

**7 December 2009**

**Meeting time 3:04 pm**

**Faculty Senate meeting**

Senate Members present: Paula Adams (Library), Becky Becker (COA), Greg Blalock (COEHP), Jan Burcham (COEHP), Josh Eycler (COLS), Bonita Flournoy (COEHP), Susan Hrach (COLS), Stephanie Lewis (COEHP), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), Sandra Stratford (Library), John Studstill (COLS), John Theis (COBCS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Dan VanKley (COLS), Troy Vidal (COLS), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS)

**Over 17 guests**, including Erma Banks, Brian Schwartz, Pat McHenry, Dan Ross, Terry Irvin, Chip Reese, Susan Lovell, Carole Burke, Rita Jones, Zodiac Webster, Noah Roderick.

***Location: Center for International Education - Sara Spencer Event Hall***

1. Report from the Provost

a. Promotion and tenure data

Provost Levi and Associate Provost Butcher at SACS Conference today, and unable to report. The Provost is willing to set up a separate meeting to discuss this issue. Will suggest Tuesday at 1pm; Wed the 16<sup>th</sup> at 9am or 1pm; next Monday the 14<sup>th</sup> at 3pm.

Exec committee provided a chart of data that we have requested.

This includes:

Promotion:

# submitted (by College):

# recommended by their college for Promotion (by College)

# approved by Provost/VPAA of those recommended (by College)

# declined by Provost/VPAA of those recommended (by College)

# approved by Provost/VPAA of those not recommended (by College)

# declined by Provost/VPAA of those not recommended (by College)

Tenure

# submitted (by College):

# recommended by their college for Tenure (by College)

# approved by Provost/VPAA of those recommended (by College)

# declined by Provost/VPAA of those recommended (by College)

# approved by Provost/VPAA of those not recommended (by College)

# declined by Provost/VPAA of those not recommended (by College)

Other faculty concerns about promotion and tenure this year?

- There may be a task force being formed, to look at standards. The Provost has requested standards from departments.
- Explanation why promoted got a pay raise, but tenured did not.
- Explanations for significant differences between this year and last year.
- There seems to have been conflicting information about raises for promotion this year.
- Were people denied tenure based on newer standards of performance?

- What role does the faculty personell committee play? There are reports that unanimous vote by that committee were overturned by administration.
- How many applications were withdrawn?
- Some faculty went up for promotion (non-tenure track) - and can not interpret the response given. The promotion process now completely unclear for non-tenure-track faculty.
- Concern is that the rules have changed, and no faculty know what the rules now are.
  - Are faculty evaluated based on the Faculty Handbook when they applied for tenure? When they became tenure-track faculty? Or should we base applications on annual evaluation and mid-tenure review feedback?
  - It was pointed out that annual evaluation and mid-tenure review were designed to provide faculty with guidance, allowing them to correct if they were not on the appropriate track to tenure.
  - An analogy was made to students enrolling in a major: if the requirements for the major change, students are still considered to need to meet the requirements of the major at the time they applied for the major, not the new requirements at the time of graduation.
- Question the communications process here – did the upper administration know the current standards? No charge was given to personnel committee.
- Will new standards be adapted retroactively? Is doing so legal?
- What was the decision making process, and how was it communicated?
- Who went up for P&T? Lists of faculty who originally applied are not available University-wide.
- The Senate will send out a call via email – did you go up for P&T? Did you get it? Call to share info... Dan Van Kley, John Theis, Gary Sprayberry, Becky Becker Bonita Fluornoy, Stephanie Lewis will collect info.
  - Dan VanKley will post this call to listserv. Faculty are also requested to conduct a grassroots campaign in order to collect information.
- A suggestion was made that the Senate should ask for the letters along the path, instead of just the result and examine whether there is unanimity in the votes of committees?
- Technically, anything written up in a personnel file is public record.
- The Provost is reported to have used a review committee. What instructions did Provost's committee have?
- During this investigation, the Senate should compare each case against each College's P&T policy. Standards of Excellence are in the VPAA office and each college/department; these can be shown on the screen. Can request these from dept chairs.

