

Verbatim Notes Faculty Senate, November 1, 2007

Patrick – I have heard a few rumors around about some heavy handedness from some department chairs in this process. The intent as I understood from the Executive Council and it was passed by the Senate was that this would be basically a faculty issue, that this would be run by faculty, decided by faculty, and the department chairs maybe would communicate what was happening, but other than that there would not be a lot of recruiting there would not be a lot of names added to the list by department chairs, but I'm hearing otherwise in a couple of places. I know in my department the chair basically said what do you want to do? You guys elect and we did that, but I'm not sure that was the case, so if you are in a department where the chair has added names or done some of these other things you may want to speak with us about that and lets sort of go back to the drawing board a little bit and figure out how we can make this as clean as possible.

Irons - We had a meeting Tuesday, our chair was not heavy handed, but he had asked for clarification about the composition and makeup of the committee and he had contacted the Provost and I think the information the Provost gave about the committee was not exactly in line with what the Senate resolution had put forward, and there's no real, the results of the election were not problematic, but the relationship between this committee, the Provost and the Task Force needs to be I think clarified, that this is a Senate committee as we move forward.

Patrick – One last comment if I can, it was my understanding from the Executive Council that we put tenured on there for a reason it wasn't a maybe, it wasn't a should be, if you have tenured faculty available that's who should be on this Council. Experience is critical. Experience is critical, so putting people in who are not tenured and having them elected by people who are not tenured concerns me a great deal.

Irons – Well what specifically happened was that the Provost said that, it wasn't to do with tenure or non-tenured, that instructors could serve on the committee.

Patrick – If tenured people are not available.

Irons – Not just tenure track, fixed term instructors.

Provost - What I said was.

Irons – We didn't hear what you said we heard what our

Provost – What I said was that the faculty has asked me for an open and an inclusive process and that I was offended if the faculty were not also open to an inclusive and transparent process, and that I felt that while there were some instances in which only tenured and tenure track faculty should have a voice, that if there were experience in a department, especially in general education, and those people were not necessarily tenure and tenure track that there was nothing that precluded them from being considered, and I will stand by that. I know that this is a faculty senate group, but I also believe that general education at this Institution is an inclusive process and that when you send the message to people who have been here for a number of years and who have responsibility in general education that they are in some way not of the correct stature to even be involved in the discussion, I think that's the wrong decision and the wrong message that we send. It's like me saying that we will only take certain people on a committee because they meet only that stature. I understand the tenure issue and that we should use tenured folks who have experience, but I also believe in an open process and that's what I expressed to the department chair that I felt that it should be open and transparent and going into a meeting already putting people in categories of non-inclusion did not serve the whole purpose of the Institution. I'm happy to debate that and talk about it but open and inclusive is open and inclusive. Yes

Buck – Well I believe the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate did call that they should be tenured people, so are you saying you reject, we are an advisory body which means of course that administrators have the right to reject our resolution, are you saying you reject the resolution that we passed?

Provost – No, I don't reject the resolution you passed, but I do say it says should, does it say should or does it say must?

Senator – Should

Provost – Ok, so it says should, so a department has the opportunity to debate that and to decide, but should they say our best faculty member to represent us is not a tenured faculty member then I think they have to have the message that that is acceptable. What I was hearing

was that there wasn't even going to be an inclusive vote, that only the tenured and tenure track faculty could vote on who the representative was. Does the resolution say that?

Senator – No

Provost – Ok then part of openness and transparency is not making up the rules as you go and say only tenured and tenure track faculty can vote. That was the message I was getting and so my message back was, we've asked for an open and inclusive process from me and I believe that an open and inclusive process from the faculty and the Faculty Senate is appropriate as well. Yes

Patrick – When the Executive Council met I believe the intent was that if there were tenured faculty available then those faculty should run. There was nothing from us that said that instructors should not be able to vote, but if there are departments that have tenured faculty that are available and willing to run and they're experienced I would believe that would be a better choice than instructors, and for department chairs to add names goes way beyond what our intention was and I'm sure probably yours as well. What I'm afraid of is that we're getting to place where once again and Senator Harford probably brought this up earlier and I'll sort of repeat that this gets tainted a bit and every time we have that kind of a process where it is tainted by a department chair, then the faculty feel like they are being excluded. I'm hearing we've got at least one, possibly two departments where tenured faculty were available and ran and were willing and were beat out by someone who is not even tenure track and at least one of those was a name that was added by a department chair. That's very concerning to me.

