

**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**April 12, 2017 #348**

**Senators present were:** Boren, Cox, Sharma, Zook, Zugay, Barenberg, Canas, Cargile Cook, Couch, Grair, Held, Ireland, Kaye, Lavigne, Legacey, Mayer, Mosher, Rice, Rider, Singh, Thacker, Wilde, Crews, Dass, Matteson, Richman, Fedler, Ghebrab, Hernandez, Williams, Blum, Kalenkoski, Henry, Metze, Cassidy, Litsey, Bucy, Gring, Ankrum, Brookes, Meek, CM Smith and Stetson.

**Senators Absent were:** Verble, Adams, Brittsan, Calkins, Forbis, McCheney, Morales, Still, Surluiga, Fleischman, Siwatu, Morse, Nejat, Zuo, Hodes, Gilliam, Ivey, Whiting, Hidalgo, McEniry, Keene. Langford and Wascoe-Hays.

- **Call to order – Dr. Gene Wilde, Faculty Senate President**
  
- **Approval of the minutes, meeting #347, March 8, 2017 – 3:16pm**
  - Motion to approve – Vice President Ramkumar
  - Second Senator Ankrum
  - Minutes approved as amended
  
- **Introduction of Guests – 3:18 pm**
  - Newly elected Faculty Senators: Catherine Jai, Matt Johnson, Jon Thompson, Jeff Williams, Dana Weiser. Rob Stewart, Senior Vice Provost, Ombudsperson Jean Scott, Parliamentarian Gary Elbow and Staff Senate Liz Inskip-Paulk. Guest speaker Paul Pare.
  
- **Speakers – 3:20pm**
  - Dr. Paul Pare – Implementing the QEP: Communication in the Global Society
    - SACS accreditation group required a QEP around 10 years ago – first QEP was Ethics
    - Second is the current and is Communicating in a Global Society
      - Five year plan began in January 2016
      - The Center for Global communication has been formed
      - Programs that have been created for fall 2017
        - A module that all students will be exposed to
        - A single unit offered that contain global challenge modules
        - Allow students to be more global savvy
        - Assessment based on direct and indirect questions
        - College level proposal as well to design program to help students communicate in a global society
        - Global fellows program
        - The different aspects of the modules
          - Global challenges
            - Population, resources, technology, information government, conflict, economics
          - Students will be exposed to the above topics in each module
      - Train the in Global exposure

- Global mindset, relationship interested, openness , resilience, self-awareness and exploration
  - Global Challenge Resource module
    - Questions
    - Videos
    - Small group discussion
    - Take home reading assignment that covers global challenges
  - The next part is the mindsets
    - Indirect assessment
      - Questions asked more about how they perceive themselves
    - Definition and cultural application
    - Case study
- How is this implemented
  - Colleges can place module into existing course
  - College or department can build a course
  - Have students enter into Raider Ready course
    - Hope is that existing courses that apply can be utilized
  - Courses must be in place by 2018
- Providing greater rigor
  - Incentivize college to come up with programs to enhance communication skills
  - Colleges will put together proposals focused on the global challenge themes
  - The student learning outcomes
    - Communication
    - Global competency
    - Cultural awareness and engagement
  - A rubric for the archival work generated by the students
    - Show the assessment of the projects
- Global fellows program
  - A more rigorous look at the QEP
  - Students will be participating in curricular and co-curricular activities
- QEP may help students develop the marketable skills businesses are looking for

**Question Senator Brookes:**

Is this a program for graduates or only undergraduates?

**Answer Pare:**

The QEP is geared only for undergraduates

**Question Senator Ankrum:**

[In audible...]

**Answer Pare:**

We would like to have some university wide freshman course. That could bring all of the students together. We are a fairly disparate community, so to get people from different college to agree on some sort of freshman class that would be a one or three hour. We are nervous that faculty will see this as too burdensome. So we decided to start off incrementally with a 60-90 minutes module. We have also has some small amount of resistance on that. What we envision is if we can get everyone on board, we can start to build enthusiasm and they may see that the one unit is well received and ask for another one.

