

Faculty Senate

Aug. 20, 2015

COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER REPORT

Kimberlee Sharp (COE)

The first regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held Thursday, August 20th, 2015 in ADUC's Riggle Room. **Chair Adams (CCAHSS)** welcomed new senators and announced appointments to a couple of committees. Because this was the first meeting of the year, the Senate did not hear reports from Senate sub – committees. The business of the meeting was as follows:

- Announcements and committee appointments;
- Chair Adams' comments regarding PAc 27 and stipulations;
- Provost report;
- Special guest report: Dr. Scott Davison, Chair of HPIL;
- Faculty Regent report.

Committee appointments and announcements:

Chair Adams provided the Senators the list of sub – committee appointments. Please see the attachment at the end of this report for a full list of sub – committee memberships. Chair Adams asked for nominations for the *Registration Advisory Committee* and for the *Reconciliation Committee*. The latter committee is activated when PAcS (Personnel Policies – Academic) are revised when competing versions between the senate and administration exist. Specifically, the Reconciliation Committee will be tasked with revising PAcS 22 and 26. Chair Adams would like to have the nominations for both groups by Thursday, August 27th. Finally, Chair Adams announced the appointment of Senator Kimberlee Sharp (COE) to the *Technology Advisory Board*.

The Governance Committee put forward a series of nominees for vacant positions that needed to be filled. On behalf of Senator Simpson (COE), the Chair of Governance, who had to be excused from this meeting, Chair Adams put forward the following appointments, which were all approved:

- B.S. Parton (COE) for University Graduate
- G. LaFleur (CCAHSS) for Student Disciplinary
- S. Lindsey (MGSE), M. Fultz (DSCT), C. Conroy (CCHASS), N. Joshi (AETD) for General Education Council

Chair Adams' comments regarding PAc 27 and stipulations:

Chair Adams informed the Senate that PAc 27 (Tenure and Reappointment Review) was being re-introduced as an action item because of administrative disagreement. [**Please note:** PAc 27 was revised during the 2011 – 2012 academic year and signed by President Andrews. It has a revision date of 8-21-12. It is also important to note that the Senate dealt with PAc 27 last year (2014 – 2015), in order to “ensure there is internal consistency and complete guidelines” (Provost Ralston, October, 2014). Please see the second addendum at the end of this report]. At the November 20th, 2014 meeting, the Senate voted to eliminate the college level committee from the PAc leaving the tenure review up to the following groups (and persons) in this order: Dept. Tenure Cme.; the Dept. Chair / Associate Dean; the College Dean; the University Tenure Cme.; and the Provost. The Senate, also on December 4th, 2014, voted in FAVOR of retaining the University Tenure Committee.

PAc 27, as reintroduced yesterday, contains several administrative stipulations:

- 1) The University Tenure Committee is deleted and replaced by the College Tenure Committee
- 2) Appropriate adjustments are made in language and process to ensure the efficacy of the College Tenure Committee's inclusion.
- 3) The University Tenure Committee is deleted and replaced by the College Tenure Committee in PAc 2
- 4) Appropriate adjustments are made in language and process to ensure the efficacy of the College Tenure Committee inclusion in PAc-2.

Senator responses to these administrative stipulations were as follows:

- **Brent Rogers (CST)** moved to reject the 4 stipulations;
- Why did the President feel the need to eliminate the University Committee?
- Why is the College Tenure Committee in PAc 2 listed as a stipulation? This PAc applies to promotion to full professor --- was this an oversight? Should the language be cleared up before we consider this stipulation?

Senators took some time to debate the administration's stipulation to remove the university committee in PAc 27:

- That, most regional and research I institutions do not have university tenure committees, and if we liken ourselves to James Madison University, we would be in keeping with what is common nationally;
- That, a university committee provides a more objective screening of the faculty seeking tenure, and the university committee is better able to detect problems in the portfolio;

- That, a college committee is closer to the faculty seeking tenure and know more intimately the requirements and expectations of the college / department;
- That, there may be inconsistency across colleges in how tenure is screened;
- That, faculty are tenured to the university, not to the department or college, which is a reason to retain the university tenure committee;
- That, if the administration had these stipulations for PAc 27 as was passed by the Senate last fall, why is it that a brand new Senate is getting the PAc to review now? It seems that every year, we're dealing with this PAc.

