

Meeting Minutes <FINAL>, Professional Concerns Committee
December 5, 2019
UC 135, 3:15 pm

Members in Attendance:

Shannon Alexander, Linda Dynan, Doug Feldmann, Kathleen Fuegen, John Farrar, Jackie Herman, Ken Katkin, Jim Kirtley, Alexis Miller, Makoto Nakamura, Michael Providenti, Holly Riffe, Hans Schellhas, Tracy Songer, Mauricio Torres, Maggie Whitson

Other attendees:

Sue Ott Rowlands, Janel Bloch, Kimberly ~~Wiley~~-Wiley, Grace Hiles

Members Not in Attendance:

Kalyani Ankem, Mike Carrell, Nicole Grant, Collin Herb, Brant Karrick, Ban Mittal, Gary Newell, Kathy Noyes, Ron Shaw/Michael Hatton, (Rep TBD from Academic Affairs/Honors/Undergraduate Education, (Rep TBD from English), Michael Washington,

1. Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda
 - a. Agenda Adopted
2. Approval of the minutes from the November 21 meeting
 - a. Change: ADD: "Decided if more will be needed" (added to the end of 4.b.f)
 - i. Holly Riffe Motion
 - ii. Shannon Alexandria 2nd
 - iii. Vote Unanimous
3. Chair's Report and Announcements
 - a. Faculty Senate
 - i. Faculty Regent reporting on enrollment and application data that was presented at the BOR meeting. Applications are down except for graduate programs (up 163% because of AP programs).
 - ii. FS President: Senator election results to be announced at December meeting.

- iii. Faculty Advocate: concern about merit scholarships and the way scholarship monies are distributed, particularly room and board. There is concern that this makes NKU less competitive. PCC has been assigned to investigate.
 - 1. PCC discussion: Perhaps this is better for Budget or a merge of both.
 - iv. Budget: survey is available, please participate.
 - v. TEEC: looking at a common syllabus, reviewing RPT policies regarding how teaching effectiveness is judged, considering a grade for “ghosting” students—a non-participation F that would not be a part of DFW rates.
 - 1. Discussion around criteria for what this would even mean.
 - 2. Concern is that a group of students may not be successful from the beginning.
 - vi. Michael Zacate is stepping down as FS president and John Farrar is running so FS will have to elect a new chair that would take over the PCC starting in the Fall of 2020
- 4. Old Business, discussion item, Support for staff during pension discussions.
 - a. See appendix A in 11.21 PCC notes for chart breaking out the 737 NKU employees in KERS
 - b. Question on the table is still trying to decide what to do – but that decision will be pushed until May since the new legislative session won’t start until January.
 - c. Change “exit” to “changes”
 - d. Change “KERS” to “NKU retirement system”
 - e. Be more specific – by saying “allocating the funds needed” to minimizing the effects of an exit of KERS.
 - f. Be more specific – minimize the negative effects.
 - g. Suggestion: being more transparent about these decisions – adding something about that.
 - h. Chair thought process: Make the resolution is just the last paragraph and the rest gives you more background knowledge
 - i. Write **BOLD RESOLUTION** above the last paragraph
 - i. Move to adopt this resolution with the above changes d – f.
Holly Riffe
 - ii. 2nd: Ken Katkin
 - iii. Motion passes unanimously.
 - j. Sent to Faculty Senate on Dec. 6th 2019

RESOLUTION

- i. **The Northern Kentucky University Faculty Senate believes that recruiting, supporting, and retaining an excellent staff is critical to the operation of the University. Those staff employees with the longest tenure at NKU possess an irreplaceable institutional knowledge. As NKU begins the implementation of the new strategic framework, *Success By Design*, which focuses on student success, staff support for faculty and students will become even more important. Therefore, the Faculty Senate at NKU urges university leadership to prioritize investing in staff by allocating the funds needed to minimize the negative effects on every staff member of changes to NKU's retirement system.**

1. Background

On July 24, 2019, Governor Bevin signed House Bill 1 (HB1) which allows Kentucky Employees Retirement System (KERS) employers the opportunity to elect to cease participation in KERS on June 30, 2020. NKU is a KERS employer, and consequently, must decide by May 1, 2020 whether to elect to voluntarily cease participating in KERS. There are currently 737 NKU employees in KERS, with 252 in Tier 1 (longest service to NKU, employed prior to 9/1/2008) and 174 in Tier 2 (entered KERS between 9/1/2008 and 12/31/2013).

HB1 mandates that the exiting employers make a number of decisions regarding the details of the exit. These include whether to pay the costs of exiting as a lump sum or installment payments, whether employees hired prior to January 1, 2014 will continue in KERS, and what alternate retirement plan will be available for exiting employees. NKU is expected to choose to exit KERS.

