

College of Arts and Sciences
Meeting of Faculty Assembly
SK 102

November 15, 2019

2:00-3:15 PM

ATTENDANCE:

ANTHROPOLOGY:	J. Haws, T. Jennings, A. Smallwood, J. Zhao
BIOLOGY:	C. Corbitt, P. Eason, L. Fuselier, D. Schultz
CHEMISTRY:	E. Mueller
CLASSICAL & MODERN LANG.:	L. Dray, T. Dumstorf, T. Edison, B. Fonseca-Gruber, J. Gabbard, M. Greenwood, M. Groenewold, M. Hencker, G. Hutcheson, A. Leidner, J. Minges, S. Olowabi, C. Sullivan, L. Wagner, M. Wu, W. Yoder
COMMUNICATION:	M. Cunningham, J. Ferré
COMPARATIVE HUMANITIES:	P. Beattie, S. Bertacco, N. Polzer, E. Wise
CRIMINAL JUSTICE:	D. Keeling
ENGLISH:	D. Anderson, M. Biberman, K. Chandler, A. Clukey, A. Olinger, S. Ryan,
GEOGRAPHY/GEOSCIENCES:	D. Howarth, M. Rochner
HISTORY:	B. Beattie
MATHEMATICS:	R. Gill, B. Jackson, D. Smith-Tone, J. Wildstrom
PAN-AFRICAN STUDIES:	R. Jones, K. Logan, K. Ojeh
PHILOSOPHY:	G. Dove, A. Kolers, D. Owen
PHYSICS:	S. Banerjee, D. Brown, C. Jayanthi
POLITICAL SCIENCE:	A. Caldwell, J. Farrier, K. Grady, M. Merry, L. Moyer, R. Payne
PSYCHOLOGY:	E. Ross
SOCIOLOGY:	M. Austin, J. Beggan, K. Christopher
THEATRE ARTS:	K. Gawley, J. Segal
WOMEN'S & GENDER ST:	J. Griffin, D. Heinecken, Kaila Story, N. Theriot

Dr. David Schultz, Chair, called the Faculty Assembly to order at 2:02 PM.

Dr. Schultz offered a series of announcements to open the meeting. First, he reminded the Assembly that the College is looking for a faculty member willing to serve as the Assembly's secretary. Second, he noted that he would like to increase assembly attendance to guarantee a quorum at each monthly meeting. To do so, he proposed to introduce a few operational changes. He wishes to avoid editing documents presented for assembly deliberation as a committee of the whole. Instead, documents should be pre-circulated and comments/suggested edits should be shared with the committee or individual submitting the proposal. Major issues can be addressed

outside of the Faculty Assembly. Standing committees will be asked to present updates and/or reports to the Assembly to ensure that faculty remain apprised of the committees' work. Finally, Dr. Schultz stated that he would like to limit how much time is spent on certain items to make sure that all agenda items are addressed. As a matter of courtesy, he planned to prevent persons from dominating assembly deliberations by allowing persons who have not been heard to speak before allowing others to offer additional commentary.

As its first item of business, the Faculty Assembly unanimously approved the slate of December 2019 graduates.

The chair recognized Dr. Avery Kolers to present the Personnel Committee's 2018-19 summary report. Dr. Kolers highlighted the committee's concern about term faculty going up for promotion being required to seek external review as required by policy even though term faculty have smaller research requirements and do not necessarily receive research support. The committee recommended that chairs avoid including a research requirement in term faculty members' AWP's unless they were also going to provide necessary support. The full text of the committee's report appears below.

The next item on the agenda was a proposed revision to section 2.1.I.11 of the A&S personnel policy, which deals with joint appointments. Dr. Mark Running presented proposed revisions recommended by the Personnel Committee. The current language and the proposed revisions appear below, but the Personnel Committee's primary argument for the change was that the new language would no longer require jointly-appointed faculty to complete two separate reviews. The new language would establish a distinction between persons holding Board-approved and ad hoc joint appointments by requiring persons in the former category to undergo a more formal review. After Dr. Running's presentation, several persons spoke against the motion, arguing that the new proposal would give effective power to the primary department and that such a movement may weaken protections afforded to faculty whose research or areas of teaching interest may be more valued in their secondary departments. Several faculty members, including Dr. Dawn Heinecken, Dr. Ricky Jones, Dr. Kaila Story, and Dr. Nancy Theriot, voiced their opposition to the motion. When the proposal was put to a vote, it only received 6 affirmative votes, so the motion failed.