The Provost's statements regarding PAc 27 were:

- he did not personally perceive the University Tenure Committee as a “problem”—he was merely reporting views he had heard
- the President may be using the stipulations as a “bargaining chip” to get the Senate to concede to administrative wishes
- he could not guarantee what the President would or would not approve
- there are two “stakeholders” in this process, and that the administrative side needs to be heard..

In the end of discussion, Chair Adams held a vote to determine whether to accept Senator Roger's motion to reject the 4 stipulations. **The Senate passed this motion.** PAc 27 is now considered “under revision.”

Provost Report:

Provost Steven Ralston updated the Senate on the following items:

- The new **winter session:** MSU presently has identified 29 online courses (9 of which are graduate) to be taught during the inaugural winter session this year. An issue has been brought to his attention involving PAc 10 (Summer Pay) and how that applies to winter teaching. Will there be a “ceiling” in which faculty can earn in any given academic year? What will HR's rules be? Is there an IRS rule?
- **Performance funding:** Provost Ralston said IT IS COMING! Unsure for what the actual metrics will be, but we know they'll pertain to achievement gap, retention rates, graduation rates, etc.
- **Craft Academy:** 60 high school juniors are attending MSU this year and living on campus. Next year, MSU plans to add 60 more for a total 120 high school juniors and seniors. These students will hopefully finish their UG degrees at MSU. **Dr. Carol Christian** plans to visit Senate soon to discuss this initiative.
- **Fall Enrollment:** “it's a rollercoaster!” First – time – freshman numbers are not finalized, but it appears the total may be down from last year. Graduate numbers are up slightly.

- **Campus “signage”:** everyone will notice that there are temporary signs in front of their buildings. The university has invested some money in improving campus visitors’ experience, and new signs will help.

Questions from the Senators for Provost Ralston:

- **Chair – Elect Mike Dobranski (CST):** asked Provost Ralston to comment on the experience of a full – time instructor (10 years and with benefits) who was laid off from the university and not informed of this until June. This same instructor was informed she could teach her course load as an adjunct and receive adjunct pay for each course. Is this common procedure for administration to treat full – time instructors in this way, and is there a policy?
 - **Provost:** there is not a policy on how full – time instructors are to be laid off. “There is no presumption of re-employment” for instructors. The Provost suggested Senator Dobranski, and others, talk to their chairs and deans about these matters.
- **Kim Sharp (COE):** asked the Provost how the merit pay and salary increases were applied this year; that her salary increase did not appear to conform to the merit she was assigned by her chair and dean. There seems to be inconsistency across the colleges.
 - **Provost:** referred to CUPA, faculty members’ time in rank, and the merit score as being the parameters by which the salary increases were determined. He also mentioned that the salary increases were only funded by 50% this year. [**note:** no one asked specifically what happened to the other 50% --- possible questions to ask later: did it go to balance the budget? Did it go to pay for administrative salary increases? Did it go to pay for President Andrews’ bonus? Etc..... Transparency in this area would be appreciated.]
- **Ron Morrison (CCAHS):** what is the purpose of being told you’re going to get an increase, especially when you’ve had a “banner year”, and you don’t get it?
- **Chair – Elect Dobranski** asked that faculty members forward him any known instances of faculty workload increases or sudden redefinitions of terms of employment.

Special guest report: Dr. Scott Davison, Chair of HPIL:

The Senate heard a report provided by Dr. Scott Davison regarding the *No – Show – Roster*. An email went out earlier in the week asking all faculty to check their course rosters for no – show students and to report them in web advisor where their rosters are housed. Dr. Davison explained that the university is trying to:

- resolve the issue of the “Protect Schedule” that seems to be problematic for some students;
- hold students accountable for their financial aid and payment of tuition, fees, etc.;

- award financial aid more responsibly and “catch” students early who potentially are misusing their financial aid;
- track down no – show students in order to determine their intention for completing courses this semester.

In sum, Dr. Davison said that this process is crucial in MSU’s efforts to retain and graduate students. No – Show – Roster DUE: Monday, August 24th at midnight.

Faculty Regent report:

Faculty Regent, Dr. Royal Berglee, shared a brief report which included:

- an announcement about the of Board of Regents (BOR) work session Thursday, August 27th;
- an announcement of the first BOR quarterly meeting to be held Thursday, September 24th;
- a statement about the competition for state dollars for higher education.

