



9-20-2016

## Faculty Senate Minutes Sep. 20, 2016

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate\\_min](http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min)

---

### Recommended Citation

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes Sep. 20, 2016" (2016). *Minutes & Agendas*. 96. [http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate\\_min/96](http://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min/96)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars' Mine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes & Agendas by an authorized administrator of Scholars' Mine. This work is protected by U. S. Copyright Law. Unauthorized use including reproduction for redistribution requires the permission of the copyright holder. For more information, please contact [scholarsmine@mst.edu](mailto:scholarsmine@mst.edu).

**Volume X, Number 1**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**September 20, 2016**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 P.M. with Past President, Mark Fitch, presenting a gavel to incoming President Thomas Schuman.

Roll was called by Secretary Barbara Hale. Those whose names are **grayed** out below were absent.

**William Bragg, Lance Haynes, Audra Merfeld-Langston, Mark Mullin, (Ron Frank for) David Westenberg, Craig Claybaugh, Fui-Hoon Nah, Daniel Forciniti, Ali Rownaghi, Richard Dawes, Jeffrey Winiarz, Klaus Woelk, Joel Burken, Mark Fitch, Fikret Ercal, Chaman Sabharwal, Michael Davis, Levent Acar, Kurt Kosbar, James Drewniak, Maciej Zawodniok, Trent Brown, K. D. Dolan, Steven Corns, Abhijit Gosavi, Ralph Flori, Wan Yang, Kathleen Sheppard, David Van Aken, Wayne Huebner, Martin Bohner, Akim Adekpedjou, S.N. Balakrishnan, Umit Koylu, Gearoid MacSithigh, Ashok Midha, Otis Register, Shoaib Usman, Paul Worsey, Barbara Hale, Ulrich Jentschura, Amber Henslee**

**II. 10 Step Process for Search for Dean and Vice Provost of CEC**

Tom Schuman explained that the purpose of the special meeting is to provide background and to discuss the ten steps identified for the search process for the Dean of the College of Engineering and Computing (CEC).

Dr. Schuman reminded the body that the proposed bylaws amendment was rejected by UM System after consultation with Interactive Business Inclusion Consultants (IBIS), a consulting firm. Referring to his President's Report from the June 16, 2016 meeting, Dr. Schuman discussed those sections of the proposal that were related to the hiring of the deans, pointing out the areas cited by IBIS as not meeting best practices in terms of diversity and inclusion and comparing the verbiage from the proposal with IBIS recommendations. The purpose for the IBIS review was to ascertain whether the bylaw description was academic best practices since, without being recommended as best practices, the Board of Curators would very likely not approve a bylaw revision for adoption.

Upon the rejection of the faculty approved bylaw revision on the grounds of not prescribing "best practice," Dr. Schuman explained that he and Provost Marley came to a "gentleman's agreement" that in the absence of an approved bylaws process for hiring a dean, if Faculty Senate could draft changes to the proposed bylaws amendment that were acceptable to the campus Chief Diversity Officer (CDO, Shenethia Manuel), he would abide by that process for the CEC dean search. While those discussions did not result in a revised bylaws proposal, a step by step process was drafted by the CDO and edited by Faculty Senate officers that was based on the proposed bylaws amendment. After circulating the process to department chairs

of the CEC, faculty had requested information concerning the evolution of the 10 step process and resulted in this special meeting being called.

Suggestions were made for combining steps of the process, specifically steps 4 and 7. Dr. Schuman pointed out that the reason those steps were kept separate, in his opinion, is they deal with parts of the search process that fall under different administrators on the organizational structure.

Dr. Hale expressed her disappointment that the discussions with the CDO did not result in a revised bylaws proposal. She stated that she does not support the final ten steps (of the dean search process) because she feels it is not in the best interests of the faculty.

There was further discussion about the difference between the approved bylaws amendment proposal and the ten steps identified for this CEC Vice Provost and Dean search. Concern was expressed that the current 10 step process may become the bylaw upon its use in a successful search.

After being asked to elaborate on the gentleman's agreement, Provost Marley stated that after the bylaws proposal was rejected by UM, he approached Tom Schuman with the idea that the problem could be fixed by addressing some of the issues pointed out by IBIS and by UM System personnel. Then, if a document could be produced that would meet with approval by Shenethia Manuel, he would use that process for the CEC Search. Dr. Marley reiterated that the ten step process was developed for this one search only, but conceded that, should it prove successful, it may prove adaptable into a bylaw. He also addressed concern expressed by some that the process allows the Provost to add an unlimited number of members to the search committee and would, thus, outweigh the tenured faculty members on the committee. Dr. Marley pointed out that a manageable committee would consist of 12-15 members. Provost Marley also discussed that it is common practice for the Provost to be able to select the chair of the search committee because that individual will serve as his representative on the committee.

Discussion continued concerning the potential impact of moving forward with this process and the consequences of not reaching consensus on this process.

Professors Fitch stated that he and Professor Hale requested from HR in writing the search requirements by law, i.e., what the regulations state regarding best practices for an administrator search process and he thinks that request put the bylaws revision work on delay.

There was discussion about the approval process for the Dean search process and whether approval would admit or preclude participation/representation in the forthcoming CEC Vice Provost and Dean search process. Dr. Schuman stated that there is no accepted approval method and that given the general disagreement with the

Significant discussion occurred regarding what is or is not best practices regarding a Dean search process and that current best practices are not well understood by the faculty. Dr. Schuman reminded the body that he has invited IBIS to visit the campus to address some of the questions regarding definition and constraints imposed by current best practices.

After an extensive discussion, a question came up regarding business to be conducted at the special FS meeting. Was there an intent that the FS members vote on support for or against the 10 Point Plan?

Dr. Schuman stated again that the purpose of the meeting was to provide a platform for discussion of the proposed process. The senators will have, in advance, two choices for committee structure that they can vote, for or against, at the special meeting.

**III. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Hale, Secretary