Professional Concerns Committee
October, 7, 2021, at 3:30pm
Agenda

1. Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda
2. Approval of the minutes from the September 16 meeting
3. Chair's Report and Announcements
4. Old Business
   a) Voting item: Replacing content of Faculty Handbook Appendix A with Administrators Returning to Faculty Status policy
   b) Discussion item: Revising language regarding typical number of years at the rank of associate before applying for promotion (Handbook 1.9.4—Qualifications for appointment to rank)
5. New Business: RPT matters
   a) Discussion item: How is the term "continuing" interpreted in terms of evaluating scholarly and creative activity and service among candidates seeking promotion? Is this term necessary? (Handbook 5.1.2 and 5.1.3—Promotion)
   b) Discussion item: Should RPT committees have a procedure for appealing administrators' recommendations?
6. Adjournment (4:30pm)

Professional Concerns Committee

Minutes for October 7, 2021

Virtual Meeting (On Zoom Conferencing Software), 3:30 pm

Members in Attendance: S. Alexander, R. Boyce, T. Cata, W. Darnell, K. Fuegen, R. Gall, N. Grant, B. Green, P. Hare, G. Hatchett, J. Herman, B. Karrick, K. Katkin, A. Miller, K. Muente, M. Nakamura, G. Newell, M. Providenti, H. Riffe, G. Sun, M. Washington

Guests in Attendance: J. Bloch, M. Cecil, G. Hiles

Members Not in Attendance: L. Dynan

---

1. **Call to Order, Adoption of the Agenda**
   a) The Meeting was called to order at 3:30pm. The agenda was adopted unanimously without changes.
2. **Approval of the minutes from the September 16 meeting**
   a) Draft Minutes from PCC Meeting of September 16, 2021 were approved without dissent.
3. **Chair's Report and Announcements**
   a) The Provost noted that on-campus enrollment is down. The under-represented minority (URM) student retention rate is down. Graduate enrollment is up, largely due to accelerated online programs.
   b) Update regarding program review. Last March, the President requested a strategic review of all university operations. The interim Provost assembled an ad hoc working group of faculty, chairs, and deans to develop a holistic approach to program review. The group met bi-weekly during late spring and early summer to develop criteria for the review of academic programs. The group delivered a report to incoming Provost Matt Cecil July 1. The provost announced that it is his goal to work with Faculty Senate in the program review process.
   c) There was a guest presentation by Bob Alston from Student Affairs. SA has updated the student Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The revised Code was approved by the BoR during its Sept 8 meeting. The revised code aligns with NKU's core values: "NKU's Core Values guide this document's approach to community and student development. As such, behavior that may violate these Community Standards are organized in a way that reflects the most closely associated NKU Core Value." For example, a violation of the student honor code (for plagiarism or cheating) is treated as an act of dishonesty and a violation of the community standard of integrity. The Student Honor Code (undergraduate, graduate) is an appendix.

d) There was a guest presentation by Gannon Tagher, Interim Assistant Vice Provost for Advising and First Year Experience. She described plans for the new first-year student success hub. Advising of all first-year students would be done by staff advisors working in the centralized advising hub. Departments and school advisors would continue to advise second-year students and beyond. The rationale for a centralized advising hub is that many students change majors during their time here. Therefore, advisors working in a centralized hub may be in a better position to track students and meet their needs as they change majors. The goal is to increase credit hours, so that more students can graduate within four years. Planned implementation is May 2022. Ten new advisors will be hired.

   This applies to on campus undergraduate students.

e) There were a lot of questions from the faculty regarding the Senate resolution mandating that all students, faculty, and staff be vaccinated for COVID-19. No action has been taken.

f) Update regarding PCC recommendation that the grade submission deadline be extended in 7-week courses: FS President John Farrar serves on a calendar committee. He sent our proposal to Registrar Allen Cole. Allen suggested that the submission deadline could be extended by one day. He expressed concern that advisors of students in the accelerated online program will not have enough time to make changes to a student's courses prior to the start of the following term.

