

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

September 4, 2012

Minutes

Present: G. Preuss (President), T. Hale (President Elect), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), J. Ahmad, C. Bachman, M. Benavides, C. Burnett, C. Nguyen, P. Deo, M. Duncan, S. Farris, J. Herrera, V. Hrynkiw, J. Johnson, R. Johnson, F. Khoja, S. Koshkin, P. Li, P. Mandell, W. Nowak, J. Schmertz, K. Switzer, J. Tito-Izquierdo, I. Wang

Absent: T. Chiavello, S. Penkar, C. Rubinson

Approval of May 8 Minutes: Moved by Schmertz, Second by Allen. Minutes Approved.

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, President Preuss thanked outgoing President Allen and Secretary Schmertz for their service.

Introduction of Officers

Overview of open Senate positions (four total—MMBA, CMS, ENG, and UE)

Faculty Senate President's Report: G. Preuss

1. APC is reviewing student class evaluations.
 - a. A nationally recognized evaluation format called IDEA is going to be piloted this semester, and faculty members are needed to volunteer.
2. Celebration of Susan Ahern on November 1, 6-9 pm, at Willow Street Pump Station.
3. Open house for ORSP on September 11, 11-1, in S-625.
4. Please note the Conflict of Interest Form that has been circulated.
5. FSEC continued to meet with the Provost over the summer and continues to be a voice for faculty interests and concerns.
6. Several meetings have been held with candidates, R & T Chairs, Deans, and Dept. Chairs regarding the electronic R & T procedures.
7. Reviewed AAUP statement on Shared Governance, which reaffirms that there are many stakeholders in policy issues. However, faculty always needs a "seat at the table." Specifically, faculty should have a voice in:
 - a. Strategic Plan
 - b. University Retention Plan
 - c. Enrollment Management and Recruiting Plan
 - d. University Diversity Plan
 - e. High Impact Practices (HIPs)
 - f. Honors Program
 - g. Community Service and Engagement
 - h. Center for Teaching Excellence
 - i. Online Teaching and Technology
 - j. Workload

- k. Evaluations
- l. Shared Governance
- m. Faculty Development

Rank and Tenure Procedures: L. Bowen

Bowen provided an overview of the electronic (online) submission of R & T portfolios.

Candidates will have individual shells in Blackboard under the “My Organizations” tab to which they will upload their documents as required by policy and the BOR. There is a “Read Me” file with instructions. There are tabs and folders for each portfolio element that is required and/or requested. L. Bowen will control access as the deadlines come and go for submission and review at all levels. Everything is to be loaded as a pdf file.

In response to Senators’ questions, Bowen clarified that there is tracking of views but no one can look at the views tracking except for in the case of a grievance. Also, extra-large pdf files should be avoided (greater than 10 mb or around 300 pages), but number of files is not limited. Common sense should be used as to the number of files to be uploaded. Bowen does not know if this format will continue as is past this year, but is willing to share feedback she receives on the process. Bowen does not know if there is a search tool for the files, but will find out.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) Election

Introduction of Senators

Call for nominations for three Senators to serve on FSEC. Those put in nomination and the election outcome was:

Jerry Johnson (NS) 23 votes *winner

Sarah Farris (ENG) 18 votes *winner

Chu Nguyen (FACIS) 13 votes

Paul Mandell (A & H) 21 votes *winner

Committee on Committees and Credentials and Elections Nominations

Nominations are needed for each committee. Preuss will clarify which colleges need representation on the committees. It is unknown when the committees meet, but this will be clarified. Senators are urged to encourage nominations from their constituents.

R. Chiquillo is still serving on CEC and served as Chair last year. Preuss will charge CEC with sending out the call for nominations for open Senate seats.

Report from Faculty Ombuds: W. Gilbert

Ombuds Gilbert reviewed the role, purpose, and constraints of the Faculty Ombuds. He notes that it is hard to get people to fill out evaluation forms. Gilbert handed out and reviewed the document "Faculty Ombuds Report for Faculty Senate." This document is included as Appendix A.

Old Business

Benavides inquired about the two resolutions that were passed at the last Senate meeting. These resolutions concerned (1) that the Chair of the Oversight Committee be a tenured faculty member elected through Senate procedures and (2) that three hours of the component area option be allotted to the Communication Component Area (for a total of nine hours, six Composition and three Communications). Allen reports that there has been little movement on these issues. The Provost is "not interested" in replacing current Chair and is adopting a "wait and see" approach for the writing component issue. Farris suggested that we need more discussion on these issues in the form of an agenda item for next meeting. Schmertz would like either an in-person or written response directly addressing the language in the resolutions.