What do we do with the numbers? Raise awareness about promotion and tenure standards at the University, and clarify policy. Ensure policy is enacted fairly.

  - If a large # were approved by committee and turned down by the Provost, there is a serious governance issue that we need to address.
  - How does this year compare to other years?
  - It may be that, as the President signed the Provost's letter, there is no appeal inside the university – only to BOR. Or, so long as you do not talk to President, can you appeal? Legal issues are involved here. Nothing in BOR policy indicates how the President communicates his decision, but policies give separate dates for reporting Provost and Presidential decisions on Promotion and Tenure. This issue is unclear.

### Comments:

- We need to do a good job of investigating these questions and getting facts straight.
- It was suggested that the Senate can get this information by submitting a Georgia Open Records Request Act form (and the University can redact the names for privacy); The Senate can also ask faculty involved if they will share the letters they have received from the administration. Currently we are asking faculty affected to self-identify.
- Comment was made that Faculty Handbook changes have been made, with no notation about when changes were made, and no approval process. This is a BOR policy violation. Note that this has happened with Search Committee policy as well.
- Comment: Note there is no specification in BOR policy which areas you must excel in.
- Grievance process that goes through the Senate, then the BOR, will be critical.

Dr. Hrach will extend request for data to include prior years data, and we will ask for faculty to discuss with Senate their cases. Will focus on the group as a whole, and whether standards were consistently and fairly applied.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Senate Resolution on Furlough Inequities

#### Draft resolution on furlough inequities for academic year faculty:

Resolved, that as faculty with academic year contracts have been unequally penalized by furlough calculations which are based on 12-month administrative salaries, the CSU Faculty Senate wishes to formally acknowledge this inequity and petition the Board of Regents to include faculty with academic year contracts in any future deliberations regarding employee furloughs in the University System of Georgia.

### b. Information item: *Regents Approve 8 Percent Budget Reduction Plan For University System.* Link to press release:

[http://www.usg.edu/news/release/regents\\_approve\\_8\\_percent\\_budget\\_reduction\\_plan\\_for\\_university\\_system/](http://www.usg.edu/news/release/regents_approve_8_percent_budget_reduction_plan_for_university_system/)

This link announces further budget cuts in 2010. Decisions about where cuts will come from to be made at the discretion of each institution. The Draft resolution above was brought to USG Senate council, and approved. At that USG Senate Council meeting, it was proposed that if there were further furloughs, academic year faculty should be compensated for unfairness in this round.

Change phrase to “petition the President of CSU and ....”

Moved by Senator Zuiderveen, seconded by Senator Thies

Motion passes unanimously. Wording of the approved motion now reads:

***Resolved, that as faculty with academic year contracts have been unequally penalized by furlough calculations which are based on 12-month administrative salaries, the CSU Faculty Senate wishes to formally acknowledge this inequity and petition the President of Columbus State University and the Board of Regents to include faculty with academic year contracts in any future deliberations regarding employee furloughs in the University System of Georgia.***

### c. Followup to the Letter about the Status of the Library

The Executive Committee met with Mr. George, Provost Levi, and President Mescon on November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

- President Mescon felt strongly that since librarians were not tenure-track, their status as faculty was already murky, and that change to professional staff status clarified roles. Librarians will be professional staff in future.
- As they are not faculty, the role on committees changes according to current policy. There was informal agreement that committee chairs with librarians on their committee to consider whether their participation is vital to your committee work, and to expect to be consulted.
- The Senate committee on the Library should now play a larger advisory role.
- The violation of the university statutes (BOR and CSU Statutes quoted below) was dismissed, because the Faculty Handbook is going to be revised, and this statute will be fixed at that time. However, USG and university faculty have an important role in modifying the statutes, so this issue will continue to be addressed.