   Discussion:
   --Provost: The advising hub is to enhance the services we are offering. Students can speak to an advisor in their department if they would like to. The point is to onboard new students in the first year and get them connected to the people they will be working with.
   --Why were faculty and advisors not included in the conversation? Provost: A majority of students change majors, 1/3 change colleges – this about a coordinated message. Based on NACADA (National Academic Advising Association). Oakland University saw a 6% increase in retention under this model. Advisors and the Advising Council was involved from the beginning.
   -- There is interest in having a workshop this fall so faculty can learn more about how advising is going to change next year. Perhaps better communication earlier in the process would have addressed some concerns. Provost: Provost Cecil was not here when this started and this is not how he would have managed the process, will try to avoid the anxiety caused by this processes like this in the future.

4. **Old Business**

a) Voting item: Replacing content of <u>Faculty Handbook</u> Appendix A with Administrators Returning to Faculty Status policy
   Discussion:
   --Clarification – we are only replacing Appendix A with the text of the policy, not with the attached policy header.
   --Clarification – Cross references, are they to the <u>Handbook</u> or some other document? They are internal reference to this policy itself. Should the reference be clarified, e.g. "see section 3 below" or "in this policy"?

   Vote:
   The vote is unanimous, motion passes.

b) Discussion item: Revising language regarding typical number of years at the rank of associate before applying for promotion (Handbook 1.9.4—Qualifications for appointment to rank)
   Background:
   Data from past 5 years shows a range of time between becoming associate and becoming full. The average is 4 years; the median is 6 years; the range is 2 – 19 years. All colleges have seen applications for full after 2-3 years. 21 faculty promoted with fewer than 6 years at rank out of 48 total.
   Discussion:
   --Some faculty would like the number removed, without a minimum. Something like "Applications may be submitted after the above criteria are met."
   --Concern from authors of this section was that people were waiting too long to apply and this was to give a sense of when to think about applying. This was not intended as a hard-and-fast rule.
   --Some faculty do not see a need to change this language.
   --Make this clearer to avoid different interpretations by admins or committees.
   --Does getting full professor in only 7 years from hire reduce respect for the rank?
   --The number of years can be used as a reason to deny. Think about retention and the social justice perspective.
   --Helps committees: allows committees who might determine an applicant is not ready to suggest the application is early and to reapply later. Beneficial to the faculty process to have this drag out; faculty have more power when the process takes longer. The word "typically" means committees should not see 6 years as a minimum.
   --Concern about the lost year. Add something like "All activities since the submission of the previous dossier will be considered as activities suitable for review of the candidate's materials."
   Action:
   --We will address this again in a subsequent meeting.
   --K. Fuegen will draft language to address issue of ensuring activities that a candidate has done prior to being at the rank of associate are also considered as

part of the dossier.

5. Adjournment

    a)   The meeting adjourned at 4:32pm.

Submitted,
M. Providenti, Secretary

ADMINISTRATORS RETURNING TO FACULTY STATUS

POLICY NUMBER: ACAD-ADMINRETURNTOFAC
POLICY TYPE: ACADEMIC (NON-RESEARCH)
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL TITLE: PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
RESPONSIBLE OFFICE: EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & PROVOST
EFFECTIVE DATE: UPON BOARD OF REGENTS APPROVAL
NEXT REVIEW DATE: BOARD OF REGENTS APPROVAL PLUS FOUR YEARS –
SUPERSEDES POLICY DATED: 10/29/1992 – FORMERLY ADMINISTRATIVE REG. AR-II-2.0-3
BOARD OF REGENTS REPORTING (CHECK ONE):
☒ PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATION (CONSENT AGENDA/VOTING ITEM):
☐ PRESIDENTIAL REPORT (INFORMATION ONLY)

I. POLICY STATEMENT

Administrators (see Definitions in Section III) with faculty tenure who are not covered by the Faculty or Department Chair Handbook or contract may return to faculty status by resigning their position and having it accepted by the appropriate Vice President or the President in the case of Vice Presidents. The following conditions apply:

