

College of Arts and Sciences  
Meeting of Faculty Assembly  
September 25, 2020  
2:00-3:15 PM

**ATTENDANCE:**

ANTHROPOLOGY: A. Beyin, A. Browne Ribeiro, J. Haws, A. Storey, C. Tillquist, J. Zhao

BIOLOGY: C. Corbitt, D. Guerra, P. Himes, A. Lackey, A. Mehring, M. Menze, R. Pigg, M. Running, D. Schultz

CHEMISTRY: R. Buchanan, A. Gorce, E. Mueller, A. Wilson

CLASSICAL & MODERN LANG.: R. Buchanan, M. Dalle, T. Dumstorf, T. Edison, B. Fonseca-Gruber, J. Gabbard, J. Greene, M. Groenewold, R. Luginbill, M. Makris, N. Marrakchi, J. Minges, S. Olowabi, R. Roebuck, L. Rothe, S. Smith, T. Stewart, C. Sullivan, M. Wu, W. Yoder, L. Zeng

COMMUNICATION: M. Ashlock, M. Cunningham, L. Della, S. Esrock, J. Ferré, J. Hart, S. Smith-Jones, K. Walker

COMPARATIVE HUMANITIES: P. Beattie, S. Bertacco, A. Hall, K. Kleinkopf, N. Polzer, P. Pranke, T. Stewart, E. Wise

CRIMINAL JUSTICE: V. Andreescu, J. Cox, E. Grossi

ENGLISH: K. Chandler, A. Clukey, K. Hadley, K. Kopelson, M. Poole, A. Olinger, G. Ridley, S. Ryan, B. Williams

FINE ARTS: T. Calvert, R. Singel

GEOGRAPHY/GEOSCIENCES: A. Gaughan, M. Walker

HISTORY: B. Beattie, T. Keeley, J. McLeod, J. Westerfeld

MATHEMATICS: D. Han, B. Jackson, L. Larson, E. Milliken, T. Riedel, D. Smith-Tone, D. Swanson, C. Tone

PHILOSOPHY: A. Angermann, J. Gibson, D. Owen

PHYSICS: S. Mendes, M. Yu

POLITICAL SCIENCE: D. Buckley, J. Gainous, T. Gray, L. Moyer, R. Payne, S. Wallace

PSYCHOLOGY: S. Bufferd, S. Meeks, E. Ross

SOCIOLOGY: J. Beggan, L. Best, K. Christopher, L. Heberle, G. Marshall, D. Roelfs

THEATRE ARTS: N. Burton, J. Calvano, R. Vandenbroucke

WOMEN'S & GENDER ST: D. Heinecken, C. Fosl, C. Snyder, N. Theriot

Dr. David Schultz, Chair, called the Faculty Assembly to order at 2:03 PM.

The Assembly approved the August 28, 2020, minutes unanimously.

Originally scheduled for October 2, 2020, the State of the College address has been changed to October 16, 2020, at 3:00 PM.

Dr. Schultz recognized Dean Owen for his scheduled Q&A. Dean Owen asked the faculty to be mindful of Fall 2020's heightened stressors and to be willing to engage with students about contemporary concerns. Dr. Owen recommended that faculty not approach this semester as if it is business as usual, particularly given local tensions surrounding the grand jury decision in the Breonna Taylor case. The dean mentioned the restorative talking circles that are being coordinated by Dr. Cherie Dawson-Edwards and Tamara Russell, encouraging faculty to participate and sharing that more such conversations will be held in the future. The dean provided a few additional updates:

- Faculty should consult the University's COVID-19 webpage for up-to-date information.
- The provost is considering "tightening" the attendance policy for Spring 2021. This policy change would establish that only students who have to go into quarantine will be held harmless if they have to miss two weeks of classes. Students should not use this policy as an excuse not to attend classes. Faculty will be able to require students to attend face-to-face meetings of hybrid courses if they are not ill and will be able to penalize them if they elect not to do so.
- The University is considering revising the academic calendar. If this revision is approved, the Spring 2021 semester would start one week later. Spring Break would be cancelled, but the schedule may be designed to include some long weekends.
- The first round of scheduled classroom technology upgrades should be completed by the spring semester's open. A second round of classroom upgrades will begin immediately thereafter. The lavalier microphones A&S ordered are still on backorder.
- The University is expected to require another two-week period of mandatory COVID testing after Fall Break.

