

**UHD FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION(S)**

**REGARDING: PS 10.A.01**

**February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

1. WHEREAS associate professors voting on candidates for promotion to professor raises concerns of quid pro quo or the perception of quid pro quo;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to remove all references and language allowing associate professors to vote on promotions to full professor or add the necessary language to prevent it.

**For 8 Against 10 Abstain 3**

2. WHEREAS the language regarding abstentions, absents, and recusals in the voting process is unclear in that it states: “Fifty percent of all members of the department rank and tenure committee must vote “yes” to register a positive vote result.” in section 2.3.4 of PS 10.A.01, which could result in a negative outcome if more than 50% recuse themselves, are absent, or abstain from voting;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to clarify the language in the policy regarding abstentions,

absents, and recusals -- with regards to what constitutes a positive vote result as specified in 2.3.4.

For 20 Against 0 Abstain 1

3. WHEREAS the policy does not address the possibility of voting electronically and/or in absentia;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to add language to allow for voting electronically and/or in absentia.

For 16 Against 3 Abstain 2

4. WHEREAS the section on confidentiality (2.2.6) is unclear, if not contradictory;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to clarify the section on process confidentiality.

For 20 Against 0 Abstain 1

5. WHEREAS the policy is inflexible in the face of increasingly large departments, multidisciplinary departments, and increasing service workloads by requiring all members of a department Rank and Tenure

Committee to vote on each and every candidate's application for promotion and does not permit departments to delegate this responsibility to subcommittees;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to add language to allow department rank and tenure committees to appoint sub-committees for promotion decisions for candidates.

For   8   Against  12  Abstain   1 

6. WHEREAS the last phrase of 2.2.5.4, "...but a minimum of six years as an associate professor is strongly recommended." is being used as a de facto requirement, which puts it in opposition with UH System Administrative Memorandum 06.A.09, is not present in the R&T documents of the other schools in the UH system, is discouraging of noteworthy and accelerated achievements, and biases promotions to full professor towards seniority over merit;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to remove the last phrase of 2.2.5.4, "...but a minimum of six years as an associate professor is strongly recommended."

For  12  Against   5  Abstain   3

7. WHEREAS the parenthetical reference in section 2.3.4 to PS 10.A.05 is to the wrong section, and unnecessary anyway since the departments development of their promotion criteria may be different from their annual performance evaluation policy;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to remove the parenthetical reference to PS 10.A.05 from section 2.3.4.

For \_\_\_19\_\_\_ Against \_\_\_0\_\_\_ Abstain \_\_\_1\_\_\_

8. WHEREAS there is currently no clear indication of whether or not Associate Deans, who are considered Administrative Staff , are allowed to apply for promotion, even though there is clear indication that both Department Chairs and College Deans (who are also considered Administrative Staff) can apply for Promotion;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to add a section to the policy (section 2.2.5.5) explicitly allowing Associate Deans who are Associate Professors to apply for promotion to Professor.

For \_\_\_16\_\_\_ Against \_\_\_2\_\_\_ Abstain \_\_\_2\_\_\_

9. WHEREAS the numbering of the sections goes from 2.3.7 to 2.3.9 without having a 2.3.8;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to correct the numbering after section 2.3.7.

For   19   Against   0   Abstain   0  

10. WHEREAS an additional rank of Distinguished Professor added to the R&T policy could further incentivize Professors to continue contributing at high levels in all three areas of Teaching, Service, and Research /Scholarship, as well as reward those Professors who have made significant academic achievements while at that rank;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to add the rank of Distinguished Professor to the R&T policy, as a further promotion that Professors can apply for.

For   7   Against  10   Abstain  2  

11. WHEREAS there is variation in how departments write 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews, department R&T committees are not expected to write these reviews, and having only one letter by two bodies who both vote for promotion and tenure decisions may hide differing opinions between those two groups;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the UHD Faculty Affairs Committee to add language to section 2.3.2, and clarify accordingly, indicating that 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year review letters are written by both the Department R&T committees and by the Department Chair.

For 17 Against 0 Abstain 1

12. WHEREAS in section 2.3.6 the policy mandates that Deans notify candidates whose promotion cases have gone forward (out of the college), as well as candidates whose promotion cases have not gone forward, by the third Wednesday of January, and this is not being done in at least two colleges;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the Provost to enforce the section 2.3.6 paragraph concerning Dean notification to candidates, whose portfolios have gone forward, by the third Wednesday in January.

For 18 Against 0 Abstain 0

13. WHEREAS the Procedures of the University R&T Committee, section 2.3.7.2, clearly indicate that those members of that committee supporting a candidacy and those members of that committee not

supporting a candidacy both write and send forward reports explaining the reasons for their support or lack of support, yet for many years there has been only one letter coming from that committee even in cases where the votes were split, potentially damaging or otherwise influencing the decisions of the President and Provost with respect to that candidacy;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate urges the Provost to enforce the section 2.3.7.2 paragraph concerning the University R&T Committees drafting, and sending forward, two reports – one for those supporting the candidacy and one for those not supporting it.

For   18   Against   0   Abstain   0