

## APPROVED MINUTES

Approval vote completed 5 January 2010

Faculty Senate meeting, 9 December 2009

VPAA Conference Room, Richards Hall

Senate members present: Susan Hrach (COLS), Greg Blalock (COEHP), Josh Eyster (COLS), Bonita Flournoy (COEHP), Rita Jones (COBCS), Stephanie Lewis (COEHP), David Schwimmer (COLS), Sandra Stratford (Library), Teresa Lang as proxy for Beverly Venable (COBCS), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), John Studstill (COLS), Dan VanKley (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS).

Guests present: 36 guests present, including President Mescon, Provost Levi, Dan Ross, Tom Dolan, Nikita Harris, Shamim Khan, Pat McHenry, Bill Birkhead, Floyd Jackson, Ely Klar, Rosa Williams, Linda Hadley, Cheryl M Smith, Doug Tompson, Bill Frazier, Rajeev B Dabke, Tim Howard, Gary Wortley, Kate Musgrove, Paula Walker, Cindy Henning, Brian Schwartz, Harlan Hendricks, John Davis, Katey Hughes, Warren Church, Roger Brown, Tyler Fleming, Barbara Hunt, Alice Pate, Zodiac Webster.

Dr Hrach called the meeting to order at 10:17am. She commented that turnout (over 50 attendees) reflects level of concern by the faculty, particularly given short notice and exam time slot (Final exam for Tuesday-Thursday 9:30-10:45 courses) today.

Dr. Hrach asked Provost Levi if she has the data we requested, or if there are any comments from the Provost.

Provost Levi said she would talk about the process first, and then numbers.

Last year the university adopted a new strategic plan, verbalizing its' new mission and vision. She read the first (of three) paragraphs from the mission to us.

From the website, this reads: "To achieve academic excellence through teaching, research, creative inquiry and student engagement." <http://www.colstate.edu/aboutcsu/mission.asp>

She further commented that when we look at faculty handbook, it articulates our part of the university mission in terms of academic excellence. In view of this articulated mission, she look at personnel evaluations.

She did share the data, but not in the requested format. She provided a handout in different format, in order to protect privacy of individuals. (handout reproduced at the end of the minutes as an appendix) She stated that there was a privacy caution due to small numbers (5 or fewer) in some of the categories requested. We are requested to not try to figure out who the individuals are, and to respect the privacy of those individuals.

There were some negative personnel evaluations this year. These were in personnel cases that were salvageable. The individuals affected have time until the 7<sup>th</sup> year, and can apply again for promotion and/or tenure again.

In order to provide support for professional development for individual faculty members, the Provost's office has created 3 new programs for professional development for faculty, and information is available on the Provost website. We are also interested in providing help through grants and projects office, and undergraduate research support. We are sensitive to the issue of travel funds, and will seek more funds for travel to conferences in future.

More about 3 new programs: CSU Faculty Mentor Grant (can apply for funds to work with faculty mentor outside of CSU – this is primarily travel funds); CSU Professional Travel Program; and the CSU Summer Research Program. More information about these programs can be found on the VPAA website <http://aa.colstate.edu/index.asp> .

Provost Levi cautioned those present: we do not have expectations to become a research university, and expectations do not include grants. But we do have expectations to academic excellence through teaching, research, service. Pursuing grant support is important due to tough economic times. With recent budget cuts, it is difficult to support initiatives, student research, travel, outfitting labs, support basic work in sciences, social sciences, etc.

The provost concluded by re-emphasizing that we must work on accomplishing our mission.

Question and Answer with Provost and President

*Question:* What is the role of the pretenure review committee for these P&T committee?

*Provost Levi responds:* To review these cases. The strategic plan was adopted last spring. It is important that we don't grandfather prior criteria.

*Question:* Was spring to beginning of fall sufficient time to meet these criteria? *Response:* Individuals denied all still have time to apply again.

*Question:* Shouldn't these individuals have an additional year, as expectations have shifted?

*Provost Levi responds:* No. These faculty have applied before the 7<sup>th</sup> year.

*Comment:* These individuals lost at least a year, working under previous assumptions.

*Response:* Provost Levi disagrees that there was a change in parameters. Publication in reputable journals is expected of university faculty.

*Comment:* Either there is a new plan, or there isn't.

*Provost Levi responds:* A number of individuals have several years to go, and shouldn't need an extra compensating year. University faculty are expected to do all three: research, teach, do service. Student engagement is also extremely important. Students follow our lead.

*Comment:* Concern in the harder sciences is that we already are doing undergrad research, which is rarely publishable. We don't have labs assigned to individual faculty, to allow students to feed into a research system. Undergrad research is faculty route to research/scholarship. Even if faculty name is not attached to student presentation, it is often counted toward faculty scholarship as part of their academic work. However, this will now penalize faculty, who cannot do this and also do publishable work.

