

NEXT SENATE MEETING:

Thursday, September 25, 2003, 3:30 P.M., UC 307

Austin Peay State University

Faculty Senate Meeting (Special Called Session considering the Tennessee Board of Regents' proposed revision of Promotion and Tenure Policies)

Thursday, September 11, 2003

DRAFT Minutes

Summary: The Faculty Senate discussed, amended, and approved the Faculty White committee's carefully considered, meticulously prepared, and clearly formatted response to the TBR's proposed revision of **promotion and tenure** policies. Faculty White committee member Senator Barry Kitterman presented the committee's work on the promotion document; Faculty White committee chair Senator Mary Lou Witherspoon presented the committee's work on the tenure policy. Major issues considered relative to both promotion and tenure policy revision were **national recognition, collegiality, the use of the term "university," standards for appropriate terminal degrees, teaching criteria (particularly teaching methodology)**, and consideration of **fiscal impact** in these personnel actions. The discussion specific to promotion policy called attention to the use of the term "community based scholarship." Additional issues involving the proposed revision of the tenure policy included the "appraisal" of candidates, extension of the probationary period, "stopping the tenure clock," granting years toward tenure at time of hiring, student evaluations, external peer review of candidates, and the processes leading to expiration and termination of tenure.

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. by Faculty Senate President Tim Winters. The roll call indicated that the following senators were absent: Kell Black, Elaine Busey, Phil Kemmerly, Thomas King, and Adel Salama. Dwonna Goldstone, who has not yet been officially elected, but is expected to be, was also absent.

Senators present were: Elaine Berg, Rhonda Bryant, Michele Butts, Art Carpenter, Steve Clark, Sue Evans, Jill Franks, Loretta Griffy, Ron Gupton, Sean Hogan, Matthew Kenney, Thomas King, Barry Kitterman, Susan Koch, Ramon Magrans, Marcy Maurer, Shirley Rainey, William Rayburn, Jordy Rocheleau, Adel Salama, Omie Shepherd, Ann Silverberg, Nancy Smithfield, Gregg Steinberg, Janet Tracy, Tim Winters, Mary Lou Witherspoon, and Faye Zeigler. Several other faculty members who are not senators were present; they were allowed to voice their opinions during the meeting.

Senator Kitterman moved that the Agenda for the meeting (containing only the proposed TBR revision of promotion and tenuring policies) be approved; it was immediately seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Senate President Winters expressed gratitude to Mary Lou Witherspoon, the Faculty White Committee, and Mickey Wadia (a faculty member much involved in the production and revision of the faculty handbook who was unfortunately not present) for producing their response to the documents rapidly, getting them posted on the senate web

page, and for presenting their responses in a clear format. The senate applauded these efforts.

Senator Barry Kitterman was called on to present the Faculty White committee's response to the promotion document. Senator Kitterman noted that he hoped today's meeting would address questions about the committee's response and, if sufficient agreement on the response and exceptions to it could be arrived at, a resolution might be made, passed, and sent to TBR. In the case of significant disagreement, a "minority report" could also be produced and sent to TBR.

Senate President Winters declared that the Senate's response would go forth as it is produced; disagreement or agreement with the proposed revision of policy would need to be shown.

Senator Kitterman summarized the three major areas which are problems in the proposed revision of the **promotion policy**:

1. **National recognition.** For promotion to Associate Professor, the revised policy would ask candidates to present "Documented evidence of high quality professional productivity that is leading to national recognition in the academic discipline." Likewise, promotion to Professor would require "sustained high quality professional productivity and national recognition in the discipline."

2. **Collegiality** or Professional Service is not listed as a requirement of candidates for promotion, but is prominently featured in the proposed revision of the tenure policy.

3. The term "**the university**" is used in a variety of places in the proposed revision, but nowhere is its meaning specified, leaving readers wondering if it refers to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, individual departments, colleges, etc. After his summary, Senator Kitterman led the Senate through the committee's response to the document point by point. The language at issue in the proposed revision and the committee's responses were projected for all to view.

From the proposed revision's introduction: "... the president will consider the **fiscal impact** of each promotion recommended to the Board." The committee felt that "fiscal impact" might need clarification, as the institution of the more stringent promotion requirements presented in the proposal might be a way of implementing fiscally conservative policy.