During the Q&A, a question was asked about how annual faculty evaluations will be affected by COVID-related disruptions. The current plan is for each department to conduct its own evaluations using internally-derived standards. This provoked discussion about the advisability of the College enacting common, College-wide standards.

Dr. Ann Hall was elected to serve as the new Faculty Assembly chair. No one volunteered to fill the soon-to-be-vacant parliamentarian position and the proposed new secretary position also remains unfilled.

Next, Dr. Schultz recognized ULPD Chief Gary Lewis, who updated the faculty on plans to improve the security of A&S buildings and the campus in general. ULPD has updated and increased the number of cameras on campus. Departments interested in installing new cameras should work with ULPD to guarantee compatibility with the University's systems. ULPD increased its patrolling of adjacent student housing facilities in addition to launching new public

safety programs like CardCruiser!, an after-hours ride service, a pedestrian safety initiative, and a suicide awareness campaign. The University has also hired a full-time emergency manager. Chief Lewis also addressed a controversial RAVE alert notice sent on September 10, 2020. After explaining how the RAVE system works (i.e., federal law requires that certain types of crimes within a certain proximity to campus must be reported), Chief Lewis reminded the Assembly that the officer who prepared and sent the notice did not follow proper procedure and did not get the message's text approved. Internal steps have been taken to ensure that such errors do not occur again. Chief Lewis also shared that ULPD is now a younger, more diverse force than when he assumed command and noted the de-escalation and implicit training are required.

Mark Watkins provided a brief update on campus COVID planning. He reported that the University has a month-to-month contract with a company that sanitizes four buildings nightly Sundays through Thursdays and that this contract will remain in place until circumstances no longer require this service.

Dr. Schultz next recognized Drs. Pam Beattie and Lauren Heberle of the Personnel Committee to present the Committee's proposed revisions to the College personnel policy. By this point, it was almost 3:15 PM. The Assembly unanimously voted to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. Dr. Beattie presented four proposed revisions, the full text of which appears in the appendix below. Simplified, the revisions would: amend policy language so that term faculty may take academic leave; create the titles of Senior Instructor I and Senior Instructor II so that qualified term faculty members without terminal degrees may be promoted; allow for electronic voting in tenure and promotion cases; and eliminate discrepancies between Board-approved personnel policy language and the dean's guidelines concerning reviews for faculty holding joint appointments. The Assembly approved each of the proposed revisions unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 PM.

AGENDA FOR A&S FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
September 25, 2020  
Virtual Meeting by Microsoft Teams, 2:00-3:15 PM

- I. Announcements and approval of A&S Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes from August 28, 2020 (<http://louisville.edu/artsandsciences/faculty-staff/faculty-assembly/minutes>) (5 minutes)
- II. Questions & Answers with Dean David Owen (10 minutes)
- III. A&S Assembly – voting for new chair and parliamentarian (5 minutes).
- IV. Mark Watkins (Operations, Chief Operating Officer) and Gary Lewis (Chief of Police, Director of Public Safety) - overview of efforts related to Covid-19 and campus security (20 minutes)
- V. A&S Personnel Committee (Pam Beattie and Lauren Heberle, co-chairs) presentation and proposed changes to the Personnel Policy (30 minutes)
- VI. Technology and Facilities Committee (Edna Ross, Chair) – report on A&S classroom upgrades for synchronous streaming of f2f lectures and racial bias in Respondus Monitoring (5 minutes)
- VII. Standing Committees (updates, time permitting)
  - Academic Discipline and Student Grievance (Wendy Yoder, CML)
  - Admissions and Appeals (Thomas Mackey, HIST)
  - Committee on Committees (Jake Wildstrom, MATH)
  - Curriculum and Standards Committee (Karen Christopher, SOC)
  - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (Asaf Angermann, PHIL and Kalasia Ojeh, PAS)
  - Faculty Salary Committee (David Roelfs, SOC )
  - Personnel Committee (Pam Beattie, HUM and Lauren Heberle, SOC)
  - Planning and Budget Committee (David Schultz, BIOL)
  - Research Committee (Micah Worley, BIOL)
  - Technology and Facilities (Edna Ross, PSYC)
  - A&S Faculty Senators (David Brown, Michael Cunningham, Karen Hadley, Eugene Mueller, Natalie Polzer, David Schultz, Christopher Tillquist, Serri Wallace, Elaine Wise)

