**Draft Minutes of Kennesaw Senate Special Meeting held on the 26th January, 2015**

Points for Discussion of Draft P&T for OWG 22 and Ad Hoc Task Force

Meeting opened 3:34 pm

**Cindy Bowers related History of new P&T proposed policy:**

1. An Ad Hoc Task Force was formed to review the recommendations provided by OWG 22 on the proposed Faculty Promotion and Tenure policy and approved recommendations from the CIC.
2. Six primary items were initially put forth for consideration and were addressed in the report from the Ad Hoc Task Force of 25th September, 2014.
3. The Marietta campus senate met on 15th January, 2015 to begin a discussion on the final report of OWG 22 and the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Task Force.

**The meeting then discussed the points raised by KSU Kennesaw and Marietta faculty concerning the conclusions of Ad Hoc Task Force.**

**Category One: Performance Categories**

1. Considerable concern over the term “noteworthy.” Should the term be retained, dropped and another term substituted, or should the concept of “noteworthiness” be left to each Department’s T&P guidelines?

Randy Stuart stated that “noteworthy” was the term used by USG. Chris Ziegler suggested that whatever term used should be consistent throughout document. A vote was held on *“****noteworthy according to the standards of the discipline and the departmental guidelines****”,* and passed by 26 votes.

1. A need to clarify the distinction between “Scholarship and Creative Activity” and “Research and Creative Activity.” Should this also be left to the Departments?

Joe Thomas raised the point that research is not the same as scholarship, and that the document is inconsistent in its use of these terms. Scholarship means peer reviewed. KSU should follow Boyer model. Marietta Campus passed resolution stating existing language does not make sense. Meeting passed resolution to clarify the difference that ***“the definitions of “research” and “scholarship” should be adopted from current handbook. (3.3.B. of handbook)”.***

1. Defining Service: The Ad Hoc Task Force states: “Service includes service to the department, school, college, university, profession and community (but the service activity must be related to a person’s status as a faculty member).”
2. The word “related” needs definition/clarification. Should we include language that excludes some kinds of services as “unrelated” to one’s status as a faculty member? What about the scholarship of service? Should this also be left to Departments?

Discussion occurred on what community activities counted. Tom Pusateri considered that faculty had to make case for such service affecting P&T. Motion passed stating that, ***”an example of “unrelated” services should be given. The director of Community Engagement should also be involved in determining “relatability.””***

**Category Two: External Letters**

1. Nature of the relationship between candidate and recommender. The problem with external letters and assessing the candidate’s scholarship and expectations in the field versus the candidate’s “likeability.”

Connected to—

1. Negotiation between Chair and candidate on external reviewers. Will the candidate have too much say in the selection of letter writers? Does the Chair’s choice(s) trump the candidates’?
2. The CIC recommendations stated “external letters . . . must come from individuals who have no previous collaborations with the candidate (a minority of external letters may come from co-authors or research mentors. For those letters from collaborators, the nature of the collaboration must be described.” The Ad Hoc Task Force changed this to “Letters from collaborators will include a description of the nature of the collaboration.”

This needs to be clarified by Departments. Josip Derado said that some small disciplines have a lot of collaboration, and it would be difficult to get external reviewers who have not collaborated.

1. Payment/stipend for external reviewers? Also, who pays for any costs included in securing external review (copies of articles, books, chapters, mail, etc.)?

There should be no costs involved with external letters as everything done with pdfs and email.

1. Is the number of required external letters too small? May candidates include more letters than the number required?

Calendar will have to allow time for external letters. Candidates can provide more material than is required. It is important that this be clearly spelled out so that people do not fail on a technicality. Motion passed for minimum of two letters for Associate and 3 for Full promotion. And that Language should be added to account for the collaborative work of translators, as, ***“Letters from collaborators and translators will include a description of the nature of the collaboration and translation.”***

1. Payment/stipend for external reviewers? Also, who pays for any costs included in securing external review (copies of articles, books, chapters, mail, etc.)?

***“No payment will be forthcoming for external reviewers.”***

1. Is the number of required external letters too small? May candidates include more letters than the number required?

***“Number of letters should be stated as minimum number required. Candidates may include more than the minimum number (allowing for letters that might arrive after the portfolio due date.”***

**Category Three: P&T Committees**

1. Voting rank: the language is unclear. The Ad Hoc Task Force states: “We recommend that only faculty at the same rank or above be allowed to vote on P&T decisions.”
2. Should the language be changed to state “only faculty at the same rank or above the rank for which the candidate is applying should be allowed to votes?” This would allow Associates to vote on Assistants to Associates and Associates to Full.
3. Should Departments be left of determine their own guidelines given their own unique compositions?

Tom Pusateri considered associates should be able to vote on full. Luc Noisset thought this would be a conflict of interest. Tom Pusateri disagreed and pointed out that many departments do not have three full professors on their P&T committees, and that many chairs are only Associate Professors. There must be at least 3 faculty voting on P&T decision. Tenured assistant professors should not be on P&T committees. ***Motion to allow Associate professor to vote on Associate to Full promotions passed 22-2.***

1. Voting tallies: The CIC recommended that there would be vote tallies on portfolios with names and would have allowed for dissenting letters from committee members. The Ad Hoc Task Force has recommended: “that whether the vote is unanimous or a majority decision be recorded on the cover sheet.” Names of those in favor or opposed would not be recorded.

