



10 Nov 2016

Faculty Senate Minutes Nov 10, 2016 (Special Meeting)

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min

Recommended Citation

Missouri University of Science and Technology Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes Nov 10, 2016 (Special Meeting)" (2016). *Minutes & Agendas*. 99.
https://scholarsmine.mst.edu/facsenate_min/99

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.

Volume X, Number 4
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
November 10, 2016

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Faculty Senate President Tom Schuman called the meeting was called to order at 12:10 P.M.

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

William Bragg, (Max Tohline for) Lance Haynes, Audra Merfeld-Langston, Mark Mullin, 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, (Greg Gelles for) Michael Davis, Levent Acar, Kurt Kosbar, James Drewniak, Maciej Zawodniok, Trent Brown, K. C. 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

A motion was made and seconded to change the order of the agenda to move item number 4 (Election of a faculty ad-hoc committee for administrative engagement) to third place and move the Post Tenure Review discussion to agenda item number 4.

The motion passed.

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 discuss the revised ten steps identified for the search process for the Dean of the College of Engineering and Computing (CEC). Dr. Schuman pointed out that the revisions were indicated by blue text in the presentation.

In prior discussions, it was pointed out that the faculty would like to be able to elect their committee chair. It was pointed out by the provost that not only is he liable as part of the university but he is also personally liable for the search. For that reason, he wants to maintain the capability of selecting the search committee chair. However, he has also said that if the committee is forwarding names for consideration, he intends to select someone that is well respected by the faculty and the committee.

Someone asked what the process had been when we had deans in the past. Dr. Schuman explained that the process during that time called for two thirds of the committee ~~was to be~~ made up of faculty, but he did not recall if the committee chair selection was specified. (Note added in approval of the minutes: T“the UMR Bylaws stated “When the position is vacated the

Dean shall be nominated by the Chancellor after formal consultation with a committee elected from and by the school or college faculty.”)

It was pointed out that the wording of the proposed process does not guarantee that the provost will choose one of the names forwarded by the committee, nor does it guarantee that the chair would be a faculty member.

Mariesa Crow stated that she feels very strongly that the chair of the committee must be from an approved slate forwarded by the committee. She does not like the fact that the provost is not compelled to select one of the three members selected by the committee.

Dr. Drewniak commented that the other function of a committee chair is really to have and command respect of external colleagues that are interviewing for this position. This wording allows for the arbitrary appointment of someone whose position does not meet that requirement. In his viewpoint, faculty are better judges of whether someone has that capacity than administrators who come and go.

Dr. Schuman pointed out that it is in the mutual interests of both parties to select someone who is going to be respected by the faculty serving on the committee, the candidates, and those whose unit is being served by the search.

Dr. Drewniak said he does not disagree with Dr. Schuman but stated that recent experience has shown that it's better to have it written down.

Dr. Crow asked what happens if this proposal is not approved. Dr. Schuman said that if Faculty Senate does not bless the proposed process, then we do not have an identified process for this search. He invited Provost Marley to speak regarding the path forward.

Provost Marley began by saying he does not disagree with anything that had been said. He said it is his intent to appoint a chair who is highly respected by the committee and that he fully intends to appoint a faculty member to that position. He also thanked Tom for his observation that it is in everyone's best interest for that to happen. In regards to the point that he is personally liable for the search, Dr. Marley clarified that the statement was made by the IBIS represented attorneys who wrote the first consultant's report recommending changes to the proposed policy. They indicated that in the state of Missouri, the hiring authority can be personally sued for actions on behalf of a committee. Dr. Marley said that makes it apparent that not only does the committee have to trust the individual selected as chair of the search committee, but that he, as the hiring authority, also has to trust that individual to do the right thing.

Dr. Long asked if the Faculty Senate has the option to amend the language or suggest a change? Dr. Schuman indicated that the process came directly from the Provost's Office for consideration by Faculty Senate. Provost Marley interjected that the ten steps originated from discussions with a couple of faculty leaders this summer following the rejection of the bylaws amendment by UM System.