Schmertz inquired about the recommendation regarding reconstituting the General Education Committee that came out of the last Faculty Assembly. The language of the recommendation states, "that the General Education Committee be reconstituted with elected, tenured faculty from each department by Sept 10, 2012." Schmertz requested that this recommendation be put on the Senate agenda for discussion.

Switzer notified the Senate that the Oversight Committee had lost a faculty member. Also, Senator Farris inquired as to whether a Senate representative who is no longer a Senator can continue to serve. Preuss notes that we have Senate representatives on other committees who are not currently senators. Schmertz recommended that we should elect two tenured faculty members to the Oversight Committee, one a current Senator.

J. Johnson inquired about the Faculty Climate Survey, past and present. A Climate Survey will be conducted in the spring by President-Elect Hale. Schmertz noted that a sub-committee should be formed to devise questions. Allen stated that there is no report from the last survey, but one could be formulated.

Adjourn: 3:49 pm

Appendix A

Faculty Ombuds Report for Faculty Senate

4 September 2012

William H. Gilbert

Ombuds: 1. Confidential, 2. Impartial, 3. Informal, 4. Independent

Faculty Ombuds probably will not learn results.

Over two years, visitors have been faculty at all ranks and from every college.

Most Issues: promotion/tenure, compensation, civility

2011

Abstentions from promotion/tenure decisions: “Abstention or recusement from voting is strongly discouraged” (PS 10.A.01, 2.3.4). Presumably, PS 10.A.01’s definition of a majority for a Departmental Rank and Tenure vote extends to the votes of the University Rank and Tenure Committee as well: “Fifty percent of all members of the department rank and tenure committee must vote “yes” to register a positive vote result. In the case of a divided vote, two reports are to be submitted.” That language strongly suggests that no binding vote should be taken when committee members are absent and unable to vote. It would be nonsensical to suppose that negative “majorities” required any fewer votes than positive majorities do. And especially when ducking a vote stems from a desire to duck writing a minority report, such a choice should be disallowed. The language in 2.3.7.2 of PS 10.A.01 clearly underscores the advisability of more rather than fewer reports to reflect different judgments on a candidacy: “Those voting in favor of a particular candidacy draft a report giving the reasons for their support. Those voting against a particular candidacy also draft a report citing the reasons for their lack of support. These reports, together with a tally of the votes for or against each candidacy, are forwarded as stated above. Should a particular group be unable to agree on the contents of a single report, smaller groups or individuals may submit separate reports.” If current committee practice does not conform with these statements, committee practice or the PS document should be changed so that the two agree.

2012

Some ambiguous, if not flatly contradictory statements in promotion and tenure documents remain and need to be reconciled. Here are some examples:

1. Does PS 10.A.01’s definition of a majority for a Departmental Rank and Tenure vote extend to the votes of the University Rank and Tenure Committee as well? If so, policy needs to STATE so.
2. We need a policy change that clearly defines participants in Rank and Tenure decisions as faculty members BELOW the administrative level of Department Chair, the highest rank included in the Faculty Assembly. Thus, any administrator who reports to and is evaluated by any person above the level of Department Chair should NOT take part in decisions regarding promotion and tenure to avoid the concern that such administrators are not independent of their supervisors.

3. PS 10.A.02 (Faculty Grievance Policy) includes non-reappointment as grievable (3.1.1), while PS 10.A.07 (Faculty Non-Reappointment) limits grievances of non-reappointment to procedural issues (2.7). It is University Counsel's position that the newer document (PS 10.A.02) takes precedence; whether the University wishes to challenge that finding, the policies must be reconciled.
4. PS 10.A.07's extends faculty grievances (2.2) beyond the original clear-cut distinction between tenure-track faculty and lecturers (PS 10.A.03, 2.2.4.1). The language of PS 10.A.03 (Faculty Appointments) clearly disallows grievances for Adjunct Lecturers.
5. Varying levels of supervision of adjuncts by degree coordinators lent support for across-the-board elimination of promised compensation for such work in Fall 2011. While some degree coordinators admitted they "didn't check student evaluations or grade distributions," others spent considerable time monitoring, advising, and mentoring adjuncts—efforts that justified extra compensation.

Handling of the deliberations over how to comply with Coordinating- Board-imposed changes in the Core Curriculum has severely damaged faculty morale. Greater transparency and cooperation need to be our goals.