

Administrative Council
March 1, 2023 - 3:35 p.m.
TEAMS Meeting
Minutes

Voting Members Present		
Dan Allcott	Amy Brown	Yun Ding
Addison Dorris	Joshua Edmonds	Savannah Griffin
Kim Hanna	Elizabeth Honeycutt	Michelle Huddleston
Samantha Hutson	Janet Isbell	Bethany Jones
Andrea Kruszka	Jane Liu	Mark Loftis
Holly Mills	Wendy Mullen	Tony Nelson
Kristin Pickering	Mustafa Rajabali	Richard Rand
Chuck Roberts	Bedelia Russell	Joseph Slater
Sandra Smith-Andrews, chair	Dan Swartling	Harrison Simpson (Proxy for Elijah Tidwell)
Kyle Turner	Hannah Upole	Aaron Anderson (Proxy for Braxton Westbrook)
Kim Winkle		
Voting Members Absent		
Teddy Burch	Kristine Craven	Dennis Duncan
Mary Lou Fornehed	Steven Frye	David Hajdik
Tammy Howard	Joseph Ojo	Scott Smith
Claire Stinson	Mark Wilson	
Resource Persons / Others Present		
Kevin Braswell	Lori Bruce	Sharon Huo
Karen Lykins	Rob Owens	Carl Pinkert
Cynthia Polk-Johnson	Donna Schrock	Diane Smith
Brian Seiler	Mark Stephens	Kevin Vedder
Lee Wray		

Summary:

Approved agenda

Approved January 25, 2023 minutes

Received revised Faculty Promotion Policy No. 206. First Reading. Information only.

Proceedings:

Chair Sandi Smith-Andrews called the TEAMS meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Andrea Kruszka motioned to approve the agenda for March 1, 2023. Janet Isbell seconded. Motion APPROVED.

Kruszka motioned to approve the January 25, 2023 minutes. Harrison Simpson seconded. Motion APPROVED.

Smith-Andrews noted the revised Faculty Promotion Policy No. 206 was submitted as a first reading and, therefore, informational and for discussion only; upon the second reading, the policy will be available for an actionable vote. Mark Stephens presented and thanked the faculty group who met to work on the revision: Linda Null, Jennifer Meadows, Mary Lou Fornehed, Tom Timmerman and Doug Talbert. Stephens stated the group also worked on the procedures and forms. Stephens pointed out that many of the changes were editorial and brought the policy in alignment with the structure that was used in the Tenure Policy 205, which was revised two years ago.

Stephens stated another goal in the revision of the policy was to clarify the process for promotion of tenured instructors and lecturers. Tenured instructors now have a new career ladder that mirrors the lecturers' career ladder. Stephens noted there was clarification on peers, because it could be different from the Tenure Policy if someone was going up for tenure versus promotion so now there is a clear statement on who the peers are. Stephens noted section III.B clarified who was eligible to vote on a faculty member's promotion and added any faculty member in the unit that was at or above the rank to which the person was requested to be promoted to, was considered a peer. Stephens added the term peers does not refer to those individuals of academic rank whose primary responsibilities were administrative such as departmental school Chair, Directors, Associate or Assistant Deans, Deans, Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, the President and any other similar situations.

Stephens pointed out that the Directors at the Center for Excellence in the College of Engineering had changed. Their status previously was administrative and they were not considered as peers and now they had been moved to faculty and were eligible to be considered as peers. Stephens noted in Section V, prior service credit were clearly defined to include prior service credit awarded toward tenure, was also considered prior service credit toward promotion unless otherwise indicated in the faculty member's contract.

Stephens noted that Section IX, the Appeal of Promotion Decisions, was the most substantial change to the current policy, the appeal process is now mirrored to the Tenure Policy appeal process. Stephens stated he presented the revised Faculty Promotion Policy to Faculty Senate in October 2022 and it was mentioned then that the proposed revision included a change from the Faculty Affairs Committee to a committee selected by the Provost. Stephens had subsequent discussion with Provost Lori Bruce and Associate Provost Sharon Huo, and it was

decided to keep the Faculty Affairs Committee as the committee to which the appeal was referred.