## APPENDIX

**16 September 2020**

**To: A&S Faculty Assembly**

**From: A&S Personnel Committee**

Dear Members of the A&S Faculty Assembly,

There are several matters in the A&S Personnel Policy (ASPP) that need to be addressed this Fall so we are bringing four proposals before the Faculty Assembly. We have separated and numbered the proposals I-IV and have provided a brief rationale before each. The heading indicates the section of the ASPP that is being revised. We would appreciate any comments or suggestions for changes in the wording before the meeting of the Faculty Assembly on September 25. Please send your comments to Lauren Heberle ([lauren.heberle@louisville.edu](mailto:lauren.heberle@louisville.edu)) and Pamela Beattie ([pamela.beattie@louisville.edu](mailto:pamela.beattie@louisville.edu)), Co-chairs of this year's A&S Personnel Committee.

### **I. Academic leave for term faculty**

Under the current policy, term faculty are ineligible for for academic leave of any kind. We propose striking a phrase from the current policy (marked in yellow) so that term faculty may accept grants and other types of academic leave.

#### **Section 1.2 – Nontenurable Full-Time Appointments in Part B: Term Faculty Appointments**

From section 1.2.B.2

*[2.] Term faculty shall be full-time faculty appointments without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. Such appointments are not probationary appointments and no such appointments, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent terms. Term faculty are not eligible for sabbaticals. ~~or other academic leaves.~~*

## **II. Promotion for term faculty holding the rank of Instructor**

Under the current policy, term faculty who do not hold the terminal degree in their field are nonetheless eligible for promotion. However, the ASPP does not provide a title or rank to which these eligible faculty members may be promoted. We propose adding the the rank/title of Senior Instructor I and Senior Instructor II so that such promotions are possible. Our proposed addition to the ASPP is marked in yellow.

### **Section 1.2 – Nontenurable Full-Time Appointments in Part B: Term Faculty Appointments**

From section 1.2.B.11

*[11.] Promotion in rank may be considered after a term faculty member has served six consecutive years in rank. Procedures for the promotion of term faculty shall be the same as for probationary or tenured faculty. Criteria shall include proficiency in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, but only the areas included in the contract or in the Annual Work Plan will be assessed. A term faculty member who does not hold the terminal degree (Instructor) may be promoted to the rank of Senior Instructor I. Candidates who are eligible for further promotion in accordance with the College of Arts and Sciences policies may be promoted to the rank of Senior Instructor II.*

## **III. Voting on Tenure and/or Promotion Cases in Departments**

A&S policy requires paper ballots that are collected and sent on to the Office of Faculty Affairs. Other units in the University allow for anonymous electronic voting, and especially under the current circumstances of the pandemic, we propose that Departments can agree to use alternate methods of recording anonymous votes, including the same kind of electronic voting process that we use for College elections. Our proposed additions to the policy are underlined and marked in yellow.

### **Section 2.2.I.9 – Procedures for Reviews and Evaluations for Tenure and Promotion**

*[9.] In tenure and promotion cases, after examination of the evidence, each probationary and tenured faculty member having principal appointment in a department shall have a single vote, and the Chair shall report the vote numerically. A faculty member may have to choose whether to vote as a personnel committee member, administrator, or as a member of the department at large. Ordinarily, department votes shall be by written ballot not marked with name, rank, tenure status, or other identifying information. The ballots shall become a permanent part of the file under review. Departments may agree to gather votes electronically (as in other college elections) as long as the electronic instrument provides for anonymous, verifiable, and recordable voting.*

#### **IV. Tenure and/or Promotion Review Process for Faculty Holding Joint Appointments**

This proposal seeks to resolve the discrepancies between the A&S Personnel Policy (which is the document approved by both the A&S Faculty Assembly and the Board of Trustees) and the Dean's Guidelines with respect to review for tenure and/or promotion. The discrepancies have led to a great deal of confusion for both the candidates who hold such positions as they are being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, as well as for the departments reviewing the candidates. The revised policy which is proposed below merges the competing processes and takes into consideration the feedback received by the ASPC from department chairs, faculty holding joint appointments, members of the Faculty Assembly, and some members of Department Personnel Committees.

