

ROBERT HOLLAND FACULTY SENATE UNCORRECTED MINUTES OF MARCH 9, 2012

The Robert Holland Faculty Senate of Mississippi State University held its regular monthly meeting in the Grisham Room of Mitchell Memorial Library at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, March 9, 2012.

Members absent and excused were: M. K. Barbier, M. Brown, T. Dobson, J. Dunne, J. Haupt, R. Hopper, R. Lemus, D. Prince, R. Robichaux, and J. Sexton.

Members absent were: D. Dampier, L. Delgado, V. Miller, and J. Silva.

The meeting was called to order by the Senate President, Meghan Millea.

Senator Wise moved that the minutes, of the February 11, 2012 meeting, be approved. The motion was seconded by Senator Byrd. The motion passed unanimously.

GUESTS

DR. JEROME A. GILBERT, PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Dr. Gilbert said that he hoped everyone was getting ready for the break next week.

He said that Dr. Keenum is cautiously optimistic about the budget. The budget may get a slight cut, but they hope to protect academic units.

Work continues on projects around campus: The new dorms on the site of Arbour Acers should open for occupancy in the fall; Lee Hall Renovation will begin July 1st; the classroom building is still in the planning stage. He thanked everyone that is serving on that committee.

Planning for upcoming 150th anniversary of the Morrill Act is intensifying. MSU is 1 of 18 universities that will be represented on the Mall in front of the Smithsonian. A visitor to campus from the Smithsonian said that MSU is the lead university. He thanked Dr. Ryan for the planning that he has done. Over 1 million people will see the name MSU on the Mall this summer.

Provost Gilbert said that he recently had a visit to Auburn University with other VPs. He noticed a lot of similarities of our campuses and is looking to partner with them on several projects. He also commented on the consistency of their web presence on all webpages associated with the university.

Finally, he said that the QEP group has met to compile the most frequent comments from the listening sessions. They plan to send out topics for additional comments and ranking after Spring Break.

DR. DAVID SHAW, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Shaw said that his office was looking at comments to the Research Priorities. He is taking them very seriously and working to modify and strengthen the language. One recurring comment was that they were written too narrowly and units did not feel that they were reflected in the document. He welcomes any additional feedback on language that would be reflective of the many groups. He reiterated that he did not want to write it specific to a unit, college, or center, but rather in language such that many groups could see themselves fit in and broadly enough for cross-curricular application.

Senator Berk said that the categories were great. They seem to lead to more economic development. But it seems that the scholarly and creative aspects of research weren't reflected. Senator Berk also commented that some faculty may not have responded because there was not a general open comments category in the survey. Dr. Shaw said that late in the process, he was made aware of the need for a general open comments section but to add it at that point would have been too difficult. He said that general comments could be sent to his e-mail. Dr. Shaw also said that he intended on defining research in the broadest sense, but will be doing some edits.

Senator Coyne asked if Dr. Shaw's comment of "spread[ing] resources too thin" meant a redistribution of resources. Dr. Shaw said that his office is not planning on redistributing resources, but hopes deans will consider these priorities in hiring new faculty.

Dr. Shaw also commented on a question asked in the February Faculty Senate meeting about a recent policy put forward on fixed price and residual balance funds. He said that the policy came about because of this national issue. As a non-profit, MSU has to be careful when we generate massive amounts of residual funds after a fixed price contract. He has looked at policies of other universities. Many send all residuals back to the sponsoring agency; some all residual funds go to University General Fund. The Executive Council has chosen that 25% would go the University General Fund. This has raised a lot of questions because it is changing the way we do business. He clarified that once the contract is completed then the funds are considered to be designated funds as opposed to restricted funds. This does not violate any contractual arrangements. Funds under \$100 are defaulted to be transferred departments designated fund to expedite the completion of contracts. They can be designated to another account if requested by the principal investigator. Departments are responsible for overruns of the direct costs since they are complete control of those costs.

Senator Nagel asked for clarification that if he got monies fixed price contracts for \$100,000 and have \$25000 left over, you will not take it but if over \$25000 you will. Dr. Shaw said that he could request to retain those funds. He has granted such requests often.

Senator Hood asked what a firmer deadline would be to get comments to him on the research priorities. Dr. Shaw said 3 weeks from now would be great.

MR. MIKE RACKLEY, CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Mr. Rackley said that there has been a discussion about the need for a social media policy and about our web environment. He gave a presentation including 20 snapshots of webpages from the university. He pointed out that there is a lot of diversity. He said that user expectations have changed. Users want: consistent navigation, ADA access, mobile access

Risks of a web environment include: liability, legal implications (ITS had recorded 20 issues of inappropriate web information in the past 5 years.), SACS accreditation requirements, academics – common for out of date program requirements to still be posted, safety – Maroon Alert web banner only able to be activated on a sub-set of MSU webpages, marketing and branding including appearance and MSU official internet domain.

Recommendations include: adoption of a policy and procedure to ensure accuracy and consistency of MSU web content, implementation of a web content management system which would provide a technical framework for implementing the policy and procedure. They have no desire to take away department ability to choose content; this provides only a framework. A content management system is able to set electronic reminders for dated content, create university templates, and it ensures a higher likelihood of ADA compliance.