1. An Administrator may return to faculty status at a salary based on the Administrator's academic and administrative experience, accomplishments, expertise, academic rank and standing in the discipline and the functions the Administrator will be expected to perform upon return to the faculty. In addition, the Administrator's salary will be within the salary range of faculty of the same rank in the Administrator's department/school and shall typically be no higher than the highest faculty salary in that department/school. Subsequent salary increases shall be based on annual performance evaluation as provided for in the Faculty Handbook. The individual's contract will be written for a nine (9)-month period (if on an academic year appointment) and be subject to the recommendation of the Provost and approval by the President.

2. If an Administrator has at least five (5) years of service at the University as an Administrator, the Administrator will be granted a one-semester paid leave to prepare for the faculty role. A description of the proposed work to be completed during the leave will be required to receive this leave, followed by a report on the work to be submitted to the Provost, or the President in the case of Vice Presidents, upon return to the University. The paid leave will be at the faculty salary determined in accordance with item 1 above.

3. Any unused vacation days will be calculated and paid to the Administrator at the date of the last working day in an administrative capacity.

An Administrator who has served in such capacity at the University for more than ten (10) years may be granted a full year of paid leave, and the conditions in items 2 and 3 above will apply.

Any Administrator who receives paid leave after returning to the faculty must reimburse the University for the leave if the Administrator does not remain in a faculty position within the University for at least one (1) year.

II. ENTITIES AFFECTED

Administrators, Faculty

III. DEFINITIONS

The following definitions (as stated in the Employment Category Definitions policy) apply.

Executive: The President, Provost, and all others who regularly serve as members of the President's Cabinet. The President may specifically designate an appointment in special situations.

Administrator: The head of a major organizational unit within the university, including Deans. For some reports and other specific purposes, Administrators also include Executives.

Faculty: Positions with formal academic appointments and other positions designated by the President/Provost. Employees in this category are primarily engaged in teaching and research. Examples include Associate or Assistant Deans, Department Chairs, Librarians, and full- and part-time faculty members.

IV. REFERENCES AND RELATED MATERIALS

REFERENCES & FORMS

Faculty Handbook - https://www.nku.edu/academicaffairs/resources/faculty/handbook.html

Department Chair Handbook - https://www.nku.edu/academicaffairs/resources/faculty/handbook.html

RELATED POLICIES

Employment Category Definitions:
https://inside.nku.edu/content/dam/policy/docs/Policies/EmploymentCategoryDefinitions.pdf

REVISION HISTORY

REVISION TYPE	MONTH/YEAR APPROVED
Revision	
Policy – Formerly Administrative Regulation AR-II-2.0-3	October 29, 1992

ADMINISTRATORS RETURNING TO FACULTY STATUS

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

PRESIDENT

Signature *A.K. Vaidya*   Date 8/3/21

Ashish K. Vaidya

BOARD OF REGENTS APPROVAL

BOARD OF REGENTS (IF FORWARDED BY PRESIDENT)

☐ This policy was forwarded to the Board of Regents on the **Presidential Report (information only)**.
Date of Board of Regents meeting at which this policy was reported: _____/_____/_____.

☐ This policy was forwarded to the Board of Regents as a **Presidential Recommendation (consent agenda/voting item)**.

  ☐ The Board of Regents approved this policy on _____/_____/_____.
  (Attach a copy of Board of Regents meeting minutes showing approval of policy.)

  ☐ The Board of Regents rejected this policy on _____/_____/_____.
  (Attach a copy of Board of Regents meeting minutes showing rejection of policy.)

VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER

Signature   Date

Bonita J. Brown

APPENDIX A

POLICY ON ADMINISTRATORS RETURNING TO
FACULTY STATUS

An administrator with faculty tenure who is not covered by the <u>Faculty Handbook</u> or the <u>Chair's Handbook</u> may return to faculty status by resigning his/her position and having the resignation accepted by the appropriate vice president or the president in the case of vice presidents. The following conditions are applicable:

An administrator who has less than five (5) years of service may return to faculty status at a salary base to be determined according to the appropriate discipline and rank.

