The meeting began at 9:40 AM.

Minutes from the February meetings will be resubmitted to Council members for approval/disapproval via E-MAIL and shall be posted on the TPDC web page upon approval.

Old Business

1. Tenure recommendations have been passed onto to the President’s Office; 3 applicants were asked to be personally reviewed

2. Set meeting – April 19th 9:30 in Cocoa at the library will finish lose ends from this meeting and welcome new members; looking at turnover for the Cocoa representative and elections for chairperson and secretary
Standing Committee for Sabbatical Leave

**DISCUSSION**

- Applicant instructions and evaluations are in the TPD handbook and up to date with last revision (3-6-2013)

- Change in the Proposal for Leave Review Form
  - need to finish changing “highly recommend”, “recommend”, “not recommend” to “recommend” and “not recommend” to avoid having criteria to substantiate “highly recommend”
  - a previous applicant made changes to the applicant form (condensed it onto one sheet for streamlining; approved by HR –pp.43,44 in handbook)
  - when had a candidate, situations arose where things were not in place and had to piece both old and new documents
    - now, once the documents are written and settled/approved by us, would go to bargaining for finality;
    - clarifications in manual need to go through union for any contract conflicts or changes prior to use and posting
    - phrasing of funding to be “at 66.6% of funding” not “up to”; is it approved or not? Not sure

**CONCLUSIONS**

**ACTION ITEMS**

- Any changes to forms
  - Sabbatical Standing Committee; approval to TPD Council then onto Union

**DISCUSSION**

- Article 5
  - confidential information statement will be on page 8
  - on page 6, added that during anything dealing with confidential information needs to be kept in the meeting eventually, discussions dealing with confidential information will be presented in the minutes to maintain Sunshine State Standards with transparency;
applicant **cannot be present** during TPDC meeting, but campus-base tenure committee may have applicant present for the meeting for Q/A; if person asks to be present at TPDC meeting for application review, answer is no across the board since numerous applications are present and available at one time; we are to insure the integrity of the process

Section 6

– p.12  TPDC Chair duties
  
  #12 – striking provost are informed of campus-base committee recommendations;

  
  #7 – not responsible for web site – responsible only to submit to College web master for update

– p.16 of handbook
  need TPD procedures for Sabbatical Standing Committee structure and timeline

– Dr. Chen brought to the Sabbatical Standing Committee a draft information page, but it was older and modified earlier
  found statement – states “selection of the committee is an agreement between UFF and administration” – no, should not be;
  selection of the standing committee was a list on a first come, first served basis, in different fields and campuses -- need, as much as possible, equal representation from all fields from all campuses;
  standing committee is close to finishing suggested handbook needs

Section 7

– 7.04 Rank Standing Committee duties – “recommendations to administration for rank changes” – should be recommendations to the TPDC, not administration; also this needs to be changed for sabbatical leave and professional development

– Appendix A – updates for rank (from the Change in Rank Standing Committee) were submitted a while ago and they have more now (p.22 under boxed items)
  – letter of recommendation must be on official letterhead and signed (electronic is fine);
  – application must be signed as well for application to be considered;
  – included “the evidence is included in the order listed below with clearly labeled dividers separating sections” for clarity when reviewing applicants

– p.23 – approve putting evidence in order beginning with most recent accomplishment;
  – check box area moved to before “guidelines for the portfolio” to ease confusion and streamline;
Human resources verification form all on one page
– Provost verification form will be on a separate page
*** Both state to have signed and return to applicant in a timely manner

– p. 28 – “applicants denied will be provided with written justification from Rank Change Committee – this is untrue; justification will come from TPDC to the President’s Office no later than Nov. 15 with justification for denials

– p.28 – TPDC chair doesn’t provide applicant with letter for denial; President’s Office shall

– 7.05, p.13 – says denied applicants will have applications sent back to candidates – should be forwarded to the TPDC chair and taken to the Council for discussion and evaluation; this is then sent to President for approval and TPDC Chair will provide justification for the President’s Office for denial – ALL applicants both approved and disapproved are reviewed by the TPD Council to insure the process

– p.14 – step 8 needs changed to be continuous with the previous change – there is no need to send application back and justification from the campus-base committee’s chair to applicant for denial

– 7.06, p.13 – first initial meeting of campus-base committee “may invite a TPDC campus representative to attend”; just to insure the process and Q/A BUT no portfolios will be discussed at that time (part C)

Appendix C
– Tenure – granting of tenure is the responsibility of the President
– requires two recommendations – one from TPD Council and the other from the Campus-Base Tenure Committee

– forms to be filled are on separate pages and clearly identified
  – p. 32 “Application for Faculty Tenure”

– Campus-Base Tenure Form was updated and approved; additional space for their justification if denied for tenure added

Appendix D
– added “include dividers clearly separating sections”
– section for professional development and contribution to the academic unit,
  – subcategories for contribution to college, contributions to profession, and (optional section) contribution to the community
  – professional development needs two evidences for support as does contributions to academic unit

***** Motion→ proposed and passed unanimously – for contribution to the
academic unit, instead of 2 evidences for support, propose 3 evidences
1 from contribution to college (mandatory)
1 from contribution to profession (mandatory)
the third may come from another evidence in either contribution to the college or the profession or one in contribution to the community

the applicant must be wary that “evidence provided in support of each section may be only utilized once”

professional development criteria, checklist, and examples are to be brought under one heading for contributions to the profession

Appendix E
– expanded for chain of custody signatures
– footnote that forms can be given to the campus representative of the TPD Council will be included

Appendix G
– flow chart moved to the beginning of Article II and the text will be deleted due to unnecessary redundancy
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