

Volume X, Number 6
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
December 14, 2016

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Faculty Senate President Tom Schuman called the meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M.

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

William Bragg, 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, (Sajal Das for) Fikret Ercal, Chaman Sabharwal, Michael Davis, Levent Acar, Kurt Kosbar, (proxy for) James Drewniak, Maciej Zawodniok, Trent Brown, (Daniel Reardon for) K. C. Dolan, Steven Corns, (Susan Murray for) 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, (Michael Schulz for) Ulrich Jentschura, Amber Henslee

II. Public Occasions Report

Sahra Sedigh Sarvestani presented the Public Occasions Report, which consisted of proposed changes to the composition, time and date of commencement ceremonies for Spring 2017 and forward. The reasons for the proposed changes are to better balance the number of graduates at each ceremony and to shorten the gap between the morning and afternoon ceremonies.

Motion: The changes to the composition, time and date of Commencement ceremonies was proposed by the Office of the Registrar at the request of the Commencement Committee and approved by the Public Occasions Committee. The motion is presented for Faculty Senate approval. The motion passed.

Details of the report are available at the following link:

[Public Occasions Dec2016](#)

III. Changes to CR&R re: Diversity and Inclusion Audit

Dr. Schuman discussed the proposed changes to the Collected Rules and Regulations regarding Diversity and Inclusion, explaining that the proposal had been referred to several committees for review, including Academic Freedom and Standards (AF&S), Personnel, Student Affairs, and Student Conduct. The Academic Freedom and Standards committee determined that there

would be no significant impact on academic freedom and standards. The Personnel Committee provided a summary of concerns related to certain sections of the CRR, as noted in their report. Dr. Fitch clarified that the summary is his compilation of notes from minutes of the Personnel Committee meeting but the committee has not yet voted on the tentative report. Dr. Schuman indicated that the comments from the committees will be discussed at the next IFC meeting.

IV. Changes to CR&R 310: Post Tenure Review

Professor Schuman indicated that the Tenure (Policy) Committee requested more time to review the proposed changes to the Post Tenure Review. The committee provided comments received from the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering department chair stating that the proposed changes to the policies with regard to post-tenure review are “too prescriptive and bureaucratic.”

There were several questions and considerable discussion related to these proposed changes, as well as annual reviews and the workload policy. Professor Schuman said when IFC reviewed the CRRS, they found that sections of the workload, annual review, and post-tenure review policies were in conflict with each other, making it impossible to be in compliance. So one of goals of this review is dovetail the policies together, clarify when they refer to each which sections are referenced, and provide the framework for annual and post-tenure reviews.

Following their review of the proposed changes referred to them, The Personnel Committee provided the following recommendation:

The Personnel Committee, having reviewed the proposal, recommends that Faculty Senate endorse the proposed changes to the CRR subject to grammar-level changes.

Professor Lance Haynes asked if there was any reason to believe legislators are still interested in this topic, suggesting it might be better to take a wait and see approach.

Professor Fitch commented that he was a little disappointed that no one had pointed out one of the more positive aspects of the proposal, namely the monetary reward specified for outstanding faculty performance.

Dr. Balakrishnan urged caution in reacting too quickly to requests made to correct potential problems in special cases (such as under-performing faculty) because sometimes the “fix” has unintended consequences. He cited several instances in which universities recently abolished tenure.

Dr. Haynes moved that Dr. Schuman report to IFC that we’re feeling very nervous about this and would like to wait and see what the other campuses do and to see what the legislature is going to do.

Another suggested wording:

Missouri S&T wants to be consistent with other campuses within the System would wait for resolutions from other campuses before reacting.

Dr. Gerald Cohen commented that he would prefer to see the discussion of these issues continue, stating that he is uneasy about ignoring the fact that there has been a stated interest by the legislature. Professor Cohen further explained that continued discussion did not necessarily indicate agreement with the proposed changes but could still result in a position paper recognizing the concern and propose it could be handled on campus.

Professor Sahra Sedigh-Sarvestani suggested a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor changing the wording “wait and see what the other campuses are doing” to “waiting to learn more about national and state circumstances.”

Amended Motion:

We would like you to convey the sense of this group, as you’ve heard it today, back to the IFC carrying specifically the message that we think we need to discuss this more.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Balakrishnan. *The motion passed.*

V. Administrative Review Process AY 2016-17

Professor Nancy Stone presented the report from the Administrative Review Committee, quickly summarizing information presented at the previous meeting regarding who is serving on the committee this year, who will be reviewed, the process of administering the survey, disclosure of the results and a tentative timeline.