**Comment Senator Ankrum:**

A more general common theme... [In Audible]

**Question Senator Lavigne:**

Is this just a five-year program? What is the role of language in the QEP?

**Answer Pare:**

Can't tell you what will happen in the future, but in the last QEP's there were centers set up and programs have been carried forward. There seems to have been some sustainability. If colleges are susceptible, they should stay around. The university is send a mix message on the role of language the representative on the executive board, recognize the value of foreign language skills and that culture is inexorably linked to language. So if we are going to enhance cultural sensitivity that has to be attached to languages.

- **Committee Reports – 3:50pm**
  - Funded Research – Senator Fedler
    - Funded research survey
      - Goal to get an idea of how research is viewed by colleges and departments
      - Encourage colleagues to fill it out
      - Institutional Research will be gathering data
      - IRM will manage the responses

**Question Senator Cassidy:**

Can you make sure the Library and Southwest Collection appears on the survey? After the rank of professor, can you add Librarian/Archivist to that list as well, because I and a number of my colleagues use the Office of Research Services as well, so it will help with feedback if we are included on the survey

**Answer Senator Fedler:**

Yes

- Academic Programs Committee – Report – 4:00pm
  - Vice President Ramkumar
  - Report on 3<sup>rd</sup> Year review OP
    - The committee was charged to draft the OP and have the senate approve
    - Hope is to have the OP voted on in the May meeting
    - Process after Senate approval, goes to provost, then the deans then the senate again

- For discussion only
- Dossier provided by the last day of the fifth long semester
- Draft provided for review
- 15<sup>th</sup> of February the Department Committee has to give their recommendation to the chair
- Review must be completed by 15<sup>th</sup> of April

**Question Senator Elect Pare:**

The dates for the dossier availability should be clearly spelled out – question withdrawn

**Question Senator Barenberg:**

It strikes me that 15 days is not a lot of time to write an appeal, especially since the Provost's office has a whole semester to investigate. I think it may be better to give the candidate more time to draft an appeal. I would recommend 30 days especially since they may consult an attorney and that is the first and only shot to write an appeal.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

How about we give them until the last day of the Semester. That is more or less 30 days.

**Question Senator Bucy:**

I agree with earlier comment about specified window. That you cannot act the day of that the portfolio is available. I really like the 2 phase questions that the policy recommends. The candidate gives the decision maker more guidance. I was just wondering the rational for the college level peer evaluator.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

The last one is to have a fair and balanced review. People who are not involved in the day-to-day politics of the department. A safe guard for the faculty member that is why it is limited to one. Based on the requirements that come from the department in sync with the college

**Question Senator Grair:**

It is still unclear to me exactly what the purview of the college level peer evaluator is? Are they looking at the same questions as the faculty member, are they reviewing the contents of the dossier, and are they reviewing the entire review process?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

They will look at the entire dossier. The point to an OP is to make sure that there is a fair and balance review based on requirements.

**Question Senator Lavigne:**

Back on the two ballot question. It is fairly clear what the criteria for the first two questions. The criteria for the peer evaluator assessing the dossier is unclear. How would the peer evaluator asses the second question.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

The second questions stems from the result of the first question. We encourage the peers to help them.

**Question Senator Lavigne:**

I guess my question revolves around the opposite. If the answer to “a” is yes, and the answer to “b” is no. How do we figure out what to do?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

There are a couple of decisions where there is an opportunity to assess the process. The college evaluator will address the no on the second ballot to intervene in the process. If the college evaluator disagrees then it will go back to the college and department to discuss

**Question Senator Lavigne:**

What if it was phrased so say is “a” is “no” then question “b”?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

Then the process.....

**Question Senator Lavigne:**

There are no criteria for an if then on the two questions

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

Then that would come up, in the comments. You can't have an OP that tells you everything to do. Certain things we can have but we do not want such specificity; it would make the OP very long.

**Comment President Wilde:**

Generally when there questions are asked they are asked separately.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

It is not a single ballot. It is a secret ballot. It is an independent separate...

