

Annual Committee Report
Tenure, Promotion and Grievance Committee (Faculty Relations) Committee
Faculty Senate of Texas Christian University
Academic Year 2013 - 2014

Submitted to: Dr. Chris Sawyer, Senate Chair
Submitted by: Dr. Dianna McFarland, Committee Chair

Committee Members

Crawford, Lindy; Jenkins, David; Michaelides, Efsthios; McGettigan, Joan; Miller, Vanessa; Kim, San-ky; Neilson, Robert; Esposito, Philip; McFarland, Dianna and our Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison, Sawyer, Chris.

The overall purpose of the Tenure, Promotion and Grievance/Faculty Relations Committee is to monitor the effectiveness of University policies on tenure, promotion, and grievance, and to serve as liaison with Human Relations on faculty benefits and compensation. Below please find a set of standing charges followed by the committee's action, then the specific charges also followed by the committee's action.

The standing charges associated with our committee are to:

1. Monitor the effectiveness of the University policies on tenure, promotion, and grievance as set forth in the TCU Faculty and Staff Handbook.
2. Monitor the effectiveness and outcomes of faculty conflict resolution processes for ensuring due process.
3. Serve as liaison with Human Resources on benefits and compensation. This is a new charge that is to go into effect for Fall 2015, but is included here for reference.

Response to Standing Charge #1

In response to this charge regarding promotion and policy effectiveness, the TPG/FRC was to examine the promotional processes for all faculty ranks; this included exploring across colleges, the number of faculty who applied for tenure and other promotions as well as the number of faculty who were successful in obtaining tenure and/or promotion. Provost Donovan stated at the first regular Senate meeting of this academic year that he was convening a committee to reevaluate any gender differences among faculty, so correspondingly, the committee decided to include gender as a factor in responding to this charge.

The committee asked the Provost's Office to provide data from its research base about fulltime faculty, with the data grouped by college and other factors. The Provost provided the information we requested regarding hiring, retiring, rank, gender, promotion attempts, promotion denials, and promotion successes. The

questions below are the items or data questions that we forwarded. Each item number (1-6) appears on the excel data report with the corresponding statistics for that respective question. Thus, the item numbers below should be used in interpreting the results. For next year, we plan to request this same information in the same format in order to compare another set of data and to begin to examine any trends that might surface. See Attachment I.

1. By college and gender, how many faculty were new-hires and at which rank were they hired
2. By college, gender, and rank, how many retired
3. By college, gender and rank, how many left the university via non-retirement
4. By college, gender and rank, how many applied for a promotion (lecturers, ranks, PPP ranks, and tenure ranks)
5. Of that group that applied for a promotion and/or tenure, how many by college, gender and rank successfully promoted and how many were denied.
6. We would also like the college/program data collapsed across to see statistics at the university level, too.

Regarding the report statistics, the committee examined and discussed the results and found no particular differences across any of the factors such as college or gender. Also, it appeared that faculty were applying for promotion and gaining promotion at ratios that seemed reasonable to the committee. We look forward to examining the same data for the next period.

Note: This past year, Senate approved new charges for the Faculty Relations committee. To fulfill upcoming charges related to benefits and compensation, it would seem logical or possible at least, to use this same analysis and just extend some of the outcome variables to include elements of benefit and/or compensation.

Response to Standing Charge #2

This charge involves grievance and the use of grievance policies. TCU has a total of three policies designed to help resolve various types of disputes or “grievances” and each can involve mediation. Human Resources (HR) typically tracks the total number of staff and faculty conflicts involving mediations and the outcomes of those mediated disputes. The policies are:

- For staff: the *Conflict Resolution Policy for Staff*
- For faculty conflict only related to denials of promotion and/or tenure: the *Faculty Appeal Policy*
- For faculty issues for all other (non-tenure/promotion) types of dispute resolution processes: the *Conflict Resolution Policy for Faculty*.

Mediation includes the facilitation of neutral third-party (non-involved with the case) individuals serving as mediators. For many years, TCU has provided training for any of its employees who want mediation training; after training, many of these employees voluntarily serve in disputes. Mediation provides a venue for individuals

who are in conflict with each other, to participate in a confidential meeting where they each tell their “whole story” and then are encouraged by the facilitating mediators to develop a commonly acceptable solution.

On rare occasion, a mediated settlement cannot be reached and the case may be forwarded to the use of arbitration, conducted by a panel of one’s peers. The spring 2014 list of faculty mediators and peer review panelists is attached to this document . See Attachment II.