Dr. Gilbert said that a benefit of centrally maintained information would be that information would automatically update on webpages such as tuition information or changes in course descriptions of required courses taught by another department or college.

Mr. Rackley said that rewards of using this type of system include: reduced exposure to liability and legal risks, helping to ensure accreditation, synchronizing program requirements, better Maroon Alert banner penetration, more efficient use of university resources, reduced effort for departments to create their own look and feel, and a capability for a mass update to the university chosen template.

The presentation concluded by looking at the Auburn University website. Mr. Rackley noted the obvious header, consistent navigation bar, and common footer navigation throughout the webpages.

Senator Elder asked for clarification if Auburn has a web content management system in place. Mr. Rackley said that he was not sure but the system would achieve the same end result.

Senator M. Hopper asked if the system would fix the problem with the search engine. She said that students have complained about not being able to find things using the search engine. Mr. Rackley said that in terms of a performance issue, the system will not improve the search engine; however, with uniformity of sites it should be easier to find things on websites.

Senator Leug asked about the time line for this system. Mr. Rackley said that it is currently in the discussion phase, but once in place, the end goal would not happen overnight and could take longer than 1-2 years due to amount of webpages.

Senator Byrd asked about the financial responsibility to update and maintain the pages. Mr. Rackley said that the university would purchase the system and ITS would develop the templates, but departments would have the responsibility to insert their own information. Senator Byrd asked if there would there be guidelines for what is on department webpages. Mr. Rackley said that it would depend on how the policy is written.

MS. MARIDITH GEUDER, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SPECIAL EVENTS AND GAME DAY

The Special Events and Game Day Committee is proactively addressing issues that became evident in the last football season related to Game Day Operations. There several subcommittees looking into specific issues: Recycling, Tailgating, Transportation, Infrastructure, External Entities, and Game Day Website.

CLASSROOM BUILDING COMMITTEE

The Classroom Building Committee met with architects and classroom consultants about the plans for the classroom building. They are emphasizing flexibility in room arrangements in the mid-sized and small classrooms. They are also emphasizing functioning flexible study space; both open space and team rooms. I encourage you to provide your thoughts to the faculty representatives on this committee- Dwayne Wise, Jerry Emison, and me.

SENATE ROUNDTABLE

Thanks for Dr. Emison for his leadership in organizing the 2012 spring roundtable. Thanks to all of the faculty participants and the administrators who spent their afternoons envisioning the opportunities that lay ahead for our university.

INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS:

On February 14th, Cody Coyne and I met with Drs. David Shaw and Ray Vaughn to further discuss documents regarding research faculty. They are developing documentation for the evaluation and promotion for the research category of faculty. We look forward to working with them to develop an AOP for these faculty members.

On February 17th, Jerry Emison, Cody Coyne, and I had a meeting with VPs Gilbert, Bohach, Shaw and Zant and Assoc. Provost Ryan and Director of Extension, Dr. Jackson. At this meeting we discussed the possibilities and process to formulate university policies related to all categories of faculty.

SENATE LISTSERVES

With the help of ITS, I have established two listserves to open the lines of communication between the faculty senates of the IHL institutions and the faculty senates within the SEC. The faculty senates at the other universities have responded favorably, including Texas A&M and University of Missouri. I look forward to productive discussions.

SPECIAL THANKS

We have several senators who have fulfilled 2 consecutive terms on the senate who will be rotating off this next year. I want to extend a special thank you to each of them for their contributions to productive deliberations of the Robert Holland Faculty Senate. It is a great honor to have the trust of your colleagues to serve as their representative. It is a great honor for us on the senate to have had the opportunity to serve with you over these past 6 years:

Hart Bailey
Cody Coyne
Dana Franz
Julia Porter
Julie Sexton

Let me also take this opportunity to thank our other senators who are completing a three year term who may or may not be with us next year:

Ioana Banicescu
Mary Kathryn Barbier
David Dampier
Randy Follett
Ken Hood
Holly Johnson
David Nagel
Jody Ray
Rebecca Robichaux
John Rodgers
Steve Taylor
Wayne Wells

Thank you for your service on behalf of your college and to your university. The senate is a better and more productive body when we discuss issues openly. Our university is a better institution for your contributions.

The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences has completed their election for new Senators. Thanks to Sylvia Byrd and Mike Cox for agreeing to serve a second term.

Respectfully Submitted,



Meghan Millea
March 5, 2012

President Millea and Vice President Emison have talked with Provost Gilbert and President Keenum about the Faculty Handbook. The Charter and Bylaws Committee has been working on the handbook this academic year. There are some executive level decisions that need to be made before it can come before the Senate, so we have initiated that discussion.

VICE PRESIDENT REPORT

Deans' Council February 27, 2012

Announcements

Provost's Survey of Administrators'—The deadline for providing input to the Provost is midnight February 27. The Provost urged deans to take advantage of this opportunity to gain insight into administrators' performance.

Diversity Conference—Deans were urged to attend the upcoming diversity conference and encourage their faculty members to join them.