*From the University Statutes (<http://faculty.colstate.edu/handbooks/fifac/appendixie.asp>) (downloaded 12/7/09)*

## **ARTICLE IX. AMENDMENTS**

### **Section 1.**

***Through the President, the University Faculty shall have the power to recommend to the Board of Regents any amendments to any part of the Statutes.***

### **Section 2.**

***The President of the institution or the Faculty shall recommend amendments to the Statutes of the University in the following manner:***

***1. The Faculty Senate shall serve to initiate and/or review proposals to amend the University statutes.***

***2. The Senate may propose amendments, or report its recommendations concerning proposals for amendments, at any regular meeting of the Faculty or at any special meeting called for the purpose of amending. The Senate shall submit all such proposals and recommendations in writing to the Faculty at least seven working days prior to the faculty meeting.***

***3. Proposed amendments must be adopted by a two-thirds majority of faculty members present, provided a majority of those eligible to vote shall be present at the time of the vote. Include article 9 section 2 of university statutes***

*From the USG BOR Statutes, [www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/3.2\\_faculties/](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/3.2_faculties/) (downloaded 12/7/09)*

### **3.2.3 Faculty Meetings**

***Each faculty shall meet at least once each academic term and at such other times as may be necessary or desirable, except at those institutions which have a council, senate, assembly, or other such body, in which case the faculty shall meet at least twice a year. Each faculty shall appoint a secretary who shall keep a record of the proceedings.***

### **3.2.4 Faculty Rules and Regulations**

***The faculty, or the council, senate, assembly, or such other comparable body, shall, subject to the approval of the president of the institution:***

- 1. Make statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students;***
- 2. Provide such committees as may be required;***

**3. Prescribe regulations regarding admission, suspension, expulsion, classes, courses of study, and requirements for graduation; and,**

**4. Make such regulations as may be necessary or proper for the maintenance of high educational standards.**

***A copy of the statutes, rules and regulations made by the faculty shall be filed with the Chancellor. The faculty shall also have primary responsibility for those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, subject to the approval of the president of the institution. (BoR Minutes, 1986- 87, p. 333).***

d. Shared Governance Task Force – preliminary report about survey

### ***Distributed handout***

Representation on the Task Force was not as even among the colleges as would be desired.

The Task Force will not characterize the numbers reported at this time. The Task Force prefers to present raw data where possible, in order to allow all to interpret the data without bias.

There were 105 respondents to the survey.

Forum report is being planned, including a transcript of the comments included on the surveys.

Dr. Hrach appreciates everyone's work for distributing the survey, and the committee's work in compiling it.

e. Admissions Policy Committee – report

Report by Dr. Wisdo.

Two pieces of data were important.

- Deadline for application has a very important impact on retention, and data verifies this concern. Move application deadline to June 30, to begin to address this problem.
- GPA is also a link to student retention. The committee has begun to discuss potential changes, in order to improve retention rates.

Are you looking at student transfer admissions policies?

One concern expressed was whether admissions criteria were applied evenly.

Admissions criteria are available online.

For this year's freshman class, the average SAT reading score was 510 (ACT reading score 20); average SAT Math score was 503, and the average ACT Math score was 20. Average GPA was 2.95

f. Initiative to Ensure Diversity on Faculty Groups – report

Recommendations – that “the faculty senate should formulate guidelines to assure diversity on major committees even if it requires the institution of some form of quota system. It cannot be left to the outcome of traditional voting procedures that do not insure inclusion of women and ethnic minorities on all major decision-making bodies, including the faculty senate itself.”

Comment – males may be the minority in classrooms, even in representation on Senate. Perhaps men should be included in these guidelines.

Comment - Need to require administrators to be actively involved.

Committee will look at Retention, Progression and Graduation rates, faculty and student recruitment, and more.

Will be creating Facebook page about diversity initiatives.

Question about “ethnicity” – does this include religion? May be problematic to include religion here.

## Approved Minutes

Approval vote completed 5 January 2010

Senator Zuiderveen moved that a task force of senate be made that looks at diversity on committees. Senator Burcham seconds.

Senator Eyer moved to amend the motion to have group define diversity to be as inclusive as possible. Senator Becker seconds. Vote on amendment was 10 for, no against, 3 abstains.

Amendment passed.

Vote on the motion: 10 for, 4 abstain. Motion passes.

As passed, the motion reads: *A task force of the Senate should be formed, to look at diversity on committees. This committee should define diversity to be as inclusive as possible.*

Senators Wurz, Adams, and Studstill volunteer to be on this task force.

**Senate meeting adjourned at 5:02pm**