Staff Congress leadership has indicated that some NKU employees have been calculated to lose hundreds of dollars per month and hundreds of thousands of dollars over the course of their retirement, assuming that NKU chooses for employees to exit KERS.

The Northern Kentucky University Faculty Senate believes that recruiting, supporting, and retaining an excellent staff is critical to the operation of the University. Those staff employees with the longest tenure at NKU possess an irreplaceable institutional knowledge. As NKU begins the implementation of the new strategic framework, *Success By Design*, which focuses on student success, staff support for faculty and students will become even more important. **Therefore, the Faculty Senate at NKU urges university leadership**

to prioritize investing in staff by allocating the funds needed to minimize the negative effects on every staff member of changes to NKU's retirement system.

5. Old Business, Discussion Item, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process (Sections 3.2 and 7.3 of Handbook)
 - a. Letters from Provost Office are sent confidential via student workers. Provost Office is saying it would be more efficient if they were able to email to individuals with electronic signature. There would be a letter scanned and then on the K drive and put in the HR file.
 - b. Suggestion: Post the letters on the Canvas site once they are written at each level.
 - c. PCC thoughts: use electronic, not canvas.
 - d. 3.2.1 – Dossier available to everyone at the same time.
 - i. Discussion – Chair and Committee at the same time and then Dean and Provost at the same time.
 - ii. Discussion – The Dean or Provost is who is asking for the additional guidelines
 - iii. Discussion – PCC is reviewing the last meeting with access.
 - iv. Discussion – Provost, Dean and Chair could put guidelines to the committee to be sure they committee is asking for the correct materials.
 - v. Discussion – this is a concern in that it would be a 3rd set of guidelines for the candidate.
 - vi. Discussion – Does this mean that this would be a “do over” asking for things that the committee needed but the appointee didn't include. This is something we need to be very cautious of.
 - vii. Discussion – it would be nice to have an opportunity to give new faculty the opportunity in case they missed something on their first go-around.
 - viii. Discussion – if it's just the RPT committee does this it simplifies the entire process.
 - ix. Discussion – clearing up from the last meeting of timeline and how we got to this place. The discussion is going back to only letting the RPT committee ask for supplemental material.
 - x. Solution – Strike the sentence at the end of 3.2.1
 - xi. Solution – Strike the sentence in 3.2.6
 - xii. 3.2.8 – Strike the first sentence
 - xiii. 3.2.13 – Add the word any
 - xiv. 3.2.13 – The notification of reconsideration needs to be shared with everyone in the process.
 - xv. PCC: Need to come back to section 3.2.14
 - xvi. Discussion of Proposal (including timeline) below

Proposal 1:

Adds a paragraph in 3.2.1 Time Schedule about the bi-annual review for reappointment and the schedule for tenure application.

More importantly it clarifies that evaluation for re-appointment as an evaluation of the documentation and information completed during the current contract.

- (Previous years have been evaluated and future work will be evaluated. The desire here is to clarify that candidates will be evaluated on their documentation and information submitted, not what they plan to do in the future.)
 - Probationary Years
 - AY 1
 - AY 2 – Reviewed for reappointment. Reviewing AY 1
 - AY 3
 - AY 4 – Reviewed for reappointment. Reviewing AY 2 and AY 3, but not excluding AY 1
 - AY 5
 - AY 6 – Reviewed for tenure, reviewing all work completed in their probationary years.

However, it does not preclude the committee from including documents and information from past evaluations.

3.2.1 TIME SCHEDULE

Each spring, the provost will issue a calendar listing deadlines for each step in the evaluation process for the coming academic year, a template for dossier preparation, and notification of any updates to the process.

Applications for reappointment are reviewed bi-annually. Each bi-annual review shall consider the information provided in the applicant's dossier from the contract years under review; however, this does not prohibit documentation and/or information from previous contract years to be included in the evaluation.

Other than exceptions defined in section 6.7, applications for tenure are reviewed in the 6 year. The dossier for tenure will be evaluated in its full context, including all years of service and any credit for prior service negotiated at the time of the initial appointment.

Proposal 2:

Adds a due date to the submission of the RPT dossier. The purpose of this is twofold:

1. To add time to the calendar for RPT committees to review the dossiers.
 - a. Large departments have a difficult time meeting the deadlines in the current calendar.
2. To clarify the review period.
 - a. There has been confusion in our department about what documents should be included for review. Teaching and Service documentation is predetermined as the previous academic year. In other words, when reviewing RPT files in the Fall of 2019, for teaching, we did not include in our evaluations Fall 2019 teaching documentations, syllabus, assignments, student feedback. The same can be said for Service. We evaluate service completed in the past. For research the times are blurred. Do we include manuscripts that are accepted for publication on September 1st of Fall 2019 in the 19/20 AY evaluation? It was accepted before the current deadline for dossier submission, but outside of the parameters of what is being evaluated, their previous work. The proposal directs the applicant to include the newly accepted manuscript in the next RPT evaluation. What should be included in the current evaluation is the research/work completed in order to submit the manuscript along with the submission, with documentation of the journal and so on. Thus, this proposal defines that all work being evaluated should be from the previous AY year(s).
 - b. It's not the intention to ignore or dismiss the work of a colleague who gets a manuscript accepted on September 1st, but rather honor the work completed in the current AY under review instead of the upcoming.