Dr. Edna Ross next presented an update from the Technology and Facilities Committee. Dr. Ross quickly reviewed the history of the A&S technology fee, which charges A&S students \$0.50 per credit hour up to a maximum of \$6 a semester. This fee is used to support classroom technology and generates approximately \$65,000 annually to support A&S's 94 classrooms. This revenue is, however, inadequate to address A&S' classroom technology needs. Dr. Ross also reported on the problems that several faculty have reported in receiving classroom support from IT, particularly after-hours. Faculty were asked to share their unmet technology needs and any difficulties they may have experienced in getting classroom support with Dr. Ross as the Technology and Facilities Committee chair.

Finally, Dr. Schultz recognized Dr. Michael Wade Smith, Chief of Staff and External Affairs. Dr. Wade-Smith updated the faculty on the University's purchase of the Jewish Hospital System,

arguing that the tremendous cash outlay was necessary both to prevent an immediate loss of \$51 million; to prevent significant disruption to the resident physicians working in the system; and to prevent losing the hospital's negative impact on the University's R1 status.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 PM.

AGENDA FOR A&S FACULTY ASSEMBLY
November 15, 2019
STRICKLER **102**, 2:00-3:15

I. Announcements

II. Approval of Candidates for December 2019 Graduation

III. A&S Personnel Committee Report – Avery Kolers

IV. A&S Personnel Committee - proposed revision to the
A&S Personnel Policy specifically for joint
appointments. – Mark Running

V. Standing Committee reports/report from A&S faculty
senators (these will be on an as needed basis as
important topics arise and as time permits)

Final Report of the 2018-19 College of Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee

INTRODUCTION

The members of the 2018-19 Personnel Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences were: Avery Kolers (Chair), Lauren Heberle, Baron Kelly (spring), Hamid Kulosman, Mark Running, Susan Ryan (Fall), Sherri Wallace.

The committee worked on numerous personnel matters ranging from departmental personnel policy reviews, merit appeals, and evaluations of pre-Tenure, Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Full Professor, and Promotion to Associate (term) candidates.

I. Case Evaluations

The number of cases in each category is tabulated below by Primary Department:

Department	Pre-tenure	Tenure & Promotion to Associate	Promotion to Full	Promotion to Associate (term)
Anthropology	2			
Biology	1			
Chemistry	1			
Classical/Modern Languages		1	1	
Communication		1		
Criminal Justice	2			
English	3	1	1	
Fine Arts	2	1		
Geography/Geosciences	1			
History	2	2		
Humanities				1
Mathematics	1		1	
Pan-African Studies		1		
Philosophy				
Physics	1		1	
Political Science	1			
Psychology & Brain Sciences	1			
Sociology	1		1	
Theatre Arts	3			
Urban & Public Affairs	2	2		
Women's Studies				
Total Cases	24	9	5	1
Total Favorable Recommendations	N/A	7	5	1

In all cases, the Personnel Committee's recommendations were affirmed at higher levels.

Breakdown by Race & Ethnicity

Action	White	African American	Hispanic or Latinx	Asian/Asian American
Pre-tenure	19	1	1	3
Tenure & Promotion	4*	2	1	1*
Promotion to Full	4	1	0	0
Promotion (term)	1	0	0	0
Total	28	4	2	4

*1 unfavorable recommendation

Breakdown by Gender

Action	Male	Female
Pre-tenure	11	13
Tenure & Promotion	5*	2*
Promotion to Full	1	4
Promotion (term)	1	0
Total	18	17

*1 unfavorable recommendation

In addition, the Personnel Committee reviewed and sent back for minor revisions two Department Personnel Policies, and, acting as the Faculty Appeals Committee pursuant to College Personnel Policy section 2.1.C.5, also made one recommendation in a merit appeal case, recommending that the Dean's and Chair's evaluations be overturned and the evaluation of the Department Committee restored. This decision was also supported by the Dean.

II. Matters of Concern

During the course of its deliberations, the Personnel Committee encountered several issues that it would like to share with the College.

1. Logistical and Technology Issues

The single biggest challenge that the Committee faced in evaluating dossiers this year was timeliness. Due largely to delays in securing extramural reviews, departments were by and large very slow to get completed dossiers to the Committee, causing the Committee's work to be delayed considerably. The Committee consulted with the Dean's office about this and is glad that practices are set to change for 2019-20. We are therefore hopeful that this problem will be resolved, but it will be important to keep an eye on it in future.

