

University Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

February 23, 2026, 3-4 PM

Seacobeck 105

Members attending: Brad Lamphere, Melissa Wells, Nicole Crowder, Smita Jain Oxford (via Zoom), Ian Finlayson

1. Call to Order 3:07 started
2. Approval of minutes 1/26 occurred via email.
3. **Motions to revise Handbook Section 7**

Melissa updated us on the February BOV meeting. The BOV subcommittee approved adding one sentence to the end of the language for § 7.3 that the UFC approved. UFAC saw no problem with the BOV addition.

- a. Minor language change in § 7.3
 - i. UFC-approved language: “The candidate and their department shall provide information about the kinds of activities that constitute appropriate achievement in teaching; scholarly, creative, and professional activity; and service within the discipline.”
 - ii. BOV subcommittee-approved language: “The department shall provide information about the kinds of activities that constitute appropriate achievement in teaching; scholarly, creative, and professional activity; and service within the discipline. It is the candidate’s responsibility to demonstrate how they have met the criteria in each of these areas.”

UFAC also posted several motions to the UFC during our last meeting. Motions to move Appendices, update language related to appeals, and other Section 7 changes all passed. Another motion on the appeals process (§ 7.12.1) was tabled by UFC since colleges are still forming their procedures.

There may be a “chicken or egg” problem with waiting on the § 7.12.1 text because the college-specific P&T committees must be aligned with Section 7. We discussed whether it was better for colleges to adapt to Handbook versus adapting the Handbook to fit what colleges want. Colleges need to know the university-level requirements to write useful P&T policies. On the other hand, perhaps having college-level P&T committees means that colleges should have greater flexibility in the relevant policies as well.

4. Which Handbook will candidates use when applying for P&T in 2026?

The ongoing changes to the Handbook create uncertainty for candidates applying for promotion and tenure in the coming year. A consistent policy on which Handbook they should use would help them. The options are to use the Handbook as of (1) May 1 (the date of the candidate's letter of intent) or (2) sometime in August (the fall file deadline). May 1 offers more lead time for preparing materials, but departments that moved colleges are a difficult case because they will probably have some significant changes.

Our consensus view was to use the August date this year and May 1 going forward. Using the August Handbook this year would give colleges time to establish their new P&T procedures in spring, which allows their candidates to be evaluated using the procedures of their current home. However, in the future, when the Handbook is more settled, using the May 1 Handbook would give candidates more clarity and time for preparing their files. based on the rules of their new homes.

Getting new Handbook language approved and posted to the Provost's website promptly will be crucial for alleviating the potential for confusion on this issue, especially this year. UFAC will reach out to the Provost to see if publishing next year's Handbook early (May 1 instead of August 1) this year is possible. If not, temporary approved documents could be shared (i.e., new universal criteria language in Section 7; college-level procedures on Provost's website; departmental guidelines on Provost's website) with colleagues this spring to inform their file preparation. Going forward, P&T changes that go to Provost site will be required to be posted by Jan 31, so this won't be an issue after this year.

5. Review of colleges' P&T documents

We reviewed the new COE's proposed P&T structure. Members had a few concerns. We offered a friendly amendment to eliminate references to Appendix K, which is being removed from the Handbook. COE also proposed allowing senior lecturers on their P&T committee, which allows representation by some departments that have no tenure-track faculty. That conflicts with a parenthetical note in Handbook § 3.3.3.1, which highlights P&T as a committee for which all members must be tenured. UFAC suggests that the parenthetical note be removed to give colleges flexibility in forming their P&T committees, especially since the earlier part of the sentence clearly establishes expectations of full-time RTA faculty serving on committees, and the parenthetical reference is outdated (there is no single P&T committee any longer). Assuming that change is made, UFAC passed the COE language.

UFAC gave extensions for CAS and COB to submit their new language by 3/20.

We discussed where the structure of P&T committees should be housed. Previously, the committee composition was in each college's governance appendix (former Appendices F, G, &

H), but it might make sense to move these to the college P&T procedures (former Appendices I, J, & K). Will consider this more once CAS and COB submit their P&T documents.

6. Review of departmental guidelines for P&T

UFAC members reviewed the language submitted by departments as their guidelines for candidates for P&T. Several departments stated that the university-level criteria were sufficient (CMDS, CPIN, CPSC, ENLI, HISP, HASO, HIST/AMST/SOC). UFAC approved each of these “No additions.” Of departments that made minor or significant additions to the university-level criteria, UFAC mostly approved with no changes (PSYC, PHYS, MUSC) or small edits (CHEM, AHPE, EDUC), which were communicated to the relevant department chairs.

ARTS had significant additions for professional activity guidelines for some promotions but not others. We tabled our review until we could confirm that they intended not to offer guidelines for the others.

THEA’s guidelines included video as a potential document for P&T applications, but that may not be permissible. The candidate’s file is meant to contain all the information the committee needs to evaluate, and videos would not do that in the same way a link to a webpage wouldn’t. Members also pointed out that videos do not meet the new accessibility requirements. UFAC tabled this review until we have clarity on that question.

Other departments had either received extensions for their guidelines (PSIA, EESC, MATH, ACCT/ECON/FIN, MGMK, BIOL) or submitted theirs too late for UFAC to review at this meeting (MLL, NURS). GEOG did not submit a document or request an extension. These will be reviewed at the next UFAC meeting.

7. Tabled other items on P&T calendar language and teaching loads for future meetings.
8. Adjournment 4:17
9. Upcoming meeting:
 - a. Monday, March 23, 3-4 PM (Seacobeck 105)