P&T Applications—The Provost expects to have the reviews of the applications for promotion and tenure completed by early- to mid-March.

AOCE Review—The Provost anticipates concluding the review of funding approaches for AOCE in a few weeks. His intention is to return more funds to the academic departments. The mechanisms for achieving this continue to be under discussion.

Academic Operating Policies—AOP 12.08 Requirements for Degrees, Academic Minors, Certificate Programs and Academic Consortial/Contractual Agreements

The Associate Deans' Council presented a draft AOP concerning degree requirements. The revisions were prompted by the need to bring university policy in line with SACS requirements. The Deans' Council passed the AOP unanimously after discussion of university programs' interactions with consortia. Emphasis was on assuring the consortia were accredited.

Academic Operating Policies—AOP 12.17 Undergraduate Academic Fresh Start

The Associate Deans' Council presented a draft AOP concerning fresh start academic requirements for undergraduates. The Deans' Council passed the AOP unanimously after noting the changes were largely typographical and continued the policies already in place.

Academic Operating Policies—AOP 12.19 Undergraduate Academic Amnesty

The Associate Deans' Council presented a draft AOP concerning academic amnesty for undergraduates. The Deans' Council passed the AOP unanimously after noting the changes were largely typographical and continued the policies already in place.

Academic Operating Policies—AOP 12.20 Academic Forgiveness

The Associate Deans' Council presented a draft AOP concerning forgiveness of academic low performance. Dr. Peter Ryan explained that the Student Senate wished to extend the number of courses from two courses/eight hours to three courses/nine hours with amnesty continuing to be provided for coverage of Bs and below. Dr. Ryan explained that this AOP did not contain such a recommendation. A straw vote of the deans concerning expansion of the number of courses garnered no support, but action was deferred to allow the Student Senate to present their views on the matter a later date.

Operating Policies—OP 01.12 Use of Information Technology Resources

The Office of Student Affairs requested that the OP be revised to address potential concerns about limitations upon free speech prompted by vagueness in wording. No Deans' Council vote was required; however the council endorsed the revised approach through adoption of a unanimous straw vote.

Changes in Withdrawal Processes

The Registrar is automating the withdrawal process for a current term so that processing will be smoother and faster.

Master Plan Advisory Committee

New Classroom Building: Meghan Millea and I participated in two worksessions with the architects designing the new classroom building. The discussions focused on arrangement and configuration of classrooms. Also consultants made presentations on furnishing and equipping university classrooms.

Traffic Policy Committee

Bike Dismount Signs: The student senate requested that parking services identify through signage and surface stencils those places on campus that bicycle riders should dismount. Specifically identified as priority needs were entrances to the Drill Field and high traffic areas. The committee endorsed the request and authorized Parking Operations to proceed with the requested signage.

Employee of Month Sign at Thompson Hall: The College of Forest Resources/MAFES requested the designation of a parking space near Thompson Hall for the employee of the month. The committee was concerned of the precedent to be set by such an action and did not endorse the request.

The Faculty Roundtable was held February 17th. The group of 8 faculty senators, 8 members of the general faculty, and 8 administrators used structured brainstorming and multivoting techniques to answer 2 questions: What opportunities will the next five years present to the university and what

actions can the university take to capture those opportunities? The summary is on the Faculty Senate website.

Classroom Building Committee has discussed design of both the exterior and interior. The committee is now in the process of giving feedback on classroom design setup. Architect is committed to listening to faculty requests.

Traffic Committee – Dr. Emison has suggested rumble strips or the like to help with traffic speed on Stone and Hardy Boulevards. This suggestion is moving forward because of the concern.

Master Plan Advisory Committee - May after classes out, MDOT will rebuild Blackjack Road from Locksley Way to the roundabout. This will begin after classes are out. The new construction will not include sidewalks and bikelanes in that area; however, the construction will not inhibit the addition of those in the future.

Senator Walters asked if there could be signs denoting sidewalks as pedestrian only. VP Emison said that the only way will be banning bikes from portions of campus which is counter to the direction we want to move in. We may have more police enforcement or police on bikes to deal with the bike-pedestrian interactions. Senator Walters suggested that maybe the signs could read “yield to pedestrians.”

Senator Wells asked about the planned crosswalk across Stone Boulevard from Dorman Hall to the Animal and Dairy Science Building. VP Emison said he would check the status. He remembered a discussion about a grade problem that would require rebuilding for one suggested crosswalk, but was unsure if it was in that location.

Senator M. Hopper asked what education is provided for students in the use bikes in crosswalks. VP Emison said that it was individual responsibility. Senator Rogers suggested that when students register their bikes, a piece of education could be provided at that time. President Millea clarified that registration of bikes is not a requirement.

FACULTY SENATE DESIGNATES ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

Senator Follett reported that the QEP committee was compiling comments and generating a survey to get a better picture of needs across campus.

Senator Follett reported that the Honor Code Committee was still working on the policy and procedure.

BUSINESS TO BE SENT TO COMMITTEES

6.1 LETTER FROM DR. GILBERT RE: INSTRUCTORS – A motion was made by Senator Bailey and seconded by Senator Follett to send this business to the Faculty Affairs committee. The motion passed unanimously.