The second biggest challenge that the Committee faced was inconsistency in platforms, between traditional hard-copy binders, SharePoint, and Cardbox. This inconsistency caused confusion on the Committee and seems also to have confused some candidates, leading to incomplete or scattered dossiers. We are aware that dossiers will migrate to Interfolio in 2019-20 and are hopeful that this problem will also be resolved henceforward.

2. Extramural Review

The Committee was consulted regarding the extramural evaluation of Research & Creative Activity for term faculty who have very low but non-zero allocations to this area. Formally, the College Personnel Policy (1.2.B.12) requires extramural review for any case where the allocation to RCA is above zero. This seems an overly strict requirement inasmuch as some levels of RCA either are not consistent with significant output or indicate merely a supporting role, for instance in the laboratory of another faculty member. The Committee therefore weighed the possibility of proposing a one-size-fits-all cutoff to be written into College Personnel Policy. We decided, however, not to do so. Instead, the Committee determined that such cases of very low RCA should be handled proactively so as to avoid unpleasant surprises when cases leave departments. Proactive handling may involve planning years in advance of eligibility for promotion to ensure either that there *is* a publication record that can be extramurally reviewed, or – if faculty are not expected to publish at all – that their AWP average for RCA will be 0%; and in marginal cases, consulting with one year's ASPC about how a case should be handled the next year. In all events, it is our hope that future Personnel Committees will interpret the policy with an eye to equitable treatment of people with very low RCA percentages.

3. Unclear Standards and Modes of Review

Another serious issue of extramural review has to do with review of Creative Activity, specifically in Theatre Arts. The Committee evaluated three pretenure cases from this department in 2018-19, and each of the cases was contentious because the Department seems to lack consensus on the definition of Research & Creative Activity, and seems to be disinclined to pursue rigorous but fair extramural review of such activities. The Committee was alarmed that this level of flux in one department's policies could impose significant burdens on the three currently junior faculty whom we evaluated for pretenure review, when they go up for promotion and tenure, and it will be an issue going forward for all the department's faculty in annual merit review. We recommend that the Dean work with the department and any faculty planning to apply for promotion within three years (on a moving window) to ensure that all parties are equipped to secure extramural review of Creative Activity. And it should go without saying that determining what counts as Creative Activity (as opposed to Service) is an extremely urgent matter, and must be clearly stated in the Department Personnel Policy, and newly hired faculty must be informed of this at the moment of hire if not before. We know that it is rare to single out a particular department in a committee review, but the number and uncertainty of these cases seems to require urgent attention.

4. Diversity and Inclusion

The ethnic breakdown of candidates for review is a matter of some concern. In all years, the vast majority of candidates at all levels have been white. Yet there is some additional concern this year, as the junior faculty undergoing pretenure review constitute a considerably less diverse cohort (79% white) than do those up for promotion in rank (64%). This is only one year, and is a reversal of the relationship that held last year (when 72% of pretenure candidates were white but 80% of candidates for promotion were white). Still, this pattern must be monitored, and efforts to continue diversifying the faculty maintained or enhanced.

5. Value and Publicity of Committee Reports

Finally, it is a matter of no small irony that this report must call attention to the fact that it is likely to descend into a black hole and be ignored. We would recommend that in future years,

starting with 2019-20, the practice of making a report to the Faculty at the final Assembly of the academic year be reinstated.

To A&S Faculty:

The A&S Personnel Committee proposes a motion to revise the A&S Personnel Policy and Procedures regarding personnel actions for faculty with joint appointments (section 2.2.I.11). For context, it had come to our attention that the A&S Personnel Committee has been using the A&S Dean's Guidelines for review of faculty members with primary and secondary appointments (section III.G), but this is not consistent with the official, Board of Trustees-approved policy outlined in the A&S Personnel Policy. In brief, the Dean's Guidelines specifies separate, full reviews of the faculty member for personnel actions in each department (see below), while the A&S Personnel Policy specifies a single review conducted by the department of principal appointment with significant participation by the second department. The A&S Personnel Committee recommends we follow the A&S Personnel Policy, with modifications that we propose below. Our reasoning includes the following:

1. The Dean's Guidelines force the faculty member to undergo two separate complete review processes, potentially with different standards in force in the two separate departments, and increases the risk of not meeting the standards of one of the departments, with potential negative consequences for tenure and promotion decisions.
2. A single review will streamline the review process, reduce overall workload, and ensure a timely review.
3. Adherence to the A&S Personnel Policy will maintain faculty governance by using previously approved procedures.