In the past Human Resources noted that since TCU has been providing this training for years, that many times, employees who have been trained or who understand mediation practices will conduct an informal mediation with or between parties in their own unit, without requesting for support from HR.

This year, Human Resources reported the following data to Senate TPG/Faculty Relations committee

- HR Incident Inquiries: 530
- HR formal Mediations: 25
- HR informal mediations: 455
- HR Peer Reviews: 0

Response to standing charge #3

To fulfill upcoming charges related to benefits and compensation, it would seem logical or possible at least, to use the analysis used to investigate standing charge #1 and just extend some of the outcome variables to include elements of benefit and/or compensation.

This ends the report on Standing Charges

The specific charges for this year were to:

1. Edit and update the Faculty Appeal Policy (FAP) and recommend changes needed in order to create alignment between the FAP and policy elements of the TCU Handbook for Faculty and Staff.
2. Investigate actions taken by departments and/or colleges in response to the Senate Resolution regarding service requirements and the value of service by faculty. This resolution had been approved by Senate during Academic Year 2012-13.

Response to Specific Charge #1

(This action involved the Faculty Appeal Policy)

The main use of our committee time during the currently ending academic year has been to focus on updating the Faculty Appeal Policy (FAP). This is the policy that guides the appeal processes for a faculty member who has been denied tenure

and/or promotion and who seeks to appeal that decision. The FAP replaced the older policy, effective April 1, 2010. There were multiple changes that the 2010 policy brought into effect; perhaps the four most noteworthy features of the new policy were:

- a) The Senate Executive Committee no longer became an ad hoc hearing committee for cases.
- b) The policy expanded from being applied exclusively to tenure-track faculty and now, also applies to all full-time, promotionally ranked TCU instructional faculty: tenured, tenure-track, professors of professional practice, and instructors.
- c) The voluntary use of mediation as a strategy for resolving issues.
- d) And finally, the policy allowed an appeal to ensure based on substantial and/or procedural concerns.

The updated policy, attached to this document, was approved at the May, 2014, Senate meeting. No changes were made to main features of the policy and below are examples of the several smaller edits that were made and subsequently approved.

- a) The timing of some due dates were changed, based on the feedback during cases across the last four years. (e.g., changing the timing of a response from one week to two weeks),
- b) Several grammatical changes were made.
- c) The rank of the facilitator (who helps guide process) was changed from tenured to a fulltime faculty with expertise in this area.
- d) New statements were included to clarify that any one faculty member who would participate in the appeal of a colleague could “vote” only once on a case. So, if the participating faculty member were in the appellant’s department and was also a member of the college advisory committee, the participating faculty member would not participate at the college level.

The Faculty Appeal Policy is attached to this document. See Attachment III.

Response to specific charge #2

This charge emerged from work and a report done over a two-year period by the TPG committee. Service, the value of service, and differences across units regarding service were explored, partly through a service survey during academic year 2011-2012. The response to this survey and interest in this topic by TCU faculty was overwhelming. So, during 2012-2013 the Senate Executive Committee gave TPG the charge of considering and making follow-up recommendations based on the data analysis of the survey. These recommendations were brought forward in Senate and approved by Senate by the end of the spring semester, 2013. The following fall (Fall 2013), the Provost brought to the Provost’s Council, the recommendations.

The charge given to TPG for this current report was to follow-up on work done on service, in order to determine if and how various colleges or units across campus were instituting the recommendations that had been forwarded. As the committee considered this charge early in the semester of fall 2013, we realized that this time also was very near the same time that the Provost would have shared this

information with his deans. Some members reported that their department chair had (just) reported to the department that they were going to be redefining service and discussing it in their respective departments. Thus, TPG felt that from a timing standpoint, that we were slightly out of sync with events that might be occurring at that same moment. We decided to focus on the FAP policy and then come back to this second charge in the spring if time allowed. The committee attempted to bring the FAP edits forward to regular Senate meetings during three months of the spring semester and our time was spent on completing that task, reworking, and bringing back to Senate policy changes for further discussion and approval.

The committee expects to have a greater focus on service during the next academic year.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianna McFarland
TPG/Faculty Relations Chair
2013-2014

List of Attachments to this report

Attachment I: Data report on faculty hiring, promotion, resignation, and retirement

Attachment II: Listing of 2014 faculty mediators and peer review panelists

Attachment III: The 2014 Faculty Appeal Policy which was approved by Senate