**Question Senator Cargile-Cook:**

I have heard this being discussed all year. What I have liked about the discussion is that there is an implied but not stated recommendation for improvement. It doesn't say what the comments are about. The way I read this, it looks like we are formalizing an up or down vote at the third year.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

We encourage the faculty to provide written comments. So if there is a negative vote they explain why they voted that way.

**Question Senator Cargile-Cook:**

So I still think there should be specificity of the comments. Recommendations for improvement, is it our intention here to make an up or down vote at the third year? If it is a down vote, the appeal does not last until the fall, most job markets happen in the fall.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

They still get a terminal contract, so they have one year.

**Question Senator Cargile-Cook:**

Is that stated that they have one year?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

That is part of the 32.01 OP on tenure. Just to qualify, I am willing to add, that provided there is a non-appointment, then improvements need to be suggested. We can state somewhere that points to improvements needs to be specified.

**Question Secretary Litsey:**

There was some discussion last time about, selection of the college level peer evaluator, and a veto type process. My concern is the line “the dean will consult with the candidate and every effort will be made...” I am not sure that is specific enough, and or affords the candidate enough that the evaluator will have their interest in mind. Could not the dean just be like, well I sent them an email and they didn’t responded so here it is. I think 32.01 has some language in there about agreement but I don’t think so. I am wondering if we can write something that says the candidate and the dean must agree or the candidate will provide three choices and the dean will select from those three, something like that. Some kind of language to protect the candidate from having a peer evaluator that is just a hatchet person.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

Then it becomes like it is a fair and balance way. Then what is the purpose. We can state it in the way it was stated in the minutes. Each candidate can have three strikes, and each provides a name...

**Question Senator Crews:**

Is there anything that addresses the dossier contents? Some colleges have deans that go in a different direction from what is submitted.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

So it is your annual review, then the chair’s response and college evaluator if necessary.

**Question Senator Crews:**

Do we have a document that says what a tenure and promotion document must contain?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

Tenure and Promotion is different, we don’t want to be... The purpose is not to scare people. The burden on the faculty is to make a sincere effort. Not asking for any additional materials

**Question Senator Held:**

My first question, Senior Vice President Stewart, is it true that if you get non-reappointment you are allowed a year?

**Answer Senior Vice Provost Stewart:**

Yes, the terminal year is issued. That is codified in a number of OP’s, it could be here as well.

**Question Senator Held:**

So it should be spelled out in here is my point. The other concern expressed a moment ago with regard to the recommendation for improvement. I was instrumental in writing the policy for post tenure review. In post tenure review, if you get a negative vote there is an opportunity, for the dean to initiate remedial policies to allow faculty members to redeem themselves and continue. There is nothing like that in this document. One of the deans have decided that in the vote is 51% negative the faculty member is fired; there is no chance for remediation. There is nothing in here to protect from that happening, which turn this into an up or down tenure vote. The other thing is there are a lot of issues

coming up here and we have only one more meeting this school year. I would rather get it right than get it fast. If there are sufficient concerns, we need to incorporate them and put the decision off.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

That is what is happening, we have time, nothing if being finalized.

**Question Senator Held:**

So you are thinking there will be several iterations. We will vote on something now, it will go to the deans, then to the provost and come back to the senate. I am ok with that. The other issue pertains to what Senator Litsey raised and you did say last time there would be strikes and it is not in here. You philosophical point is this, that this policy is designed to ensure a successful candidate. To preserve the investment of the university to make sure we do not arbitrarily get rid of people. I do not know about your department, but in my department, there are a number of sub disciplines who are competitive with each other for hires. If there is animosity for a hire retaliation could be an outcome from the peer evaluator from a competitive discipline. I do not see enough safeguards to prevent that. This peer evaluator is a complete wildcard. I agree with Senator Litsey if we are interested is protecting the candidate for some fairness; we need to allow the candidate to choose their evaluator.

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

We can put it out and it goes to the administration. Can I ask for a motion that we specify the selection of the peer evaluator? The candidate puts out three names and the dean selects from there.

