

Faculty Senate Meeting

MINUTES

October 28, 2004

3:00pm

Emerson Alumni Hall

Meeting Agenda

Approval of October 21, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Pierre Ramond, Chair

Information Item

- Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure Report
Recommendations

James Klausner

Approval of October 21, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Pierre Ramond

Discussion: No Discussion.

Conclusions: Minutes from 10.21.2004 were approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Members of the Tenure Committee discussed the recommendations outlined by the Committee in their report as well as questions and comments from those in attendance.

- 1.) Tenure When Ready: The Tenure when ready recommendations were unanimously accepted by members present during the straw poll conducted at the 10.21.2004 meeting.
- 2.) Six Year Maximum Probationary Period: Faculty and administrators expressed favor for either the six-year maximum probationary period or the seven-year plan. Several representatives from the health sciences and the book disciplines expressed favor for the longer term. Suggestions were made to allow colleges the flexibility to set their own individual maximum probationary periods based on what is required. Several individuals expressed concern that UF will lose people based on this issue. It is important that each define the criteria and review annually. Reference was made to peer institutions and the guidelines that they have in place. A straw poll conducted showed that the majority favored a six or seven year probationary period with flexibility left up to the department. Few favored having a seven year probationary period.
- 3.) Tenure Clock Stopping Policy: The Committee's recommendations were defined. Based on the straw poll results taken 10.21.2004 there was minimum attention to this issue.
- 4.) Midterm Review Policy – By End of 3rd Year: The committee feels that the midterm review is part of the natural continuum of the tenure process and serves to prepare junior faculty for the steps ahead. The results of this review should not be used in a punitive fashion. The committee views this process as advisory. Some administrators in the audience expressed the view that midterm reviews can be important in making employment decisions. Believed that although not the intent for future use this document, especially in written form there is a possibility that it would be. This should be used as a step in helping the individual to get ahead. In a straw poll conducted the majority voted in favor of a third-year midterm review set up at the discretion of the college.
- 5.) Junior Faculty Mentoring Program: Mentoring should be done, but evaluations are constructive criticisms and should not be included as an assessment. Candidates should have the option to choose whether they want oral or written evaluations. If a letter is written, it should be restricted and not used for the evaluation process. The Tenure Committee conducted a straw poll and the majority of senators felt that mentoring should occur but without formal assessment. It was stressed that those that currently are mentors would not continue if their assessments were included as part of the formal evaluation process. Mentoring is to offer support and to encourage individuals in areas in which they may need to focus or to alter their methods. Mentoring is an option in which a more experienced tenured faculty member to assist in offering experience and wisdom to new faculty members. The Committee stated that this should be written into the report because currently this is occurring in a sporadic fashion and by having it in writing it may encourage further implementation of the program. In a straw poll conducted the faculty-senate majority voted to accept that no evaluation be included.
- 6.) Distinction not Explicitly Defined: The committee recommends that distinction not be defined. Such definition should be left to the individual colleges. Some faculty members stated that they were not aware of any definition within their college. They expressed their concern that this should be provided to faculty. It was noted that this was the responsibility of each individual College/Department. Administration and faculty will encourage distribution. The criteria for defining distinction will be reviewed annually.
- 7.) ½ of Members on College T&P be Selected via Peer Voting: The committee recommends that one-half of the members of college tenure and promotion boards be selected by the faculty. In a straw poll conducted it was supported by the majority present and voting that this be accepted.
- 8.) Faculty Assessments by T&P Members Recorded in Tenure Promotion Packets: The committee recommends that the college tenure and promotion boards continue to serve in advisory roles to the deans and the president. The committee suggests that individual members of the boards have individual voices that can be reviewed by the Academic Personnel Board or the president. The individual would each an individual voice but would remain anonymous. There was some concern expressed regarding how this practice would be affected by the Sunshine Law. Barbara Wingo stated that because it would be in an advisory capacity and not a committee, this would not violate the Sunshine Laws. A straw poll showed that this was accepted by 44 of the 54 individuals that voted on this item.
- 9.) Minimum of 5 Peer Evaluation Letters: Committee recommends that a minimum number of outside peer evaluation

letters be required for tenure review should be five. At the 10.21.2004 meeting this recommendation passed with only one unfavorable vote.

Additional Notes:

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Attendees:

Voting Senators:

Janaki Alavalapati
Samim Anghaie
Barbara Barletta
Jerry Bartz
MaryLou Behnke
David Bloom
David Bloomquist
Kenneth Boote
Frank Bova
William Buhi
Margaret Carr
Douglas Cenzer
Carlene Chase
Bill Chen
Robert Cohen
Dan Connaughton
Jerry Cutler
Timothy Davis
Donna Duckworth
MaryAnn Eaverly
Tim Flynn
Richard Foltz
Paul George
Pete Giacobbi
Abraham Goldman
Donald Graetz
Steve Hagen
Peter Hansen
Peg Hall
Alice Holmes
Mike Katovich
William Kem
Richard Kerschner
Saeed Khan
Peter Kima
Margaret Kohn
Christy Lemak
William Lindberg
Joseph Little
Lisa McElwee-White
Jack Mecholsky
Cathleen Mook
Paul Mueller
Carol Murphy
Winston Nagan

Satya Narayan
Max Nickerson
June Nogle
Scott Nygren
Mickey Parish
Rebecca Pauly
James Pettigrew
Jim Rodrigue
John Schueller
Richard Segal
Mark Sheplak
Rahul Shrivasta
Charles Smith
Wesley Smith
Colette St. Mary
Laura Bond Sutton
Crystal Thorpe
Edward Valenstein
Thomas Vickroy
Bryan Weber
John Werning
Danaya Wright
Allen Wysocki
Anthony Yachnis
Rick Yost
Robert Zloetecki

Officers:

Pierre Ramond, Chair
Kim Tanzer, Chair-Elect
Anthony Brennan, Past-Chair
Barbara Wingo, Parliamentarian
Rick Ragan, Secretary

Guests

Robert Watson
Jessie Varnes
Andy McCollough
Peter Bushnell
Chelsea Dinsmone
Oscar Crisalle
Donna Lee
Allan Burns
Kim Emery
Nancy Schaefer
Nita Ferrew
Steve Pritz
Ken Gerhardt
David Colburn
Joe Glover