Senator Witherspoon noted that the "fiscal impact" material is in the current document (as well as in the proposed revision). Senator Clark asked if anyone knew of situations where promotion was denied to faculty because of funding problems. No one knew of any such cases. If a freeze on the pay raise did arise, Senator Clark said that perhaps the promotion could be effected regardless and thus the production of the portfolio need not be repeated.

Senator Griffy: There was a time when that did happen; promotions were made in name only, money followed later.

Senator Kitterman: There was concern that [promotions without raises] could have happened last year.

Senator Franks: Cuts should be made elsewhere in such cases.

Senator Rayburn: If one is approved [for promotion] in all other respects, apart from the money situation, should faculty be given the promotion separate from the raise, rather than together?

It was generally agreed that fiscal concerns should not bar the promotion process from going forward, but awarding promotions without raises should be vigorously avoided.

Regarding the proposed revision's list of Research/ Scholarship/Creative Activities, Senator Kitterman pointed out that the committee would like to have the term "**community-based scholarship**" clarified as its meaning is vague. Regarding revision of the Teaching criteria, the committee felt that asking faculty to remain current in "his/her field of specialization and in **instructional methodology**" might lead to faculty chasing "fads" in order to be current; some faculty also do not favor prescriptive methodologies or technologies but feel they should have the freedom to choose among them.

Senator Carpenter brought up the limited opportunities for conducting research in traditional physics and related fields at Austin Peay and similar institutions. He noted that teleconference classes and the like do take effort that could be considered pedagogical research, despite the fact that only one university in the United States offers a Ph.D. in pedagogical physics. Pedagogical research is appropriate at teaching institutions [such as Austin Peay].

Senator Witherspoon agreed that there is a place for research that improves teaching, but she asked if should it be documented as part of a candidate's work in research or in teaching.

Senator Gupton responded that such work might be documented in both places [as research/scholarly/creative activity and as part of the candidate's teaching credentials].

Senator Koch noted that one of the last phrases under the teaching rubric calls for documenting research and innovative approaches in instruction.

**Revision of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor** was discussed. The committee preferred that evidence of professional productivity "leading to **national recognition**" [as the revision provides] rather than evidence of "national recognition in the academic discipline" be used in consideration for promotion to both Associate Professor and Professor.

Professor Till asked if the use of the two different phrases constituted an attempt to compare, effectively predicting what might come next in a candidate's career versus evaluating the candidate's actual achievements.

The proposed revision states that candidates for **promotion to the rank of Professor** will provide "documented evidence... of **national recognition** in the academic discipline"; unlike the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor, this statement does not include the phrase "leading to national recognition"; the expectation is that candidates will have attained this recognition at time of the advance in rank.

Senate President Winters stated that this provision (requiring candidates for promotion to Professor demonstrate national recognition) has generated lots of electronic responses (email and discussion board), far more than others.

Senator Kitterman noted that the "national recognition" requirement is also featured in the section of the proposed revision which deals with research, and thus he asked that we discuss this issue later.

Professor Till stated that the group had not been clear about resisting the "national recognition" requirement and suggested that the Senate do so.

The discussion progressed to later sections of the revised promotion policy.

Senator Franks stated that teaching [in a manner so as] to raise teaching evaluations does happen.

The Senate's general consensus was that the word "substantively" be struck from the sentence attempting to distinguish between the accomplishments of Associate Professor and Professors, as the word was felt to be vague.

Senator Butts noted that she considered the process of revising promotion policies (and tightening requirements to be "part of a larger thing": the same sort of policy revision is occurring in other state agencies, such as the State Library. The gist of it is that evaluations are perceived to have been unrealistically high, and thus there is a need to hinder promotion in the state. The State Library is getting the same message: there is a need to cut the number of promotions.

Senator Kitterman turned to the language regarding **terminal degrees**. The revised policy mentions the use of "**national standards**" in determining appropriate terminal degrees for faculty in each discipline, but provides no means of discovering exactly what these standards are or who determines them.

Senator Berg noted that the library has a standard also. Deciding to use national standards is not the same as deciding what they are.

Senator Griffy asked if, for example, it would be possible to teach business with a JD (Doctor of Laws) degree.

Senator Rayburn suggested that such faculty would be judged qualified to teach business law.

Senator Griffy noted that there had been a liberal interpretation of this, and exceptions have been made [to the general rule that degrees match the subjects faculty teach.]

Senator Koch noted that such individuals might also teach tax classes also.

