

Minutes for FPPC
Meeting 5
Friday, November 4, 2022
Called to order 12:35

In Attendance:

Robin Richesson, Richard Marcus, Al Colburn, Don Haviland, Tracey Mayfield, Malcolm Finney, Jalal Torabzadeh, Leslie Andersen, Tianjiao Qiu

1. Approval of Minutes. Approved.
2. Announcements.
 - a. Policy on Reassignment of Faculty is in Senate.
3. University RTP Policy 09-10
 - a. Review of proposed changes from Meeting #4
 - i. Robin: Section 5.5.1. Early tenure. Why are expectations for early *higher* than for tenure as opposed to accepting that 6 years work of work has been accomplished in 4 or 5 years? “Significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline.” Proposed to change to “...accomplishments consistent with those expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline.”
 - ii. Leslie: 5.5. “A candidate applying for early tenure is expected to meet all criteria for early promotion to association professor.” Why the connection to promotion? Delete?
 - iii. Jalal: Promotion sometimes happens without promotion. How to implement the process. In the 80s early promotion/tenure is common.
 - iv. Discussion to, philosophically differentiate early tenure and promotion or not.
 - v. Robin: I would keep this new language, although I understand the desire to discourage.
 - vi. Robin: So is the fear that after tenure people will slack? Don: I could see that being part of it. Tracey: It happens.
 - vii. Jalal: It is not the policy. It is how it is implemented that is of concern.
 - viii. Vote: Passes to change language to “...accomplishments consistent with those expected for tenure on the standard six-year timeline.”
 - ix. Al: proposal to delete “most establish compelling evidence of distinction in all areas and” and focus on “inspire confident that the pattern of strong overall perforce will continue. Richard: Support as it is easier to consistently implement. Vote: Passes.
 - b. 5.5.2 – is Early Promotion the same criteria? Do we remove “exceeds” in promotion as well? Discussion. Richard acknowledges early promotion is not the same as early tenure but supports consistency with early tenure. Leslie: supports. Vote: Passes.

- c. Al: 3.5 College RTP Policy. Proposal to replace “consistent with university to “consistent with the university RTP policy. And, delete “problationary” in favor of “tenure track.” Vote: Passed.
- d. Al: 3.2 Department RTP Policy. Propose to add: “Department RTP policies must be otherwise cosnsiten with respective college and university RTP policies.”
Richard: What are the implications? Might it be interpreted as limiting a department’s ability to be more specific in the type of RSCA, Service, or Instructional Activity? Change to “standards” rather than “policies”? Al: “standards” are different. Vote: Passes.
- e. Tian: Concern about policy and putting procedure into policy. Erly: Keep the proposed sentence but remove the preceding sentence “Department standards shall not be lower than college-level standards.” Richard: Concern that “standards” is different than consistency with policies as it implies that a department cannot have RSCA, Service, or Teaching expectations that are less rigorous than the college or university. Don: Similar concerns. It does happen. Creating a situation where a candidate passes the department level but not college level. Jalal: It does happen. Vote: Fails.
- f. Erly: Way to change “lower” in the standards language? Al: “Department disciplinary standards must be at least as rigorous as college-level standards”
Vote: Passes.
- g. Leslie: Need to revisit who collects the outside letters – the department chair or the RTP chair? Concern for why we have an “index” required when now we are in Interfolio. Al: It is in the contract, so it needs to be included.
- h. Erly: Concern that having the committee chair might not even be elected in time to upload the documents
- i. Leslie: What if we left it to the Senate to weigh in – we’re having a hard time coming to consensus.
- j. Tracey: what if we just let the department decide.
- k. Erly: just say it is the department chair OR the committee chair – since both have access to Interfolio, which is needed.
- l. Vote: passes
- m. Discussion about whether we need to leave the preparation of the index for open period materials. We could not find the language in the CBA at this time. But we elected to leave the clause in the document.
- n. Next time we will review Tracey’s addition to RSCA, review language changes, and seek to pass the policy.

Adjourned at 2:29 pm

Future Meetings this semester:

November 18

December 2