Since the last report of the Faculty Council, the following issues have been addressed:

- The Faculty Welfare Committee and the Elections Committee have established web sites. The web sites include general information concerning the committees’ responsibilities and membership. In addition, the Elections Committee website contains a list of the current committee vacancies and a nomination form for the upcoming spring elections.

- Dr. Abdelkrim Brania has been appointed to replace Dr. Curtis Clark on the Faculty Development Committee for the spring semester of the 2002-2003 academic year. The remainder of Dr. Clark’s term (2003-2005) will be open for nominations during the spring elections.

- Plans for the Faculty Appreciation Luncheon are underway. The program will be held on Wednesday, May 14, 2003 during the Faculty Retreat. Thirty-one (31) members of the faculty will be honored for service of 25 years or more to the college.

- Results of the January Workshop on Diversity are available for review.

- The Faculty Forum was held on Tuesday, March 18, 2003 from 4:00 – 6:30 p.m. (originally scheduled from 4:00 – 5:30 p.m.) and was well attended. The topics of discussion dealt with term limits for the non-tenure track and non-tenure track conversion, tenure application and the appeals process for denial of tenure, and post-tenure review. The following are some of the issues that were put forth as concerns of the faculty:

  **Non-Tenure Track –**

  Term limits and “grandfathering” issues were debated. What is the reason for term limits? Is there an accreditation issue involved? Many faculty members regard the time limit to long-term non-tenure track faculty as unfair. For example, faculty members who have already been in service for 10 or more years will be asked to leave after 2006-2007 academic year. Comments were made that it was not practical to replace experienced faculty with new faculty who have limited teaching experience. This could affect the students’ education at the college. Non-tenure track faculty teach the majority of the service and introductory courses. Will departments be able to adequately fill the number of vacated positions left during the first round of dismissals? Allow departments to evaluate the quality and value of their faculty. Is the new rule for term limits of faculty truly “grandfathering?” Many see it as unfair to retroactively impose a rule after an individual has been hired.
There was a discussion of the non-tenure track conversion process. For faculty who were hired prior to the 1997-1998 academic year, April 1, 2003 is the deadline for departments or divisions to submit a request to the Senior V.P. for conversion to tenure-track. If allowed to convert, these faculty members must apply for tenure in the fall of 2006. Faculty considered for conversion will be those who possess a Ph.D. or those who are ABD. What is the desired composition of tenured faculty at the college? Once conversion is made and tenure application is submitted, will there be tenure positions available in the respective departments? Is the acceptance of an individual to become tenure track a commitment by the college to assure a position if tenure is granted? Will non-tenure track faculty who go through the conversion and tenure application process find there are no tenure positions available?

Currently the evaluation instrument is the same for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. A new evaluation instrument is needed for non-tenure track faculty that differentiates between research and non-research requirements.

Further comments regarded the lack of opportunity for real input into the October 2001 Handbook. It is felt by some that there was no opportunity for close examination and discussion.

**Tenure Track**

Tenure track faculty have a maximum limit of (9) years to apply for tenure. Application can be made as early as the sixth year if desired. However, if tenure is denied during the sixth year, the faculty member will only be granted an additional year to remain at the college. Since tenure-track faculty essentially have a 10-year limit of service, many members present felt that there should be an additional opportunity to reapply. This occurs in some institutions. Faculty members noted that the ability to apply for tenure only once during the tenure process has not always been the case at Morehouse.

Tenure track faculty would like a basic list of guidelines for compiling a dossier. It was commented that there appears to be some imprecision and vagueness regarding requirements for tenure. Although some requirements are stated in the Handbook, how the RPC and APT apply them is unclear. It is felt that some standardization is needed. A checklist of items to be included in the dossier would help the faculty in their preparation and the APT in their assessment of the application for tenure. Departments should come up with a standardized checklist for tenure. Also noted was that when tenure candidates are asked by the APT to produce additions to the dossier, they are given 5 days to produce them—-a time limit which does not appear to be referenced in the Handbook.

Newly hired tenure track faculty should be afforded with an orientation session that would not only familiarize them with their departmental responsibilities and college benefits, but how they should begin to prepare their dossiers for tenure application.
Standards for quality and quantity of research should be developed at the departmental level and the college level. For example, some individuals have been penalized for not being first authors on publications. It was noted that in science, the main author is frequently the last author listed. Additionally, research in some areas lengthens the time involved in producing a refereed publication; therefore, the number of publications by individuals in certain areas may be less than others. The APT should be made aware of these and other distinctions among disciplines when reviewing tenure applications.

A question was raised regarding the wording on page 29 of the Faculty Handbook, which at first glance seems to suggest that a candidate for tenure must present evidence in teaching or research. It further states that candidates must show excellence in one or the other, and in addition give evidence in the other category of consistently meeting performance standards. Faculty were of the opinion that currently the standards are vague, although departments have recently been asked to establish a list of standards.

Many faculty members felt there is a limited opportunity to appeal a denial of tenure. It was recommended that a distinction should be made between a Board of Appeals and a Faculty Grievance Committee, whose charge seems to be limited to investigations of irregular procedure in the tenure process. Is the Grievance Committee a faculty committee or a college committee? It was also suggested that a blind review of the tenure application by outside experts in a candidate’s field would ensure fairer evaluation. The outside reviewer should also come from a comparable institution. It was noted that a faculty member who is denied tenure must petition the Grievance Committee within 14 days of the date of first notification.

Tenure track faculty were informed that the tenure clock may be stopped only once, and then only with approval of the Department Chair, Division Dean and the Senior V.P.

**Post-Tenure Review** –

Post-tenure review will be a comprehensive evaluation of tenured faculty members’ performance to be administered every 5 years. Faculty members were unsure as to how much this process would differ from the current yearly review. What is the outcome of a poor review? It was noted that a start date for post-tenure review has not yet been established.

- In an effort to clarify issues addressed in the faculty forum, a meeting will be scheduled with Dr. Sheftall and all concerned faculty members before the end of the academic year. The exact time and place will be forthcoming.