6.2 LETTER FROM DR. LEOPOLD RE: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS – A motion was made by Senator Porter and seconded by Senator Coyne to send this business to the Faculty Affairs committee. The motion passed unanimously.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

NO REPORT

ANCILLARY AFFAIRS

7.1.1 AOP 13.08 and OP 62.01 both Re: Travel

Senator Johnson reported that these documents are very similar and it is the Deans Council's recommendation to merge the documents. Currently the merged draft is in the Office of Procurement to ensure all state requirements are covered. From there, it will return to the Deans Council for approval then the Associate Deans Council followed by the Faculty Senate before adoption of the merged OP.

CHARTER AND BYLAWS

Senator Rude reported that his committee was nearly finished revising the Faculty Handbook.

FACULTY AFFAIRS

President Millea reported that last year Dr. Shaw requested the Senate to review the definition and scope of service. The Faculty Affairs Committee reported that the modifications suggested did not warrant opening up the Promotion and Tenure document. Additional requests from Provost Gilbert, Dr. Shaw and faculty indicated that we were ready to open up the document for review. The Faculty Affairs committee has been working on this document for this academic year. It has come before the Senate in January, February, and now March. Given the size and importance of the document, much thought has been given on how to manage discussion. The Faculty Affairs has a large portion in which they have agreement. The committee will move to accept that portion of the document. We will have discussion and then will vote on the wording of that portion only. There are 11 places where they were not in agreement but have options. The Faculty Affairs Committee has recommendations on most of those options. Where they do not, the Executive Committee has made a recommendation. The intent is not to preclude discussion, but to systematically bring them to the floor. When the Senate has accepted the wording, then they will be worked together for presentation to the senate for approval.

7.2.1 P&T document

Senator Coyne presented the Promotion and Tenure Document and made a motion on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee to accept the wording in the portion of the document that contains no options.

Senator Wise asked what the motivation for guaranteeing department head will provide a list of names to create a master list of potential external reviewers in section 9.1.2. Senator Coyne said that he thought that it was common practice across campus. Senator Wise commented that this would cross-contaminate the faculty stream of information and the administrator stream. Senator Coyne said that there was another place in the document where all 3 sources provide names. Senator Wise moved to strike "and Department head" from the section. Senator Byrd seconded the motion. Senator Toghiani commented that in the case where there are no full professors in a department, excluding the department head from providing names leads to a disadvantage for the candidate. Senator Rude suggested that Senator Wise change the amendment to read "or the Department Head" to allow flexibility for departments in their departmental P&T documents. Senator Foster said that both Wise and Toghiani had valid points; however, Senator Toghiani's concern would be eliminated by the ability of the candidate to ask the department head for suggestions of names for inclusion. Senator Wells said that a mix of both candidate and department head providing names in

his department works well. Senator Wise rejected Senator Rude's suggestion because it makes me uncomfortable to combine those streams of information. In a vote to accept the amendment to strike "and Department head" from section 9.1.2., the motion failed with a vote of 15-16-1.

Senator Byrd made a motion to strike "infant," add "in writing" to section 4.8.3 in accordance with the Work, Life, and Balance Committee. The motion was seconded Senator Jacobs. Senator Follett commented that the section should say "must" instead of "can." Senator Coyne said that it was changed to "can" to allow for the decision of an extension to happen before leaving. Senator Follett suggested to Senator Byrd to leave the sentence the same and add a second that says, "Such an agreement must be in writing." Senator Nagel suggested that the department P&T committee also needs to be aware of the extension and suggested the addition of "in writing" to the last sentence of the section. Senator Toghiani said that the department P&T committee only needs to know that an extension has been granted, but not the reasons for approval. President Millea didn't think that the addition required the committee to know the reason for the extension. Senator Porter suggested that it could read to say the applicant is to be notified in writing of the decision. President Millea clarified that the last sentence says that the committee is to be notified if an extension has been granted. Senator Leug asked for clarification if it would be too late to ask for an extension for an event that occurred in year one in the 3rd year. President Millea said that the window of opportunity is within 3 months of the event. Senator Coyne said that the original wording was added in order to provide flexibility for candidates to request an extension before or after return from leave. Senator Leug commented that "can" was not really the right word since it must be done before or within 3 months of return. President Millea clarified that the word choice was currently "must" then read section 4.8.3. as amended. In a vote to accept the amendment to strike "infant;" change "can" to "must;" add the sentence "Such an agreement must be in writing;" and add the phrase "in writing;" the motion passed.

Senator Byrd suggested that some wording be incorporated into Section 7.1 for departments that merge. The P&T process may vary greatly from the hiring department to the department that they are re-aligned to. Vice President Emison said that the University cannot change the terms of contracts. Senator Byrd withdrew her comment. Senator Nagel pointed out that when departments merge, they do change terms which is why Senator Byrd will like language in the document; however, this problem is covered in section 7.3.

Senator Dodds pointed out that in section 8.3.3.1.X. "mandatory" is misspelled.

