

Unit Criteria Committee Meeting
Tuesday, August 30, 2016. **3:00 to 4:00 PM**
502 Rasmuson

Meeting Notes

Present: David Maxwell, Sara Hardy, Julie Matweyou, Bob Bolton, Doug Goering, Mara

As a preliminary meeting primarily to choose a chair and set the fall meeting schedule, there was no set agenda and no outstanding business from the end of last year (at least as directly related to unit criteria review/approval).

Mara expressed interest in continuing as chair, which was agreeable and supported by those present.

Fall meeting schedule is set as follows (third Thursday of every month)

October 20, November 17 and December 8 - all meetings 2:15 - 3:15

It was decided not to have a September meeting since there is no current business and it would be after the September faculty senate meeting.

There was open discussion on the joint appointment primacy issue (carry-over from AY16) - with agreement from returning committee members that the original charge was vague and unclear as to what the expectations were of the unit criteria committee.

Doug offered valuable insights as to some of the complexities and issues surrounding joint appointments - especially when it comes to promotion and tenure of joint-appointed faculty that have an appointment in a research institution and in an academic department, wherein lies the locus of tenure. He pointed out that this was a source of greater conflict in the past when the research institutes did not have their own unit criteria, but with the trend now of more and more having approved criteria - this improves the situation, somewhat.

Still, there does need to be some type of effort to address and clarify the promotion and promotion with tenure process for joint appointed faculty, as well as stipulations that joint appointed faculty are tenured only to the percent of their appointment (i.e. 50%) so as to prevent academic units from having to support 100% of funding when grant/soft funds dry up/are not obtained.

In general - if the joint appointee is under review for promotion only, then both sets of criteria from the units should be evaluated equally; if the review is for promotion and tenure, then the tenure-line unit criteria dominate, with some consideration

given for criteria from the other research unit that are substantively important (funding success, research activity, etc) and unique to the research unit.

Further action: Doug will discuss this at the Deans' Council meeting - and get the pulse of whether there is still support to continue with developing recommendations and bringing issue to Ad Com/Senate.

Mara will send similar query to Orion and Chris, as well as send out to the unit criteria committee the short report that was prepared and submitted to Faculty Senate at the end of AY15.

General consensus of the committee is that we have some concrete points and direction with which we can now proceed, and that we can likely craft some language for further and future action by the Faculty Senate.

Adjourned at 3:50 PM