

University Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

October 1, 2025, 2-3:30 PM via [Zoom](#)

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

1. Start 2:02
2. Section 7 revisions
 - a. For many faculty, their preferences on the composition of the P&T committee depend on the details of the Handbook relevant to P&T, so the committee is developing that language now.
 - b. Draft text from Davis Oldham's proposed language in Spring 2025 for the broad University-level guidelines for promotion in Section 7 are broad and generic, which has some advantages
 - i. Some were concerned that the broad guidelines weren't clear enough.
 - c. The committee worked to integrate the more specific information available in Section 6 (Annual evaluations) and Appendices I, J, and K (College-level policies).
 - i. Incorporated several elements from the "meets expectations" language from Section 6
 1. Some concern that these standards would be too lenient.
 2. More emphasis on performance/ accomplishments, in contrast to the focus on effort in the draft Section 7 text.
 - ii. Comparing college-level standards showed some variation
 1. CAS and COE define professional service (leadership in prof societies, editing journals, consulting) as professional activity, while COB has handled it as service.
 - a. Will note that distinction in the revised language
 - d. Several distinct promotion steps (Tenure, Assist-> Assoc, Assoc->Full, Lect ->Sen Lec), but criteria for those steps look pretty similar
 - i. Language for the teaching component is nearly identical for all.
 1. Committee had no objection to that, since teaching is the primary task.
 - ii. Professional development and service expectations should differ for different levels

1. For Assoc-> Full promotion, applicants are expected to hold leadership positions in service and also achieve professional recognition beyond campus.
 - a. CAS and COB require three off-campus letters in applications for promotion to Full, but COE does not stipulate.
 - e. Next steps (timeline)
 - i. Need to complete a more detailed comparison of I, J, and K before next meeting to cover other discrepancies.
 - ii. Indicate sources of new language in the rationale for the proposed text, so that readers can see the basis for the general criteria.
 - iii. Once language is complete, distribute to all faculty, and submit to UFC for discussion.
3. Final Revised Subcommittee Model (2.0)
 - a. Feedback from UFC
 - i. Many expressed concern about the small sub-committee having strong influence, but most alternatives create an untenable workload for P&T members.
 - ii. Concern from UFC (and within UFAC) that discipline expertise not guaranteed by any University P&T
 - b. Legacy COB prefers for each of its 4 departments to be represented on important committees
 1. Concern that it may be necessary for AACSB accreditation
 2. The committee requested the AACSB guidance on representation, since that would limit the possible configurations for a University-level P&T process.
 - a. Received that language and will review prior to next meeting
 - c. Briefly reviewed the potential variations to the Subcommittee Model that address the concerns above while still keeping the committee's workload down.
4. Next meeting: 10/8, 2-3 PM