Regent Berglee, in sum, is committed to supporting FACULTY issues; that, although he is a regent and represents the university, he is passionate about ensuring the BOR listens to and understands the faculty perspective on the issues facing the university.

If you have questions or comments regarding the content of this Senate Communications Report, please contact:

Kimberlee Sharp, Ed.D.

Faculty Senate Communications Officer

k.sharp@moreheadstate.edu

I will be happy to return your message.

Thank you.

Please see the addenda on the following pages.

Thank you.

2015 – 2016 Faculty Senate Committees

Academic Issues:

Hans Chapman (COST) *I am not positive on this one*
Ophelia Chapman (LIB)
Chris Cottingham (COST)
Nathan Dishman (CCAHS)
Rus May (COST)
Sandra Riegle (COE)
Bo Shi (CBPA)
Sue Tallichet, Chair (CAHS)

Evaluations:

Sanjeev Adkikari (COST)
Gina Gonzalez (COST)
Ken Henderson, Chair (COBPA)
Gary LaFleur (CCAHS)
Elizabeth McLaren (COE)
Roma Prindle (CAHS)
Chad Rogers (COST)

Faculty Welfare and Concerns:

Katy Carlson, Chair (CCAHS)
Jennifer Dearden (COST)
Lynn Geurin (COE)
Cyndi Gibbs (CCAHS)
John Hennen (CCAHS)
Thomas Kiffmeyer (CCAHS)
Sean O'Keefe (COST)
Gilbert Remillard (COST)

Governance:

Tim Conner/Darryl Privott (COE)

Anthony Dotson (CST)

Sam Nataraj (COBPA)

Steve Reid (COST)

Brent Rogers (COST)

Timothy Simpson, Chair (COE)

Cathy Thomas (CCAHS)

Michele Waters (COST)

Issues:

Mike Dobranski, Chair (CST)

Tim Hare (COBPA)

Eric Jerde (COST)

Jennifer Little (LIB)

Beverly McCormick (COBPA)

Ron Morrison (CCAHS)

Kimberlee Sharp (COE)

Joyce Stubbs (COST)

Wesley White (COST)



OFFICE OF THE
PROVOST

MOREHEAD, KENTUCKY 40351-1888

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Robert Royar
Chair, Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. Steven Ralston 
Provost

DATE: October 9, 2014

RE: Review PAc-27

I request that the Faculty Senate review PAc-27 to ensure there is internal consistency and complete guidelines. Attached to this request is a document that outlines two apparent problems and notes the way in which Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate agreed to proceed this year.

I would appreciate the Senate's response before the end of classes this fall term.

PAC-27, as last revised on 8/21/12, includes an apparent conflict and one instance of inadequate direction. Listed below are the two areas of concern and the agreed upon approaches adopted by Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate for the 2014-2015 academic year that address temporarily the apparent problems.

Tenure Committee Membership

Section 9, paragraph 5 indicates that "Any member of the University Tenure Committee that previously participated in the review of the candidate's portfolio at the department or college levels must recuse themselves from participating in this review." The statement suggests that faculty members may serve on more than one tenure committee (i.e. at the department level, college level, and university level). However, section 10, paragraph 5 states, "No faculty member may serve at the department level and either at the college or university level during an academic year. No faculty member may serve on both the college and university level during an academic year." Section 9, paragraph 5 and Section 10, paragraphs 5 are in apparent conflict.

2014-2015 Approach

Consistent with the committee structure approach used in PA-c 2 (Promotion to Full Professor) as last revised 5/2/13, we agreed to allow faculty members to serve on more than one tenure committee (i.e. at the department, college, and university levels) but were required to recuse themselves from both discussions and voting on tenure candidates if they had already participated in a review at a lower level. Since the policy also states that the department tenure committee will consist of all tenured full-time standing faculty members in the department, we agreed that no faculty member would participate in the discussions or the voting for tenure candidates from their departments at the college tenure committee or university tenure committee levels.

Construction of College Tenure Committee

Section 10, paragraph 2 states that "The College Tenure Committee will consist of tenured full-time standing faculty members from the college and will have equal representation from each department in the college." The section provides no clear direction for how the College Tenure Committee will be populated.

2014-2015 Approach

Consistent with the approach used for promotion in PAC-2 we agreed that the deans would build the college tenure committee by selecting one tenured, full-time standing faculty member from each department to serve. In the event there were fewer than five departments, the dean would select enough faculty members to make a committee of five, maintaining equal representation from each department.