

Faculty Senate
Minutes
April 4, 2012
Classroom Building 118

I. **Call to Order:** 3:05 p.m. by Senator Dixon

Attending:

Dan Althoff

Brett Elliott

Halet Poovey

Dennis Brewster

Diane Dixon

Susan Webb

Chris Bradshaw

Steven Emge

William Fridley

Bruce Johnson

Richard Braley

Chris Moretti

Kathleen Hargrove

Not Attending:

Deborah Combs

Jacob Wallace

Michael Reed

Lawrence Silver

Riley Coker

George Jacox

Martin Bressler

Kay Daigle

Blythe Duell

II. **Approval of March 14, 2012 minutes:** with minor numbering and format changes, the Minutes were approved

III. **Archivist Report**

- A. Tabled items 4 & 5 from March 14 meeting—these two items were un-tabled (motion Senator Fridley, second Senator Elliot, unanimous approval). The two items were then withdrawn (motion Senator Fridley, second Senator Poovey, unanimous approval).

IV. **Committee reports**

A. **Personnel Policies (report attached below)**

1. Post-Tenure Review—Senator Fridley began explaining and commenting on the portion of the Personnel Policies Committee report that pertained to the March 28th meeting of the Post-Tenure Review Task Force. While Senator Fridley was explaining his understanding of the response of the administrators on the task force to the FS approved “Post-Tenure Review: A Recommended Policy and Procedure,” Dr. Bryon Clark walked into the meeting. Senator Fridley then asked Dr. Clark for comment on the task force meeting and the response of the administrators to the Senate’s recommended policy.

Dr. Clark indicated that he came primarily to discuss the APPM (Agenda item), and that while the task force meetings were the preferred venue to discuss these

matters, he would entertain our questions. He made it clear that his opinions were subject to change (he was open to being “persuaded”) and that his comments did not necessarily reflect those of President Minks. A major point of discussion was Dr. Clark’s argument that post-tenure review be considered a personnel decision and since the President has ultimate authority on personnel decisions, the President (or his designee) should have a say in the post-tenure review processes. Several senators objected to this position; citing policy, offering counter examples, and providing reasons for why post-tenure review is a means for evaluation of faculty and for faculty development, and should not be regarded as a personnel decision. Only in the event of two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations, it was argued, does post-tenure review become a personnel issue with bearing on the faculty member’s employment status. And, it was noted that both current policy and the FS’s recommended policy recognize and allow for that eventuality.

Dr. Clark was asked if there were any other specific objections to the recommended policy. He cited one example: namely, that the recommended policy document included two “outdated” references to ‘BOROC’ (an acronym for Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges). One senator objected that such a technicality that can easily be fixed is hardly substantive grounds on which to object to a recommended policy. Furthermore, reasoned the senator, the term ‘BOROC’ is used numerous times in the APPM. Dr. Clark replied that the APPM was unreliable in respect to this because it is “woefully outdated.”

2. APPM—Senator Fridley read the section of the Personnel Policies Report (attached below) titled “Ongoing ‘Developments’ on the APPM.” Dr. Clarke then indicated that this was the topic he wanted to discuss with the FS. Dr. Clark was asked if he had been invited to attend the meeting. He replied that he had not. He indicated that he saw the topic listed on the Meeting Agenda and wanted to inform the Senate about some developments in the administrative response to the specific action items request that the Personnel Policies Committee sent to Dr. Clark on Wednesday, March 7, 2012. Dr. Clark apologized for not responding to the action item request document, and he went on to explain the actions he was prepared to take. In effect, there were three proposed actions: a policy on policies would be included in a preface to Chapter 1 of the APPM, editorial changes to Chapters 1 and 2 of the APPM, and approved policy recommendations would be included for Chapters 1 and 2 of the APPM. Dr. Clark indicated that he would send the documents to Senator Dixon to distribute to the FS for review. When asked if he could provide the FS with a written description of these proposed actions, Dr. Clark expressed his view that he did not see the need for this. Other senators seemed to agree, and said in effect: no need to give a written explanation of what you are going to do, just do it (i.e. send us the documents). Dr. Clark’s unannounced visit had taken approximately 45 minutes.

B. Planning

1. Faculty Senate Award tie-breaker—a secret ballot tie-breaker vote for one of the Faculty Senate awards for Teaching was conducted.

C. Executive

1. Topic for Shared Governance Forum--The Senate decided that we needed to solicit questions as to what questions we wanted on the faculty opinion survey about promotion and tenure. The Senate Chair will send an email asking for suggestions for questions to the Faculty Senate. Faculty senators should ask faculty that they represent if they have any suggestions. The questions would be due Monday April 9th at 5. The executive committee would meet Tuesday at 11 to finalize the survey. The survey would be put on Survey Monkey on Wednesday. Faculty would have until Wednesday the 11th to complete the survey. (we lost the quorum at 4:10)

D. Committee on Committees

E. University Affairs

F. Budget

V. Old Business

VI. **New Business--** We also discussed the problem of senators not coming to meetings. It was suggested that if a faculty senator missed 3 meetings in a row that could be grounds to be asked to be dismissed.

VII. Adjournment—4:20

Respectfully submitted,

William Lloyd Fridley (and Diane Dixon and Brett Elliot)

Personnel Policies Report to the Faculty Senate—Wednesday, April 4, 2012

Post-Tenure Review Task Force

Background:

The Personnel Policies Committee submitted two documents for the task force's consideration:

- "A Critical Analysis of the Faculty Senate's Principles for Post-Tenure Review: An Explanation, Clarification, and Justification with Policy Recommendations" (approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 8, 2012)
- "Post-Tenure Review: A Recommended Policy and Procedure" (approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of February 22, 2012)

The Faculty Senate also approved a policy recommendation on February 22 to change the wording of references in the APPM from "two consecutive unsatisfactory post-tenure performance evaluations **will be** grounds for dismissal or suspension" to "**may be**" in order to conform to RUSO policy. The policy recommendation was emailed by the Faculty Senate to Dr. McMillan (cc Larry Minks and Bryon Clark) on March 2. On March 9, Dr. McMillan emailed Diane Dixon (cc Minks, Clark, Scoufos) recommending that the policy recommendation should be sent to Dean Scoufos. FS Chair Dixon responded to Dr. McMillan on March 9 with an explanation of why the policy recommendation was sent to the administration. On March 12, the Faculty Senate emailed the policy recommendation to Dean Scoufos (cc the FS Executive Committee). The policy recommendation was included in the packet of documents provided to the PTR Task Force.

Meeting Dates:

The original date scheduled for the second meeting of the PTR Task Force was for Monday, March 12. This was then changed to Wednesday, March 28.

Providing FS Documents to the Task Force:

The "Critical Analysis" document and the text of 3 related motions that were approved by the FS on 2/8 was emailed to Dean Scoufos by William Fridley on 2/9 (cc Personnel Policies Committee). A hard copy of the document was hand delivered to Dean Scoufos' office on 2/9. The document was also sent to Dean Scoufos on 3/1 as an email attachment from Diane Dixon (cc FS Executive Committee).

On March 9, Dean Scoufos emails the PTR TF and attaches files of relevant documents. The email does not include the "Critical Analysis" document. On March 10, William Fridley sends Dean Scoufos an email informing her of the omission and again attaches the document.

A "bound" hard copy version of the PTR documents is delivered to members of the PTR TF on Monday, 3/26. It does not include the "Critical Analysis" document.

Meeting of the Task Force:

The PTR TF met on Wednesday, March 28. The meeting started at approximately 3:15.

Members Present: Lawrence Silver (replacing Jane Licata), Chris Moretti, Dennis Brewster, William Fridley, George Jacox, Hal Poovey, Dan Althoff, Claire Stubblefield, Lucretia Scoufos, Jerry Polson, Bryon Clark, and Stacy Weger (replacing Will Mawer)

Dean Scoufos asks if all the relevant documents were included in the binder. When informed that it did not include the “Critical Analysis” document, she requested that one of her assistants run copies of the document. The copies were then distributed to those attending the meeting.

There was no Agenda for the meeting, and it did not appear that there was any clear direction for how the meeting should proceed.

Dean Scoufos asks if there is agreement that we should have PTR. It is mentioned that since PTR is a RUSO requirement, we don’t have any choice in the matter.

The matter of the recommended language change in the APPM (from “will be” to “may be”) was brought to the floor. There was consensus on supporting the recommended language change.

It was then suggested that the FS’s “Post-Tenure Review: A Recommended Policy and Procedure” be used as a starting point for discussion since it was the product of much thoughtful deliberation and was approved by the FS and endorsed by the SE Chapter of the AAUP. It quickly became apparent that the administrators were not familiar with the document.

While the administrators were at a loss to give specific or detailed criticism of the recommended policy, a major source of their resistance seemed to be that—in their minds—the policy did not allow for sufficient administrative input.

In response, Stacy Weger suggested modifying the Faculty Senate’s recommended post-tenure review policy to allow more participation from the Dean of Instruction. He suggested that in the event the departmental review committee upheld a department chair’s “unsatisfactory” evaluation of the professor, then the Dean would work in conjunction with the department chair in order to craft the plan of action for the professor to remedy identified deficiencies. This idea seemed to be welcomed by the FS members present in that it would work to support Dean Scoufos’ stated desire to use the post-tenure review process as a means for faculty development.

A related suggestion was that the Dean of Instruction could focus on supervising the evaluative methods and protocols of department chairs. It was argued that this could serve to ensure evaluative consistency across the university, and it would also be an intelligent division of labor (rather than having the Dean review and make an evaluative decision on every PTR).

I (William Fridley) had to leave the meeting at 4:20 to teach a class. I was told that Dean Scoufos indicated she would draft a report of the meeting to deliver to Dr. McMillan, and that another meeting of the PTR TF would be scheduled.

As of today (4/4/12), a meeting has not been scheduled.

On Thursday, 3/29, a newly-bound copy of the PTR documents was delivered to members of the TF. It included the "Critical Analysis" document.

Ongoing "Developments" on the APPM

"Communication" and attempts to arrange meetings between the Personnel Policies Committee, FS Executive Committee, and Drs. McMillan and Clark continue. As of today, no definitive action on our long-standing concerns (a policy on policy, decisions on pending policy recommendations, edits of the APPM) have taken place.