Professor Haynes asked for a parliamentary ruling on the fact that the Senate was in the middle of a vote when quorum was called at the last meeting. Parliamentarian Steve Corns stated that yes, there was an amendment on the floor, quorum was called, but there was not a quorum so the meeting was adjourned.

Professor Audra Merfeld-Langston commented that she believes the discussion was prematurely closed last time, a two-thirds vote was needed in order to close the debate, and the vote did not happen. Dr. Corns clarified that when Professor Haynes called the question, that action closed the debate. The precise wording of the amended motion was not available because the minutes of the November meeting had not yet been approved for distribution.

Dr. Schuman stated that with no approved minutes in hand, he preferred to table the prior amendment to the committee’s motion. There was a call for a paper ballot. Secretary Barbara Hall passed out paper ballots.

Motion to table consideration of the committee’s motion or the amended motion until after the rest of the presentation. The motion was seconded. *The motion did not pass.*

Michael Davis commented that since it had been stated that last year's review was fumbled (or bumbled), when the problems with the last review were actually of a technical nature, how can we ensure we will not repeat the same mistakes again this year if we make a decision without hearing how the committee proposes to proceed?

Susan Murray added that there was also some controversy over releasing results based on a percent of participation. She asked if that was a one-time rule or if it is still in effect. Dr. Schuman clarified that it was a one-time rule decided by the Faculty Senate officers for that particular review. He further explained that while the Administrative Review Committee owns the review process, the results are presented to the Faculty Senate Officers, who decide what happens with the results of the review.

Dr. Balakrishnan asked that if that happens again, that those people who ask you to violate your word to Faculty Senate are brought to the Senate to talk to us.

Dr. Sedigh Sarvestani pointed out that there were two issues: one was that results of the review would only be released if the participation was at least 51%; the other was that the System President had asked the Faculty Senate President not to share the results publicly but instead to issue his (President Middleton's) letter.

Motion from the Administrative Review Committee:

The committee moves that the Vice Chancellors of Global and Strategic Partnerships; Human Resources, Equity and Inclusion; Finance and Administration; University Advancement; and Student Affairs be reviewed in this academic year.

Since the motion is from a committee, no second is needed. Professor Haynes restated his intent to amend the motion as presented to include the Chancellor, the Provost, and the Vice Provost and Dean in the review for this academic year. The motion was seconded.

A motion was made to amend the committee's motion to include the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Provost and Dean in this year's review. The vote was conducted by paper ballot. *The motion to amend the committee's motion passed.*

Tom Schuman mentioned that Dr. Balakrishnan wanted to point out that it would be difficult to review eight individuals in a single academic year, both from the committee's perspective and for those responding to the survey. Professor Haynes pointed out that if the questionnaire was limited to ten questions, then it would be reasonable to review eight people in an academic year.

Amended Motion:

The committee moves that the Chancellor; Provost; Vice Provost and Dean (CASB); Vice Chancellors of Global and Strategic Partnerships; Human Resources, Equity and Inclusion; Finance and Administration; University Advancement; and Student Affairs be reviewed in this academic year.

The vote was conducted by paper ballot. *The motion, as amended, was approved.*

Dr. Stone then discussed the process of administering the surveys proposed by the committee, mentioning that the committee has worked with Cheryl McKay to test the process to make sure it is working as expected.

Professor Haynes moved for a “sense of the Senate” vote to limit the number of questions on the survey to around ten questions with the last question being to retain/do not retain that should take most people no longer than ten minutes to complete. A friendly amendment was made to add “include a comment section.”

The motion was seconded. *The “sense of the Senate” motion passed.*

Discussion continued regarding the various aspects of the process including the type of data collected, how the results would be shared, the timeline and the job description questionnaires.

A **motion** was made and seconded that since the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Provost and Dean were just reviewed last year, the statement of accomplishments for those three be limited to include accomplishments since the last review. *The motion passed.*

Lance Haynes made a motion requesting the committee bring the results to the Faculty Senate officers no later than the end of the first week in April. The motion was seconded. *The motion passed.*

Details of the report are available at the following link:
[AdminReviewDec2016](#)

VI. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Hale, Secretary