*Comment:* last January, departments turned in standards of excellence. What communication has there been back to the faculty about all of this?

*Provost Levi responds:* Dr. Levi doesn't know about last spring, refers again to our mission of excellence. She invited the faculty to embrace that mission. "If you believe that you can or cannot do a thing, you are usually right."

*Question/Comment:* What communication about these issues has occurred this fall? Most of the faculty (chairs, deans) didn't know that the criteria had shifted. Not one person in committees brought up that strategic plan instead of previously published criteria were important. How were all of the faculty expected to know?

*Comment:* The overriding issue seems to be that we have a 2009 mission, faculty that have spent years developing portfolios, and who have not been given an opportunity to change focus in order to meet that new mission. Raising level of work at the University is admirable, but faculty need time to reach that goal.

*President Mescon responds:* Late in spring, strategic plan was affirmed. He stated that all know it is the nature of Comprehensive Universities to embark on aspirational odysseys, and that it is almost implausible to find a peer institution that has not done so. Dr Levi and Dr. Butcher spent

Faculty Senate meeting, 9 December 2009

VPAA Conference Room, Richards Hall

time at SACS meeting reviewing their criteria. He then discussed his history with the business school at Kennesaw State as an analogy for rising standards.

He made the decision to award all colleagues awarded promotion last year with a substantial raise. No one from the previous year has complained of unfairness. The overwhelming number of portfolios submitted were those with 5 years of service. System guidelines state that there is a seven year timeline for tenure.

“Until a department defines otherwise, the only standard is a peer reviewed publication. Departments may choose to refine this. But for now this is the only standard” (and this may manifest differently in the arts, for example).

*Question:* Can we have clarification about the change in promotion process for non tenure-track faculty? It now seems to have been turned back to directors and departments only. Some non tenure-track faculty received letter stating additional discussion during annual evaluation regarding promotion would take place, rather than a promotion decision.

*President Mescon responded:* This is idiosyncratic. We have an extraordinary # of colleagues in nursing, for example, who have faculty contracts that are non tenure-track positions. In most of USG, most of these have migrated to lecturer and senior lecturer positions. If it is appropriately determined that a person’s contractual assignment should be as associate professor, make the decision at the school level, not the university level (as only tenure is more appropriately a university decision, as it represents a life investment).

*Question:* Could you describe what process will take place now for those faculty in non tenure-track positions?

*President Mescon responded:* We are having those discussions now.

*Comment:* There is concern about communication, and expectations for these faculty.

*President Mescon responded:* In the next 60 days, decisions about process will be made.

*Comment:* In the “3 legged stool” of faculty expectations, we have teaching, research, service. Teaching is typically mentioned first. All parts of the “stool” are there for faculty. Some faculty have decided to focus on service, and those faculty have achieved excellence in service. Many have taken on the task of being excellent teachers, and CSU has a great reputation in our community for this. Some faculty are nationally famous for their research. But now we are told that the only one that matters is research.

*President Mescon responds* – that’s not what we are saying. But for a submission of tenure, to have an absolute absence of scholarship of any kind is unacceptable. In our sector, to have no evidence of scholarship at the point of tenure is not acceptable. We did not say a journal article a year, or every other year, but rather evidence of your ability to publish within your discipline. We are still honoring the sanctity of teaching, the critical role of undergraduate research, and the important role of service. That manifestation of service will morph over your career. For junior faculty, it is more germane to focus on research.

*Question:* To clarify, these decisions (this year’s promotion and tenure decisions, both positive and negative) are now the notification of this change in standard?

*Provost Levi responds:* These faculty colleagues received formal notification from the VPAA and acknowledgement by the President why submission in 36% of cases did not meet standards. Faculty, chairs, and even deans may not have had this level of clarity previously.

What we are looking for is evidence of teaching excellence, service, and scholarship (and this scholarship manifests in the preponderance of disciplines in peer reviewed publications)

*Comment:* The problem is communication of these standards. Somehow there has to be clear communication, or problems will continue to occur.

*President Mescon replied* – faculty and graduate students know that standards shift all the time. The administration will work mightily to reach a level of clarification for all. There always seems to be some haziness among the criteria. We must be clear and transparent.

*Comment:* We all understand the standards can change. One way would be to do it gradually, but I have never heard of standards changing retroactively, and with no notification that those standards have changed, and therefore allowing faculty to have no chance to meet those new standards.

*President Mescon replied* – this is an incredibly frequent occurrence, and faculty do get caught in the middle. But most of those affected, they were very early in the submission process for tenure.

