**Minutes: Faculty Issues Committee**

**November 24, 2014**

**Archer 114**

**Call to order: 3:04 p.m.**

Attending: Ted Mahavier, Cristina Rios, Nicki Michalski, Ricardo Tovar-Silos, Cristian Bahrim, Xenia Fedorchenko, and Vivek Natarajan (guest)

**The minutes for September 24 and October 15, 2014 were approved.**

**Chair’s Report:**

* The syllabus general policy information has been updated and is the same on both the SACS and Academic Issues websites. We are not sure yet if we will be able to link to these pages in our syllabi or if we will have to cut and paste. Dr. Doblin will provide an answer.
* The 6 years’ time for promotion to full professor was a compromise. Having one criterion across the board was a faculty senate proclamation, but the administration seems open to reviewing the matter.

**Revisions to the Piper Process:**

* We need to move away from the popular vote since it does not seem to be yielding success.
* We have outlined the following potential process:
	+ We will use each college’s committee that already picks their merit and university professor nominees. They will forward one or two nominees. These nominees should meet the following criteria:
		- Significant scholarly activity, particularly in teaching innovation and development
		- Extracurricular activity including guiding undergraduate research, advising, mentoring, advising student organizations or other activities that indicate connection with students
		- Five strong letters of recommendation that focus on teaching innovation, curriculum development, impact on students, etc. Two letters should come from faculty, two from students, and one from administration.
		- Full teaching load (as defined by their college) for the previous two years and active teaching in the year of nomination. This shall be demonstrated by the inclusion of the teaching load portion of their F2.08.
		- High scores in teacher evaluations and a list of positive comments from those evaluations.
	+ The candidates’ portfolios will be forwarded to the faculty senate which will vote.
	+ The winner of the vote and runner-up will be forwarded to the Provost for approval.
	+ The university nominee’s final portfolio should be reviewed and polished with the assistance of a committee of previous winners.

**Promotion Issue:**

* Dr. Vivek Natarajan told the committee about why the issue of promotion to full professor was being presented to us.
	+ There was confusion about whether the 6 years in the handbook meant to go up for promotion in year 5 for 6th year activation or to go up in year 6 for 7th year activation.
	+ Seven years seems an arbitrary number; where did it come from?
	+ Our sister schools use five years.
		- This can make recruiting faculty more challenging.
		- It discourages faculty achievement if they perceive promotion as “only an issue of time”.
	+ A faculty member can apply in year five, but only if “extraordinary” which is a very vague term.
* The real issue is whether we want to use the same timeline as our sister schools.
* The matter is tabled until we can gather information about the timelines at peer institutions.

**Adjournment:**

4:30 p.m.