

## **Faculty Senate Meeting April, 26, 2011**

### **Unapproved Minutes**

I. Call to Order at 11:05

II. Review and adopt minutes from April 5, 2011 meeting

Moved by Elizabeth Evans and seconded by Mack Felton. Motion carried

III. Old Business

Faculty Senate survey discussed in the last meeting. It will be passed out and ask that it be filled out. It is not required.

IV. New Business – various letters from the administration

1, Faculty Handbook draft – The handbook does not physically state that T&P are together. However, it does not separate them. The fact is that the tenure and promotion for T&P are the same. What it does say about being promoted through the ranks is discipline specific. We were directed to look at MSU policy. This was in July, 2010 so we looked at it and we adopted some of those principles. We basically made it discipline-specific.

Can someone enlighten Dr. Schreiber as to best practices? Discussion over what “best practices” means.

A senate member stated that T&P are separate processes.

A senate member gave information on an active USM case where a professor was promoted but denied tenure—and the Courts upheld the university decision separating T&P.

A faculty member queried – don’t the new requirements say that you must be tenured in order to receive promotion? Anyone who is going to be promoted would already be tenured. AAUP deals with tenure at one place and promotion at another place according to a faculty member. If faculty members apply for tenure and promotion at the same time....

This was followed by a discussion of illogic of comparing research institutions and teaching institutions.

What are we going to do about Dr. Hammond’s letter?

A faculty member stated: What we need is a handbook. If there is no distinction between the qualifications for T & P... [unclear what the end of this statement/discussion was.]

A senate member still thinks that we need to deal with T&P. According to several faculty members, it the USM case was the administration making a political statement that they did not want that particular faculty member on campus. A faculty member stated that at two research institutions, T&P were tied together because those institutions placed a lot of emphasis on research and publications.

The present handbook was not written by anybody here—the 2006 handbook. And the 2004 handbook is the same thing. Those handbooks were not prepared by the faculty. The administration is saying that we are giving tenure to faculty with non-terminal degrees. If that practice was stopped, it is not the faculty's fault.

A faculty member questioned: Has anyone checked with the commissioner to see if a Provost can suspend T&P? Dr. Broadwater stated that an institution cannot make changes to its policies without the Board's approval.

Resolution number one: Motion—by Dr. McNair with many seconds. . The Faculty of MVSU states that arbitrary decisions made by academic affairs violate their contract—illegal and unfair; against shared governance. Discussion. Full approval by voice vote.

Faculty handbook: We have talked about the handbook. A faculty member stated it's a shared process. If the decision is to be joint, how is the decision final from administration?

A faculty member stated — we worked diligently to have persons evaluating tenure and promotion files who are at the correct rank.

Add a line connecting tenure and promotion in the draft. You can be given an extension under medical and extenuating circumstances.

Motion to include a statement specifically linking T&P. In order to get tenure or promotion you have to go with what IHL says, and they say terminal degree. Moved by Dr. Green. Seconded by unknown. Motion carries by.

Specifics for promotion and tenure were not very clear. In the previous handbook draft, there was a whole list of criteria, which the administration rejected. 15% is service. The administration is actually looking for us to say what we have to have. The department should figure out what the criteria is. We know what service and teaching are. A faculty member stated that there should be department-specific criteria for scholarly activities. We should move toward that.

A faculty member stated – there was a group who went up in 06 and received tenure but no promotion. The concern is that we will institute a policy that accepts that. There is no difference now in the application of policy. Different application of the rules.

Faculty Handbook:

Second change was removing the language of department-specific criteria for teaching and service. Only within the scholarly activity are the criteria department-specific. Faculty are being penalized because we have set so much in stone. Two abstentions; six opposed and the rest in favor. Motion carried.

A faculty member says we should standardize across departments for the protection of the faculty. 70-15-15. (Teaching, Service and Research)

Amend that portion of the handbook to say that 70% is teaching; 15% is service and 15% is scholarly activity. Moved by Josh Vincent, seconded by Ms. Hutchings. Passed unanimously.

Voted on the handbook: Section 1, 2,, and the appendices. Dr. Robinson moved. Dr. Felton seconded. Five abstentions; 1 no. Motion carries.

2. Faculty Evaluations – Next year use what is in the draft (Appendix C). If that’s the case, it’s probably superior to what is going on with human resources. Take what is in Appendix C and use that for the faculty evaluation this year. A senate member discussed the evaluation, and the ad-hoc faculty evaluation committee wrote a letter to the faculty senate with a list of recommendations. The FS agreed that we would not go forward with any inter-departmental faculty evaluations. A faculty member says that they do not fully know all the rules and regulations; we don’t have the right to say that we are not going to use that instrument. The President said that we need to figure out what we are going to do.

A faculty member stated: the President’s (Oliver) problem is that we’re using a variety of different instruments in different departments. Use the one that’s on the web. A faculty member said that the ideal faculty instrument should be done in a shared/collaborative way.

A faculty member stated —who has the right to determine what is the evaluation?

Let’s find out what has been filed.

The faculty agreed that we would continue to do what we did last year for this year and use Appendix C for next year.

#### V. Other

A faculty member stated: since you won’t let me come to the meeting with the Commissioner: I am offended by the arbitrary nature of the decisions being made by the Provost and Academic affairs and by people suggesting that we are incompetent and don’t know what we’re doing. At some point as a faculty we need to decide whether or not we’re going to continue being hammered at that level. I would like you to tell the Commissioner that we have to work too hard to counteract all the things that are not congruent with the academy. The atmosphere here is unproductive. Dr. Schreiber read his proposed statement to the Commissioner.

It was the sense of the Faculty that Dr. Schreiber needs to suggest to the Commissioner that we would like to meet with him. Dr. Schreiber stated that the faculty members who would be meeting at 1:00 pm with the commissioner were handpicked by the President.

#### Vi. Announcements/Comments

#### VII. Close

**Minutes submitted by Kathryn Green**