Senator Byrd made a motion to require annual review of departmental P&T documents in section 8.2.2.2. The motion was seconded by Senator M. Hopper. Senator Walters asked what would be the point of an annual review if they are synced up with the University P&T document. Senator Byrd said her rationale was for the cases of consolidations of departments. Senator Walters pointed out that the college P&T committee would be doing the review so no new faculty would be looking at the document unless major changes were made. Senator Byrd said that she was mistaken and changed her amendment to include an annual review of departmental documents in section 8.3.3.1. Senator M. Hopper seconded her motion. Senator Wise commented that annual review of departmental documents would be a burden on the college PT committees to contact each department to make sure that their documents are the currently approved ones. Senator Hood suggested a three review of departmental documents. Senator Porter suggested a 5 year review because annual review could cause anxiety for new faculty. Senator Rude commented that section 8.2.2.8. delineates that the college P&T committee has to approve any changes to departmental P&T documents; however, it doesn't have anything about an annual review. Senator Berk commented that section 8.3.1. describes departmental P&T committees and does not prohibit departments from

establishing their own review cycle. Senator Jacobs said that he was aware of couple of departmental documents that had a review period. In a vote to amend section 8.3.3.1, the motion failed.

Senator Byrd asked if there are guidelines about when candidates must notify department heads of intent and referred to section 8.3.3.1.X. Senator Coyne said that it was addressed in another section. He said that it says that it is mandatory for departments to decide on a date, but left the decision up to the department.

Senator Nagel asked if the University document is allowing departments to set their own standards, why a minimum of four external letters is included. He referred to section 9.1.X. Senator Coyne said that he thought that this should be homogeneous across campus. He said that very frequently this is an issue for appeals because there aren't enough letters. A recommendation is included that you ask for more letters or start earlier. It says at least 4 because you can't exclude any letters received. Senator Nagel if my department requires me to have 8 letters and another requires 4; I have twice the requirements of someone else. Senator Nagel moved to amend the document to read "n=4," Senator Byrd seconded. Senator Toghiani said that it would put candidates at disadvantage if their committee only requested 4 and then received less. Senator Byrd suggested that as letters come in, committees could ask for more. Senator Coyne asked Senator Nagel what would happen with the extra letters and commented that choosing 4 out of those submitted would be biased. Senator Wise called to question. Vice President Emison seconded. The call to question passed by majority vote. In a vote to change "n=4 minimum" to "n=4," the motion failed.

Senator Walters asked why n=4 was included. Senator Coyne said the notation was included so it is easy to find. Senator Walters moved to strike n=4 throughout document because of redundancy. The motion was seconded by Senator Foster. Senator Bailey said that removal of n=4 would take out the number of letters required. Senator Walters clarified that in section 9.1.X "(4)" would replace "(n=4)" and "(n=4)" would be removed two times from section 9.1.3. Senator Toghiani said that if all letters received have to be included, the dossier may include more than 4 letters. Senator Coyne confirmed. Senator Jacobs moved to call to question, seconded by Senator Wells. The motion passed unanimously. In a vote to strike n=4 from sections 9.1.X. and 9.1.3., the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Coyne asked if the requirement for committees to be composed of at least three members is too small in section 8.3.2.1. Senator Wells said that three is small for large departments.

Senator Nagel made a motion to strike "tenured" in section 8.3.2.2. Senator Hood seconded. Senator Hood said that in departments with extension faculty, this would exclude extension faculty from serving on department P&T committee; however, we are under the same regime for promotion. Senator Elder said that since the document is a P&T document, it sounds like extension faculty may need a different mechanism for promotion. President Millea clarified that this amendment would allow faculty with rank to serve including clinical, research, and extension faculty to serve on P&T committees. Senator Hood added that in his department only tenured faculty vote on tenure questions. Senator Rude said that "tenured" could take out 8.3.2.2., but we may want to include "tenured" on 8.3.2.1. so that the committee has at least 3 tenured members so that non-tenure track faculty do not comprise the whole committee and make decisions on tenure. Vice President Emison asked if Senator Rude was suggesting 3 tenured members on the committee but in voting on tenure, the majority voting could be decided by non-tenured faculty. Senator Cox said that somewhere it says that if you are promotable, you are tenure-able. Senator Follett clarified that if you are tenured, you are automatically promoted to associate professor. Senator Wise said that he felt that there needed to be a separate promotion document. President Millea said that there is currently

no promotion-only document. Senator Carskadon said that if a non-tenured faculty member is voting on tenure, you could argue that they are making tenure more attainable for others so the precedent is set. Senator Walters asked if a sentence could be added that would say “Only tenured committee members can vote on tenure decisions.” Senator Toghiani said that if you are taking about tenured professors going up for promotion. President Millea clarified that this document applies to promotion and tenure of tenure track faculty. Senator Hood said that if this document doesn’t concern promotion of non-tenured faculty, then why does non-tenure track faculty serve on P&T committees. Senator Nagel 8.3.1 says that departments decide who makes up the committee. Senator Nagel pointed out that there was already a motion on the floor for an amendment. President Millea said that Senator Walter’s amendment was an amendment to Senator Nagel’s. Senator Wise called to question on the strike “tenure” amendment; Senator Foster seconded. President Millea read section 8.3.2.2. as amended by Senator Nagel. The motion to call the question passed by majority vote. In a vote to strike “tenured” from section 8.3.2.2., the motion failed by majority vote. Then, Senator Walters rescinded his amendment.