After five years of service as an administrator:

1. An administrator will be granted a one-semester's paid leave to prepare him/herself for other service to the University such as classroom teaching, special projects, etc. A description of the proposed project will be required to receive this leave, followed by a report on the project upon return to the University.

2. The administrator's salary will be reduced by 15 percent and his/her contract written for a ten-month period (if appropriate).

3. Any unused vacation days will be calculated and paid to the Administrator at the date of his/her last working day in an administrative capacity.

If an administrator has served in such a capacity for more than ten (10) years, he/she may be granted a full year of paid leave; the conditions listed above in Items 1, 2, and 3 will apply.

Section 1.9.4: PROFESSOR

A professor holds all the qualifications of an associate professor and is recognized as a very effective teacher, has a record of high-quality scholarly and creative activity, has demonstrated significant service activity as defined in college and departmental/school RPT documents, and has attained professional recognition at the regional, national, or international level. These criteria are listed in order of importance.

The applicant's entire academic career will be considered, with an emphasis on activities after tenure and promotion to associate professor. Applications may be submitted as soon as the above criteria are met, but faculty applying for promotion to professor will typically have completed six years at the rank of associate professor.

Section 5.1.3: PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

A candidate for promotion to professor must hold the appropriate terminal degree. In order of importance, the candidate must be judged very effective (as shown by appropriate evidence) in teaching, in continuing high-quality scholarly and creative activity, and in continuing significant institutional and public service, and must have attained professional recognition at the regional, national, or international level.

Section 5.1.2: PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A candidate for promotion to associate professor must hold an appropriate terminal degree, and must, in order of importance, be judged effective, as shown by appropriate evidence, in teaching, in continuing scholarly and creative activity, and in continuing institutional and public service.

According to the collegial governance agreement, faculty should have the strongest voice in RPT decisions, but this is not reflected in our policy and procedures. Right now, a faculty committee makes the first RPT recommendation, which is followed by recommendations by 3 administrators. Only the provost's recommendation is submitted to the BOR, so the BOR has presumably no knowledge of the faculty's perspective.

After making its recommendation, the RPT committee has no procedure for appealing administrators' recommendations to the contrary. A candidate may appeal a negative recommendation, but the RPT has no recourse if their recommendation is ignored.

The idea: In cases in which the provost disagrees with the RPT committee, both the provost's recommendation and the recommendation of the RPT committee will be submitted to the BOR. The president submits the provost's recommendation to the board, and he/she would probably refuse to submit the RPT's recommendation. Therefore, the faculty regent would be charged with submitting the RPT committee's recommendation.

3.2. PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONS ON REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

3.2.9. PROVOST After receipt of the dean's recommendation, the department chair's or school director's recommendation, the department or school committee's recommendation, and the applicant's file, the provost shall make a written recommendation to the president. The reasons for the provost's recommendation, whether positive or negative, shall be included in the written recommendation. The provost may consult with the department or school committee, the department chair or school director, the dean, or with any combination of them, but not with individual committee members. As part of his or her deliberations, the provost may meet with the applicant to aid in his or her decision. A copy of the provost's recommendation shall be given to the applicant, the dean, the department chair or school director, and all members of the RPT committee. When a negative recommendation is made, the applicant shall be informed, in writing, of the right to appeal using the procedures set forth in Section 14, Grievances.

According to the collegial governance agreement at NKU (Appendix C. B. 1), faculty bodies have been identified as having the *primary responsibility* for academic personnel decisions. For this reason, the recommendations made by faculty RPT committees should be implemented unless there are "compelling reasons" for not doing so.

3.2.10. PRESIDENT The president will forward the provost's recommendation to the Board of Regents. However, in any case in which the provost and respective RPT committee disagree about a recommendation for reappointment, tenure, or promotion, both the recommendation by the Provost and the recommendation of the RPT committee will be forwarded to the Board of Regents.