Provost – Was this in a nomination process?

Patrick – I don't know the process, all I've heard is rumors so far, but what I'm getting to here is, that was never our intention. In our discussion of this it was supposed to be a faculty process and frankly it concerns me the idea that a tenured faculty member couldn't represent an instructor is very concerning to me, but that an instructor could represent a tenured faculty member, when they have never gone through that process, is a bit difficult for me. I understand inclusion, I understand that, but let's be clear about what we were talking about and what I mean here, I think these should be tenured people who are probably hopefully ten or more years here, people that understand the process, that have gone through it for a long time. I don't think it was ever our intention to exclude anyone, but I don't think that by having a tenured faculty member to represent an entire department that just because they're tenured they can't represent instructors.

Provost – And I don't think you and I are talking about anything different.

Patrick – But the process has been tainted because of that, because of the advise

Provost – In what way?

Patrick – In what way? I just said, I just said that at least one department, it sounds like it, now you can check on it, but at least one department

Provost – You're talking about the one department where the department chair

Patrick – Yeah

Provost – Well you see I don't know anything about that. Now what we may think about doing and this is entirely up to the chair and the Executive Committee is to look at that list that comes through and not to go back but to see if there were situations of coercion and that kind of thing. Now open and inclusive is not coercion, ok and I never said to anybody you may add names.

Patrick – So you support even if you have tenured faculty who are willing to serve you would still support having an instructor instead.

Provost – I think that's the vote of the faculty. I'm not going to tell the faculty how to vote. If a faculty in a department had both tenured and untenured, I don't care what rank, now if this was a promotion and tenure process I'd be right on top of it, because I agree anything that has to do with going through rank and tenure has to be done by the appropriate rank and tenure faculty. This is a general education group that is going to be the conduit, as I understand it, to the rest of the faculty for inclusion and so if a department had a process and let's just say there were names put forth that represented all groups and they were nominated by the faculty and the faculty voted, I don't see that as tainted. If the faculty nominated a slate of folks and then there were names added, not by the faculty but by the chair, then I think that's a different situation. That is not a faculty driven, but if faculty nominated others I don't see a problem there.

Patrick – I'm just saying that was not our intention.

Provost – Ok

Patrick – And that was not what was communicated to this group.

Breschel – From what I recall the intention for the strong recommendation for tenured faculty it was on two grounds, one was experience and the other was we wanted people to be in there who could criticize and feel safe about it. That's just natural, seems that tenured faculty were just naturally in a better position to do that. From what I remember from the discussions, there wasn't anything about exclusivity as much as we just wanted folks in there who both had the experience and felt safe enough to do a decent job, that was our intent.

Provost – Did the faculty have a copy of the resolution when they did the vote?

Senator – No

Provost – And why didn't they?

Senator – They did in some departments.

Hypes – They did in our department only because Manuel and I made our department chair make a copy of what she had received from Eric, otherwise she told us she did not feel it was necessary for them to see the document to be able to have a vote.

Provost – Well this is a different issue

Hypes – They need to know what the committee is all about and what they are voting on, but if we hadn't insisted upon it that would not have happened.

Provost – So what is the role of a Faculty Senator in their department? Did you have copies of the resolution?

Senators – Not the final version; no; yeah; I had a copy marked up and I distributed to my department that had the actual language and made sure the document was there.

Provost – We've got a question back here and then I want to make a comment about this issue of what we just talked about. Eric I don't mean to take all the meeting. She's had hers up longer

