## Agenda

## Faculty Senate Special Meeting (TEAMS)

# August 15, 2023

#### 11:00 am

- I. Roll call
- II. Compare SB 18, particularly the language concerning reasons for faculty dismissal, to current policy. Make suggestions as necessary.
- III. Examine current process of post-tenure review, particularly concerning due process. Make suggestions as necessary.
- IV. Suggestions/comments concerning revision of institutional policies 12.01.01 and 12.06, particularly post-tenure review policies as they appear in the Faculty Handbook.

#### From Dr. Arenaz:

Due process is embedded in the handbook and we will need to update 12.06 to include. We need to be sure we are congruent with System Policy and Education code. Our procedures for assessing faculty members and determining who would fall under post-tenure review are consistent with policy and may need to be tweaked if the System changes language in the policy.

# From Dr. San Miguel:

Review our policy on implementing tenure and compare it to SB 18's language.

# Our policies are

these: <a href="https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.tamiu.edu%2Fcompliance%2Fdocuments%2FRules%2520and%2520SAPs%2F12.01.01.l1institutionalruleforimplementingtenure.pdf&data=05%7C01%7Chkazen%40tamiu.edu%7C1f3300c5dfc34dfed9fc08db9a647769%7Ce6e9982505da4869bf49e63a0e04d314%7C0%7C0%7C638273528843795284%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=6lHooZ39piNBi9Dh9l8FMK9zBxB6N8EkKY9KZAHujcE%3D&reserved=0</a>

The attachment I sent earlier, which I am including again here, is the general regulation by the

system on 12.01.01. As you can see, the system is proposing some changes in the way things are worded to comply with SB 18. But, in general, there are not substantial changes. For instance, the Office of the Provost does post our own regulation on 12.01.01 to our website and it's also posted on the HR website. We used to provide copies of it to faculty but now, we must do so. Again, not a substantial change just once that required that we must do it.

#3 on the attached pdf, says if we are to make changes to our own regulation on 12.01.01, we must seek faculty input. As Dr. Arenaz mentioned, our regulation is in-line with SB 18 so we do not anticipate any changes but this is where Faculty Senate should compare SB 18 to our own regulation to ensure we are in compliance. Dr. Arenaz also wants you to look at due process in general for 12.01.01 and also due process for post-tenure review. As you can see from our regulation of 12.01.01, we do not mention post-tenure review although it is mentioned in the Faculty Handbook. System has it in

12.06: <a href="https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpolicies.tamus.e">https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fpolicies.tamus.e</a> du%2F12-

06.pdf&data=05%7C01%7Chkazen%40tamiu.edu%7C1f3300c5dfc34dfed9fc08db9a647769%7C e6e9982505da4869bf49e63a0e04d314%7C0%7C0%7C638273528843795284%7CUnknown%7C TWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQljoiV2luMzliLCJBTil6lk1haWwiLCJXVCl6Mn0%3D% 7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=H74TDmQtHxbo35dHTAqIBXGsSXJFp6ad20YDQ9Lmiw0%3D&reser ved=0 Thus, we may need to implement our own regulation of 12.06 and ensure that faculty are given due process if he/she is placed on post-tenure review and if he/she is dismissed due to a negative outcome of post-tenure review. Again, we do have that in the Faculty Handbook, we don't have it as part of our own regulation.

## **Concerning SB 18**

SB 18	TAMU/TAMIU Policy	AAUP Suggestions
Address the granting of	12.01.01	
tenure		
allow for the dismissal of a		
tenured faculty		
member at any time		
after providing the faculty		
member with appropriate		
due process, on a		
determination that:		
exhibited professional	College PPE (teaching, research,	
incompetence	service)	
continually or repeatedly	College PPE (teaching, research,	
failed to perform duties or	service)	
meet professional		
responsibilities of the faculty		
member's position;		

failed to acceptable.	Faculty bandbook ng F4	
failed to successfully	Faculty handbook pg 54	
complete any post-tenure		
review professional		
development program;		
engaged in conduct involving		vague and can be interpreted in a
moral turpitude that		multitude of ways since it is not
adversely affects the		defined by courts, but only loosely
-		interpreted. Recommend using a
institution or the faculty		clear list (e.g., as specified here:
member's performance of		https://kielichlawfirm.com/what-is-
duties or meeting of		moral-turpitude/) and explicitly
responsibilities;		exclude conduct or beliefs that can
·		be deemed immoral by some but
		should definitely not be included as
		they violate one's freedom of
		expression (e.g., one's sexual
		orientation, their opinion on
		women's reproductive rights, etc.) "Moral turpitude" is defined in the
		Texas Administrative Code as (A)
		Public Lewdness; (B) Indecent
		Exposure; (C) Enticing a Child; (D)
		Improper Contact with Victim; (E)
		Abuse of Corpse; (F) Prostitution;
		(G) Promotion of Prostitution; (H)
		Obscene Display or Distribution; (I)
		Obscenity; (J) Sale, Distribution, or
		Display of Harmful Material to
		Minor; and (K) Employment
		Harmful to Children;
		Policy for dismissal clearly state-
		action is taking place during
		employment NOT private lives.
		Obscenity should be more clearly
		defined. Differentiate from
		profanity. Teaching materials that
		reference obscene material should
		be protected (ex sex trafficking or
adalasad la casa de 19		nude art)
violated laws or university		The "laws", "policies", "crimes", and "unprofessional conduct"
system or institution policies		referenced above should be
substantially related to the		explicitly enumerated. The list
performance of the faculty		above is vague and lacks specifics.
member's duties;		For example, replace "crime" with
member s duties,		"felony". Example rewording: "v.
		violated laws or university system
		or institution policies substantially
		related to the performance of the
		faculty member's duties; vi. been
		convicted of a felony affecting the
		fitness of the faculty member to

been convicted of a crime affecting the fitness of the faculty member to engage in teaching, research, service, outreach, or administration;		engage in teaching, research, service, outreach, or administration; vii. continually or repeatedly engaged in unprofessional conduct that adversely affects the institution or the faculty member's performance of duties or meeting of responsibilities;"  See above
engaged in unprofessional conduct that adversely affects the institution or the faculty member's performance of duties or meeting of responsibilities falsified the faculty member's	Clear	See above
academic credentials;	Cicai	
there is actual financial exigency or the	Already stated	
there is other good cause as defined in the institution's policies; and	See above	This appears to be a catch-all provision and refers to "institution policies," without specifying which policies and whether such policies can be amended or changed at any point after the Regents Rules are changed. Recommend changing wording to specify which policies, who can initiate the changes to these policies, and under what process. The text above only says who approves the policies, but presumably such policies would come as a result of faculty inquiry as they are the body affected by said policies
provide [providing] for a periodic performance evaluation process for all tenured faculty [tenured] at the institution.	TAMUS 12.06 Faculty Handbook	

# **Concerning Due Process**

Section 3(c-4) does not codify the faculty member being allowed to examine the evidence presented against them, cross-examine witnesses, have hearing in front of a faculty committee, or finish the grievance process before termination (AAUP).

Current Due Process	Comments/Proposals
Faculty Handbook (Post-Tenure Review &	Need to add timelines to steps (professional
Grievance sections)	review process)
	Add policies to SAP rather than just faculty
	handbook
	Stress that the responsibility is on institution
	to prove incompetence within post-tenure
	review
	More detailed definition of teaching
	effectiveness.

Do the due process procedures only refer to TT faculty or also FT?
Although FT faculty do not have post-tenure review, are they allowed a growth plan as TT are?