

University Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

September 17, 2025, 2-3 PM

via [Zoom](#)

Committee members attending: Brad Lamphere, Melissa Wells, Nicole Crowder, Smita Jain Oxford, Ian Finlayson

Visitors: Colin Rafferty (CAS P&T), Dave Henderson and Alex Dunn (COB), Janine Davis (COE)

1. Call to Order 2:03 start
2. Subcommittee model
 - a. We discussed the proposed Subcommittee model with representatives from the existing P&T Committees. The CAS and COE guests expressed general approval, though each had significant concerns. COB guests expressed more serious doubts about the proposal, favoring an approach that included an explicit review and vote at the college or departmental level.
 - b. The primary concern raised was that the University-level committee and sub-committee would lack the discipline-specific knowledge needed to fairly evaluate candidates from COB.
 - i. Chair and faculty letters are meant to evaluate and interpret the discipline-specific accomplishments in terms of the university-level criteria for promotion and tenure. Guest asked, if they're already doing that, why not have a formal vote that passes on to the University P&T committee?
 1. College-level for content, University level for "was process followed?"
 2. Key issue for accreditation is how to resolve cases where the college-level and university-level reviews come to different decisions.
 - a. Dean and Provost review would/ should resolve those.
 - c. Guests also raised other concerns that could be mitigated within the proposed model.
 - i. The 3-person subcommittee would have great weight in the decision. Need checks and other reviews to ensure that decisions are made fairly.
 - ii. As proposed, the committee in general, and the subcommittee in particular, could lack the institutional and discipline knowledge needed to make a fair decision.

- iii. The distinction between department-specific guidelines and university-level criteria needs to be explicit. That might alleviate the concern about being evaluated by people outside one's discipline.
 - iv. RTA's promotions would be handled in this system, even though they'd have no representatives in it.
 - v. The criteria for promotion to full Professor and other Section 7 info are lacking.
 - d. Several participants also questioned the need for a new model, since the "grandfathered" approach in place this year functions.
 - i. The proposal must have a strong, clear justification for the need to adopt.
- 3. Inquiry about office hour modality
 - i. Online office hours are becoming common. Do we need to have formal guidelines or Handbook language for that? Our consensus is to let departments have flexibility in the modality of office hours.
- 4. Section 7 revision
 - a. The proposed changes to P&T will require changes to Section 7 of the Handbook. For many, their opinion of the proposal depends on how Section 7 defines the details of the promotion and tenure process.
 - i. The broad university-level criteria for P&T are particularly critical for many.
 - ii. "Chicken or egg" issue because Handbook revisions have a distinct process from changes to P&T. Need to move on both fronts now to avoid another bridge/ grandfather year. As a result, we will draft Section 7 revisions that are responsive to either a future University-level or college-level P&T structure.
 - b. Significant language to support the revision was written earlier in the year, so compiling them is the next task.
 - 1. Analysis of tenure criteria across colleges, compiled from appropriate Handbook appendices
 - 2. Motion from Oldham (UFC Chair 2024-5)
 - 3. Also need to align the revised Section 7 with language in Section 6
- 5. Next meeting: 10/1, 2-3 PM (definite)