The next meeting of the 2019-2020 Faculty Governance Committee will be held on Wednesday, April 22, at 3:00pm via video conference.

MINUTES OF MEETING DATE: April 8, 2020

PRESIDING: Jeff Popke (vice-chair)

REGULAR MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (X IN ATTENDANCE):
Crystal Chambers, Rep. of Chancellor _X_; Don Chaney, Rep. of Chair of the Faculty _X_; Mike Van Scott, Interim VCREDE __; Grant Hayes, Acting Provost / VCAA __; Mark Stacy, VCHS _X_; David Thomson, Rep of Faculty Senate _X_

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Rachel Baker; Linda Ingalls for Office of the Provost; Wendy Sergeant, Assistant VC for Personnel and Resource Administration in Academic Affairs; Lisa Hudson, Associate VCHS and Human Resources Administration Director.

I. Call to Order, 3:04 pm.

II. Minutes
The minutes of March 25 were approved.

III. Continuing Business
A. The committee resumed discussion of Covid-19’s impact on promotion and tenure clocks. Since the committee made its last recommendation, to allow timeline extensions, several questions have arisen.

1. Ingalls explained that extensions of the probationary period have the effect of extending existing contracts, but do not guarantee reappointments (i.e., new contracts).

2. Ingalls and Sergeant provided a revised timeline to show the effect of an extension.

3. If someone who requested an extension later asked for a reversion to the original schedule, would this be tantamount to a request for early tenure?
   a. Ingalls suggested: requesting early tenure is the simplest expedient, because there is already a provision for it in the Faculty Manual. Or candidates could request an amended timeline.
   b. Newhard: both of the options outlined by Ingalls should be advertised to candidates.
c. Chambers reiterated a concern expressed at the last meeting, that requesting an early tenure decision invites extra scrutiny, which would not be appropriate in this case.
d. Chambers and Altman questioned whether extra scrutiny was warranted in any case.
e. Lockerbie, Walker, Duffy acknowledged the problem, but noted that it’s hard to control tenure committees.
f. Stacy observed: sometimes the discussions are complicated, but in Health Sciences the process has been fair to candidates. One thing that keeps it fair is evaluating the candidate at several levels, not just the unit.
g. Hudson pointed out that candidates who request early tenure consideration can explain the circumstances in their PAD, and this information can also be presented to review committees.
h. A majority of the committee agreed that the Faculty Chair should advise candidates who decide they don’t need an extension to use the Faculty Manual’s existing process for requesting early consideration.

4. If a candidate for tenure and promotion does not elect to extend and is then denied tenure, is there any retroactive discourse?
a. Wilson-Okamura: No, there should not be. Putting a candidate up for tenure requires considerable energy and resources from the department and from external reviewers. Candidates need to decide whether they are ready or not.
b. Hudson not that candidates can withdraw during the summer, by not submitted a PAD.
c. Ingalls: progress toward tenure letters and annual evaluations should help candidates know where they stand.
d. Chambers: it should work that way, but sometimes it doesn’t.
e. Stacy: true, but that larger problem won’t be solved by giving advice on Covid-19 extensions.
f. Wilson-Okamura suggested that we apply the same standards for Covid-19 as we do for other extensions.
g. A majority of the committee agreed that Covid-19 extensions could not be requested after someone has submitted a PAD. As Newhard suggested, all candidates should be advised to request an extension and then request early consideration if the extension proves unnecessary.

5. How long should extensions be?
a. Ingalls: increments shorter than one year would require permission from the Board of Trustees, because the Board only reviews Tenure once a year.

6. The committee agreed that, if a candidate requests an extension, progress toward tenure letters need to adjust their expectations accordingly.
B. On April 6, Interim Chancellor Ron Mitchelson approved revisions to the interim policy Resolving Allegations of Discrimination, “if edited as recommended.”
   1. The committee agreed that some of the recommended changes were substantive rather than editorial, and would need to be addressed at a later meeting.

IV. New Business
   A. On April 6, Interim Chancellor Ron Mitchelson approved revisions to the Academic Integrity policy, “if edited as recommended.” The committee reviewed a suggestion to move this policy from the Faculty Manual (hereafter FM), Part VI, Section II to the Policy Manual (PM).
      1. Popke asked for the committee’s advice on two issues: should we move this policy, and what kinds of policies should be moved?
      2. Walker, who was Chair of the Faculty when the PM was created: we reviewed all sections of the FM to decide what should stay and what should be part of the new PM. This particular section was carefully revised at the same time, in 2011.
      3. The committee agreed that academic policies, including academic integrity, should remain in the FM.
   B. Prior to the meeting, Popke circulated a draft of advice for using technology in personnel actions.
      1. Chambers spoke to the need for flexibility.
      2. Walker suggested that we clarify who is responsible to save email correspondence when it becomes part of the record.
      3. Lockerbie suggested that we not name video conferencing platforms but stipulate simply that they must be university-approved.
   C. The committee commended Popke as Chair of the Faculty for his hard work, patience, and practical intelligence during this period of extraordinary strain and unforeseen challenges.

V. Adjourned at 4:46.

Respectfully submitted, David Wilson-Okamura.