

Faculty Senate Minutes March 1, 2012

Call to Order: Chair Sharp called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm; Riggle Room; ADUC

Senators Absent: Ray Bailey, Vincent Cesaro, Cyndi Gibbs, Jeanne Petsch, Craig Tuerk

Minutes: Senator Chatham asked that the Committee Report for Senate Committee on Issues be changed to "No Report". Senator Rogers moved to approve the minutes of February 16, 2012 as amended. Senator Baruth seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Committee Reports:

Academic Issues: Reported on the Student Retention Team's work

Evaluation: 1st reading of revised Student Course Evaluation Instrument

Faculty Welfare and Concerns: PAC 27 continued

Governance: Governance committee will not meet next week

Senate Committee on Issues: Internal resolution regarding Ombudsperson

Reports:

Chair's Report:

- Thanked Lori Baruth and Brent Rogers for volunteering to serve with the "mymoreheadstate" portal advisory group
- Reported on COSFL Meeting
- A proposal from the Faculty Salary Model Workgroup is almost ready for the President; Phil Gniot will provide the Executive Council with the proposal to be distributed to the Senate

Open Chair Segment:

John Hennen provided the Senate with information on upcoming Forums on Culture, Politics & Society.

Forums are on Tuesdays at 7:00 p.m. in 002 Breckinridge Hall. The dates for March are:

- March 6, 2012 - "The Right to Work for a Living Wage," Gordon Simmons, West Virginia Public Workers Union UE 170
- March 13, 2012 - "Planned Parenthood and the Women's Sexuality Debates," Jennifer Johnson, Planned Parenthood of Lexington and MSU Alumni
- March 27, 2012 - "Prejudice & Race in Contemporary America," MSU's David Butz

More dates and information can be found at: <http://www2.moreheadstate.edu/calendars/>

Provost's Report:

- Thanked Senator Hennen for providing information regarding the Tuesday Forums
- Faculty Salary Model Workgroup is close to a recommendation for the President
- At approximately 85% fall to spring retention for first time freshman
- Talked about the budget reduction plan

Regent's Report:

- Support the President in making strategic cuts rather than across the board to preserve the core mission of the University
- Regents meet March 15
- Discussed the open records request from Speaker Stumbo

Senate Actions:

Faculty Welfare and Concerns:

Chair Sharp indicated that there would be 45 minutes of discussion on PAC 27 before moving on to the remainder of the agenda.

Senator Rathbun provided Power Point Slides of friendly amendments submitted by faculty since the last meeting.

- Discussion began with Senator Rathbun explaining that "the College Dean" was left out of line 29 and has been corrected in the document.
- There was a friendly amendment made to add the following on Line 114: "Faculty who are hired with five or more years of service may submit a paper portfolio for review, as an alternative to 'the approved faculty activity reporting system'." After questions and discussion, it was decided that the following sentence should be added after Line 52: "The documents supporting this statement may be provided in paper form."
- The next friendly amendment slide regarding Line 115 was changed to "Candidates for tenure and reappointment are strongly encouraged to maintain in their possession copies of the portfolio contents (as described above) in an electronic or paper copy plus any supporting documents for reference until the tenure process has been completed and a decision for tenure or non-tenure has been made by the Board of Regents, as portfolios will not be returned by the University in the event of non-reappointment."
- Line 164 semantics change "Any sealed ballots submitted by absent faculty members shall be included in the tally with all ballots opened and counted at the same time during the Department Tenure Committee meeting." Accepted. A Senator brought up a conflict around line 244 regarding abstentions. FWC will address this issue around line 244 in committee and correct the wording.
- A friendly amendment to add a sentence around Line 179 and 180 in reference to Annual Review was discussed and changed to add: "Prior to submission to the department chair, these documents will be added to the portfolio. The candidate will have the opportunity to realign the organization of contents. The additional materials would remain in the portfolio for subsequent review." This will also be added to line 259.
- There was a suggestion to add "These revisions and additional documents will be added to the portfolio prior to being submitted to the next level" after "The Department Tenure Committee may request from the candidate, revisions, additional information, and documentation not provided in the portfolio. This will also be reviewed around line 259."

The allotted time for discussion ended. Senator Blackledge moved to continue discussion. Chair Sharp instructed 10 more minutes of discussion. A Senator stated that they would like to have a "clean" final version in hand prior to voting.

