



TPD Council Meeting

FEBRUARY 8, 2013 9:40 –1:00 PM Cocoa Library Room 205

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 22, 2013 9:35 – 11:30 AM Melbourne Library Room 122

MEETING CALLED BY	Dr. Chris Petrie
TYPE OF MEETING	Tenure Meeting
FACILITATOR	Dr. Chris Petrie
NOTE TAKER	J. Bottesch
TIMEKEEPER	
ATTENDEES	<p>For 2/8/2013 Debbie Anderson, Karen Simpson, Norma Rudmik, Dr. Chris Petrie, Dr. Carol Bourke, J. Bottesch, Mark Marovich, Dr. Sasan Kermani, Teresa Moore</p> <p>For 2/22/2013 Debbie Anderson, Karen Simpson, Norma Rudmik, Dr. Chris Petrie, Dr. Carol Bourke, J. Bottesch, Mark Marovich, Dr. Sasan Kermani, Teresa Moore</p>

Agenda topics

[TIME ALLOTTED]

TPD Old Business

DR. PETRIE

DISCUSSION	<p>The meeting began at 9:40 AM.</p> <p>Minutes from the November 9th, 2012 meeting were approved and shall be posted on the TPDC web page.</p> <p>Old Business</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High number of tenure E-MAILs – predominantly were asking about the process but will be cleaned up in the March meetings with rewrites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Where do portfolios go?” was in a large number of questions – after shown to the Department Chair, the campus-base committee would need to be assembled next; need to have signature page for the Chair upon receipt of the portfolio so that the Chair sets up the campus-base committee;
-------------------	---

We need verbage to signify that this is a faculty-run process, not an administrative-run one;

Check list page for the applicant is needed so it's a more streamlined process;

Committees need to have tenured members;

2. Rank applications from the Fall – denied applicant was an issue; Council needed a full page letter to justify the denial;

Better verbage is required to state that **this letter needs to come from the President's office and in a timely fashion**; this would have avoided many of the problems experienced

For the letter of denial -- lack of applicant signature; lack of letterhead on recommendation; items included in portfolio were not identified as to which items went with which criteria (leaving the committee to map out on their own);

Council fully understands and appreciates the candidate's contribution to the college, which is great, but the organization was lacking

Applicant denoted items brought up in committee which must be solely kept in committee ; discussion ensued on making the guidelines more clear so to avoid any hard feelings as well as avoid unpleasanties

** One evaluation sheet with just checkmarks so that it is clear and streamlined for the applicant and committee members would be instrumental in clarification

3. Tenure candidates were receiving procedural advice from an outside source, and the information was outdated and thereby giving off incorrect information

Need to add a line in the TPD Handbook that all contact with this Council should be done through the Chair; this should aid in the fluid dispersal of consistent, reliable information to potential candidates;

Need a FAQ section to help this flow (for the March meetings);

Updating to TPD Council web site is necessary ASAP, but due to recent updating on the site as well as the institutional name change, it has not been done (but needs to be to avoid future confusion with new candidates for rank and tenure)

4. Dr. Kermani – concerns over maintenance of continuing contract – the way it is currently set, it is very rigid with respect to the number of credits for college courses taken in 6 years;

But if one takes classes up through the 5th year, one should be able to

extend the course credit hours beyond to the following continuing contract time period;

This option is usually utilized by individuals going for PhD so as to not do other aspects of continuing contract while concentrating on the degree;

This courtesy is not being extended for someone with a PhD already, where it would be extended to someone with an MS going into a PhD? Sending an incorrect message for diligent behavior and professionalism?

***** perhaps a bargaining item for J. Schatte, but not for TPDC

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

Post November minutes

Bottesch or Dr. Petrie

At Leisure

Letter to Rank candidate

Dr. Petrie

ASAP

[TIME ALLOTTED]

Tenure Questions

DR. PETRIE

DISCUSSION

3 applications for Tenure came to Council with approvals with conditions

Campus-base committee is not entitled to add personal comments;

If a candidate has satisfactory reviews and has been retained for employment, then according to documentation and protocol, he/she has completed satisfactory requirements;

Problems are arising with evaluation process for the classroom performance and the candidate's interaction within the department;

seems not valid as candidates receive "satisfactory performance" from a third party that may not be qualified to assess the performance adequately and not receive a full picture of the candidate's actual performance;

Issue for union?? – recc. to J. Schatte

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Issue needs to be raised with Judy Schatte and identify input from the Union perspective	Dr. Petrie	At leisure

[TIME ALLOTTED]

STANDING COMMITTEE UPDATES

TPD COUNCIL
MEMBERS OF THE
RESPECTIVE
STANDING
COMMITTEES

DISCUSSION	Rank and Professional Development – none	
	Debbie Anderson and Karen Simpson – Sabbatical Need a sabbatical section to be written in a formalized form for the TPD Council Handbook; awaiting approval of the previous edits prior to moving forward	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[TIME ALLOTTED]

TENURE PORTFOLIO REVIEW

DR. PETRIE

DISCUSSION	<p>21 candidates for tenure approval came from the campus-base tenure committees portfolio evaluations ran to 1 PM and the library's closing;</p> <p>need to have a meeting for the reviewed portfolios on 2/22/13, if allowable to have a one day extension for decision (previously 2/21 as cited in the Handbook and contract)</p> <p>Update – extension approval was given until Monday 2/25/13 and the meeting on the 22nd is being currently worked out</p>
------------	--

	<p>From 2/22/13 TPDC Meeting:</p> <p>Confidentiality in the meeting was addressed again; this is crucial and needs to remain within the meeting for maintenance of the integrity of the Council, the process, and the contract</p> <p>Note: Health sciences only evaluated once a year (one class per year – year long, so one performance evaluation for student input and supervisor), and need to have the latest evaluation as being “acceptable” or “satisfactory”</p> <p>Next meeting – March 15th in Melbourne Library; following and last semester meeting will be in April</p> <p><u>Tenure Portfolio Review (continued from the 2/8/2013 meeting)</u></p> <p>21 candidates up for tenure</p> <p>After TPDC review:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">12 approved after 1st round of review</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">9 were discussed in Council – 8 approved after discussion</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">1 disapproved after discussion</p>
--	--

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

[TIME ALLOTTED]

DISCUSSION	

CONCLUSIONS	

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