It was noted that exceptions to the general rule have to be made to the TBR, and thus the question is how to satisfy the Board that qualifications match teaching areas and that appropriate degrees have been earned by faculty.

Senator Berg recommended that the Board of Regents recognize another agency or agencies [other than itself] to recommend appropriate terminal degrees in the various disciplines.

Senate President Winters stated that the TBR must be informed as to what appropriate terminal degrees are, from national agencies.

Senator Clark asked if SACS [the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which is Austin Peay's accrediting agency] addresses this issue.

Senator Witherspoon stated that in the areas of Mathematics and Computer Science, doctorates are required of faculty by SACS; a mathematics Ph.D. has been considered acceptable for faculty who teach Computer Science. There has been a local question

about this issue. Some regard hiring candidates with doctorates in mathematics to teach Computer Science as problematic, but in many cases this occurs.

Senator Kitterman asked if someone could tell us who comes up with terminal degree standards. There was a general consensus that this matter should not be left in the hands of the TBR.

Senator King stated that we [the Senate/Faculty] should send them [the TBR] information regarding terminal degree standards.

The discussion turned to the provisions of the proposed revision regarding **promotion criteria**.

The revised promotion policy states that "universities must develop written guidelines with specific criteria" for evaluating research, teaching, and service.

Senator Kitterman read a note that the committee had appended to their response to this stipulation. The note points out the fact that **collegiality** and professional conduct are not included in the three areas mentioned here but have been given high prominence in the revised tenuring policy. The two policies should be consistent.

Senator Witherspoon noted that "universities" as used here is nebulous and requires further definition.

Moving to the language regarding **teaching criteria**, Senator Kitterman noted that it seems that the revised policy will allow "universities" to assign appropriate weight to the criteria for teaching, but it would be preferable that departments make this determination. He asked several questions: will faculty be required to chase instructional fads, which might include online instruction? What does the phrase "current...in **instructional methodology**" mean? Would use of such teaching criteria penalize those faculty who are unwilling to incorporate specific teaching methods or technologies in their work?

Senate President Winters stated that use of a phrase such as "awareness of current teaching methodologies" would be better than giving the appearance of requiring their implementation.

Senator Rayburn asked if currency in teaching content rather than in teaching method might be a better criterion for evaluating teaching.

Senator Witherspoon stated that effective teaching should be an appropriate criterion.

Senator Koch noted that faculty are already being asked to be "current" and that every teacher will not be effective using the same methodology.

The discussion turned to the proposed revision of criteria for promotion in **Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities**.

The Senate took issue with the statement that "**national recognition** is considered the most important criterion in evaluating scholarship for promotion to full professor."

Senator Kitterman stated that the phrase "national recognition" has no inherent meaning. It could be used very loosely in order to prevent promotion.

Professor Till suggested that the phrase "national recognition" be eliminated from the promotion policy everywhere it appears. He added that while a university might promote itself by stating that "our professors are recognized nationally," this is quite different from asking faculty to document such recognition for promotion to Professor.

Senator Rayburn noted that the level and expectation of recognition has to be different at different universities and in different units.

The Senate arrived at a strong consensus that the phrase "national recognition" should be eliminated from the proposed revision of the promotion policy.

Use of phrase "**the university**," which occurs in a number of places in the proposed policy revision, was discussed.

Senator Clark asked if this phrase referred to the college or department.

Senator Witherspoon stated that it might mean college, department, or individual academic unit. It is important that the college or university not make all promotion determinations, as the proposed revision tends to suggest. Authority should rest with academic units.

Senator Koch noted that the School of Business should make such decisions, not the college.

Senator Zeigler stated that several units are neither Schools nor Departments.

Senator Kenney suggested that the phrase "immediate academic unit" might be used.

Senator Witherspoon noted that a careful search would need to be done to insure that this phrase would be appropriate every time it is used in place of "the university" in the proposed revision.

Senate President Winters stated that the phrase "the university" certainly needs clarification.

Senator Smithfield corrected an earlier comment she made regarding the qualifications of faculty teaching in the areas of Computer Science, stating that the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science does have one faculty member with a Ph.D. in computer science, and also has a faculty member with a doctorate including a computer science concentration.

