I. CALL TO ORDER – Dave Evans

II. ROLL CALL – Steve Sheel

III. APPROVAL OF April 6, 2005 Minutes

IV. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

V. PROVOST AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(1) Richard Dame, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletic Committee makes the following motion:

After discussions with the Athletic Director and Linda Vereen, I make the following motion concerning the elected membership of the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee:

that the membership of the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee be determine following the new committee membership format regarding an elected member from each College with a staggered time cycle.

The rationale for this change is to help increase communications between the athletic and academic components of the University community.

(2) Sharon Gilman, University Student Retention and Assessment Committee Recommendations for Improving Student Retention at CCU (Pages 3-5)

(3) Michael S. Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Development Committee, in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs, submits the following motion for consideration. (Page 6)

(4) Michael Gilbert, Chair, Student Life Committee Recommendation (Page 7)

(5) Dennis Wiseman, Graduate Council (Page 8)
(6) Dan Ennis, Chair, Academic Affairs presents the following for Senate approval (Pages 9-12)

Annual Reports:
   (1) Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Annual Report for 2004-05
       Michael Ruse, Chair (Pages 13-14)
   (2) University Promotion and Tenure Committee Annual Report for 2004-05
       Steve Hamelman, Chair (Pages 15-17)

VII. PENDING BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

X. GOOD OF THE ORDER

XI. ADJOURNMENT
April 20, 2005

To: Dr. Dave Evans, Chair, CCU Faculty Senate
From: Sharon Gilman, University Student Retention and Assessment Committee
Re: Recommendations for Improving Student Retention at CCU

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the University Student Retention and Assessment Committee (SRAC) reviewed current literature on national best practices for achieving acceptable levels of student retention at universities. The list of Long-Term Goals below summarizes these and is adapted from a 2004 ACT Report, “The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention.” We recommend that this list be adopted as overall goals for Coastal Carolina University.

In order to organize our efforts for achieving these goals at Coastal, the SRAC developed a list of primary faculty and staff responsibilities in the Academic, Social, and Administrative areas. They are listed below. There are more actions that we can take to improve student retention but, in the short term, our recommendations are effective and manageable.

Finally, the Committee requests that the Administration, through Faculty Senate, provide an assessment report on what has been done to address the recommendations listed below before the first fall 2005 meeting of the University Student Retention and Assessment Committee.

I. Recommendations

A. Academic Area
   1. Improve freshman class attendance.
      a. Enforce CCU’s attendance policy.
      b. Use the “Helping Students Succeed” program as an early warning system for poor attendance.
      c. Provide mid-term grades (A-F) for freshmen in their first semester to increase awareness of their academic performance.

   2. Develop a freshman support/advising center.
      a. Coordinate academic support services for new students and provide academic advising for all first semester freshmen.
      b. Explore a freshman year college concept that connects academic advising, special interest housing/learning communities, co-enrollment, the Big Read, success seminars, etc.

   3. Support and enhance the Freshman Success Seminar program.
      a. Make the seminar mandatory for all freshmen and/or new transfer students.
      b. Involve more faculty in leading first-year success programs/seminars by providing appropriate incentives.
      c. Ensure that each student has a complete academic plan.
4. Administer an academic advisor evaluation form to students with the student course evaluation form.

B. Social Support Area
1. Increase faculty/staff involvement in co-curricular programs.

2. Establish an alcohol coalition of faculty, staff, and students that reviews issues of concern and recommends proactive and reactive measures to improve campus climate.

3. Develop an interactive website that provides students with helpful responses to adjustment issues (e.g., self-evaluation programs for alcohol/drug use, concerns about homesickness, depression, relationships).

4. Expand and update existing recreation facilities for the general student population.

5. Develop short-term plans for Student Center renovations that begin to address the needs of a growing campus.

C. Administrative Area
1. Hire a coordinator of campus-wide student retention programs.
   a. Develop goals and benchmarks for student retention and graduation.
   b. Develop a structure/mechanism for reviewing/implementing/coordinating recommendations that are directed at freshmen.

2. Provide information, professional development programs, and appropriate incentives for faculty and staff who engage in freshman support efforts.

