

**2012-2013 Year-End Report of the Personnel Policies Committee—for the FS Meeting of May 1, 2013
(includes Report on our last meeting, and charges for 2013—2014)**

Meeting Report

Agenda Items for meeting of April 30:

- Discussing and developing procedures for conducting FS votes and business electronically (and perhaps re-visit procedures for conducting FS business in the Summer)
 - Discussing and developing policy and procedures pertaining to the *percentage cap on tenured faculty*
 - Review and discuss Senator Moretti's proposal on faculty load allocations (i.e. the percentage of time devoted to *teaching, scholarship, and service*)
 - Review the policies on *family leave*
 - Draft the charges for next year's Personnel Policies Committee
-

Met on Tuesday, April 30 at 2:00 in the Faculty Lounge

Members present: William Fridley, John Mischo, Dan Althoff

A quorum was not present, but there was discussion over the following points:

- 1. Discussing and developing procedures for conducting FS votes and business electronically (and perhaps re-visit procedures for conducting FS business in the Summer)**

There was agreement that email voting should only be a “last resort” and only used in extraordinary circumstances. At the same time, extraordinary circumstances are those that would seem to call for discussion and deliberation by the Senate. Therefore, the consensus was that electronic votes not be used.

We discussed the related issue of parliamentary procedures for maintaining a quorum throughout a meeting. Specifically, we asked whether a quorum must be maintained in order to carry on official business, or whether, once a quorum is attained that would suffice to conduct official business at a meeting (even if a quorum is no longer present). We found no guidance in the APPM. After the meeting, Senator Althoff forwarded the relevant section from *Robert's Rules of Order*:
<http://www.robertsrules.com/faq.html#3>

Question 3:

Is it true that, once a quorum has been established, it continues to exist no matter how many members leave during the course of the meeting?

Answer:

No. Once a quorum at a meeting has been established, the continued presence of a quorum is presumed to exist only until the chair or any other member notices that a quorum is no longer present. If the chair notices the absence of a quorum, he or she should declare this fact, at least before taking any vote or stating the question on any new motion. Any member noticing the apparent absence of a quorum can and should make a *Point of Order* to

that effect whenever another person is not speaking. It is dangerous to allow the transaction of substantive business to continue in the absence of a quorum. Although a *Point of Order* relating to the absence of a quorum is generally not permitted to affect prior action, if there is clear and convincing proof no quorum was present when business was transacted, the presiding officer can rule that business invalid (subject to appeal). [RONR (11th ed.), pp. 348-49; see also pp. 12-13 of [RONRIB](#).]

2. Discussing and developing policy and procedures pertaining to the *percentage cap on tenured faculty*

The issue had been discussed previously in communication with Vice President McMillan, regarding the current percentage of tenured faculty and how that percentage is calculated.

At the April 10 meeting of the Executive Committee and Drs. McMillan and Clark, Dr. McMillan indicated that we were very close to 65% tenured faculty, and he suggested that the FS develop some procedures for how that should be handled.

The policy on the tenure cap is APPM 4.6.4:

The Regional University System of Oklahoma Board of Regents **recommends** that not more than sixty-five percent (65%) of the full-time faculty at a University receive tenure. Once the sixty-five percent limit is reached, there will be no additions to the tenured faculty at Southeastern. However, the tenure process on campus will continue. Faculty members recommended for tenure will be placed in a priority-hold status by year pending tenure vacancies.

We noted that this is a RUSO recommendation. We also thought it might be a good idea for the FS to draft some principles for how this issue should be handled. Ideas included clarification of the definition of *full-time faculty*, when a professor retires, that should be regarded as an 'open slot' and not as a reduction of faculty members (and thus a higher percentage of tenured faculty); and, using a seniority system for those on "priority-hold status" (i.e. those with the most years at assistant professor would be the first to receive tenure).

3. Review and discuss Senator Moretti's proposal on faculty load allocations (i.e. the percentage of time devoted to *teaching, scholarship, and service*)

We agreed to forward consideration of this proposal to next year.

4. Review the policies on *family leave*

Senator Mischo had done some research on family leave policies in the RUSO Manual, at our sister institutions, and a recent AAUP report on family leave. We agreed to forward discussion of this topic to next year.

5. 2013-2014 Charges for the Personnel Policies Committee

- a. Continue work on Tenure & Promotion policies, their incorporation into the APPM, and holding workshops to explain the policy changes to faculty.
- b. Continue work with Drs. McMillan and Clark on post-tenure review policy.
- c. Continue to work with Dr. Clark on editorial revisions to the APPM.
- d. Develop a position paper with protocols on the 65% tenure cap recommended by RUSO
- e. Explore and investigate family leave policies: research pertinent documents, interview pertinent parties (e.g. Human Resources), poll faculty for their concerns on the matter, collect case studies of faculty experiences with family leave.
- f. Explore Dr. Moretti's proposal on allocation of teaching, service, and scholarship for full professors.
- g. Explore protocols for conducting FS business electronically

Prepared by Senator William Fridley