Senator Kitterman moved that the Senate forward the committee's response to the TBR with the following adjustments:

1. Language that seems to require faculty to adopt "cutting edge teaching approaches" should be dropped from the proposed revision.
2. A list of agencies capable of determining the **terminal degree** appropriate in each discipline should be compiled.
3. **Teaching criteria** for promotion should not ask or imply that all faculty use the same methodologies.
4. A phrase such as "immediate academic unit" should replace the term "**the university**" where it occurs.
5. The phrase "**national recognition**" should be struck from the proposed revision of the policy.
6. **Fiscal impact** should not be a defining criterion for promotions to occur. If there is no money for paying the raises attached to promotions, the promotions should still occur. Delay of promotion raises should be avoided.

Senator Kenney asked if a two-year window [for delaying promotion raises] should be specified in the document.

Senator Kitterman noted that it is possible that **delayed promotion raises** will occur.

Senator Gupton noted that promotion raises are normally funded with money saved when faculty members retire; only rarely have promotion raises been funded with money from other sources.

Senator Witherspoon asked if the motion could be amended to recommend that the proposed revised policy strike the phrase suggesting that the fiscal impact of promotions would be a criterion in granting promotion.

Senator Rayburn asked if faculty members would have to reapply for promotion if they were turned down for fiscal reasons. It would be better to be granted the promotion without the raise than to have to repeat the steps required in applying for promotion.

Senator Clark concurred.

Senator Koch stated that she felt the phrase regarding the fiscal impact of promotions should be struck, but she also believed it would nevertheless remain in the document.

She stated that the fiscal impact of promotion raises should not hinder promotion.

Promotions without raises should not happen, however, the promotion process should go forward even if the fiscal situation does not make the raise possible.

Senate President Winters concurred with these statements.

Senator Hogan noted that language to the effect that consideration for promotion would be tempered by fiscal conditions is in introduction to the proposed revision, and will need to be amended.

Senator Franks stated that creating promotions without raises is a problem; extra work for no compensation or for delayed compensation should be avoided.

Senator Clark stated that delayed compensation has happened before; at least the revision proposed would insure that the promotion process is not repeated.

Senator Kitterman called the question.

Professor Till warned the senate that providing for promotion without compensation (the associated raise in pay) could result in promotions becoming merely honorific.

Senator King stated that we (the Senate/faculty) should tell the TBR our list of agencies qualified to determine the terminal degrees in various disciplines.

Senate President Winters reminded the Senate that our response to the proposed revision of promotion policy is due by September 25<sup>th</sup>, we hope to have our response document online (linked to the Senate web page) soon.

Senator Rainey asked if the TBR would need to receive a list of agencies qualified to determine terminal degrees would be needed with this document.

Senator Witherspoon responded that yes, this list should accompany our response.

A motion to accept the document outlined above with the emendations as discussed and forward it to the TBR was rapidly made and passed unanimously.

Senate President Winters called on Senator Witherspoon to present the Faculty White committee's response to the proposed TBR revision of **tenure** policy.

She explained that the prepared response "doesn't count 'til we say it does" [until approved by Faculty Senate].

The committee took issue with the proposed revision's statement that the quality of the faculty is "maintained primarily" through **appraisal** of candidates for tenure by "competent faculty and administrative officers.". Senator Witherspoon pointed out that candidates for tenure experience many levels and types of evaluation or appraisal, including student evaluations.

Senator Carpenter maintained that appraisal of candidates is required, and it does maintain quality.

Senator Clark felt it would be appropriate to delete the word "primarily" and include a phrase stating that the quality of the faculty is maintained in part by appraisal and in part through the support of a wide variety of professional development.

Senator Rocheleau asked if this language appears in other places in the document.

Problems with references to TCA (Tennessee Code Annotated) and cross-references to other sections of the policy were noted.

The question of appropriate **terminal degrees** and **national standards** for them, which had been discussed earlier in regard to the proposed revision of promotion policy, was raised, and it was felt that the same procedure should be followed in the tenure policy (the Faculty Senate should supply a list of agencies qualified to determine the appropriate terminal degree in each discipline).

Section III.D. was discussed at length; this portion deals with the timing of application for tenure, policy regarding **early application** for tenure, and **extensions** of the probationary period.

Professor Till noted that all kinds of scenarios could allow disasters to occur.

It was generally agreed that candidates for tenure might apply in the fifth year of their probationary appointment, but no earlier. At the time of hiring, some faculty members may be granted years toward tenure.

Senator Koch said that it seems that granting no years toward tenure at the time of hiring seems to be the rule; she was told not to ask for any.

