

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Faculty Senate

2-23-2015

Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Minutes, February 23, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_aft

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Minutes, February 23, 2015" (2015). *Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee*. Paper 11.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_aft/11

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



**Utah State University
Academic Freedom and Tenure (AFT) Committee**

In attendance (in person or via dial-in): Bruce Duerden, Troy Beckert, Kurt Becker, Cathy Bullock, Peter Adler, Farrell Edwards, Becky Thoms, Kathy Riggs, John Stevens, Michael Lyons

Old Business

- Handbook
 - Kathy Riggs suggested re-wording last point under Grievance Hearing Panel to read "...give both sides a chance to question witnesses and ..."
 - John Stevens was given homework to contact Provost's office to obtain the original versions of their timeline barcharts (for clean inclusion in a .docx file). Consensus was that making the appearance of the grievance and sanction timeline figures more consistent would be helpful, and AFT members favored the barchart versions.
 - After one more pass through AFT committee, the hope is to have a handbook draft ready for the Provost's office to review.

- Response from Executive Senior Vice Provost Larry Smith regarding two issues from previous meeting – non-responsive respondents and "advisory" nature of tenure advisory committees (Appendix 2)
 - The current handbook draft includes a section on "Guidelines for Respondents" that seeks to include the basic message of Larry's response on that matter.
 - The matter of the "advisory" nature of tenure advisory committees generated considerable discussion. General points of consensus were:
 - The essence of the Provost's office's position (that committees should evaluate rather than advise faculty members, while giving feedback on progress towards tenure, and should specifically not advise on the P&T binder contents) is consistent with code but not well-understood by the faculty at large.
 - AFT should work with Provost's office to uniformly communicate the appropriate role of the tenure advisory committee to the faculty, maybe through inclusion in the booklet that pre-tenure faculty are given, and also as part of ombudsperson training. It is important to have this information published rather than spread by word of mouth alone.
 - John Stevens was given the homework to invite Larry Smith to our next AFT committee meeting to discuss this "advisory" matter, including the

following questions (with the intent of shaping our work on this with the Provost's office):

- What are the do's and don'ts of tenure advisory committee roles?
 - What is the difference between "feedback on progress towards tenure" and "mentoring"?
 - If the committee should not be advising the faculty member on the contents of their P&T binder, who is it that decides what is essential vs. useful vs. distracting in terms of the content? This will be an issue in the forthcoming availability of electronic binders, and would be worth addressing early.
- Post-tenure review code revisions – on the horizon; see pages 51-59 at <http://www.usu.edu/fsenate/fs/2014-2015/agenda/FSAgenda01122015.pdf>
 - There is nothing new to report here, but AFT committee members should be prepared to read through and weigh in on the proposed code revisions when we receive them. The stated goal of faculty senate leadership is to have something to us within this next month.

New Business

- Next meeting Monday 3/23 at 3pm.