Bardsley – I guess I'm a little concerned about the chairs adding names though not extensively because there was a vote. Actually I think we dodged a bullet when you made the clarification because I guess the resolution is kind of like an email you don't hear the tone. So I remember at our meeting we tried to clarify that the reason we wanted tenured faculty was so they would be protected and they could feel free to offer criticism and things like that, but it fell a little flat and you're in a room full of people who have been fixed term instructors for 15 or 20 years who mostly teach in our Gen Ed classes and frankly they're the best qualified to redo that program, if it's done in a spirit of openness. I think the University should pass a resolution that if it stops being fun stop doing it. I mean why can't it be fun to reinvent Gen Ed, it should be a fun process. I think I'm really glad, I think it went against the tenure of the meeting, but if you misunderstood what we were saying and you were here, a lot of people would have misunderstood through that document right and so I think we dodged a bullet because of your misunderstanding so thank you. We didn't want to be exclusive, that wasn't the intention it was to keep people safe and to protect them, but I guess when you're in front of people it come across a little bit paternalistic. Also, it was our fear of having chairs put people on there that they wanted, but it sounds to the department like it's the Faculty Senate trying to put people on there that it wanted, but that's equally bad if you're not part of either, so I we dodged a bullet there and I just wanted to say so.

Buck – I'm still not sure exactly what Charlie means by chairs adding people. That's not my question but I wanted to have that clarified. What do you mean by adding people?

Patrick – Only a rumor

Buck – What do you mean by adding people? A second person on the committee or what?

Provost – No adding a person to the ballot.

Patrick – I don't know the circumstances.

Buck – Adding a person to the ballot.

Patrick – I was told that there was a circumstance where there were tenured faculty running and another name appeared.

Buck – Who was not nominated by a member?

Patrick – I don't know, it doesn't matter how that process goes if there were people who basically were on the ballot ready to vote and then all of a sudden another name comes on and

Buck – If they were not nominated by the faculty and by the chair that's interfering and it needs to be investigated

Provost – Michael and then I'll go back to this

Harford – I was just going to say

Buck – That wasn't my question, that wasn't my comment, my comment was, the only reason we picked should rather than must is that it was clear that in some departments there might not be tenured people, or even if they had tenured people they might not be willing to serve. The only

reason we put should there instead of must is because of the fact that there may not be tenured people who wanted to serve. Clearly it was our intention that if there were tenured people available who wanted to serve, the should meant that if there were tenured people who wanted to serve they should be picked and only if there were not tenured people who wanted to serve available then someone else could be picked, that was our intention. We probably should have worded it must, if available, because that was our intention that it must be tenured people if available.

Provost – Ok Mike you and then I want to say something else.

Harford – You know I love the process of legislative intent interpretation it takes me back to law school and those studies, but it seems to me that the critical thing about all this process is to maintain the openness. Charlie's to be congratulated for bringing the problem to our attention and we need to make sure that we address all those problems, but the one thing that needs to come out of all of this is the thing that I keep hearing from the President and the Provost is that everything is on the table. That means that everybody's level of participation is on the table and just because we got elected, and I am the representative from the department who is going to represent Management, Marketing and Real Estate, just because I got elected doesn't mean that I have the say for everybody in that department. My job I think is what you just said is to make sure that as many people have input on this as possible because I don't know whether everybody else knows it or not, I've been slow to realize it, but these things that we had the meeting about yesterday are a radical reshaping of what we are supposed to be doing at this Institution and if we don't respond to it in radical ways of changing our own thinking then we are going to get left behind, not just in trying to achieve a US News and World Report ranking but in the state of KY in terms of money. There are things that target specific groups of people for success in this productivity index that I'm not sure that we all know about and only because Beth Patrick did a great job in the Planning Committee do I know about it. If we don't pay attention to development people that we are going to lose money from our general budget and its getting all this information into the open that's there and so my feeling is that and I'm the guy on the Executive Council this thing needs to have 30 people on it not 1 from each department. We need more people on it, what we really need is a general education reform that has 346 faculty members irrespective of rank involved in it and that's our job but you know what, we need people from outside the University coming in, we need our advisory boards in Nursing and in IET and Philosophy. We need as many voices as possible in this so I don't think we need to be concerned we do at a high level, I think we need to be concerned and I'm certainly a person who has expressed the thing that maybe the Provost, if I may, maybe you got this from me there's a degree of distrust at this University and it includes the faculty to the chairs and chairs to the faculty and we got to get over that.