Senator Franks felt that there should be some standardization in **granting years toward tenure** when hired.

Senator Griffy noted that the proposed revision implies that the employment period and the probationary period are the same, and this may not be the case in every instance.

Senator Silverberg noted that the proposed revision seemed to suggest that once an application for tenure has been made, the probationary period cannot be extended under any circumstances.

Senator Clark stated that he felt that earlier application for tenure is more prudent than waiting until only one opportunity is available.

Senator Witherspoon noted that current policy provides a probationary period of seven years.

Professor Till noted that faculty should have a year of work ahead if tenure is denied [a grace period.]

Checking current policy, Senator Witherspoon noted that it calls for not more than seven, and no less than five years [as the probationary period], exceptions may be made to the minimum upon recommendation to the university president, the TBR's chancellor, and with the approval of the Board of Regents

Senator Clark said that notification of tenure decisions is late, occurring in late June or July.

Professor Till stated that in that case, faculty denied tenure should have two years of employment ahead.

Senator Witherspoon quoted current policy, stating that "When a faculty member on a tenure-track appointment completes the sixth year of the probationary period, the faculty member will either be recommended for tenure by the president or will be given notice of non-renewal of the appointment following the seventh year of service. Such notice of non-renewal should be given not later than the final day of the sixth academic year. The faculty member's right in an instance where timely notice is not given is described in I(1). " (III.F.2. from the current tenure document)

Senator Koch noted that the retention policy may differ from tenure policy regarding notification dates. It seems unclear.

Senate President Winters asked if the committee's response should be left as it is, providing candidates who seek tenure early with a second opportunity to apply if denied. Senator Koch asked if this would mean that probationary faculty could apply for tenure before their fifth year.

Professor Till stated that current policy must allow faculty to apply for tenure in year five.

Senator Rainey stated that she knew of a case in which the years before tenure application were negotiated, allowing a probationary faculty member to apply for tenure after only two years in the department. This person applied for tenure twice and was granted it on the second try.

Senate President Winters noted that he arrived at Austin Peay with seven years' experience, and was granted no years toward tenure; this allowed for more preparation for the tenure application, but also made for a lengthy probationary period.

Senator Rayburn asked if in general it would be advisable to apply for tenure earlier.

Professor Deanne Luck stated that granting years toward tenure affects whether a probationary faculty member can apply for tenure early or not.

Senate President Winters suggested that we ask for a change in policy about granting years toward tenure.

Senator Witherspoon stated that we should seek to keep the intent of current policy in this section, but ask for clarification regarding awarding years of service toward tenure.

Senate President Winters asked if the exceptional cases [where years toward tenure have been granted] are due to faculty members arriving with many of years of service.

Senator King asked if there is a standard length for **extension** periods.

Senator Witherspoon read the prior part of the document (III.E.2), in which extensions in one-year increments are mentioned.

Senator Magrans stated that it seems that the administration does not follow policy anyway. He said that he would like to see our administration stick to policy.

Senator Franks asked where it is written that the administration can arbitrarily change policy. She also asked whether what the Faculty Senate says and does has much of a chance to make a difference.

Senator Griffy noted that Dr. Short (chair of the TBR Academic Subcouncil) likes to hear the faculty's voice, not just the administrators' voices, as she often hears from the latter.

Senator Witherspoon turned to Section III.E.2.b. of the proposed revision, where "**stopping the tenure clock**" during the probationary period is permitted when "circumstances exist that interrupt the faculty member's normal progress toward building a case for tenure." The committee felt that "stopping the tenure clock" should be a right rather than something that the faculty member must request, as the proposed revision states.

Section IV.A.1 was discussed next. This part of the proposed revision details **evidence of teaching excellence** to be included in tenure candidates' portfolios.

Senator Carpenter asked if evidence of teaching excellence in tenure applications may include peer input, or is peer input only used for post-tenure reviews.

**Student evaluations**, particularly for summer courses were discussed, as the proposed revision asks that "systematic student evaluations for each course each semester" be included in each tenure candidate's dossier.

Professor Till noted that we've been told that they [student evaluations] can be done in the summer, if they can, it should be possible for student evaluations to be done for all courses.

It was suggested that the phrase "may routinely" replace the words "should routinely" in the paragraph listing documentation of teaching excellence.

Senator Clark asked if it might be better to use a phrase such as "the candidate may choose to include" before listing types of evidence of teaching skill.

