

Southern Connecticut State University

## FACULTY SENATE

---

### FACULTY SENATE PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE

#### Minutes

April 4, 2024

**Attendees:** Mike Shea, Stephen Tomczak, Laurie Bonjo, Virginia Metaxas, Tricia Lin, Amy Jansen, Alison Wall, Michael Sormrudee

Guests: Troy Paddock & Maria Diamantis, Current and Past P & T Committee Chairs

12:10

Minutes of March 20, 2024

#### OLD BUSINESS

- Explain P & T COMMITTEE Procedures Document
  
- Revisions to Documents (UPDATES)
  
- Weighting disciplinary action in P & T file evaluation process (brief review)
  - Troy Paddock attended and shared that for the first time since becoming a category of consideration, P&T had a candidate with a disciplinary action (category 6). There is inconsistency with addressing disciplinary action in the recommendations letters. Years in rank is also frequently left out of letters.
  - Highlighted document provided by P&T committee to show where the areas of clarification are.
  - On sealing document: add a check box about category 6 when reviewing letters to ensure that the candidate has checked their file and addressed it (even to say it doesn't exist).
  - Clarify that Category 5 & 6 are ratings – not averages or on a scale.
  - Discussion regarding how to consider the disciplinary action and whether the candidate included it. Should we count 1 point for each disciplinary action that exists? What to do if every level of evaluation doesn't address it?
    - Currently description is vague with multiplicative factor -1, but no details as to how to factor it in. Discussion as to how to address it.
    - Current language in PT document Part IV.A.3 (page 32): "Category six, which is "Record of Disciplinary Action", if such documentation is included in a candidate's P&T file, the P&T committee members shall assign the candidate a number on an eleven-point rating scale (0-10).
    - From P & T Internal Procedures: If there is no documentation of "Record of Disciplinary Action" in a candidate's file, committee members shall enter a rating of 0 (zero)."

- Every letter should address all 6 categories.
- DEC membership – clarify that you can only serve on one DEC at a time.
- Question regarding voting if one or more members cannot participate in a vote (e.g. participates during initial vote, but not during reconsiderations). Text addition:
  - **Suggested Language:** “In instances where all 15 committee members are not available for voting on a file, a simple majority of those present will determine the outcome of the vote.”
- Concerns expressed about the length of the meetings and the schedule. The committee requested that they committee be allowed to break sessions into more than one Friday.
  - Resolution that the P&T committee can determine their schedule as long as the schedule is made available prior to the elections.
  - Could introduce bias if all 15 can’t participate in discussions if splitting the levels of evaluation (e.g. 15 present for the first round of tenure discussions, but only 14 for the second round).
    - Concerns regarding members scheduling conflicts. Current language regarding time commitment needs to be clarified that it’s Friday evening often late into the night.
  - - **TIME INVOLVEMENT:** Heavy involvement during evaluation period, January and February, often Friday evenings.
  - Discussion regarding 9/6 vote as determining recommendation or not
- Update on issue in the [P & T Procedures](#) (FS approved May 3, 2023) document. Referred to EC, pending

Under Part II: Standards for Promotion and Tenure, page 4, we have the standards for promotion to Associate Professor described as

Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or Associate Counselor

1) An earned doctorate or a terminal degree appropriate to the field, plus at least five (5) years of full-time employment as faculty, counselor, or librarian in a college or university at a rank above Instructor,

or

2) Ten (10) years of full-time employment at the rank of Assistant Professor, Assistant Librarian, or Assistant Counselor,

or

3) Credentials and/or experience substantially comparable to the above.

The problem is with 1) as highlighted above. Per the AAUP contract, page 36 section 5.3.3 online [here](#), the same standard is

5.3.3 Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, Associate Counselor

An earned doctorate or a terminal degree appropriate to the field from an accredited college or university plus at least five (5) years of full-time service in a college or university **in a rank of Assistant Professor or above.**

Tabled for next meeting:

- P & T Guidebooks: review and determine if updates are needed and make recommendations; determine purpose and therefore existence of the guidebooks (consult with Troy Paddock & Maria Diamantis – invite to future meeting)
    - Discussion regarding the necessity of the guidebooks and the difficulty of updating five separate documents (Procedures and each of the four guidebooks)
      - What is the support system that could replace the guidebooks (if it exists)?
      - Could AI or the switchover to Interfolio support replacement of the guidebook (technology impact)?
    - Item for continued discussion after review by Executive committee
- 

- Statement on Service – Consideration of new draft by M. Shea. review for approval to send to Executive Committee. **Referred to Senate, awaiting disposition**

- Procedures that need Extensive Examination – Continue discussion

- How to factor in academic advising to further clarify in the faculty evaluation categories? How is academic advising viewed/evaluated in the renewal, promotion and tenure documents?
  - Changes being introduced in Fall 2024; want to expand the role of academic advising into mentoring students for first year and beyond.
  - Launching academic planner tool to work with degree evaluation
  - Conversation about what role departments want to take and be accountable for in advising
    - Accountability approach versus incentive approach (cultural shift)
    - Resolution as first approach to request load credit designation
  - Ensuring that the workload doesn't just fall on non-tenured faculty or certain demographics (which category of evaluation – how to include it in professional assessment post-tenure)
    - What is the minimum standard for advising and what goes beyond (e.g. faculty who send out pins versus faculty who take a more consultative/mentoring approach with multiple meetings, advice for future paths, etc.)
    - How does it get enforced?
    - Should there be a sliding scale for credits (e.g. if above 10 students, start receiving load credit)

Use central document as tool to promote good advising

May not be wise to include in evaluation documents, due to inequities of assignment, ambiguity in evaluation (qualitative, quantitative). Difficult to assess

Recommend that it be included in Department bylaws or other guidelines – documentation

Recommended Solutions from Committee

- No action on evaluation documents – leave status quo in place
- Recommend use of Central document, with input from advising office
- Recommend Departments develop equitable guidelines around advisement

- Benchmarking:

- [ExpectationsforFacultyandAdvisors.pdf \(ccsu.edu\)](#)
- [Faculty Advising Resources - Eastern \(easternct.edu\)](#)
- [Advising Resources for Faculty and Staff | Southern Connecticut State University \(southernct.edu\)](#)

No NEW BUSINESS

Meeting Adjourned at 1:50 pm.