PRPC Minutes
November 16, 2005

Present: Jennifer MacAdam, Cathy Bullock, Rob Morrison, Tilak Dhiman, Ronda Callister, Dallas Holmes, Jim Barta, Kurt Becker, Richard Sherlock, David Olsen

Flowchart of PRPC Activities
Jennifer briefly discussed a flowchart that explains the placement of PRPC work before the Faculty Senate. Clarifications of the code can be moved to Senate as information items, but any substantial revision of the code must technically be done at the direction of the Senate. When such items have not originated in the Senate, they move from PRPC to Senate as action items for which a code change has been suggested, and further action on changes to the code will depend on a Senate motion.

Report from FSEC meeting on November 14, 2005
1. Electronic Participation at Annual P&T Committee Meetings
   Jennifer provided PRPC with wording as revised by Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC). This change was accepted by PRPC. FSEC put this code change on the Senate agenda as an information item (i.e., a non-substantial change to the code). Dallas Holmes pointed out two locations in the code referring to the fact that an ombudsperson must be present at all meetings of the tenure advisory committee. PRPC will seek clarification from the Provost to determine if the language on electronic attendance at tenure advisory committee meetings may also apply to ombudspersons.

2. Senate Standards of Conduct
3. Senate Committee Meeting Policy
   FSEC put these on the Senate agenda as action items.

4. Dean’s Tenure Advisory Committees
5. Non-Renewal of Grant-Funded Faculty
   PRPC will seek input from the Provost before FSEC moves these to the Senate agenda.

Excellence Criteria
Richard Sherlock presented the issue of unwritten criteria for promotion and tenure, specifically expectations of excellence in areas other than the major role as defined by the role statement, and provided specific language for consideration. After discussion, it was decided to take this issue forward for consideration at four levels: role statement (if minor roles are to be held to a criterion of excellence), departmental (workload documents to specify expectations at the academic unit level), college (deans’ expectations to be specified in writing) and University administration (central committee expectations to be specified in writing).

Pre-Tenure Probationary Period
Discussion of proposed language led to some revision as noted below. PRPC will solicit input from the Provost on this proposed addition to the code.

405.1.4 Pre-Tenure Probationary Period
(3) Leaves of absence.
An academic year(s) in which leave without pay is taken will not count as part of the faculty member's pre-tenure probationary period. When a tenure-eligible faculty member is on any leave of absence with pay for one or more semesters in an academic year, upon recommendation from the faculty member's department head or supervisor, director (where applicable), and the dean or vice president, the Provost may approve an extension from the faculty member's pre-tenure probationary period in cases such as, but not limited to, Family and Medical Leave, Sick Leave, Military Leave, and Jury and Witness leave.

Even if a leave of absence is not taken, at any time during the tenure process a tenure eligible faculty member can request an extension of the pre-tenure probationary period for one year for reasons including, but not limited to, medical needs of the faculty member or a family member or family responsibilities (including birth of a child or adoption). This extension may be requested up to two times. Upon recommendation from the faculty member's department head or supervisor, director (where applicable), and the dean or vice president, the Provost may approve an extension of the faculty member's pre-tenure probationary period. During the year in which the pre-tenure probationary period extension is granted, faculty teaching and service responsibilities may be negotiated but the pressure to move forward with research and publications is reduced through the extension of the number of years allowed to gain tenure. Salary and possible raises should not be affected by the request. When the faculty member that has extended the pre-tenure probationary period goes forward for tenure, research expectations will be no greater than if the tenure extension had not been utilized.

New Business
1. In an FSEC discussion of the need for early third-year review by tenure advisory committees, Bruce Miller explained that the purpose of the early schedule was to provide for rapid (i.e., within six months) termination of tenure-track faculty not renewed at the third year review. However, the only reference to this is in Code 407.7.3, which notes the date of notification of non-renewal, depending on the year of review. It was recommended that PRPC seek clarification of practice from the Provost, and revise the code to make the purpose and implication of early third-year review more clear for both candidates and committees.

Dallas suggested the following revision:
The role statement shall be reviewed, signed and dated annually by the faculty member and department head or supervisor, and when needed the role statement shall be revised as needed.

Next meeting
Jennifer noted that the activity from the September and October PRPC meetings will be on the Faculty Senate agenda for December 5th, and that the items from the November PRPC meeting will go to FSEC on December 19th and on to Faculty Senate on January 9th. She therefore suggested delaying the next PRPC meeting until after the Faculty Senate meeting in January.

Vacancies on PRPC:
It was noted that Ronda Callister will be going on sabbatical and Rob Morrison is moving to Chicago, both effective Spring '06. Both are Senate appointments to PRPC, so Jennifer will contact Doug Ramsey, chair of the Committee on Committees, to fill these vacancies.