Senator Coyne has a motion on the floor from the Faculty Affairs Committee to accept the portion of the document as amended on the floor. Senator Wise moved to accept by acclamation; there was no second. In a vote to accept the wording of the document as amended, the motion passed by a majority vote.

After a short break, President Millea directed senators to move to the second portion of the P&T document where there are options to be considered.

Senator Coyne moved on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee to adopt option 1 of section 2.2.2. into the final promotion and tenure document. After no discussion, the motion passed by a majority vote.

Senator Coyne moved on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee to adopt option 1 of section 2.2.3. Senator Johnson noted that “their person’s” should be changed to “his or her.” The motion passed by a majority vote.

Senator Coyne moved on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee to adopt option 1 of section 6.1.1. Senator Elder asked why graded student work was removed. Senator Jacob asked how does graded student work qualify teaching. President Millea pointed out that sample course materials is still included and retaining graded student work was redundant. The motion passed by a majority vote.

Senator Coyne moved on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee to adopt option 2 of section 6.1.3. into the final P&T document. Senator Nagel pointed out that scholarship in the form of peer review publication is not part of service. Senator Byrd asked how it relates to service but not teaching. She said that it appears to be pointed directly at extension faculty. Senator Coyne said that the sources for input for these options were multiple, but preferred not to say how it was added. Senator Byrd asked the intent. Senator Coyne said that if this was going to be an academic mission for tenured track faculty member for them to get tenure, there should be some scholarship involved; however, it does not say what the scholarship has to be. Senator Byrd noted that the option eliminates moving to full professor with service as excellent. She asked if faculty should be publishing in the service area. Senator Coyne said one of the motivations for including, was to have a mechanism for demonstrating excellence rather than participation. Senator Brashier pointed out that there are faculty members that are presidents of their national associations. There is no way to publish that, but it is certainly excellent. Vice President Emison moved to delete the sentence beginning with “Scholarship in the form of...” in option 2; Senator Foster seconded. Senator Berk

pointed out that there are other options that speak to this issue. Senator Coyne pointed out the provided bulleted points that point out the salient features of each option. Senator Brashier asked the procedure to move to another option. President Millea said that option 2 would have to be voted down. In a vote to delete the sentence in option 2, the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Zhang asked why the portion in the 2nd paragraph of option 2 was struck. Senator Coyne said that it was contained in the preceding paragraph.

Senator Carskadon pointed out that every option with exception of the original makes it significantly more difficult to use service as a means to promotion. He said that if you favor service as a way to promotion, you should vote down anything other than option 6.

Senator Nagel moved to include “/plant” in addition to human and animal health in option 2; Senator Brashier seconded the motion. After no discussion, the motion passed by majority vote.

In a vote to adopt the wording of option 2 of section 6.1.3. as amended on the floor of the Senate for inclusion in the final P&T document; the motion failed.

Senator Carskadon moved to adopt option 6 of section 6.1.3. to maintain importance of service; Senator Follett seconded. After no discussion, the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Coyne reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee did not have a preferred option for section. 8.1.2. Vice President Emison moved to adopt option 3 of section 8.1.2.; Senator Bailey seconded. VP Emison explained that this option did not mingle faculty with administrators in the decision making process. Senator Brashier asked if the section was strictly referring to the university P&T committee. President Millea confirmed. Senator Nagel questioned why department head was stricken because there is some debate on if they are considered administrators or faculty members. President Millea said department heads are coded as faculty members and are able to serve on the Senate by university guidelines. Senator Jacob asked about the status of directors. President Millea said that the status of directors is ambiguous. Senator Bailey asked if department heads would be able to serve on P&T committees as it’s written. President Millea confirmed. Senator Nagel moved to add “or department heads.” Senator Bailey seconded. Senator Bullington asked about directors that are de facto department heads. Senator Nagel agreed that directors could be included. President Millea suggested that the section could include directors of academic units. Senator Toghiani would that include directors of research centers and asked if they had administrator status. President Millea said that they would be able to serve dependent upon the director’s classification. Senator Jacobs clarified that they should only serve if they are not involved with the P&T process in another phase. Senator Brashier asked if the clauses provided were already included or yet to be voted on. President Millea said that they could be included were not at that point. Senator Brashier pointed out that if they were linked it would take care of the concerns. Senator Follett commented that since the section deals with the composition of the university committee should it read “the committee” rather than “a committee.” In a vote to accept the amendment of department head/director of an academic unit, the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Nagel moved to include clause 2 into option 3 of section 8.1.2.; Senator Brashier seconded. Senator Bullington commented that it would be an ineffective clause due to the fact that it would never happen since the section deals with the university committee. Senator Toghiani asked if it would address a conflict of interest between people serving on the university P&T committee and a candidate. Senator Toghiani asked what would the mechanism for appointing an administrator in this event. President Millea said that it would have to happen at the college level. In a vote to include clause 2 into option 3 of section 8.1.2., the motion failed by majority vote.

Senator Toghiani moved to include clause 1 into option 3. Senator Elder seconded. Senator Bailey commented that it was already included in the amendment to option 3. Senator Toghiani rescinded the motion.

Senator Wise called to question. The motion was seconded by Senator Bailey. The motion passed by majority vote.

In a vote on option 3 as written in agenda and amended in the committee of the whole, the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Coyne reported that the Faculty Affairs committee did not have a preferred option for section 9.1.2. dealing with the definition of conflict of interest related to external reviewers. Vice President Emison moved on behalf of the Executive Council to accept option 3b with the change of “tenured professors” to “tenured faculty.” Senator Follett seconded the motion. VP Emison said that the option made it clear who should be consulted, but also provides some flexibility. Senator Johnson pointed out that “exempt” should be changed to “excluded.” Senator M. Hopper what was the intent of the addition of collaborating co-authors. Senator Coyne said that some of the language has been inserted from the good practices guide where you can’t include co-authors; however, for some disciplines that would be impossible because of how they publish. He said that there may be a better way to word it, but the intent was to not exclude someone who published in a manuscript with 100 others. Senator Foster asked how peer and peer-plus institutions are defined, by whom, and if they were appropriate for each department. Senator Coyne said that there is a list in the Provost’s office. Senator Berk said that departments have submitted their list to the Benchmarking Committee. President Millea pointed out that both peer and peer-plus institutions and departments are included in the wording because they may be different. Senator Foster said that it should be determined at the time that the P&T committee solicits letters because it may be difficult to find specialists in some areas. Senator Wells said that since generally is stricken, extension faculty could not be external reviews. President Millea said that it does limit reviewers to tenured faculty. Senator Elder asked why the italicized section was italicized and asked about the phrase “In disciplines or field where the general conflict-of-interest definition commonly does not apply...” Senator Coyne said that the wording came from a department where this applied. They said that commonly they don’t do this way and would like the ability to justify external reviewers.

Senator Hood pointed out that the document only applies for promotion for tenure track faculty only and said that he did not feel comfortable making decisions as a non-tenure track faculty member. President Millea said that she understood his feelings, but as a member of the Senate, he was representing the entire faculty of his college.

Senator Brashier moved to un-strike “generally” from option 3b; Senator Follett seconded. Senator Toghiani pointed out that the addition of generally would allow national recognized members of various fields to provide external reviews even if they are not tenured faculty. Senator Dobbs said that the addition of generally would also resolve concerns with peer and peer-plus departments and institutions. Senator Toghiani asked if the word “generally” is added should a mandate of a number of letters be academic. President Millea said that it could be added. Senator Berk said that someone who has never been through the tenure process may not have a basis for the process. Senator Coyne said that it was originally crossed out to mandate that reviewers were tenured faculty. Senator Berk commented that there is nothing that precludes the submission of ten letters with for being from tenured faculty and six from others from national labs or Nobel laureates. This is just establishing the minimum criteria. Senator Toghiani said that without the word generally all ten letters would have to be from tenured faculty. Senator Follett said with “generally” added, he felt that there would

be rare case where you would have one non-tenured letter, so he wasn't sure that it would be an issue. Senator Toghiani said that it would be in some departments. Senator Follett said that he felt it would be very rare. Senator Bullington said that departments could write more restrictive criteria. Senator Rude asked if the generally could apply to a specific packet rather than a letter because that would be very rare that a candidate was in a specialty with no tenured faculty at a peer or peer-plus institution.

Senator Franz called to question; Senator Follett seconded. The motion passed by majority vote.

In a vote to add the word "generally" to option 3b of section 9.1.2., the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Jacobs asked if the definition of conflict of interest in option 3b is inconsistent with the university Human Resources policy which establishes conflict of interest.

Senator Wise called to question. Senator Brashier seconded. The motion passed by majority vote.

In a vote to include the wording of option 3b as amended to section 9.1.2., the motion passed.

Senator Coyne reported that the Faculty Affairs committee recommended option 1 for section 9.1.2. regarding external letter reviewer qualifications. Senator Brashier said that in option 1 a candidate can submit a list of reviewers, but it doesn't state that the list has to be observed. President Millea said that it would seem as though you could not get a letter from someone where a conflict of interest has been identified by the language of the entire document. Senator Toghiani said there are situation where the department head or members of the department P&T committee may not be aware of external reviewers that have conflicts of interest with particular candidates and commented that the last sentence of the option says that the candidate's list needs to be considered. Senator Brashier said that option 2 gives the candidate the right to exclude someone. Vice President Emison said that the Executive committee didn't agree with the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs committee because of the burden on the applicant to reveal any conflicts of interest, and would be prepared to suggest option 3. In a vote on option 1 for section 9.1.2., the motion failed.