- Line 288 thru first word of 293 will be changed to read: "(6) The Provost will review all tenure recommendations from the department and college levels and any responses provided by the candidate in rebuttal. The Provost will make a recommendation to the President regarding the granting of tenure or non-tenure. If the recommendation of the Provost differs from the recommendation of the College Dean, the Provost will consult with the College Dean prior to making a recommendation to the President."
- Beginning with the second word in line 293 FWC accepted the following sentence: "The University Tenure committee shall be convened to review selected candidates when there are conflicting recommendations from the Department and College levels. The Provost shall..."
- There was discussion of adding the following sentence at line 348: "The Faculty Senate Governance Committee shall ensure that College and University Tenure Committees are created before the university approved deadline for candidates to submit portfolios for consideration for tenure." Discussion from Senators showed that PAc 2 was written to take care of this issue. The proposed sentence was not accepted.
- A Senator suggested adding the following sentence at line 364 "Faculty members selected to serve on the College or University Tenure Committees in a given year should recuse themselves from participating in discussion and voting on their own Department Tenure Committees concerning candidates applying for tenure in their own departments." There was considerable discussion. It was a consensus of the Senate that the University and College Tenure Committees should be constituted before the Department committee.

Senator Chatham moved to suspend the rules and continue discussion of the PAc and the meeting for 15 minutes. Motion seconded and passed.

There was continued discussion on the issue of the constituting of the Department, College and University Tenure Committees. The Faculty Welfare and Concerns Committee will review the wording regarding this, consult with the Governance Committee and revise.

- FWC accepted a revision to Line 369 and 370 changing them to: "A faculty member cannot serve on the University Tenure Committee and the University Faculty Promotion Committee or the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee in the same year." This revision brings PAC 27 in line with the language of the revised and approved PAC 7.

Committee Descriptions for these three committees will need to be reviewed and updated.

- FWC added a clarification at the end of the document when the policy will take effect. It reads:

"EFFECTIVE DATE

This document becomes effective on the date it is approved by the Board of Regents and will govern tenure and reappointment review procedures for all existing and new probationary faculty from that date."

Senator Rathbun stressed that the PAC must be approved so that it can be reviewed by the Provost, President and BOR in order to be in place for faculty sitting for tenure in the fall of 2012.

The Provost was asked about the Administrations' reasoning for adding the third level of review. The Provost stated that "Colleagues at the department and college level have more insight into the programs and faculty in those units. Therefore, when there is consistent support for a candidate at all levels in the college, including a College Committee to provide a wider perspective, then it should not be open to a University Committee where there may be less familiarity with the disciplines, etc. to overturn consistent support. The addition of the College Committee provides that extra level of review within the College that is missing and assists me in ensuring that there is consistency. Keeping the University Committee for instances where the disagreement within the department and/or college will provide that extra opportunity for review and ensure fairness."

Senator Chatham moved to postpone discussion of PAC 27 until the next meeting and move on to the other agenda items. Senator Wymer seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Evaluation:

The Evaluation Committee presented a Draft Student Course Evaluation to the Senate for 1st reading. It was noted that the administration of the IDEA form and whatever replaces it is governed by UAR 120.01 and also some language in PAC 7. Senator Carlson explained that the setup of the document is that the first 10 items are a core and that 11 thru 26 would be added as appropriate to the class.

There were questions about:

- the first 3 questions and their placement
- item 20

Suggestions made were:

- add "N/A" to appropriate questions, such as number 7
- add an individual section dealing with ITV classes

Senate Committee on Issues:

The Committee on Issues presented a report containing two items:

1. an Internal Resolution asking the Senate body for approval to continue with the drafting of a PAc document for the Establishment of an Office of Faculty Ombudsperson
2. PAc 33 Subject: Faculty Ombudsperson with the following note: "Please note that the committee is **not** ready to present the PAc that follows – there are issues that we have not yet resolved, such as a process for firing wayward Ombuds and the process for training. We include it for discussion purposes only"

After clarification by Chair Sharp, Senator Chatham, on behalf of the committee, moved the adoption of the following internal resolution:

We resolve that the lack of a faculty ombudsperson office is a significant and important issue for faculty at MSU and further that the Faculty Senate Issues Committee will formally draft a PAc document for Establishment of an Office of Faculty Ombudsperson and present it to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Questions on PAc 33:

1. Reason for wording of Line 5
2. Line 52 Item (7)
3. Number of terms an Ombudsperson can serve consecutively
4. What will this person accomplish
5. What will be the end result of consulting with the Ombudsperson
6. Will they be an advocate

Senate Rathbun seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Senator Berglee moved to clarify that this is only an internal resolution giving approval to the Committee on Issues to continue with development of the PAc. This resolution will not be forward to the Provost and President. Senator Rathbun seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Adjournment: 6:20 p.m.