**For the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 9, 2016**
Three Motions from the Personnel Policies Committee

## Motion 1

It is moved that the numbering and headings of the APPM 3.6 be updated as follows:

- **3.6 Function and Membership of General Faculty Councils** change to **3.6 General Faculty Councils**
- Add **3.6.1 Function and Membership of General Faculty Councils**
- **3.7 Other Committees and Councils** change to **3.6.2 Other Councils and Committee**

**Rationale:** To remove an inadvertent redundancy in the numbering of the APPM.

## Motion 2

It is moved that the policy on the Shared Governance Forum format (APPM 3.8, Shared Governance Forum, paragraph two) be replaced with the following:

Two forums will be held each semester. The topic for one forum will be determined by the President and the topic for the other forum will be determined by the Chair of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Chair will then arrange (date, time, place) the meeting and agenda between the President and the Faculty Senate (all faculty will be notified and invited to attend the meetings). Faculty will be informed of the topics for the meeting at least two weeks prior to the meeting. While members of the faculty are encouraged to actively participate at the meeting, it is recognized that not all faculty may be able to attend. In such circumstance, the faculty senators may represent or speak for members of the faculty at the faculty member's request. The agenda sequence will alternate between the President's topic and the Faculty Senate's topic. A report of this meeting will be part of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee report to the Faculty Senate. The report will be sent to the President for review, prior to publication of the report on the website.

**Rationale:** To align the policy on the Shared Governance Forum format with the current practice.

Should Motions 1 and 2 pass, they be emailed to VPAA Clark, with the request that the Senate Archivist be permitted to make these editorial changes in the working Word document version of the APPM and send it to VPAA Clark for timely publication on the SE website.

## Motion 3 (the PPC voted by email on 11-6-2016 to forward this for the Senate's consideration)

It is moved that the Faculty Senate preview and consider the SE AAUP chapter's **draft** of a *faculty revitalization proposal* (see below). The final version of the *faculty revitalization proposal* will be emailed to the Faculty Senate for their review and consideration (November 14 is the anticipated date for emailing the proposal). An email vote seeking the Senate's endorsement and support of the proposal will be conducted from Thursday, November 17 through Friday, November 18. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will conduct the voting process.

**Rationale:** To lend united faculty support to this important step in revitalizing faculty!

The AAUP, RUSO, and Southeastern are in agreement that the faculty has primary responsibility in curricular matters: subject matter, methods of instruction, faculty status.[1] The Academic Council, composed of chairs elected by their departments' faculty, represents the entire faculty. As a result, we suggest that the Academic Council take the lead in collating faculty input into future academic and faculty priorities. To begin this process, we therefore ask that department chairs consult with their departmental faculty on the following questions, and submit their departments' answers to the Academic Council:

1. What would it mean to reorganize your program(s) to function long-term at current staffing levels?

> For example: Are there multiple small sections that could be consolidated? Are some faculty teaching overloads, when another faculty member could be teaching one of those sections? Could a faculty member teach a course "housed" in another department to either relieve the overload of a colleague or to prevent hiring adjuncts? Might a major be reconfigured with fewer elective options while maintaining its core functions? Could core courses within a major be reorganized to cover the essential material in fewer courses?

2. What would it look like to reorganize your program/department in order to function at a high quality in the long term and what staffing levels are needed?

> For example: Are there examples of inter-departmental curricular arrangements that are worthy of pursuit (a joint hire that accommodates two different disciplines)? Are there instances where adjuncts who have demonstrated high quality teaching can be hired as full-time instructors? Are there critical needs where immediate tenure-stream hires are necessary to the long-term viability of a program? Are there projected needs for future hires given expected retirements, enrollment growth, or changes in the field?

Some departments may agree that all is going reasonably well with their programs and operations. However, departments who are not functioning optimally should consider doing things differently. These questions are meant to encourage both short- and long-term thinking about future program sustainability and development.

Once departments have worked together to answer these questions, we ask that the department chairs bring the answers to Academic Council, and establish a process for prioritizing requests for hiring tenure-stream faculty. The prioritized list could be forwarded to the administration and presented as the faculty's professional judgment, in the exercise of primary responsibility, through the mutually agreed upon and duly constituted university committee structure.

---

[1] Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, and granting of tenure and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based on the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. (Similarly stated in the APPM 3.7.4.)