Our goal in this policy is to resolve the discrepancies in a way that is consistent, fair, and transparent AND:

- Ensures that A&S Personnel Policy is the primary document that will guide review of all faculty for tenure and/or promotion
- Ensures that faculty governance is maintained in personnel policy decisions
- Protects faculty under review from undue burden
- Protects the interests of both primary and secondary departments in alignment with the percentages of the joint appointment
- Ensures that faculty under review and that the departments conducting the reviews are able to comply with deadlines and provide timely reviews

- Distinguishes between “official” BOT-approved joint appointments and “informal” agreements between departments
- Supports interdisciplinary faculty appointments, both existing and future

There are some issues surrounding periodic career reviews of those faculty members holding joint appointments that cannot be addressed simply by resolving the discrepancies between the A&S Personnel Policy and the Dean’s Guidelines. To that end, we recommend, at the very least, greater clarity in Letters of Appointment, improved communication between the departments “sharing” a faculty member, and greater specificity of expectations on the AWP. We expect that this clarity will be more urgent in light of the University’s new budget model.

The two conflicting versions of the review policy follow the proposed new language. The proposed policy is marked by italics.

## **Proposed A&S Personnel Policy for joint appointments**

### **Section 2.2.I. – Procedures for Reviews and Evaluations for Tenure and Promotion**

*2.2.I.11. Joint appointments include 1) official, Board of Trustees (BOT)-approved appointments specified in the original Letter of Offer, and 2) ad-hoc arrangements between two departments (sometimes referred to in individual departments as “affiliate faculty”).*

#### *i. BOT-approved joint appointments*

*If a faculty member has appointments in multiple departments within the College of Arts and Sciences by action of the BOT, each of those units will evaluate his or her tenure or promotion file bearing in mind the percentage of the faculty member’s appointment in each department. The department of primary appointment will initiate the review process and oversee the creation of a review file, and the complete dossier of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion will be made available to all departments involved in the review. In each of the departments, a recommendation will be prepared by the personnel committee, a faculty vote will be conducted, and a chair’s report will be prepared. The reviews can take place simultaneously and the reports from all departments will be inserted into the candidate’s review file prior to sending it on to the Office of the Dean.*

*In cases where the secondary appointment is 25% or less, the candidate may elect an alternate procedure in which one member from the secondary department shall be appointed to the personnel committee of the primary department 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 review of the case by the department Chair of the primary department.*

*In either scenario, once the review file reaches the Office of the Dean, the review will continue as in the case of a faculty member with an appointment in only a single department. If the reviewee has an appointment involving the College of Arts and Sciences and another academic unit within the University, the A&S department 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 facilitate its review.*

*In all cases, the Chairs of the relevant departments will collaborate on the creation of the Annual Work Plan (AWP) from the time of the initial appointment so that the departmental expectations and the faculty member's responsibilities in each department are transparent and equitable, particularly in the area of Service.*

*ii. Ad-hoc interdepartmental arrangements*

*A faculty member whose principal appointment is in one department but who contributes to the teaching, service, or research and creative activity of a second department on an ad-hoc (non-contractually obligated) basis is entitled, upon the faculty member's request, to be reviewed for personnel actions with the participation of the second department. Upon the faculty member's request, the review 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 review of the case by the chair of the department of principal appointment.*

**Here is the language from the current ASPP.** Note that this language does not differentiate between BOT-approved joint appointments and more informal, AWP-indicated, contributions to a secondary department.

## **Section 2.2.I. – Procedures for Reviews and Evaluations for Tenure and Promotion**

[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.

Here is the language from the current dean's guidelines:

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.