*Comment:* In the past we needed to be meritorious in two of three categories (and peer review publication was meritorious, not acceptable). Previous policy was that any two of the three categories (teaching, research, service) should be meritorious, and that policy did not specify which two categories.

*President Mescon responds* in terms of Chemistry Department's ACS accreditation effort. We needed to subscribe to Chemical Abstracts to be ACS approved Chemistry degree, modest price. It is incumbent upon the administration to ensure that library resources are available to ensure success.

*Question:* To revisit an earlier issue – rewarding those that received promotions and those salary increases? Those that were granted tenure only received nothing. Can you comment on the equity of this?

*President Mescon responds:* In our sector, we are an outlier, and an embarrassing one. Within the academy, there is an inherent disconnect between tenure and promotion at CSU. We have bifurcated a process (promotion and tenure) in a way that is anathema for our colleagues at other institutions. He is hoping that through candid dialogs to review what peer institutions do, we will be able to align better with other institutions.

*Question:* Will decision about raises for those faculty be made?

*Response from President Mescon:* No retroactive look will be done. We need a dialog about why our system has evolved to be so antithetical to how most of higher education works.

*Response from Provost Levi:* When she arrived at CSU, she reviewed faculty salaries, and determined that she needs to identify pool of funds for merit raises, for promotion, ongoing meritorious performance, etc.

*Comment from President Mescon:* At a recent University Presidents meeting, they discussed issues they all deal with. One such issue was, how is it that initially some institutions were separated out? What were the criteria? Based on enrollment, and little else. Is this acceptable now? University Presidents are now questioning why we are positioned the way we are.

## APPROVED MINUTES

Approval vote completed 5 January 2010

Faculty Senate meeting, 9 December 2009

VPAA Conference Room, Richards Hall

President Mescon also has been asking, Why are we at the bottom for tuition? There are no answers. Changing it is something else.

*Comment:* There is nothing about service in our strategic plan. Is it not a consideration in promotion and tenure?

*Response from Provost Levi:* Our Mission does include research, teaching, and student engagement. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, it addresses community development, public-private partnership, economic development.

The entire mission statement, from the university website, reads as follows:

CSU mission statement

- To achieve academic excellence through teaching, research, creative inquiry and student engagement.
- To achieve excellence in the student experience and prepare individuals for a life of success, leadership, and responsibility through community awareness, engagement, and service to others.
- To achieve recognition as a leader in community development, regional economic development, and public-private partnerships.

<http://www.colstate.edu/aboutcsu/mission.asp>

*Continued response from Provost Levi:* The University has been working to develop centers to support and engage community, like GIS center, Survey Research center, and others, such as one that has the potential to collaborate with city management.

*Comment from President Mescon –* Goal 3 of the Strategic Plan is all about working with community service, outreach, and experiential learning. For example, the Halleck Lecture Series in political science. The donor for that lecture series has now committed a substantial bequest to CSU to underwrite faculty positions.

*Provost Levi* adds that this position will leverage future development of masters program in history.

*Comment:* Obtaining chemical abstracts is great, but the library is getting rid of many other journals (3-4 page list of titles was sent out over the summer). When we discuss getting rid of publications, are we replacing them with digital format? Are we expected to do scholarship with fewer resources?

*Response from President Mescon:* Library budgets had not changed at all for the 4 years previous to Dr. Mescon's presidency. Last year, an additional \$50,000 was allocated, plus student tech fee money, to the library.

*Librarian comment:* She asked that each of us communicate to our colleagues, that resources that are eliminated are available in Galileo before things are cut locally. Many faculty are not currently aware of this.

*Question:* Are we continuing the content of this meeting, as some participants need to leave for other obligations?

*President Mescon responds:* He intends to have open, candid, transparent dialog, ad nauseum if necessary. We are in an aspirational trajectory, indicative of the quality of faculty at this institution.

President Mescon and Provost Levi left the meeting at 11:31am

Continued comments and discussion

Many of us support being aspirational, but there is concern that we have not communicated the damage done to the morale of the faculty, and perhaps the upper administration intended all along to announce new standards through P&T denials. It is about all about fairness, process, and collegiality.

Several participants expressed that they were unsatisfied with the result of this meeting with the President and the Provost. Through every step in the process of promotion and tenure this fall, word did not get out to anyone about the changes.

Comment: The upper administration seems to be willing to accept a dip in morale, and perhaps upper administration believes that this is how the process should have been all along.

**Motion:** That the Senate request that the Provost provide a written list of precise criteria used in the promotion and tenure decision making process, to be sent to Senate Executive Committee no later than 12/30/09. Moved by Studstill, seconded by Jones.

Discussion

Can we send this information to chairs as well?

Motion needs to ask for specifics. Vague answers to date do not have answers for much of this.