Senator Silverberg noted that there could be a problem with requiring tenure candidates to present student evaluations for each course each term: some classes have such small enrollments that student evaluations are not conducted.

Senator Zeigler stated that she has known of situations where student evaluations have been lost between the department and the computerized collation of them, leaving faculty without this data. She felt that less emphasis on student evaluations would be appropriate.

Senator Rayburn agreed.

Senator Witherspoon noted that the proposed revised policy emphasizes teaching evaluations less than the current version.

The Faculty Senate agreed with the Faculty White committee's opinion that it is unreasonable to require tenure dossier/applications to "include **evidence of external peer review** of the candidate's record of research/scholarly activity" (Section IV.A.2).

Senator Witherspoon noted that in Section IV.A. 4 of the proposed revision, **collegiality** seems to have been made into a fourth criterion, comparable in importance to the areas of teaching, research, and service. The committee felt that collegiality would best be mentioned in the overview (Section IV.A).

Senator Gupton stated that "professional conduct" might be a better phrase to use rather than the term "collegiality."

Senator Clark noted that including collegiality as a standard could allow judgments to flow from personality conflicts, which would be an abuse.

Senator Rayburn stated that highlighting collegiality as a criterion for tenure could actually perpetuate dysfunctional professional and interpersonal relationships amongst faculty.

Senator Witherspoon said that the Faculty White committee suggested striking Section IV.A.4 and addressing collegiality in some manner in the overview.

Senator Clark noted that is seemed out of proportion to elevate collegiality to a fourth criterion equal to teaching, research, and service.

Senator Witherspoon noted that the first sentence of the committee's response to the revised Section IV.A.4 is taken verbatim from the Faculty Handbook. This sentence mentions the faculty member's "willingness and ability to work effectively with colleagues."

Senate President Winters asked if the revised policy should include a statement about the possible abuse of this [rather subjective] standard.

Senator Carpenter asked if the revised policy might acknowledge the fact that faculty members have diverse personalities, recognizing the need for diverse attitudes and perspectives. There should be problems only when abuse of this criterion is egregious.

Senator Clark noted that often important people have been iconoclasts.

Senator Witherspoon stated that the Faculty White committee found that advisement of students has been placed under the rubric of service in the revised policy; the committee asked if it should be placed under the teaching rubric instead.

Senator Silverberg noted that if advisement is not part of teaching, it would leave open the possibility of not counting these activities as part of faculty teaching loads and responsibilities.

Senator Magrans concurred that advisement is part of teaching, not service.

The Faculty White committee also noted an unclear or incorrect cross-reference in the proposed policy revision referring to timely notification of non-renewal of tenure-track (probationary) appointments.

Senator Carpenter brought up the proposed revision of policy regarding the **expiration of tenure**. He quoted the proposed revision of policy, which states that tenure shall expire on retirement, or in the event of permanent inability to perform one's duties as determined by one physician, etc. This could result in expiration of tenure upon the recommendation of a single physician, which would not be fair. Senator Carpenter insisted that fairness, openness, and due process should apply to cases where termination of tenure is at issue. A process for loss of tenure due to disability should be instated similar to the process governing loss of tenure for due cause; "an authority" [acting alone] should not be effectively permitted to judge whether a disability necessitates loss of tenure. An appeal process for this should also be instated.

Procedures for termination of tenure are provided in Section V.G.5 of the proposed policy revision. Senator Witherspoon noted that current policy has a detailed list showing the steps that are to be taken when **termination of tenure** is effected for curricular reasons. In this list, part-time faculty are those that would be terminated first, and tenured faculty with the greatest seniority in rank would be eliminated last. The Faculty White committee recommended that this list be reinstated in the proposed policy revision and the Faculty Senate concurred.

Senator Witherspoon noted that current policy provides a step-by-step process for termination of tenure for cause. Current policy requires that a committee of tenured faculty be appointed; this committee would try to come up with a solution to the problem, or recommend that the termination process go forward.

Senator King praised the response to the proposed policy revision produced by Senator Witherspoon and her committee.

Senator Rayburn moved that the Faculty White committee's response to the proposed revision of the promotion and tenure policy be approved as amended and sent forward to the TBR; Senator Magrans seconded this motion and it carried with no abstentions or objections.

The meeting unanimously and spontaneously adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ann L. Silverberg  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
Professor, Department of Music  
(931) 221-7644  
silverberga@apsu.edu