3.2.2 INITIATION OF REQUEST

The applicant is responsible for initiating consideration by applying for reappointment, promotion, tenure, or a combination of them. A full-time administrator with academic rank may apply for tenure or promotion supported by documentation. The applicant will compile **and submit** an RPT dossier, including a cover sheet provided by the provost's office **no later than August 15th, 11:59pm the year of their request for consideration.**

Proposal 3:

Changes the due date that applicants are required to be notified of their reappointment. (Keeping in mind the deadline to notify NTTRs of non-reappointment is mid-spring)

Corrects what appears to be a mistake in the dates for notification of reappointment.

- If candidates are notified on December 15, 2019 of non-reappointment, their current contract actually ends in Spring 2020.
- This is where the assumption of a lame duck year is found. This removes the assumption/protection and instead grants the choice of an additional 12 month contract to the department. (whether this should be the chair's decision, a search committee, or RPT is left open)

The inclusion of 6.8 below is to indicate that the lame duck year is secured separately for the applicant who is denied tenure.

The date of December 15th now corresponds with RPT calendar, see last page.

3.2.12. NOTICE OF NON-REAPPOINTMENT

Notice of non-reappointment of a probationary contract must be in writing, by the provost, and given:

- Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service;
- ~~At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service at the University.~~
- Each department will have the choice whether to extend a 12 month contract upon a notice of non-reappointment.

6.8. DENIAL OF GRANT OF TENURE

A faculty member who is not granted tenure during the sixth year of probationary appointment, including university-recognized credit for prior service, will receive a one-year terminal contract.

Proposal 4: Proposed Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Schedule/Calendar

Between April 1 st and 30 th , 20__	Spring RPT meeting with tenure track and provost. Open to all, but department chairs and RPT committees are specifically requested to attend. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This meeting is for the RPT applicants' questions.
Between August 1 st and 14 th , 20__	Fall RPT meeting with RPT Committees and the provost. Deans, department chairs and committee chairs are specifically requested to attend. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This meeting is for the RPT Committee members' questions
August 1, 20__	Candidates for reappointment, tenure, non-mandatory tenure review and promotion to full professor provide notification to the department chair and the dean of the intent to apply for tenure review or promotion to full. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe we should create a form that can be completed to provide this intent
August 5, 20__	Dean notifies the provost of faculty applying for reappointment, tenure, non-mandatory tenure review and faculty seeking promotion to full professor. Office of the Provost then provides cover pages for these candidates.
August 10, 20__	Office of the Provost provides rosters and cover pages for candidates for reappointment, mandatory and non-mandatory tenure review, and promotion to full professor to college deans for distribution to departments.
August 15, 20__	Chair and membership of departmental RPT committee and, if applicable, the full professor committee due to the dean and the provost from the department chair.
August 15, 20__	Candidate's reappointment, tenure and promotion dossier due electronically to Department RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee. Candidate will not be able to make changes to the dossier after 11:59 pm. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Associate and Full promotions
August 16, 20__	RPT Committees and Chairs access to the electronic dossier begins at 12:00 am. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assumption that chairs do not need the RPT Committee's and full professor Committee's letters to draft their own.
October 31, 20__	Department RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion due to department chair by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the department chair and sent in hard copy form with a copy to the candidate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RPT Committee and, if applicable, full professor committee's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
October 31, 20__	Department chair's recommendation for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the dean by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the dean, sent in hard copy form, and copied to the Department RPT Committee members, if applicable, full professor committee and the candidate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chair's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
November 1, 20__	The deans, provost and president's access to the electronic dossier begins at 12:00 am. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same assumption from above.
November 30, 20__	Dean's recommendations for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the provost by 11:59 pm. Letter is addressed to the provost, sent in hard copy form, and copied to the department chair, the Department RPT Committee members, and the candidate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dean's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
December 15, 20__	Provost recommendation for reappointment, tenure and promotion due to the president. Letter is addressed to the president, sent in hard copy form with copies to the dean, department chair, and Department RPT Committee members with a copy to the candidate.

	The Office of the Provost uploads all letters into the electronic dossier. These letters remain a permanent part of the candidate's dossier. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The provost's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm.
March 1, 20__	President submits reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations to the BOR. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The president's access to the electronic dossier ends at 11:59 pm

xvii.

Adjourned 5:00

Respectfully submitted,

Tracy Songer
PCC Chair