

11-6-2018

Motion to discuss transitional tenure and promotion policy

Jonathan Hilpert
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hilpert, Jonathan, "Motion to discuss transitional tenure and promotion policy" (2018). *Faculty Senate Index*. 669.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/669>

This discussion item request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Senate Executive Committee Discussion Item Request

Motion to discuss transitional tenure and promotion policy

Submitted by: Jonathan Hilpert

11/6/2018

Subject of Discussion:

Motion to discuss a draft copy of the transitional tenure and promotion policy

Rationale:

During consolidation, the faculty welfare OWG began work on a transitional tenure and promotion policy meant to provide guidance for how and when faculty will transition to the new tenure and promotion guidelines formed post consolidation by the departments and colleges of the new institution. This work remained incomplete at the end of the 2017-2018 academic year. In Fall 2018, a subcommittee of the FWC completed a draft policy. The draft policy was created based on statements made by the provost during the 2017-2018 academic year (i.e. from senate minutes), draft language discussed by the faculty senate provided by the faculty welfare OWG, draft language provided by the former Armstrong senate president, and suggestions made by the FWC subcommittee members assigned to draft the policy. The draft policy was unanimously approved for senate discussion by the FWC subcommittee on 10/16/18 and the FWC on 10/22/18. We do not seek a vote of approval. Rather, we hope to gain input from senators and administrators to help us move toward a version of the policy that can be passed by the senate at a future meeting. A copy of the draft policy is provided in the attached documentation.

Response:

Attachment: Draft Transitional T and P policy for Senate

Discussion 11/9/2018: SEC approves this to move to the floor for discussion.

Minutes, 11-27-2018: e. Discussion Item on Transitional Tenure & Promotion Policy (page 15) Jonathen Hilpert (COE) and chair of faculty welfare introduced a motion on transitional tenure and promotion. This motion request guidance for transitioning faculty to new, post-consolidation guidelines. The OWG left this issue unfinished, so this subcommittee of the welfare committee is developing a comprehensive policy to transition. He opened up the floor to discussion.

Comment: Chris Cartright (CAH) asked about limited term faculty and how LTF were affected and if they could receive merit raises. Do these policies impact LTFs? Hilpert (COE) responded

that the policy does not address LTF. Dustin Anderson (CAH) said this issue had come up for discussion.

Comment: Ted Brimeyer (CBSS) noted that we will officially be one university in July 2025. Also, he was concerned that the Armstrong requirement of two articles to be full professor is pathetic, and he claimed that the Armstrong standards are driving the whole university. Hilbert (COE) explained that this policy included input at all levels. Carol Jamison (CAH) asked where he gets this number that two articles are sufficient for this promotion, and he responded that this is the case in several departments that he has seen.

Comment: Christy Moore (WCHP) noted that course load affects publication. Hilpert (COE) noted that people may go up on very different sets of guidelines for the next six years, but it was determined that it is only fair that one should advance under expectations at time of hiring. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) noted that between the campuses, there are “loud and soft” narratives. Instead of speaking for our whole department, we should give Hilpert (COE) input so these soft narratives can be heard. Hilpert (COE) suggested communicating with him, senators, and faculty welfare members about these concerns.

At this point it was 6:00. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) made a motion to extend meeting, and Meca Williams-Johnson (CED) seconded.

Hilpert (COE) then continued that he hopes to get feedback from us. Janice Steirn (CBSS) notes that it is understandable that this is transitional. However, we are asking people who are close to their evaluation to be ready to change to the new guidelines. Will the new guidelines be a compromise of the two existing sets? Hilbert (COE) responded it is being decided now by colleges and departments. Steirn (CBSS) then asked if there were guidelines that indicated which directions these should go. Richard Flynn (CAH) said that these guidelines originate from the department up rather than being determined top-down.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) asked about differences and where these disagreements are coming from. Maybe the committee could provide some guidance in what is reasonable and fair and send them to Hilpert. Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked Hilpert to explain how the figure of six or seven years came about for transitioning. Hilpert (COE) explained that this figure would cover all faculty pre-consolidation. She then asked about how this differs for faculty going from associate to full. Robert Costomiris (CAH) noted that the policy says this expires in 2025 unless faculty get an extension. Anderson (CAH) noted that the intention is to allow colleagues to succeed. Hilpert (COE) noted that two people could get tenure with two very different records, yet we have to pass a policy that allows fairness in transitioning to new guidelines. The sunset clause allows associate professors a six-year period to prepare for new guidelines to full professor. Anderson (CAH) asked if he could accept suggestions. Hilpert (COE) said the idea is to vote at the next meeting. Suggestions can be sent to Ginger before agenda is set for the February meeting.

Janice Steirn (CBSS) asked about the five-year post-tenure review and if it counts as a subsequent promotion. Hilpert (COE) responded that no, it does not. Heidi Altman (CBSS) then asked if an associate professor who has been at this level for a while will now have six additional years to advance to full. Hilpert (COE) answered yes. Dustin Anderson (CAH) asked that Senate members send additional questions to Ginger Malphrus, and we should encourage our departments to do the same.