3. Revise student employment practices in order to increase the availability of on-campus jobs for new students.

4. Increase awareness of retention issues among faculty.

II. Long-Term Goals

1. Determine student characteristics and needs, set priorities among these areas of need, identify available resources, evaluate a variety of successful programs, and implement a formal comprehensive retention program that best meets Coastal’s needs.

2. Take an integrated approach in retention efforts that incorporates both academic and non-academic factors into the design and development of programs to create a socially inclusive supportive academic environment that addresses the social, emotional, and academic needs of students.

3. Implement an early alert, assessment, and monitoring system based on HSGPA, SAT/ACT scores, course placement tests, first semester college GPA, socioeconomic information, attendance records, and non-academic information derived from formal
college surveys and college student inventories to identify and build comprehensive profiles of students at risk of dropping out.

4. Determine the economic impact of college retention programs and student time to degree completion rates through a cost-benefit analysis of student dropout, persistence, assessment procedures, and intervention strategies to enable informed decision-making with respect to types of interventions required, academic and non-academic, including remediation and financial support.
To: Dave Evans, Chair, Faculty Senate  
From: Michael S. Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Development Committee  
RE: Faculty Manual Revision  
Date: April 20, 2005

As per our charge from the faculty senate, the FWDC in consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs submits the following motion for consideration.

Motion: We move that the Faculty Manual be revised as per the text below:

Section IV.B, pg 14

Change: “The faculty will be consulted on any election or appointment to the Office of President, Provost, and other administrative positions reporting directly to the President or the Provost. Through an appropriate committee, the faculty will then communicate its views to the President and the Board of Trustees.”

To: “In the event that faculty participation in a full search committee is not possible, the Faculty Senate or the full Faculty will be directly consulted prior to any election or appointment to the Office of President, Provost, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for University Advancement, or Vice President for Organizational Development and Human Resources. The President will inform the Chair of Faculty Senate, who, in consultation with the President and the Executive Committee, will arrange an appropriate time for the Senate or the full Faculty to meet with the President, if such a meeting is possible. Through an appropriate committee, the Faculty will then communicate its views to the President and the Board of Trustees.”
To: Faculty Senate, c/o Dr. Dave Evans
From: Michael Gilbert, Chair, Student Life Committee
Re: Recommendation from the Student Life Committee
Date: April 1, 2005

Last spring, the Faculty Senate approved a recommendation from the Student Life Committee to look into the development of an “academic manual,” to include a more detailed discussion of plagiarism and other information related to academic integrity. The Student Life Committee has discussed this project during the 2004-05 academic year and concluded for several reasons that the project is an important one for our campus as a whole.

First, national campus reports continue to describe increasing incidences of academic dishonesty and there is no data to suggest that our campus is isolated from this national phenomenon. Second, while some areas on campus have developed academic integrity statements, the Committee feels that the campus would benefit from a single document that applies to all students, regardless of major or program affiliation.

Therefore, the Student Life Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate create a special committee, to include representatives from the faculty, administration, and student body, for the purpose of developing:

1) a statement of core values for the University as they apply to academic integrity;
2) an expanded text on plagiarism and cheating; and
3) a predictable and effective process for educating students about these matters (e.g., an academic manual, a new section in the Student Handbook, a Website, etc.).

In addition, the committee may wish to develop other recommendations that foster a campus culture that support high standards of academic conduct.
The following items of business were considered and approved at the April 6, 2005, meeting of the Graduate Council.

**Spadoni College of Education**

**Proposed Course Prefix and Title Changes:**

**Current Courses**

EDET 700  Principles of Instructional Design  
EDET 704  Technology in Curricula  
EDET 710  Educational Technology Tools  
EDET 720  Psychology of Educational Technology  
EDET 730  Educational Videography  
EDET 740  Design and Development I  
EDET 750  Design and Development II  
EDET 760  Educational Technology Leadership  
EDET 770  Field Experiences in Educational Technology  
EDET 780  Seminar in Educational Technology  
EDET 790  Technology and Society

**Proposed Changes**

EDIT 700  Principles of Instructional Design  
EDIT 704  Technology in Curricula  
EDIT 710  Instructional Technology Tools  
EDIT 720  Psychology of Instructional Technology  
EDIT 730  Instructional Videography  
EDIT 740  Design and Development I  
EDIT 750  Design and Development II  
EDIT 760  Instructional Technology Leadership  
EDIT 770  Field Experiences in Instructional Technology  
EDIT 780  Seminar in Instructional Technology  
EDIT 790  Technology and Society