They focused on publications (but not only possible venue for scholarly work – do you get credit for peer reviewed proposals, 2<sup>nd</sup> author of peer review publications, etc);

What was the date of criteria change and details of how this was communicated to all?

Schwimmer moves to **amend the motion** to include the date of criteria changes, and the method of communication to applicants and lower administration about these changes. Sprayberry seconds amendment. Vote: 15 yes, no opposed. **Amendment passes unanimously.**

Zuiderveen moves to **amend the motion** to ask for criteria on a disciplinary basis and to include the phrasing to make decisions about promotion and tenure separately. VanKley seconds. Vote on amendment: 15 yes, no opposed. **Amendment passes unanimously.**

Vote on motion. 15 yes, no opposed. **Motion passes unanimously.**

**As passed, the motion reads:**

*The Senate will request that the Provost provide a written list of precise criteria (on a disciplinary basis) used in the promotion decision process, and the tenure decision process, separately, including the date of criteria changes and the method of communication to applicants and lower administration about these changes, to be sent to Senate Executive Committee no later than 12/30/09.*

Comment: Data provided to us today did not include faculty that withdrew applications at any point along the way, which we know occurred.

**Motion:** VanKley moves that we ask for the number of faculty who expressed to their Dean the commitment to go up for tenure, broken down into promotion and tenure as separate numbers, as well as the names of those faculty who were eligible to apply. Seconded by Wurz.

Discussion

There was concern about asking for names, based on privacy issues, but we do want numbers, and break it down to promotion and tenure as separate sets of numbers.

Can we conclude something, if dept encourages faculty to withdraw?

APPROVED MINUTES

Approval vote completed 5 January 2010

Faculty Senate meeting, 9 December 2009

VPAA Conference Room, Richards Hall

Vote on motion: 13 in favor, 1 opposed. **Motion passes**

As passed, the motion reads:

*The Senate will ask for the number of faculty who expressed to their Dean the commitment to go up for tenure, broken down into promotion and tenure as separate numbers, as well as the names of those faculty who were eligible to apply.*

Ranks for non-tenure track, and change in process?

Comment: what are faculty, really? Do we need to define this in the university?

Comment: Everything in the discussion has been about how idiosyncratic we are, and yet they have just chosen to make the Library idiosyncratic by changing the status of the Librarians, and removing the Dean, and changing their status from a College to a group reporting to UITS.

Comment: Non-tenure track faculty should be covered under same promotion rules, based on Board Of Regents policies.

Comment: There is a lot of subtext behind removal of faculty status for librarians.

Comment: We should tie in a formal response about Library to other issues, and save it for the January Senate meeting.

Comment: We also need to clarify issues about pay raise for promotion only, as well as post tenure review issues, and many other procedural issues that need to take place.

Comment: The big problem is communication.

Comment: The Handbook Committee has been looking at these things all semester, aligning them to BOR policy. However, for Promotion and Tenure it is already aligned. The language from the Strategic Plan is outside of this. However, BOR policy discusses research and achievement relevant to the mission, which must be on file with BOR. Nothing in BOR that says you must have a peer reviewed journal publication, or that says that one must be excellent in research.

Comment: A University Task Force will be writing new university standards, and passing them down to departments. Chairs have objected, and said that it should be Department up, rather than top down. Nominations have gone forward for this task force (Deans have been asked to send names).

Comment: Are deans communicating enough, to inform faculty of these changes?

Comment: It is a *big* concern that no one can be grandfathered in. For several disciplines, two years is insufficient to allow work for a peer reviewed publication. Also, what are they going to consider peer reviewed?

Executive Committee will request specific dates for further dialog about promotion and tenure issues.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Dr. Kimberly Shaw

Data provided by Provost  
 2009 Tenure and Promotion Summary

	<b>COA</b>	<b>TCOBCS</b>	<b>COEHP</b>	<b>COLS</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Applications for tenure/promotion	6	5	4	13	28
Favorable – dept.	4	2	4	8	18
Favorable – chair	4	4	4	11	23
Favorable – college	5	3	4	12	24
Favorable – dean	5	4	4	12	25
Favorable – provost	3	4	4	7	18
Favorable - president	3	4	4	7	18

Percent Favorable

Promotion/Tenure cases, Fall 2009	<b>COA</b>	<b>TCOBCS</b>	<b>COEHP</b>	<b>COLS</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Favorable – dept.	67%	40%	100%	62%	64%
Favorable – chair	67%	80%	100%	85%	82%
Favorable – college	83%	60%	100%	92%	86%
Favorable – dean	83%	80%	100%	92%	89%
Favorable – provost	50%	80%	100%	54%	64%
Favorable - president	50%	80%	100%	54%	64%

*Note: Tables reproduced from handout distributed by the Provost.*