

# Discussion:

Proposed changes to COAP's membership, election process, recusal process, and responsibilities

(Faculty Handbook: Part One, Bylaw One, Section VI of the Faculty Handbook)

## Committee on Governance

Len Albano (CEE)

Tanja Dominko (BBT)

Glenn Gaudette (BME)

Eleanor Loiacono (BUS)

Mark Richman (ME)

Liz Ryder (BBT)

Suzanne Weekes (MA)

Bruce Bursten (Provost)

---

# Task Force Recommendations

1. Broaden the criteria for promotion from Associate to Full Professor
  2. Require that every academic department create an elected Professional Development and Promotion Committee to provide mentoring and feedback to all Tenured Faculty and to all Continuing Non-Tenure Track Faculty
  3. **Modify procedures used by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) during review of promotion cases**
    - **Election**

Elections for COAP be run by the COG consistent with elections for COG and CTAF
    - **Composition and Recusal Process**

To accommodate recusal, the size of COAP be enlarged by one elected member, and that policies be established for determining which six committee members participate in each case
    - COAP's recommendation letter

We propose that the COAP letter to the Provost, with its recommendation for or against promotion, should be addressed to the candidate as well as to the Provost, and that this letter should be available to the candidate after the decision by the Board of Trustees
    - Appeals procedure

We propose that a mechanism be instituted to appeal a negative decision for promotion based on procedural grounds, but not based on the merits of a case
-

## **Outline:**

- 1. Revised Nomination and Election Process, Membership, Recusal Process**
  - 2. Changes in Responsibilities:**
    - recommendations to the Faculty**
    - recommendations to the Provost**
  - 3. Updates** (changes that should/could have been made in the past)
  - 4. Editorial Changes**
-

# 1. Nomination and Election Process, Membership, Recusal Process

## Addition

- Add: “ Nominations and elections for COAP are conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. The election procedure is as follows: The Secretary prepares a nominating ballot listing eligible Faculty members by department and distributes it to all members of the Faculty, with instructions to nominate up to one person from each department. The member of each academic department who receives the largest number of nominations and is willing to serve if elected is then placed on an election ballot to be distributed to all members of the Faculty. The number to be elected annually will rotate from three to two to two in successive years. Vacancies to unexpired terms will be filled by the same nominating and election procedure as for full terms. ”
    - This recommendation was made by the task Force on Promotions to **elevate the importance, status, and primacy of service on COAP.**
    - The proposed election procedure is exactly parallel to the CTAF election procedures.
-

# 1. Nomination and Election Process, Membership, Recusal Process,

## Change

- The language ...” (COAP) consists of **six** elected Faculty Members **holding the rank of Professor...**” changed to “COAP consists of **seven** elected Faculty members **holding the rank of Professor...**”
  - The addition of one COAP member makes it possible to recuse one COAP member from each promotion case.
  - The flexibility to recuse one member from each case will parallel the recusal mechanism used by CTAF, and will allow COAP to recuse one of its members due to any conflict of interest.

## Clarification

- Add “...**Department Heads, Deans, and the Provost are not eligible to serve on COAP. The term of office for this committee is three years, and no member may serve successive terms.**”
    - These additions are purely to clarify the current and intended practice.
    - They are parallel to the CTAF membership rules.
-

# 1. Nomination and Election Process, Membership, Recusal process

## **Addition**

- Add: "For the purpose of considering each promotion case, a Joint Promotion Committee is formed, consisting of six members of COAP, and a Nominator and an Advocate. "
  - The (proposed) formation of a Joint Promotion Committee that formally includes the Nominator and the Advocate will ensure that in each case the Nominator and Advocate play a more significant role in the promotion-deliberations.
  - This will improve the level of communication between COAP members and those who know the promotion candidate's qualifications best.