**Rationale:** During the 2003-2004 academic year the M.Ed. in Educational Technology was changed to the M.S. in Instructional Technology. To establish consistency with the new program name, certain course titles should be changed to reflect Instructional as opposed to Educational and course prefixes should be changed from EDET to EDIT. The total credit hours and numbers of courses required for degree completion have not changed.
Dan Ennis, Chair, Academic Affairs presents the following for Senate approval:

Core Curriculum Committee:

1. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course:** MATH 135, Pre-Calculus. (4) (Prereq: Math placement). Proposed Catalog description: Properties of functions, techniques of graphing polynomial and rational functions, systems of equations, and properties and applications of exponential and logarithmic functions. Right triangle and circular trigonometry, graphs of trigonometric and inverse trigonometric functions, trigonometric identities, solving trigonometric equations, vectors, complex numbers, and their applications. **Justification:** This class is for science majors who need a refresher of algebra and trigonometry before taking calculus.

2. The Honors Program is seeking permission to add the attached course, HONR 101, to the core curriculum as a “Humanities” course, and that it be listed alongside Art History 105, Art History 106, Music 110, Philosophy 101, Philosophy 318, Religion 103 and Theater 101. **Course description:** A humanities-based interdisciplinary course designed to introduce students to the foundations of human thought and expression through a selection of “great books” and “great works.” Students will study artistic, literary, philosophical and historical achievements from multiple traditions in order to foster their own critical thinking, cultural awareness and civic engagement.

College of Humanities and Fine Arts:

3. **Change(s) proposed for an undergraduate program:** English, BA. Proposed changes: Deletion of courses from program: Some courses will be rendered inactive by these changes, but will be kept in the system in case of future need. Other: Comprehensive changes in major. This revision changes neither the total hours for the degree nor the distribution of non-major hours. We have instead made internal changes to simplify the curriculum and take advantage of recent hiring decisions. Rather than “track” students we will offer them the ability to “direct” their coursework toward literature, professional writing and creative writing. This program will also enhance our ability to train teachers. **Justification:** New program better reflects the abilities and qualifications of current faculty, will streamline advising, and give students more choice in their upper-division coursework. Program can be more easily tailored to support student professional and academic aspirations.

4. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course:** ENGL 300 (with letter), Critical Conversations in English. (3) (Prereq: Completion of ENGL 275, 276, 287 or 288). Course restrictions: Required for a major. Proposed Catalog Description: A seminar designed for newly-declared English majors, this course emphasizes critical thinking, analytical writing and textual analysis as the foundations of success in the major. Texts—connected by generic, thematic or historical factors—will vary based on faculty expertise, but will be the means to introduce students to some of the research methodologies, critical “conversations” and professional factors that are central concerns in the discipline. May be repeated for credit once under a different instructor. **Justification:** Many of our peer institutions offer similar
courses for their English majors (cf The College of Charleston’s ENGL 401: Studies and Problems, Winthrop’s ENGL 491: Departmental Seminar and UNC-Asheville’s LIT 499: Undergraduate Research in Literature). Such courses emphasize the processes and methods of literary and language study, and do so using faculty areas of expertise as a source of working examples. This course is to be repeated under two different faculty so as to expose students to the variety of techniques and subfields in the discipline. Combining exposure to literary works in innovative configurations, demonstrations of research techniques, and a pre-professional orientation in one course, the department believes ENGL 300 is not only justified, but will become the centerpiece of our major.

5. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course:** ENGL 301, Creative Writing Workshop. (3)
   (Prereq: ENGL 101 and ENGL 102) Proposed Catalog Description: A course that introduces the fundamentals of composing poetry, fiction, creative nonfiction and other types of creative writing using a combination of example readings and writing workshops. **Justification:** Student requests for more creative writing offerings dovetail with the departmental need for a “feeder” course to support the already existing ENGL 462 and ENGL 468.

6. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course:** ENGL 465, Creative Nonfiction Workshop. (3)
   (Prereq: ENGL 301) Proposed Catalog Description: A workshop course in the writing of creative nonfiction. Students learn the craft of this “fourth genre,” developing skills in memoir, personal essay, nature writing, and/or other subgenres of creative nonfiction. **Justification:** Increased student interest in creative nonfiction, increasing publication opportunities in the field, and new faculty expertise all suggest this will be a successful addition to our creative writing program.

7. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course:** ENGL 496, Senior Thesis in English. (3)
   (Prereq: ENGL 300) Proposed Catalog Description: Students will design and execute an original research project with the guidance, support and oversight of the class instructor. Students are encouraged to choose a research mentor from among the full-time faculty in the Department of English, but the final evaluation of the project is the responsibility of the course instructor. Students will publicly present their projects at the conclusion of the course. **Justification:** Senior theses are standard offering across the disciplines, and the course makes particular sense for a major that emphasizes reading, writing and research.

8. **Request for changes in an undergraduate course:** ENGL 462, Writing Workshop – Fiction. Change in prerequisite(s) from none to ENGL 301. **Justification:** Instructors of upper-division creative writing courses have requested a new course (ENGL 301) as preparation for the 400-level creative writing courses. Basic principles of creative writing will now be covered in 301, freeing the 400-level classes to focus on advanced technique and pre-professional activities.

9. **Request for change in an undergraduate course:** ENGL 468, Writing Workshop – Poetry. Change in prerequisite(s) from none to ENGL 301. **Justification:** Instructors of upper-division creative writing courses have requested a new course (ENGL 301) as preparation for the 400-level creative writing courses. Basic principles of creative writing will now be
10. **Proposal for a new undergraduate program**: Art History minor. **Rationale/Justification:**

Art History as a discipline requires fundamental research skills, good writing, an exposure to the inherent interdisciplinarity of the humanities (*drama, English literature, foreign language, gender studies, music, philosophy, religion, social and economic history*), and the ability to critically evaluate imagery of various types; theses are vitally important skills in this age of video and related media culture. A minor in Art History will provide a useful background for a variety of career paths and graduate school programs, including art history, arts management, curatorial and gallery work, studio art and its sister programs (including graphic design, videography, film studies, architecture, interior and landscape design, city planning), publishing, historical conservation, advertising, business marketing, anthropology, and teaching art, art education and art history at the primary and secondary levels.

Art History is emerging at CCU as an integral component to Study Abroad Programs, with recent Maymester courses in Spain and Paris (2004), and Florence and Rome (2005). Additionally, ARTH 392 takes students to major cities, including New York (2003), Paris (2004), and Mexico City (planned for 2006) to expose them to major museums, galleries and collections, and to historical sites.

11. **Change(s) proposed for an undergraduate program**: Latin American Studies Minor.

Adding cross-listed courses: HIST/POLI 321, POLI 488. Other: Required course presently shown as History/Politics 320, should be changed to read History/Politics 320 or 321. Politics 488 should be added to the list of elective courses. **Justification:** As the foundation survey course History/Politics 320 and History/Politics 321 are offered on alternate years, it has been determined that either course may be taken to satisfy the requirement for the minor in Latin American Studies. Politics 488 was mistakenly not included in the original proposal for establishing the minor in Latin American Studies.

**College of Natural and Applied Sciences:**

12. **Request for changes in an undergraduate course**: MATH 220, Mathematical Proofs and Problem Solving. Change prerequisites from: MATH 161 and MATH 174 to MATH 161 and MATH 174 with a grade of C or better. Change number of credit hours from 2 to 3. Change Catalog description to read: Detailed investigation of the methods of mathematical proof: direct, indirect, induction, contradiction, case analysis and counter examples. Topics include set theory, functions, relations, cardinality, elements of number theory, elements of real analysis and elements of abstract algebra. Major emphasis placed on understanding, attacking and solving problems. **Justification:** To lay a better foundation for the upper division courses which are proof intensive.

