

**FDC Minutes**  
**October 18, 2019**  
**Miller Hall 2212**  
**1:00 - 3:00**

**Attendance:**

**Present:** Basu Dutt(chair), Jill Drake (for Denise Overfield), Stacey Britton (note-taker), Nguyen Hoang, Jeff Reber, Amin Boumenir, Ericka Wentz, Salvadore Lopez, Kelly Dyar, Michael Camp, Kristy Carmen, Anja Remshagen, Ajith Desilva (Rules Committee)

**Topic one-**

Anja speaking on the BOR policy for tenure and promotion in the faculty handbook. How do we change our wording to align more closely with the BOR policy - are we in violation or do we want/need to change wording?

- Our institution requires terminal degree for associate or full
- Problematic in academic achievement says terminal degree
- Prof dev examples include academic examples (pubs) and professional development (workshops)
- We have nothing really listed in #3, so the suggestion is to possibly have something in all four categories.

In addition to terminal degree, thoughts about whether this can be listed as 3 for achievement 8.3.6.1 / 103.0302 minimum criteria for promotion

If it is BOR policy, we HAVE to follow it. We can add to the recommendations, but we must use the

-We reviewed the UWG policy then addressed the BOR accessed online. Discussion specific to 3 and 4 and how we delineate (if we do at all). Jill brought up how to differentiate.

Professional development doesn't really show up in our paperwork. How do we consider conferences when we present? Are we actually showing PG&D? Became a discussion of terminology and what it means? The lack of matching terms is problematic.

What are the next steps? Bigger debate than just this committee. Is the next step to make our categories align with BOR? What do other institutions do in terms of PR&D?

Compared Tech and UGA and we are closely aligned, so the conversation is to potentially leave it as is.

Group may have come to the consideration that we are aligned with the BOR already. Then we don't make changes, after much deliberation there was a move by Jeff and second by Amin, passed by vote.

### **Point 2 on agenda**

Mark Faucett is chair for next fall, and a committee of 3 with him as chair to work on the grants. A subcommittee that looks at the what and the how of faculty research grants. Basu formed the sub-committee, with Mark as chair. The committee only handles paperwork and dealing with the grants, timing, how is already set - it is read by more than just the committee. The subcommittee would deal with organization and dissemination. Mark chooses who from FDC to serve on subcommittee.

4. How do things get put on the agenda for FDC? Information is sent to Basu and not solicited.

3. Not sabbatical but a paid leave.

- Noted faculty handbook policy regarding how a sabbatical can be absorbed - decided upon by the chair. How are decisions made on who gets it? There is not currently a process on comparing applicants and how it can happen. If we want faculty development, then the department needs to be able to support leave. How do we advocate for leaves of absence? How do we make it equitable?
- It is not an issue that FDC addresses, the only thing we can address is development and building faculty.
- Money is in the colleges budget, so the conversation has to be from the dean. Thought has been that the department has to absorb the cost.
- Thought for the money being a product of the university rather than the department.
- Possible suggestion, availability of funding from the (dept, college, uni level) rather than just unit.
- Should money go to college for the purpose of LOA? Still decided upon by the chair/dean. Provost - to college to the department.
- Not about how chair decides who gets it.
- FDC could propose that the matter be considered (a more equitable way of discerning who is able to take paid leave).