Provost – Since you said that and I'll go back to the question what I was going to say to you is first of all as Faculty Senators you have a responsibility to help inform your faculty, but I'm extremely concerned at the level of distrust that I not only hear between the faculty and their chairs but that I hear between the faculty and the faculty. Oh we can't put that person on a committee, they don't represent our interests, or that person didn't make the decision the last time that I wanted a decision made or that it didn't turn out to be the right thing so obviously they've got flawed judgment. Now I expect you guys not to trust me, I'm fair game, anybody above a department chair, deans included are fair game, that's part of being in a bureaucracy. Now I'd like to change that and I'm going to do my damndest to change it, but I can't do it without working with you. If we've got a problem with department chairs and faculty then we're going to fix it, we're not going to have these discussions of we have to legislate what's in this document because the department chairs don't understand, I've got news for you folks they've been faculty too. They know what it's like to sit on this side of the fence; some of them have been burned as well. I'm not minimizing whatever happened before I got here, people get hurt, they get burned, they've seen promise out there and they've been told something and it doesn't materialize and they get no explanation. They've been asked to be on a committee, the committee works hard, they get a good report, they make recommendations and it's put in the file drawer and I've got to tell you I've been on that side of the fence too. I was at the University of Missouri for 15 years and the reason I left the University of Missouri was because I was worn out. I was worn out writing strategic plans and asking for budgets and justifying my program and getting nothing. And I had two choices, I could stay there and be miserable and be a contentious faculty member, make life hell for my department chair and my dean, or I could get the hell out of dodge and I

could focus on my career and what I had to contribute to the world. Now I'm not perfect, and I'm going to make mistakes and I told the Executive Council that I am going to make mistakes, but if you as the Faculty Senate and you as the faculty don't have the nerve to walk in the front door of Howell McDowell and say to me you know, you told us you'd do this and you didn't, and you stand on the sidewalk and you say, see happened again, the Provost lied to us, then you're going to get exactly what you deserve because I am not perfect and you are not perfect. When I say to you we need to do better, it's not personal, it's not because I want to be able to say oh look what we've done, it's because we have a population in Eastern North Carolina that needs to be educated, oh I'm sorry, Eastern Kentucky, both places, but I really apologize, I think that's the first time I've done that in three months.

Senator – Well you're emotional.

Provost – I'm very emotional right now, but we have students we have a population in this part of the state and the rest of the state and we have institutions hanging around KY who think they're better than we are, no they are not, NO THEY ARE NOT but who's going to tell them, who's going to show them that they aren't better. Ok maybe we don't play in the league of basketball or football that UK does, frankly I don't want to, I'd rather see my resources be put into academic programs into better facilities and into computers and going to a game on Saturday that's actually fun because those kids are out there because they want to be out there, not because they're being paid to be out there. I want everybody west to wake up one day and go what happened in Morehead, they're out there in community engagement, their students are doing well, everybody wants to go to Morehead because the faculty care, but you know what the faculty can't care and they can't teach if we're fighting with each other and if we're fighting with the department chairs and we're sitting there going yiiiiiii. Hello, we're smart people, we can communicate, we don't have to agree. Charlie doesn't agree with me today, but you know what that's ok, I'd rather have Charlie talking to me than Charlie going, well one more, and so if we can't talk to each other about these things then we aren't as educated as we think. We've got diplomas but we aren't educated and we certainly don't have the end point in mind when we're doing that because the world isn't going to care that we were on Faculty Senate or that I was a Provost or that the faculty got to say who could be on this committee and who couldn't or that we left somebody off, that's not what they are going to remember. What they're going to remember is what they got from this Institution and what it meant to their lives and the moms and dads who watched their kids go across the stage and see them do better, that's what's going to count. The question is how do we get there, how do we get there? Do we get there by throwing blame to each other or do we get there helping each other take that next step, because all of us are going to fall, all of us are going to have bad years, bad semesters, make a mistake here, make a mistake there, but the sign outside of Howell McDowell says "United We Stand" I think that's the motto of Kentucky isn't it? And I'd say to you, how united are we going to be? Are you going to fight me because I'm the Provost and you're faculty? Am I going to make decisions just because I can? We have to decide that so I'm going to say to you, help me decide, because we can do anything we set our minds to do. You got a question then I'm going to

Irons – You asked a question that I don't know if you wanted an answer to, it was about the role of Faculty Senators in departments and it may relate to chairs communicating information. I'm not currently a Faculty Senator, but when I was a Faculty Senator, I'm in a large department and it was very difficult to find a forum in which I could communicate with the faculty where you have face time so the subtleties of intention that are lost in a written document on email are present, but I've also been in Eric's position had the opportunity to hear initiatives at the Provost level which then filtered through deans to chairs, then I'm back in my department as the faculty member, and I don't want to place blame on individuals, it's a matter of when you have information through a chain and a hierarchy that by the time it got to the faculty through that chain it was very different from what I heard from Mike Moore's mouth. And that is a structural problem for communication in this process.

