy on Tenure.

5. Concerns from the Faculty Senate on the Revised Calendar for Summer School

Jeanie Kline discussed data related to the revised summer schedule that will take effect in summer 2014. The schedule has been revised in response to questions and comments received from individual faculty and the Faculty Senate. Dr. Kline also presented the results of a student survey that was sent to all students who enrolled in a minimum of one class during summer 2013 and a detailed class schedule for summer 2014.

6. Outside Employment Involving Teaching or Consulting for Another Institution for Administrative and Professional Faculty and Classified Employees

This issue will be discussed at the next meeting.

7. Topics for discussion at the September 10 meeting will include Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Evaluation of Academic Deans, Survey Form for the Evaluation of Deans, and Faculty Productivity Data and Workload Analysis

8. Announcements

A. Nominations for University Professor designation are due to the chair on September 1.
B. Nominations for the Eminent Scholar designation are due to the chair on September 15.