Several options for changing the wording of the process were suggested and discussed, weighing the pros and cons of each.

A friendly amendment was suggested to remove the words “for consideration by the Provost in selection of a chair” and inserting instead “to the provost from which a chair will be selected or the entire slate rejected. And the process will be repeated.” In the interest of moving things along, Provost Marley accepted the friendly amendment.

The amended process was approved.

III. Election of a faculty ad hoc committee for administrative engagement

Dr. Schuman began the discussion by saying that when he met the new President-Elect, Dr. Choi indicated, he had heard that faculty on our campus have some issues and he wanted to hear from faculty. UM System then contacted Dr. Schuman and asked him to put together a group of faculty to meet with President Choi. It was discussed by the RP&A and RP&A came up with the following motion.

Motion: Whereas the University of Missouri System has requested that the Faculty Senate president and six other faculty meet with President-designate Choi, and Whereas a group of faculty met with President Middleton in Spring, and Whereas the Faculty Recruitment and Retention Council has current knowledge of the COACHE survey, and Whereas each group has extensive experience with the various surveys and campus administration and include diverse views,

Therefore RP&A moves that Faculty Senate select either the group of faculty that met with Dr. Middleton in February, or the group of faculty comprised of FRRC members:

Original group that met with Dr. Middleton in February

Dick Brow, Administrator
Kris Swenson, CASB, ETC (chair)
Barbara Hale, CASB, Physics
Bill Fahrenholtz, CEC, MSE
Jim Drallmeier, CEC, MAE (chair)
Sahra Sedigh, CEC ECE
(Mike Bruening is on sabbatical and will not participate)

Group comprised of FRRC members

Mariesa Crow, Administrator
Merilee Krueger, CASB, Psych
Bih-Ru Lea, CASB, BIT
Doug Bristow, CEC, MAE
Joel Burken, CEC, CArE (chair)
Sahra Sedigh, CEC, ECE

Since the motion is from a committee, a second is not required. Dr. Crow urged support of selecting the FRRC group. Dr. Schuman pointed out that he has been asked to sit in on the group that is selected.

Dr. Fitch mentioned that as a point of order, the motion on the floor is whether to accept the motion put forth by RP&A.

The motion is approved.

Motion: Dr. Van Aken made a moved for Faculty Senate to select the group comprised of FRRC members as the representative group to meet with President Choi. The motion was ~~selected~~seconded by Dr. Drewniak.

The motion passed.

IV. Proposed Amendment to the Post Tenure Review Bylaws (CRR 310)

Dr. Schuman then moved to the next item on the agenda, the proposed amendment to the Post Tenure Review Bylaws. He explained that this is not about UM System imposing new standards to post tenure review; instead, it is clarifying the existing CRR, specifically incorporating the relatively new workload model into the annual and post tenure review processes, as well as providing for additional faculty incentives with regard to reward for having continued outstanding performance.

The reason behind the proposal is that campuses were not following the CRR; for example, departments have not established review standards, and departments and administrators were not following the annual and post tenure review processes. There were also a large number of “waivers” of the established teaching load. Overall, S&T had a well-policed waiver policy.

Dr. Schuman went over the various aspects of the workload and post tenure review processes that are currently under review and Inter-Faculty Council recommendations for improvement. He explained that what is being sought at this time is feedback related to the redline document with feedback from the chairs, individual faculty, and deans.

Dr. Schuman encouraged the faculty to look at the redline document and provide feedback. Once feedback is received, IFC will reconsider and present a final recommendation to the Board of Curators.

Discussion continued for some time with comments running the gamut from the proposed process being cumbersome and time consuming to it being essential for managing the workload assignment of a department.

Dr. Schuman invited faculty to submit comments and suggestions either to him directly or to Susan Brownell.

V. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven Corns for Barbara Hale, Secretary