13. **Proposal for a new undergraduate course**: MATH 330, Geometry for Middle School. (3) (Prereq: MATH 160) Proposed Catalog description: Plane and solid geometry taught from an inductive approach, using manipulatives and technology components such as Geometer’s
Sketchpad. Deductive reasoning and justification are included. **Justification:** Required for Middle Grades Education major.
Faculty Welfare and Development Committee Annual Report
April 22, 2005

The membership of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee (FWDC) is as follows: Drs. Daniel Abel, Margaret Fain, Varavut Limpasuvan, Treelee MacAnn, John Marcis, John Mortimer, Sandra Nelson, Julia Orri, Michael Ruse (Chair). Dr. M. Scott Hicks acted as substitute for the Professional Enhancement Grant ranking process, and Dr. Terrance Fries replace Dr. Limpasuvan for the spring semester. The full committee met five times during academic year 2004-2005 (9/13, 9/27, 11/12, 2/4 and 3/4). The committee elected Dr. John Marcis as its representative to the Grievance Committee.

The charge of the committee, as stated in section IV on pages 11-12 of the 2003-2004 Faculty Manual, is to

consider policy matters pertaining to salaries and other aspects of the personal welfare of the faculty and to act as the initial agent of the faculty in matters concerning discipline of its own membership. In addition, this committee assists in all aspects of faculty development, including the organization of seminars or workshops to support continued education, scholarly research, and publication, or travel to professional meetings. Recommendations concerning scholarly reassignment leave applications and the awarding of faculty development grants are forwarded to the Provost.

Professional Enhancement Grants:

The committee received 22 applications for grants with a total budgetary request of $73,453.10. One of these was an application for a Proposal Writing Grant, six applications were for Academic Enhancement Grants, and fifteen were for Research Enhancement Grants. Dr. Richard Moore of the Office of Grants received a set of applications so that he could give his input to the committee. The chair received his recommendations in advance of the meeting.

In total, one Proposal Writing Grant, five Academic Enhancement Grants and fifteen Research Enhancement Grants were awarded by the Office of Academic Affairs as per the recommendations of the FWDC (funding totaled approximately $61,463).

Scholarly Reassignment:

The Committee received two applications for scholarly reassignment in the fall application period and two additional applications in the spring application period. Each proposal was ranked and a report was submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. As per the recommendations of the Deans Committee and the FWDC, all four scholarly reassignments were awarded by the Provost and President.

There was some discussion of the types of activities that warrant a reassignment and how that may vary from discipline to discipline. The FWDC plans to consult with departments in order to determine what types of research and publication are valued within each discipline. The question of whether or not the production of textbooks is an appropriate activity to be granted reassignment...
was at the heart of the issue. Questions concerning intellectual property rights were also raised during the committee deliberations.

Tuition Benefit:

At the request of the Chair of Faculty Senate, the FWDC is constructing a survey in order to determine the approximate cost of offering a tuition benefit for the spouses and children of faculty as a means to better recruit and retain quality faculty. The survey will be administered early in the fall semester. It is essential that all members of the faculty take part in the survey in order for us to get an accurate picture of the potential demand. Extension of the benefit to full time staff would need to be studied through HREO.

Salary Compression:

This is the second year of the salary compression initiative undertaken by the Administration. The second adjustment will be dispersed to those Full Professors and Associate Professors who received the first adjustment last year. The Full Professors will receive the final 30% of their total adjustment and the Associate Professors will receive the final 50% of their total adjustment.

On November 1, 2004 the FWDC forwarded a comprehensive salary report to the Provost, Executive Vice President and the Chair of Faculty Senate. The report contained three proposals.

1. The Faculty Welfare and Development Committee requested immediate representation on the body studying decompression for Assistant Professors and those Associate Professors who were promoted the year prior to the decompression study, held that rank at the time of the study, but for some reason did not receive any decompression adjustment.

2. The FWDC proposed that a one-time, CUPA-based salary adjustment be instituted using a years-at-rank incremental system across all ranks of the university.

3. The FWDC proposed that an immediate study of the costs and benefits of adopting a merit-based, incremental salary structure be undertaken by a body that includes representation from the FWDC.

I would like to thank membership of the committee for their efforts and attention to the business of the Faculty Welfare and Development Committee.

Respectfully Submitted:
Michael S. Ruse, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Development Committee
TO: Professor David Evans, President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Professor Steve Hamelman, Chair, University Promotion and Tenure Committee

DATE: 24 April 2005

SUBJECT: Report from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee 2004-2005

1. Members

During this academic year, the members (in alphabetical order) of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereafter UPTC) were Darla Domke-Damonte, David Evans, Craig Gilman, Steve Hamelman, Emory Helms, Michael Lackey, Brian Nance, Tom Secrest, and Douglas Smith.