Provost Bruce added that the Tenure Policy would now need to be revised since the revised Faculty Promotion Policy now conflicted with an existing policy. Smith-Andrews stated the Faculty Promotion Policy was consistent and combined the process of the Tenure Policy with the process that was already in place for the Promotion Policy. Smith-Andrews acknowledged the Tenure Promotion Policy should be adjusted and commended the work done on the Faculty Promotion Policy.

Stephens noted there were fairly strict time limits for the appeal process and suggested that under section IX.6, the time for the decision letter from the President be extended from 60 business days to 90 business days from the appellant's filing the letter of intent to appeal, absent good cause. Smith-Andrews noted the ten business days the faculty member had to file a letter of intent to appeal pending the negative promotion decision was not part of the 60-day equation. Smith-Andrews also noted that the 30-business day process for the Faculty Affairs Committee was a little tight. Smith-Andrews added that Information Technology Services would set up a folder for level four data and that may take up to a week as well as explained the steps that the Faculty Affairs Committee had in the process. Smith-Andrews suggested that if the total appeal process was going to be extended to 90 business days, that the Faculty Affairs Committee's process should be extended to 45 business days. Stephens agreed that the appeal process should not be rushed.

Smith-Andrews noted that section IX.5 stated the President could request that the committee conduct more deliberations on matters warranting further investigation before making a final decision and asked if that time period was within the President's timeline for the total 90 business day process? Stephens replied yes.

Kim Hanna asked if on page 21 of the tracked changes, Section D, General Considerations Related to Documentation of Promotion Decisions had been moved or completely deleted? Hanna wanted to make sure it was somewhere in the document. Stephens answered that those sections were moved and/or covered in other areas, certain parts became redundant. Stephens said he would go back to make certain it was included.

Richard Rand noted in Section V, page 10 in the tracked version, Full Professor – the wording was significantly different than paragraph five for Assistant and Associate, which added; "...in accordance with Tennessee Tech's employee Code of Conduct." Was this intentional? Stephens indicated that it was an oversight because they all should be the same.

Rand asked what the thought process was when the significant Section V policy changes were made? Stephens replied that the committee wanted a section that was more general, to document their demeanor and how the professors interacted with students and faculty. Stephens added that it was preferred to use the terms professionalism, integrity and objectivity

as a standard to which everyone should aspire to. Stephens noted it was decided to use terminology from the new University Code of Conduct Policy No. 600. There was discussion on whether some of the previous terminology was measurable or could be construed. Provost Bruce added that when referred to the Code of Conduct Policy it focused on professionalism and the conduct of the individual and things that were measurable, not whether they were likeable.

Stephens also stated there was some modification on degrees considered terminal for Tennessee Tech. Smith-Andrews added that Faculty Senate had asked Dr. Stephens to review this section. Smith-Andrews requested members email Dr. Stephens with any additional feedback on the policy.

Other Such Matters. Smith-Andrews stated the nomination period for Administrative Council was currently open. Academic Affairs sent an email dated February 20th that asked for nominations for Administrative Council. Smith-Andrews added there were three at-large positions up for election.

Smith-Andrews commented that there needed to be a nominating committee to elect the next vice-chair for the 2023-2024 Administrative Council. Mary Lou Fornehed would lead that committee per procedures and there was a need for one or two more individuals to serve on the nominating committee which would provide a name/names for consideration for the next vice-chair at the final meeting of the year. Kruszka and Holly Mills were selected.

Rand motioned to adjourn. Kruszka seconded. Adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Diane Smith, recorder

Documents on file with minutes:

Agenda of March 1, 2023
Minutes of January 25, 2023

First Reading Policy:
Faculty Promotion Policy No. 206