**Comment President Wilde:**

If someone is willing to make a motion as a guiding recommendation

**Comment Senator Richman:**

I am concerned that there may be unintended negative effects on the candidate by implementing this in the way we are describing. The more people that you seek input into evaluating a candidate and giving them feedback. If the candidate nominates someone that they think will be a favorable reviewer. Do we see that the candidate could be receiving conflicting information from the peer evaluator, the faculty vote and none of that matter to what the dean is trying to promote. I am concerned, that is actually may have a counter therapeutic effect. Of giving a candidate, affirming information and the dean disagrees with the process. That may provide misinformation and encourage a candidate to keep going and if the dean is going in a different direction. Let's not collect a lot of data and let a candidate think that that data is supportive.

**Motion Secretary Litsey:**

Motion to amend the "College Level Peer Evaluator" to read:

The Candidate will provide the dean with three potential evaluators. The dean will consult with the candidate and chairperson and select from those three the peer evaluator.

**Second Senator Held**

**Comment President Wilde:**

Discussion – none

Vote called: (2) nays – Motion carries

**Comment Senator Brooks:**

I am uncomfortable with the scenario where faculty will vote yes on “a” and no on “b”. The faculty have already set up the criteria for tenure and promotion so this set up a scenario where the voting could not be based on the criteria, but on their personal relationships. I like Senator Lavigne’ suggestion of an if “a” then “b” questions

**Comment President Wilde:**

Would there be an issue with that operationally, Rob?

**Answer Senior Vice Provost Stewart:**

No, in the college of Arts and Sciences, if I remember correctly was the questions were separate and you did not get to the second questions fi the first is positive. I am wondering if there should be a ballot for question 1 and then a second ballot for question 2 if necessary.

**Comment Senator Barenberg:**

I just want to echo that, our concern [in audible...]. In some cases having that two-step where only the second questions is asked if necessary. [in audible...]

**Comment Senator Meyer:**

Again, I think you hit on a key point. There may be a place or a time, but for the faculty in a department this may be the only place and time where that would come into account. Where yes on paper, they are great, but they are demeaning to students, they are stealing supplies, or things that are egregious. Sometimes the unlisted things are only brought to light during the third year review.

**Answer Senior Vice Provost Stewart:**

So if I am understanding the conversation. There is some assumption that this process in regards to question “a” is happening in isolation. I would hope that the whole department would be able to get together and talk about it in person. That might relate to the other question. I just want to clarify this out loud and represent the persons best interest.

**Comment Senator Kalenkowski:**

[in audible]

**Comment Senator Bucy:**

I was just going to build off some of the comments. [in audible...]. We want to keep the interest of the department in mind as well. We don’t want to get stuck with the wrong person even if they look good on paper. I am in favor of not over specifying the process, but we also have to evaluate everything.

**Question Senator Zook:**

In the College of Architecture, where should the evaluator be gotten?

**Answer Vice President Ramkumar:**

Can still be modified as applicable, without specifying the Library or Architecture.

**Comment President Wilde:**

You have an opportunity to look at this and the committee can consolidate the comments and return with a final draft. Please send in other comment to Vice President Ramkumar. If distributed please



remember it is a working document and a draft. Not intended to alter the criteria for faculty evaluation, but to provide a timeline for the process.

- **New Business**

**Question Senator Crews:**

How is our university working on mini sessions for graduate school? Will we have a winter session?

- **Liaison Reports – none**

- **Announcements**

- Senator Held

- It has come to my attention that there may be budget cutbacks in departments. The budget cutback come as a result of differential tuition models. They are receiving less money up to 20-25%. When the discussion in the Senate occurred about differential tuition and whether it would cause problems. We were assured that there would not be a discrepancy in the move to that model. So far, chairs have not gotten an answer on the discrepancy. Provost Galyean affirmed that departments would not receive less than they had in course fees. I think this is a problem that should be addressed and determined what is going on in the other colleges.

- **Adjourned**