

Faculty Senate
Minutes: May 14, 2002
Approved 09/24/02

Senators Attending: C. Bowden, A. Brown, E. Curtin, G. Ferrence, V. Hutchinson, K. Khazeh, R. Long, D. Marshall, R. McKenzie, M. Mitchell, M. O'Loughlin, D. Rieck, K. Shannon, D. Whaley

1. Announcements: R. McKenzie

Next week will be election of new officers. Nominations re encouraged.

2. Provost Comments: D. Buchanan

Intellectual Properties Report was submitted to systems office. System requested minor changes. Final copies will be distributed once approved.

Deadline for Technology Fluency Report deadline was changed and necessitated moving ahead more quickly.

3. Gen Ed Restructuring: R. McKenzie

Restructuring of Gen Ed was introduced for discussion. A motion to delay Senate action on Gen Ed until the receipt of the assessment report in Spring 2003 was made. Motion carried. (12 for, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.)

4. IT Fluency Policy: D. Rieck

A paragraph for the catalog is needed regarding the IT Technology Fluency Policy. D. Rieck made a motion to accept proposed catalog statement. (Secretary needs copy of proposed statement from David) Motion carried with 11 for, 0 against, 1 abstention.

5. Alcohol/Drug Policy: R. McKenzie

A motion was made to request that the Provost initiate a review of the sensitive position designation of faculty at SU for the purpose of reclassifying sensitive positions of teaching faculty to non-sensitive status. Motion carried 12 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions.

6. Evaluation of Administration/Administrative Offices: D. Rieck

A motion was made to direct the Senate President in concert with the Executive Committee to set up a committee consisting of two Senators, two faculty at large, two exempt staff and two students, for the purpose of determining a process by which faculty may participate in evaluation of

administrators and administrative offices. The committee once formed should report back to the Senate no later than October 15, 2002 with preliminary findings and to receive further guidance from the Senate. After debate the motion passed with alteration. The approved motion reads:

Move to direct the Senate President in concert with the Executive Committee to set up a committee, consisting of two Senators and two faculty at large for the purpose of determining a process by which faculty may participate in evaluation of administrators and administrative offices. The committee once formed should report back to the Senate no later than October 15, 2002 with preliminary findings and to receive further guidance from the Senate. (Note the deletion of "two exempt staff and two students." The main concerns were that the committee should be a faculty committee and that the process should be faculty driven.) Motion carried with 12 votes for, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Rich asked Mark Holland to serve on the committee and needs the Executive Committee and mark to find the other members. Names should be forwarded to R. McKenzie.

7. Promotions Committee: D. Rieck

Motion made to charge UPC with investigating ways that the proposals A and B (as amended) dealing with forming a school based promotions structure could/should be implemented after consulting with all interested parties. The UPC should report to the Senate no later than October 15, 2002 on its preliminary findings and to receive further guidance from the Senate. Motion carried with 10 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Proposal A: School Level Evaluation

In most cases, evaluation and recommendation of faculty for promotion will move from the University Promotions Committee to school committees. Each school shall create standards for promotion and a promotion committee to evaluate faculty for promotion.

The following motion was made and approved with 12 voting in favor, 0 against, 1 abstention.

Each school will determine the make-up and structure of the school promotions committee along with procedures for selecting its members. Establishment of and changes to the structure and procedures for school committees must be approved by the U.P.C. and by a vote of the tenure track faculty in the school. The U.P.C. will work with the schools to develop acceptable proposals. At least half of the tenure track faculty in the school must vote on any proposal regarding school committees and at least 2/3 of those voting must vote for a proposal for the proposal to be adopted. In the

event that members of a school wish to make a proposal that the U.P.C. does not approve, the Faculty Senate, may, if they choose, approve (by majority vote of the senators present at a meeting) the proposal instead of the U.P.C. The proposal must still be ratified by the tenure track members of the school as above to be adopted as policy. The U.P.C. will be responsible for maintaining and publicizing the current procedures for each school committee.

R. McKenzie presented Proposal B which passed after being amended to read:

The functions of the University Promotions Committee (UPC) will be: to develop and maintain university wide criteria for promotions, to approve all structures for the promotions process at the school and departmental levels and to serve as the official conduit for promotions decisions from the school level to the administration. In addition the UPC will serve as an oversight committee for the entire promotions process and as an appeals body for applicants dissatisfied with the results of promotions decisions at the school level. Motion carried with 12 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstention.

Proposal C was discussed and resulted in a motion to direct the UPC to implement the following portion of Proposal C: "Change the required years in service for promotion to Associate Professor from seven years to six years. Tenure decisions will occur in the fall semester of the sixth year and Promotion decisions will occur the spring semester of the sixth year. Tenure and promotion will remain separate decisions." Motion carried with 12 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstention.

A motion concerning Proposal D was approved with 8 votes for, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

Proposal D charged the UPC with implementing Proposal D and then investigating the possibility of using the exact same packet of materials. Motion stated "Require nearly identical packets for tenure and promotion. Making the tenure and promotion portfolios nearly identical will decrease the work for candidates applying for tenure and promotion. Tenure portfolios will include everything currently required in the promotion portfolio except the last semester's student evaluations, chair's evaluation for the current calendar year and the self-evaluation for the current calendar year. A candidate for promotion will keep a copy of the materials in the tenure portfolio and before submitting it for the departmental promotion committee add the fall semester student evaluations, chair's evaluation for the current year and self-evaluation for the current year. All other materials, including the personal statements, should be able to remain unchanged. In the personal statement a candidate may refer to anticipated developments.

8. Faculty Welfare Proposal on High Merit: L. Seldomridge

L. Seldomridge presented the Procedure and Principles for Awarding "High Merit" Money to Faculty document for endorsement. With the following two changes, the Senate voted to endorse the document with 8 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstaining.

Item #6, strike "typically" and have item read: The Provost shall, in a given year from all three categories combined, award "high merit" to at most 2-3% of the total faculty (i.e. perhaps seven or eight faculty members.)

Item #11, delete excellent in and replace with exemplary so that item reads: Only those faculty members judged by their chairs (or in the case of chairs, judged by their deans) to be exemplary in teaching will be eligible to receive awards for any category.

9. Statement to Senate: Kashi Khazeh

"I would like to make this statement, for the record. As the senator representing the Perdue School, I have tried to make the senate and its standing committees be more responsive to the voice of the faculty at this university. Additionally, I did try to improve the structure of the committees as well as the senate so that no school will have the potential of having a dominating role. To that end, the late Dr. Lade and I co-sponsored a proposal and submitted it to the senate. Furthermore, one year after the submission of that proposal, I made a motion to the senate, to no avail, to further look into the school representation issue in all the committees as well as the at-large positions in the senate, so that, again, no school will have the potential to dominate the agenda and/or overturn the decisions of the committees/faculty (i.e., Gen Ed 200 & +/- in grading). Therefore, as my term is expiring, I will recommend to the Perdue School that since smaller schools do not have a reasonable voice, the other alternative is to secede from the senate. The Perdue School faculty may or may not agree, but this would be my recommendation to them."

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

C. Bowden
Secretary