



October 12, 2009

To: Faculty Senate

From: Missouri S&T Personnel Committee

- C. Sotiriou-Leventis, Chair
- S. Balakrishnan
- N. Book
- M. Davis
- S. Manuel
- D. Myers
- P. Neogi
- T. Watts

*CSLeventis*

Re: Campus Personnel Committee Annual Report 2008-09

The following were the issues that the Missouri S&T Personnel Committee dealt with in 2008-09:

**1. Revised Format for Confidential Report of Conference Between Department Chair and Faculty Member**

A referral was made to the Personnel Committee to review the documents associated with the annual review for faculty members to ensure that they comply with the present requirements. The Personnel Committee modified the form and is attached herewith:

Format for Confidential Report of Conference Between Department Chair and Faculty Member

As part of the Faculty Activities Report Program, each department chair must annually, in the spring, prior to the May Commencement, discuss individually with faculty his/her assessment of their contributions. It is required that the department chair specifically comment on each of the following: 1) What were the duties this faculty member was expected to fulfill? 2) What has been performed well? 3) What needs improvement? 4) What objectives are agreed upon for the coming year? 5) The chair's summary of the faculty member's progress toward tenure and/or promotion during the past year when applicable. In addition, if not already covered above, the chair will summarize the primary contributions of the faculty member to the department and/or university during the past year.

Faculty Member's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member's Rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

First Faculty Appointment: \_\_\_\_\_ Tenured: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Conference: \_\_\_\_\_



Chair's Comments:

Chair's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty Member's Comments:

Faculty Member's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

It is the responsibility of both the faculty member and the chair to ensure that the annual conference, as recorded herein, provides the faculty member with sufficient information to set goals for the following year's performance. The signed original is retained in the faculty member's personnel file in the department. Copies of this document are for chair and faculty member only, but available to Provost, Chancellor, and as necessary for Post Tenure Review.

Adopted at April 25, 1991 Academic Council Meeting. Revised at November 20, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting.

## 2. Revised Pilot Grievance Procedure

On April 8, 2005 the Board of Curators approved a pilot grievance procedure, added to the Collected Rules and Regulations as section 370.015, for faculty on the University of Missouri-Columbia campus. The procedure was to serve as a pilot grievance process for the University of Missouri-Columbia, instead of 370.010, for a period of three years, at which time the campus was to review and share the results of the review with the other campuses so that all four campuses could use the information derived from the pilot to craft a common grievance procedure for all campuses for consideration by the Board of Curators by the end of the 2007-2008 academic year. Subsequently, on April 4, 2008, the Board of Curators approved an extension of the Columbia campus pilot procedure for one calendar year to allow the MU Faculty Council to recommend changes to the pilot grievance process based on the campus experience with it, and for the other campuses to review the



changes with the ultimate goal of producing a single faculty grievance policy for all four campuses. The MU Faculty Council has recommended a substantially revised pilot grievance procedure for faculty that was developed by an Ad-Hoc committee and approved by the Faculty Council and general faculty of the campus. The UMKC Faculty Senate has voted to participate in the revised pilot.

The revised pilot procedure varies from the initial pilot by attempting to streamline the process with the goal of reaching a decision within 90 days from 320 days; attempts to make an informal resolution more likely by creating a Grievance Resolution Panel including two faculty members and a high-level administrator to replace the current 5-person faculty committee; does away with the position of Investigating Officer permitting the Grievance Resolution Panel to directly collect and evaluate evidence and administration; imposes limits on the use of grievance materials for discovery purposes during the pendency of the grievance; and establishes an Oversight Committee appointed by the Faculty Council to monitor the overall process and report back to Faculty Council.

At the request of Chancellor Deaton and Interim Chancellor Morton and the Columbia and Kansas City campuses, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs Graham recommends that the revised section 370.015 be adopted as a pilot for a period of three calendar years for the Columbia and Kansas City campuses while changes are being reviewed by the other two campuses. During that time the faculty grievance policies can receive the full review process with the ultimate goal of producing a single faculty grievance policy for all four campuses.

The Personnel Committee carefully examined the revised Pilot Grievance Procedure and found it to be faster and less convoluting than the current one, however, the committee saw some challenges with regards to the small number of members (1 administrator and 2 faculty) in the Grievance Resolution Panel including the recruitment, training and workload of these persons (appointed for a three-year period). Overall, the Personnel Committee thought that by participation of our campus to the revised Grievance Procedure, Missouri S&T will be in a much better position to recommend changes to the Pilot Grievance Process based on the campus experience with it at the end of the three year period (2011). Therefore, the committee made a motion at the February 19, 2009 faculty senate meeting to request that the Board of Curators include Missouri S&T as a participating campus in the Revised Pilot Grievance Procedure. The motion was passed.

### 3. Proposed Promotion Procedures for Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty

A referral was made to the Personnel Committee to review the proposed NTT Promotion Procedures provided by Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Dr. R. W. Schwartz on 3/6/09. The personnel committee has met and had the following corrections regarding the NTT Promotion document:

1. In the title, the word:" ranked" needs to be inserted. So it reads: Promotion Procedures for Ranked Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.
2. **I. General**, second line: insert the word "ranked" before non-tenure-track (NTT)
3. **II. Procedure** item 4. (page 2) lines 8-10:.....any major documentation is added to the dossier, the dossier shall be returned to the department for consideration. This needs to be in line with the current promotion procedures for tenure (based on our knowledge, there are specific deadlines and no added documentation is allowed).



4. B. Campus Level item 1 (page 2): The campus review committee must include a representative of the department of the NTT faculty member who is applying for promotion.
5. B. Campus Level item 3 (page 3). In order to make it more clear, the wording of the first sentence needs to be changed to: During any given academic year/promotion review process, if there are candidates from both the teaching and research tracks who seek promotion, different NTT faculty members, as appropriate to track, may serve on the review committee.
6. B campus Level: number items 3-9 consecutively. Number 3 is used twice.

Right now, the policy is being reviewed by UM General Counsel. The issue is that CRR 310.035 requires the participation of tenure-track faculty on department and campus level promotion committees. There is currently consideration in revising this CRR to no longer require the participation of tenure-track faculty on the committees. If this revision is adopted, the policy we reviewed earlier this year for promotion considerations should be ready for final review and approval on campus.

#### **4. Member of the Personnel Committee in the Tenure Committee**

A motion was made by Dr. P. Neogi, former Chair of the Personnel Committee (2007-08) to include the Chair of the Personnel Committee to Tenure Committee. After considerable discussion between Dr. J. Cohen, Chair of the Tenure Committee (2008-09), the Personnel Committee and members of the RP&A Committee, the motion was not passed.