2. Meetings

The committee met seven times: September 24, 2004; and January 7, January 21, January 28, March 24, April 1, and April 21, 2005. Each meeting lasted at least one hour; most of them lasted two hours or more. The meeting on January 7 was a special session that included the Provost, the deans from every college, and the UPTC. This meeting, the longest, lasted more than two hours. In addition, in my role as chair I met alone with the Provost twice, on October 15, 2004, and February 14, 2005, to discuss the committee’s progress. On November 15, 2004, I met alone with Dean Lynn Franken for more than two hours to discuss her concerns about the process. Communication among members of the UPTC wasn’t limited to discussion at meetings. I sent approximately thirty group e-mails that generated over a hundred responses from the members.

The meetings were devoted mainly to discussing and then voting on the files of nine applicants for tenure and/or promotion and three applicants for the post-tenure review ranking of Exceptional. It should be understood by all readers of this document that all members of the UPTC read the files, secured in the Provost’s office, on their own time before convening with their co-members to perform their duties as elected representatives on this committee.

3. Present Concerns and Future Solutions

Among all committees serving across Coastal Carolina University, the UPTC has a unique distinction: although it is the most visible committee, it is at the same time the one most restricted in terms of communicating the details of its deliberations. In other words, the UPTC cannot broadcast the content of its discussions or the reasons for and results of its votes. All communications, oral and written, among members of the UPTC must remain in the strictest
confidence. The most I can divulge is that, aside from doing some organizational work during its first meeting in September 2004, the UPTC spent all its time examining the twelve files on the other days listed above—except on January 7, when the committee met with the Provost and the deans to analyze strengths and weaknesses of the process.

Having fielded ideas from the deans as well as from two interested faculty members, and having conceived many ideas of its own, the UPTC believes that in order to improve the overall process, the college committees, the Faculty Senate, and the next version of the UPTC should consider the following recommendations (not fully debated by the current UPTC), as well as others that any or all of these groups proceed to identify.

- The vote-letters written and then forwarded by the college committees to the UPTC should include specific reasons for the final decisions. The specificity in these vote-letters currently ranges from quite detailed to very vague. The very vague letters make it next to impossible for the UPTC to understand the exact reasons for a given committee’s endorsement of or lack of support for a given candidate’s application for tenure and/or promotion.

- Chairs of the college committees should report to the chair of the UPTC. If the latter decides that more information is needed in the vote-letter, he or she should communicate this need to the respective college chair, who will then elicit this information from his or her committee and include it in a second vote-letter. If the initial vote-letter goes back to a college committee, the candidate involved should be informed of this action and the reason for it.

- After voting, the UPTC should place into each candidate’s file the result of its decision in the form of a majority or unanimous Yes or No, without including the actual vote-count and without detailing reasons for the decision.

- The college committees, deans, chairs, and Faculty Senate should address these two questions: Are members of the UPTC who are not full professors qualified to evaluate the files of full professors applying, in the post-tenure review process, for Exceptional ranking? And are non-Exceptional full professors on the UPTC any better qualified to do the same thing?

- In the event that a college committee’s evaluation of a candidate is not unanimous, a dissenting opinion should be written by the dissenting member/s, and this dissenting opinion should be attached to the vote-letter submitted to the UPTC.

- When hard proof exists that a member of either the UPTC or a college committee has broken confidence related to deliberations on a candidate’s file, this transgression should be reported and some type of discipline—ideally, removal from the respective committee—should ensue.
• Before submitting their decisions on post-tenure review to the UPTC, the college committees should clarify the criteria they will use when they re-evaluate a faculty member who received a Conditional ranking the previous year.

• Concerning the third-year review process, the college committees, not the UTPC, should be responsible for defining and enforcing their own policies.

4. Conclusion

I invite any reader of this document to contact me should he or she wish further clarification of any aspect of it. Although I won’t be able to cite specific cases in the UPTC’s deliberations this year, I will be able to convey to any inquirer the committee’s general feelings about the points I have cited in this report.

Respectfully,

Steven Hamelman
Professor of English
Chair, University Promotion and Tenure Committee

c: University Promotion and Tenure Committee; Pete Barr, Provost