Motion to remove any tallies passed 22 – 0 to ***“recommend retaining current KSU policy of committee acting with one voice.”***

**Category Four: PTR**

1. CIC recommended a second binder for PTR. The Ad Hoc Task Force recommends: For PTR, one binder must be submitted. As is the case at both SPSU and KSU, it includes a coversheet(s), the narrative, previous annual reviews, a curriculum vitae, and department guidelines. The narrative should be no more than six pages and should place the faculty member’s work for the last five years in a broad perspective, and outline their goals for the next five-year period. The faculty member may choose to include additional documentation, but this is not mandatory. The additional documentation should not exceed five (5) pages.

Supported by meeting.

1. Should external letters be required for PTR?

Not supported by meeting

1. Should candidates for PTR demonstrate “satisfactory” achievement in all performance areas rather than “noteworthy” in teaching and “satisfactory” in the other two categories?

Meeting supported “satisfactory” in all areas. ***“Senate recommends adopting b.”***

*Categories 5 to 8 not discussed due to lack of time*

Meeting ended at 4:51 pm

**Category Five: Handling of Portfolios/Addition of material.**

1. The Ad Hoc Task Force recommends: Once a portfolio is submitted, no new material can be added. However, “updating” information (e.g., a paper going from submitted to accepted or a grant going from submitted to funded) may be included in a response letter and considered by subsequent levels of review. This is a simple “status” change of something already submitted; it is not considered a submission of new information. Previous levels of review will not reconsider their decision based on this status change.

**Category Six: Translation of “inches” and “binders” in the shift to electronic portfolios.**

1. How do “inches” translate to electronic portfolios? Page number limits? Size of portfolios at all levels? Should there be a restriction on the number of pages or the number of documents?

**Category Seven: Date of Implementation/Training for new system**

1. Ad Hoc Task Force has recommended full implementation Fall 2016.
2. If the new policy goes into place instead in Fall 2015, will there be training (will there be time for training?) faculty and administrators for the new policy and procedures? CETL?

**Category Eight: Need for carefully-written departmental guidelines and rubrics for P&T**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendance (26th January, 2015)** | | |
| **College/Constituency** | **Faculty Member/Liaison** | **Attendance** |
| Accounting | Thomas Devaney | X |
| Art & Design | Keith Smith | X |
| Biology & Physics | Jerald Hendrix | X |
| Chemistry & Biochemistry | Chris Dockery | X |
| Communication | Emma Wertz | X |
| Computer Science | Dick Gayler | X |
| Culinary Sustainability & Hospitality | Thorir Erlingsson | X |
| Dance | Mara Mandradjieff | X |
| Economics, Finance & Quantitative Analysis | Luc Noiset | X |
| Education Leadership | Earl Holliday | X |
| Elementary & Early Childhood Education | Shannon Howrey | X |
| English | Cindy Bowers | X |
| Exercise Science/Sports Mgt. | Jennifer Beck Willett | X |
| First-Year and Transitional Studies | Richard Mosholder | X |
| Foreign Languages | Jaime Cruz-Ortiz | X |
| Geography & Anthropology | Matthew Mitchelson | X |
| Health, Physical Education & Sport Science | Peter St. Pierre | X |
| History & Philosophy | Alan LeBaron | X |
| Inclusive Education | Joya Carter-Hicks | X |
| Information Systems | Humayun Zafar | X |
| Instructional Technology | Jo Williamson | X |
| Interdisciplinary Studies | LeeAnn Lands | X |
| Management & Entrepreneurship | Doug Moodie | X |
| Marketing & Professional Sales | Sandra Pierquet | X |
| Mathematics | Josip Derado | X |
| Music | John Warren | X |
| Nursing | Jackie Jones | X |
| Political Science & International Affairs | Ken White | O |
| Psychology | Tom Pusateri | X |
| Secondary & Middle Grades Education | Joanne Simpson/Jim Wright | X |
| Statistics & Analytical Sciences |  | X |
| Social Work & Human Services | Irene McClatchey | X |
| Sociology & Criminal Justice | Tanja Link | X |
| Sturgis Library | Cheryl Stiles | X |
| Theatre, Performance Studies & Dance | Jane Barnette | X |
| University Studies | Ree Howard | X |
|  |  |  |
| **Liaisons** |  |  |
| Administrators Senate | Caryn Young |  |
| Chairs Council | Alice Pate |  |
| Part-time Faculty Council | Yvonne Wichman | O |
| Staff Senate | C. Beam/J. Costen |  |
| Student Government | Ryan Delaney |  |
| **Ex-officio** |  |  |
| President | Dan Papp | O |
| Provost and VPAA | Ken Harmon | O |
| AVP for Faculty | Ron Matson | X |
| AVP Enrollment Services | Kim West | O |
| Faculty Executive Assistant to President | Maureen McCarthy | X |
|  |  |  |
| **Visitors** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |