

**Agenda for the Personnel Policies Committee Meeting—Monday, February 27, 3:00 in BS 205**

To be held as a joint meeting with the FS Executive Committee

- To discuss how we can assist Dr. McMillan and best respond to his request for further documentation of FS work on academic policies and shared governance (in response to Dr. McMillan's email of February 22, 2012).
  
- To discuss how we can assist Dr. Clark and his request to schedule dates to continue his work with the Personnel Policies Committee on the APPM (in response to Dr. Clark's email of February 20, 2012, which was sent in response to William Fridley's email of November 15, 2011)
  
- To discuss the degree of progress in our long standing efforts to communicate with the administration on matters of policy, the documentation of these efforts, and the substantive results of these efforts in terms of the formal adoption of (and response to) FS policy recommendations, the consistent application of and compliance with existing policies, keeping a timely record of policy changes, and clearly communicating with the FS in a timely manner.
  
- To discuss established FS protocols for communication with the administration.

### **Minutes from the Personnel Policies Committee Meeting of Monday, February 27**

The joint meeting with the Executive Committee was held on a picnic table on the grounds of the Biological Sciences Building. It was a beautiful day, albeit windy. The meeting convened at 3:20.

Members Present: William Fridley, Dennis Brewster, Dan Althoff

Executive Committee Members Present: Diane Dixon, Chris Moretti

- To discuss how we can assist Dr. McMillan and best respond to his request for further documentation of FS work on academic policies and shared governance (in response to Dr. McMillan's email of February 22, 2012).

A working draft of a document was presented to the group and the group discussed revisions. It was agreed that the document would be honed through email correspondence amongst the committee members before being sent to Dr. McMillan.

- To discuss how we can assist Dr. Clark and his request to schedule dates to continue his work with the Personnel Policies Committee on the APPM (in response to Dr. Clark's email of February 20, 2012, which was sent in response to William Fridley's email of November 15, 2011)

It was agreed that a statement would be drafted that would request a consolidation of our work over the last year on the APPM. We agreed to include requests for three action items:

A policy on policies; a decision on pending Faculty Senate policy recommendations; editorial changes to the APPM, Chapters 1—3

It was agreed that the statement would be honed before it was sent to Bryan Clark.

- To discuss the degree of progress in our long standing efforts to communicate with the administration on matters of policy, the documentation of these efforts, and the substantive results of these efforts in terms of the formal adoption of (and response to) FS policy recommendations, the consistent application of and compliance with existing policies, keeping a timely record of policy changes, and clearly communicating with the FS in a timely manner.

The discussion of these topics was covered in our discussions of the specific documents we were drafting.

- To discuss established FS protocols for communication with the administration.

The issue of the "smoke-free" campus was discussed. One member of the committee (a smoker) revealed that he would not want to argue against a "smoke-free" campus. He had no desire to be on the wrong side of history. However, the time-frame and voting mechanisms used by the FS were briefly discussed. It was recommended that the committee discuss (in the near future) the development of some kind of deliberative voting mechanism for these types of "emergency" situations.

### Information Items for the Faculty Senate—Meeting of March 14, 2012

1. Text of email sent from Doug McMillan to Diane Dixon and William Fridley on Wednesday, February 22, 2012 at 3:47 PM:

The following paragraph was included in the minutes from the meeting of the Faculty Senate Personnel Policy Committee on January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012.

The PPC expressed a sense of discouragement about what we perceive as a lack of administrative responsiveness to, clear communication about, and action on Faculty Senate concerns about policy. These concerns have included post-tenure review, tenure and promotion processes, departmental criteria for T & P, long-pending policy recommendations, formal processes for shared governance, developing and publishing a policy on making policy, faculty prerogatives to create classroom policies, the selection processes for academic department chairs, departmental independence, policy and precedent on faculty re-applying for tenure and promotion, and fulfillment of the University's mission to "adhere to well-defined organizational structures, policies, and procedures (APPM 1.5.2 "for the faculty" point 3).

In an effort to better communicate about these issues, I am attempting to develop a document that describes the administrative response to the issues that the Personnel Policy Committee is discouraged about. I have not been able to find any Faculty Senate Documents on the following issues: any long-pending policy recommendations, the selection processes for academic department chairs, departmental independence, and policy and precedent on faculty re-applying for tenure and promotion. These issues were taken directly from the minutes of the Personnel Policy Committee. Will you please send me any supporting documents for each of these items, so that I can determine if the administration ever did respond to these items. If no response has been forthcoming I want to try to get you one as soon as possible. I am working on responses to the other issues raised in the minutes and will have them to you shortly.

Thank You,

Doug McMillan

---

2. Text of the Document drafted by members of the FS Executive Committee and the Personnel Policies Committee that was emailed to Dr. McMillan on from the Faculty Senate on Wednesday, March 7, 2012 at 12:37 PM.

Dr. Douglas McMillan  
Vice President  
Academic Affairs

Dr. McMillan:

The Faculty Senate is in receipt of your email request (February 22, 2012) for information concerning issues of the Senate. It would appear that the hard work of the Senate has not been properly

distributed to the appropriate administrators dealing with many of the important issues facing this university. We find this troubling. There would appear to be two issues at stake in your request. First, is the issue of providing the necessary information described in your email; and second, is an apparent gap in the flow of information from and in the response to Senate actions.

Concerning the matter of information that you have requested, and in the spirit of cooperation, we would offer the following ideas. First, many of the items that you mention have been discussed with various administrators and Senators over the years. For example, Dr. Clark has been working with the Senate Personnel Policies committee on policy issues, so he could provide both the Senate policy recommendations and resolutions and the progress on implementation of those recommendations and resolutions. Second, the Faculty Senate is more than willing to provide information that you cannot locate through your office. All of the Senate records can be found on our website. We suggest that you contact the Faculty Senate Archivist, Dr. William Fridley (216 Morrison Hall, extension 2638) to schedule an appointment at which time Dr. Fridley will assist you in working through any missing information that you might need. If Dr. Fridley cannot supply the needed information he can then request the information, from the various Senate committees. The Senate is confident that Dr. Fridley, working through the Faculty Senate organizational structure, will be able to assist in all of the issues of information you seek, both from a documentation level and a substantive history of the issues you are seeking to address.

**Comment [wf1]:** Insert a comma here

Concerning the information gap noted in the first paragraph above: the Personnel Policies committee has been working with Dr. Clark to develop a policy on creating and/or modifying policy since the spring of 2011 without any definitive result. We feel a clear policy with regards to the receipt and routing of information from the Senate to the administration and from the administration to the senate will help resolve the issues with the information flow. We are concerned that the administration has not taken the proper procedural steps to protect the process of shared governance at Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

We hope our response to your request can be processed in an expedient manner and we welcome your response to the many issues you addressed in your request. As always the Faculty Senate welcomes the opportunity to discuss issues facing both the University and the faculty at Southeastern Oklahoma State University.

Cordially,

The Executive Committee and The Personnel Policies Committee of The Faculty Senate

3. A list of related email exchanges will be include in the next Personnel Policies Committee Report

4. Text of the document that was attached to the email of March 7, 2012, at 2:33 PM from William Fridley (Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee) to Bryon Clark:

Wednesday, March 07, 2012

Dr. Clark,

On Monday, February 27<sup>th</sup>, the Personnel Policies Committee met jointly with the Executive Committee to discuss how we should proceed with our work on the APPM. We agreed that it would be best at this point to solidify our work of the last year into some tangible form before moving any further. Toward that end, we would like to recommend three action items:

1. We request that you provide—for the Faculty Senate’s review—the draft of the *policy on policies* that you shared with us at one of our meetings this summer. Upon the Faculty Senate’s review and approval, we will ask that the *policy on policies* be formally included in Chapter 1 of the APPM, and that an email announcement of the formal policy adoption be sent to the SE Faculty.
2. We request a formal response to all the pending Faculty Senate policy recommendations that you were given last year. The formal response can be: (a) official adoption of the policy recommendation and inclusion and publication of the policy in the APPM (accompanied by an email announcement to SE Faculty), or (b) a detailed explanation of why the policy recommendation will not be adopted, and/or a detailed explanation of what needs to be changed in the policy for official adoption to occur. The Faculty Senate will then review and respond to these detailed explanations.
3. We request that you provide—for the Faculty Senate’s review—a Word document of Chapters 1—3 of the APPM that includes and clearly indicates the recommended editorial revisions that you and our committee have made in our meetings. These editorial changes shall only include matters of compositional clarity, punctuation, spelling, and the revision of outdated references. In short, these editorial revisions shall contain no substantive policy changes. Upon the Faculty Senate’s review and approval of these editorial changes, we will request that said changes be published in the APPM. Moreover, we request that the publication of these revised chapters be done in a way in which there is ready access to a record of what changes were made and when they were made.

We believe the achievement of these items would be a great stride in improving the clarity of university policies and procedures, and would mark an important step in improving the process of shared governance at our university.

Thank you,

William

Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate

5. A list of related emails will be included in the next Personnel Policies Report

**One Action Item for Discussion:** Any suggestions on how the meetings of the Post-Tenure Review Task Force should be reported to the Senate?