**However, the exact role and privileges-of the Nominator and the Advocate are to be determined.**

---

# 1. Nomination and election process, Recusal process, Membership

## Addition

- Add: “ **If the candidate and one of the COAP members are from the same department, then that COAP member is recused from the Joint Promotion Committee automatically.** The Joint Promotion Committee also will consider whether any of its members should be recused due to **direct conflict of interest.** In the event of no departmental overlap or conflict of interest, the selection of the six COAP members to sit on the Joint Promotion Committee will be governed by COAP procedures developed to lead to an overall pattern of recusals distributed over the COAP membership so as to ensure appropriate participation for each COAP member. If recusal of two COAP members is necessary, then the most recent qualified past Chair of COAP will serve for that particular case. The Joint Promotion Committee is chaired by the Chair of COAP. If the Chair is recused, then the Joint Promotion Committee is chaired by the senior-most elected member of COAP participants. “
    - The recusal mechanism proposed is consistent with the recommendation of the Task Force.
    - Assures “uniformity” with respect to Departmental representation among the six COAP members on the Joint Promotion Committee
    - The recusal mechanism parallels the recusal process used by CTAF.
-



**Discussion:**

**We want your input!**

---



## 2. Changes in Responsibilities: Recommendations to the Faculty

**Current:** • “(COAP) makes recommendations to the Faculty for changes in recognized titles of academic rank and criteria of eligibility thereto.”

### Proposed Changes:

- **Focus - on promotion criteria from Associate Professor to Full Professor**
  - CTAF is responsible for promotion criteria of Assistant to Associate
- **Add – responsibility for criteria for appointment and promotion of continuing non-tenure track faculty members**
  - To reflect policy approved in 2012
- **Require - collaboration with COG**
  - To broaden Faculty governance input in these matters beyond full Professors
- **Remove - in recognized titles of academic rank and criteria of eligibility thereto.**
  - To be consistent with how these recommendations have been made in the past

### New Language:

- “**In collaboration with COG, COAP makes recommendations to the Faculty for changes in criteria for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, and changes in criteria for appointment and promotion of continuing non-tenure track faculty members.**”
-

## 2. Changes in Responsibilities: Recommendations to the Provost

**Change** • Change from COAP advises the Provost on:

“...initial appointments above the rank of Assistant Professor...”

to

”...initial appointments of Associate Professors without tenure and Full Professors ...”

- Avoids duplication of effort between COAP and CTAF by leaving initial appointments at the Associate Professor **with tenure** level to CTAF.
  - Is parallel to the change made in 2000 to give CTAF the simultaneous responsibility to recommend both for or against tenure and for or against promotion to Associate Professor.
-

### 3. Updates

- Update** • **Add:** COAP makes recommendations to the Provost "...on
- initial appointments of Associate and (Full) teaching and research Professors,
  - initial appointments of Professors of Practice,
  - promotions of continuing non-tenure track faculty members to the Associate and (Full) teaching and research Professor levels, and
  - reappointments of Professors of Practice.”
- This change reflects the new responsibilities of COAP that were assigned when the non-tenure track faculty structure was put in place in 2012.
  - These added responsibilities are outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Part Two, Section 7, Subsection E) but were never incorporated into the Faculty Handbook charge for COAP.
- Update** • Replace COAP’s role in evaluation of “academic administrative officers” with COAP’s role in evaluation of “...Department Heads.”
- This change reflects current and past practice, in which COAP has been involved with Department Head evaluations (Faculty Handbook Part 2, section 1C) and COG has been responsible for the faculty evaluations of administrative officers.
-

### 3. Updates

- Update**
- Delete the (blue) language specifying that COAP makes recommendations to the Provost on appointments and promotions “...after consultation with the appropriate Department Heads and others concerned.”
    - COAP does not always consult with the candidate’s Department Head, and “others concerned” is vague and ill-defined.
    - The extent to which Promotion Committees consult with others is a procedural matter that should be provided in a separate description of promotion procedures.
-

## 4. Editorial

- The language “...advises the Provost...” changed to ...”makes recommendations to the Provost...”
    - This is purely an editorial change that reflects the common description of the relationship between COAP and the Provost in dealing with promotion cases.
  - The language “..individual...” changed to “...initial...” in reference to COAP’s involvement with appointments.
    - This is an editorial change that better explains that COAP’s involvement in such appointments occurs when Faculty members are *initially* hired.
-