Vice President Emison moved to engross option 3 so that there was shared decision making on the list, but no burden to the applicant. Senator Bailey seconded. Senator Foster asked why option 2 was not the preferred option, where the candidate has some veto power. President Millea said that in option 2 the candidate sees the entire list, and there was a concern with anonymity of reviewers. Senator Toghiani asked how the rights of faculty are protected. Senator Rude said that option 3 does not prohibit candidates from giving a list of people that would not be good reviewers also departments can write that into their departmental P&T documents. Senator Carskadon pointed out that maximum protection of candidates is the biggest concern, option 2 is the best choice; however in light of the concerns mentioned, option 3 is best. Senator Byrd asked if department head needed to be removed in light of earlier decisions made. President Millea said that the earlier decision was concerning the university P&T committee. In a voting to incorporate the wording of option 3 into section 9.1.2., the motion passed by majority vote.

Senator Coyne reported that the Faculty Affairs committee did not have a recommended option for section 9.1.5. regarding what stage candidates should be notified of decisions. VP Emison moved on behalf of the Executive committee to accept option 2. The motion was seconded Senator Wise. VP Emison said that the option gets the information to the candidate at appropriate stops and requires explanation to candidate at each level and provides opportunity for rebuttal. Senator Dobbs pointed out that "rational" should be "rationale" and "their" should be "his or her." Senator Jacobs asked if there was concern for anonymity of letter writers because some comments could be so distinct that

the candidate would know who the writer was. In that case reviewers should be notified that likely their letter would not be anonymous. VP Emison said that there was a concern for mischaracterized reviewers' comments and candidates cannot rebuttal. Senator Jacobs moved to delete "all of the original (exact) language." Senator Rude seconded. Senator Carskadon said that it is important to protect the faculty member and the amendment would not. Senator Bailey said that using phrases rather than sentences the information could be taken out of context without the entirety. Senator Rodgers asked will candidate get a copy of the letter or a paraphrasing from the letter. VP Emison clarified that if decision was made on the letter, the portion would be lifted from the letter and provided on the letter of justification of the decision to the candidate. Senator Berk said that the option provides for the communication of the content of the letters. Senator Jacobs said that it could be done in a summary. Senator Toghiani said that candidates should have access to what was said in the letters to allow for rebuttal of factual errors before the committee makes a decision. Senator Berk said that it would also give opportunity to pull the application for promotion decisions. Senator Wise called to question; Senator Carskadon seconded. The motion passed by majority vote. In a vote on the strike through provided by Senator Jacobs, the motion failed.

Senators Johnson and Dobbs reworded the portion of the option previously amended to read, "The Department Head will accurately describe to the candidate in a written letter the recommendation and rationale..." Senator Toghiani expressed concern for the percentage of direct quotes from letter. Senator Berk asked if Department Heads were to write a summary of each letter submitted by external reviewers for the candidate as they come in. VP Emison clarified that the department head was to describe what in the letters brought the committee to their decision. Senator Berk pointed out that that the option says each letter must be described. Senator Bailey asked if there was another place in the document where candidates have the right to see what is in the letters. He said that this section appears to be dealing with the department head's decision. Senator Coyne said that the intent of the option is that the first notification to the candidate comes from the department head at the departmental level. Senator Franz said that this option would be that in one long letter the department head would include what is in external letters, the departmental P&T committee recommendation, and his/her own recommendation. Senator Coyne confirmed. Senator Byrd said that option 2 is eliminating the departmental P&T committee from providing letters to candidates of their recommendation. Senator Coyne confirmed. VP Emison said that the department head has to convey complete rationale for the decision, to make sure candidate gets a picture to adjust their behavior appropriately. Senator Wells asked if that meant that department heads would have to write all those positives and negatives. President Millea said that only parts that contribute to the decision would be included. Senator Berk expressed concern for quorum and said that it may be more important to discuss what happens to external letters first in 9.1.2. President Millea said that the Executive committee has established a link between 9.1.5. and the last phrase of 9.1.2; therefore, disposing of 9.1.2. limits the options of 9.1.5. In a vote to adopt the wording of option 2 as amended, the motion passed by majority vote 13-8

President Millea said that the Faculty Affairs committee did not have a recommendation for section 9.1.2 concerning applicant rebuttal of reviewers. Vice President Emison moved on behalf of the Executive Committee to recommend option 2. The motion was seconded. Senator Byrd called to quorum. President Millea said that the meeting no longer had a quorum. She said that the document could be discussed further, but cannot conduct official business. Senator Zhang asked what about the last vote. President Millea said that since the question was raised prior to the vote on 9.1.5. results will be eliminated. She said will ask Senator Coyne to attend and will ask senate to approve him as a consultant. Senator Toghiani asked if new members of the senate would be apprised of the current state of the document. President Millea said that the items voted on during the meeting

would be engrossed into the document and continue with what has not been dealt with. Then the full document will be presented as a whole, at that point any part can be discussed and then the whole document will be voted upon for adoption. Senator Elder asked if the minutes would reflect what has been done today. President Millea said that it would and a copy of the minutes would be sent before the agenda. She expressed appreciation for the time and patience of the senators present.

Senator Follett made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Senator Bailey.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Submitted for correction and approval.

Dana Pomykal Franz, Secretary