The modified policy for joint appointments that we propose acknowledges and addresses the two different types of Joint appointments: 1) official, Board of Trustees-approved appointments and 2) ad hoc arrangements between two departments, and provides the faculty member more flexibility in the latter situation. Below are the relevant sections of each document and our proposed changes to the A&S Personnel Policy (changes highlighted in yellow).

Dean's guidelines version [aka, what we've been doing]:

III.G. Review of Faculty Members with Primary and Secondary Appointments

If a faculty member has appointments in multiple units within the College of Arts and Sciences by action of the Board of Trustees, each of those units will evaluate his or her tenure or promotion file. In each of the units, a recommendation will be prepared by the personnel committee, a faculty vote will be conducted, and a chair's report will be prepared. The reports from all units will be inserted into the candidate's review file. In general, the unit of primary appointment will initiate the review process and oversee the creation of a review file, but all units involved will be expected to cooperate in the review of the faculty member. Once the review file reaches the 13 Office of the Dean, the review will continue as in the case of a faculty member with appointment in only a single unit. If the reviewee has an appointment involving the College of Arts and Sciences and another academic unit within the University, the A&S unit involved will conduct its review in accordance with the policy and guidelines for tenure and

promotion reviews in the College and, to the extent possible, the College will cooperate with the other University unit involved to help facilitate its review.

A&S Personnel Policy Current Version

2.2.I.11. A faculty member whose principal appointment is in one department but who contributes significantly to the teaching, service, or research and creative activity of a second department is entitled to be reviewed for personnel actions with the participation of the second department. "Significant contribution" in teaching is defined as teaching in one academic year one or more courses unique to or cross-listed with another department. "Significant contribution" in service and research and creative activity is defined as performance in either category which exceeds 10 percent of an annual work plan commitment. Upon request of the faculty member under review, the faculty member's file will be made available to the chairperson of the second department, and the chairperson of the second department shall write a letter of recommendation based on the reviewee's participation in that department. This letter shall be placed in the triptych prior to the review of the case by the chair of the department of principal appointment.

In addition, one member from the second department will be appointed to the departmental personnel committee in cases when teaching, research and creative activity, and service in the second department exceeds 25 percent of the faculty member's average annual work plan commitment for the period under review. This additional member will be selected by the Dean of the College from a list submitted by the Chair of the second department after the reviewee exercises his or her right to preemptory challenges, the number of which shall not exceed 50 percent of the tenured faculty of the second department. The additional member will serve only in the evaluation and recommendation of the reviewee covered by this provision to the policy. In cases where the department personnel committee is augmented, the Chair of the second department shall write a letter of recommendation based on the reviewee's participation in that department. This letter, along with relevant evidence (for example, student evaluations, extramural reviews, etc.), shall be placed in the triptych prior to review of the case by the department Chair.

Proposed A&S Personnel Policy for joint appointments

2.2.I.11. Joint appointments include 1) official, Board of Trustees (BOT)-approved appointments specified in the original employment contract, and 2) ad hoc arrangements between two departments.

A faculty member whose principal appointment is in one department but who contributes significantly to the teaching, service, or research and creative activity of a second department **on an ad hoc basis** is entitled, **upon the faculty member's request**, to be reviewed for personnel actions with the participation of the second department. "Significant contribution" in teaching is defined as teaching, in one academic year, one or more courses unique to or cross-listed with another department. **"Significant contribution" in service is any activity that constitutes a major component of service commitment and is likely to be**

recognized as such by the second department. "Significant contribution" in research and creative activity is defined as performance that exceeds 10 percent of an annual work plan commitment and is of a nature that is typically recognized as significant by the second department. Upon request of the faculty member under review, the faculty member's file will be made available to the chairperson of the second department, and the chairperson of the second department shall write a letter of recommendation based on the reviewee's participation in that department. This letter shall be placed in the personnel file prior to the reviews of the case by the Personnel Committee and Chair of the department of principal appointment.

In the case of BOT-approved joint appointments, one member from the second department shall be appointed to the departmental personnel committee for review of the case. This additional member will be selected by the Dean of the College from a list submitted by the Chair of the second department after the reviewee exercises his or her right to peremptory challenges, the number of which shall not exceed 50 percent of the faculty of the second department. The additional member will serve only in the evaluation and recommendation of the reviewee covered by this provision to the policy. In addition, the Chair of the second department shall write a letter of recommendation based on the reviewee's participation in that department. This letter, along with relevant evidence (for example, student evaluations, extramural reviews, etc.), shall be placed in the personnel file prior to the reviews of the case by the Personnel Committee and Chair of the department of principal appointment.