Provost – Well it's also a natural phenomenon, have you ever lined people up and started a message at one end and heard what the message was at the other? It doesn't have anything to do with being a dean or a department chair or Provost or faculty member, it has to do with, who are our communications people in here? Is this not just an issue here, but part of what we have to do is what the President and I were trying to say yesterday, is that everything is open. We have to talk to each other at every possibility. I don't know why you guys got into the academy but one of the reasons that I wanted to be part of the academy was because of the rich

conversations that used to go on among faculty. We used to make time to sit down and talk to each other. We used to get in the hall and not complain about our department chairs, but we used to actually talk about things we were doing and joining forces and collaborating and stuff like that and I don't know where that went.

Senator – Someone invented email.

Provost – Well email may be part of it, but part of it also has to do with what I referred to yesterday as the layering and the Band-Aid approach, we just kept adding things and adding things and we don't ever fix anything. We never take it apart and say are we doing what needs to be done? Is our structure right for what we want to accomplish? We never do that, we have that opportunity at Morehead State University and yesterday the President and I were basically saying to you, do you want to be part of this or not? Do you want to do something that almost every other institution has been unable to do because people throw their arms up and say oh I don't want to be on a committee with that person or man this is hard, this is really hard let's just go off and do what we've always done, I want to have fun.

Breschel – This is my fourteenth year here and looking at what is coming out of the legislature, what Wayne Andrews has been talking about and what you are talking about and the revision of Gen Ed this looks to me like our best opportunity since I've been here to get in and get this a whole lot closer to where it ought to be. Maybe I'm naïve but I'm actually kind of excited about this. We've got some problems to get past and that kind of stuff and we've got our communication problems, but it looks like to me from the plan I saw yesterday if we're going to increase enrollment, if we're going to try to increase retention, by the way, I've got close to 20 years left until retirement, in ten years I'd like to be teaching at a University where instead of 43% of our folks staying, less than that dropping out along the way, that would be a great place to work. We've got a shot at doing a lot to make that happen. This is probably our best shot that we've had in a long time. Not that I'm enthusiastic about generally doing committee work or anything like that, but we've got a good shot at revising some of these things and in terms of people feeling vulnerable like what's going to happen to my program, or what's going to happen to my job, or what's going to happen to my department, if we're talking about increasing enrollment and keeping people here the way we're doing, nobody is going to come out and say oh there's nothing that's a sacred cow, there's nothing that can't be cut, but at the same time, it seems like if we do this right, we're talking about adding resources and adding stuff to the University not coming even close to taking resources away if we do it right, on the flip side we better do it right now, because this is ultimately our best chance.

Provost – Thank you, you summarized it very well. Any other questions or comments and with your permission I'll consider that my report. Any other questions or comments, I thank you for listening, oh go ahead

Wallace – My only comment is, I would love to have seen this passion yesterday. I love to see the passion

Provost – Well, I should have just gotten mad yesterday. I got to tell you, President Andrews orchestrates a lot, he wants things to be very good when they go to the faculty and so we had a run through and it was my first time in front of a lot more faculty and we had an agenda yesterday, we had to share all that information with you, but Eric can tell you that I get passionate like this in all the committee meetings that we have and maybe we should rename them, no committees, maybe we should just say important work groups.

Breschel – I doubt if anybody would be fooled, but we could try it, but this is important stuff to do.

Bardsley – I was thinking about the concerns that were raised at the last meeting that made us add the should. Actually, I think there are better ways to deal with those concerns, so if we're worried that instructors or tenure-track people will be afraid of speaking, we need to go to those people on any committee and say if you get pressure that makes you feel uncomfortable come tell me and I'll quit. I'll protest to, I'll protect you, I want to stand with you. If we're worried that instructors will go on to that committee and not represent the interests of the University, we should stop treating our instructors like crap so that they feel connected to the University. That would be the only reason they would go against the interest would be the history of not being treated right, so if we're not treating them right then that would be a worry, but I think we probably do ok by them so and if we don't think tenure track people was mentioned would go on the committee and either not feel protected or just use it as a service opportunity and make it empty then you're probably giving them too much to do, because people would naturally want to

take part in a process like this so I think there needs to be trust and there needs to be other ways of dealing with these concerns beside saying you're not welcome on the committee.

Provost – And I agree with that, but I will also tell you that I am not naïve, Charlie is not going to trust me just because we disagreed today, Charlie's going to trust me when I'm consistent, Charlie's going to trust me when we disagree and I still speak to him on the sidewalk and I still ask him to do things that are meaningful. Charlie's going to believe me when we move down this process and I keep my word so I know that you're going to watch everything and you're going to listen to everything and that's ok, as long as I have your pledge to tell me when you think I've gone astray. I told somebody today, they work in my office, and I said look I don't like people to say yes to me because I'm the Provost. You are only looking out for the best interest of this Institution when you can, and I will tell you respectfully, because there are people who aren't respectful when they say things like this, respectfully saying you're wrong, we need to do this a different way or we need to think about it a little more. That's what I value, that's what I value, and I value it in a spirit of going forward.

Lyons - There's no doubt that we do need trust, but leaving you and your position aside there isn't trust in other levels. What are we going to do to work with that? How are we going to

Provost – We're going to call it as it is. Every time we have a situation like this where Charlie's heard a rumor, we're not going to talk about rumors we're going to go and find out what is factual and I will be happy to do that if you want me to or anybody on the Senate can do it. You can go and say respectfully, close the door and say I heard this rumor, tell me your side of the story. Let's not accuse people before we know the story. It would be like, I'm going to pick on Roland because he has his hand up all the time, it would be as if someone said to me, don't pay any attention to Roland because he has his hand up all the time, so I ignore Roland and I don't listen to what he has to say.

Buck – That's what they do.

Provost – Is that what they do? You have your hand up so what do you want?

Buck – Instructors are completely at the mercy of the chairs because they can be let go without any reason whatsoever. Tenure track have a little more protection because there is a process of evaluation etc., where the department actually makes the recommendation as to whether the tenure track person should be retained or not, which means that if the committee recommends the tenure track person be retained then the chair is going to have to justify letting the person go. So even the tenure track people have more protection the instructors do not have because they don't do what the chair wants then they're gone.

Provost – Well then I'm going to say to you there's something wrong with the system.

Buck – Well that's the system.

Irons – That's the system we created.

Provost – So the next question is, when we get past the first big hurdle which is the curriculum audit, then what I anticipate, I hope nobody's waiting for us to get to this point and we're all done, because what's going to happen from this process is things like this are going to surface and we're going to say ok that's the next thing we have to tackle. Then we're going to say, we want differentiated work loads, our FEP's and promotion and tenure documents don't support that, well put that on the list. The bottom line is we have an opportunity to recreate a University and recreate it not just to right wrongs or to create understanding and trust, but to create an environment in which we all want to come to work, that we look forward to being with our students, with our colleagues, that we look forward to coming to convocation, not because the Provost cancelled classes and you know that means you need to come, but because you want to know what's going on, because you want to be part of it. You want to come to graduation and be there in your caps and gowns and your regalia so that you celebrate with those students that go across the stage, that it's not something that oh gosh got to go to graduation. We have lost our perspective and we've got to get it back. Thank you for indulging me, I don't always blow a cork.

Macintosh – I'm hoping that we streamline..... those what if conversations which I still try to have some of I get the sense that I'm just trying to get through the day and get what absolutely has to be done for tomorrow done to try to survive.

Provost – Yes I know, and you know what it's not just you, it's everybody in this room who's working hard.

Macintosh – Oh I know.

Provost - It's the chairs, that's why we have to take this apart, we can't keep putting band aids on it. We have to have a quality of life and I'll just say this, one of the comments that was made

on the web about this was we're just going to create more work for people to do and they're not going to have any time for their families and blah, blah, blah. It was just really, you could just see that this person was freaking out about this and I thought to myself, no we are only good at what we do when we have another life, when we get away from it. What we have to do is create that environment where we work hard, I don't expect us not to work hard, but we also ought to play hard and we also ought to have an enriching life. We have to model what we want the rest of the world to be.