

Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Friday, April 18th, 2003
SC 233, 3:30 p.m.

Members present: Senators, Bradie, Cartwright, Game, Gray, Keeling, Kidd, Marshall, Purtle, Schell, Siochi, Underwood, Weiss, Wheeler, and Winder

Members absent: Senator Doyle

- I. Faculty Senate President Tim Marshall called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.
- II. President's Report
 - A. Since a new Senate was not elected on April 16th due to the lack of a quorum, the meeting of the full Senate with President Tribble, originally scheduled for Monday April 28th will be rescheduled.
 - B. Marcus Griffin is working on the Senate web page. He is looking for some language and list of senators. President Marshall will provide him with the information.
 - C. There are Board of Visitors meetings coming up Thursday April 24th the Finance and Audit Committee will meet. Tuesday April 29th the Academic Affairs committee will meet. The Student Life Committee will meet Tuesday April 29th. There is a new committee, the Development Committee, and the Senate needs to appoint liaisons. Bob Gray and Kelly Cartwright will serve. Tuesday April 29th is the first meeting. The main Board of Visitors meeting is scheduled for April 30th in the Student Center.
 - D. There was no quorum at the General Faculty Meeting. We need to discuss a time for rescheduling it. 2:00 on Friday May 2nd seems to be the best time now. There are no official tests or classes at that time. It may be easier to meet in divisions than as a whole faculty. (SSPS, LA, etc.) It may be easier to arrange one meeting rather than four. What about the Monday grades are due? The CAL Task Force meeting may be able to be moved back. The sense of the Senate was to have the separate units meet and put off the resolutions until next year. The elections committee will report to President Marshall and he will call the meetings for those areas.
- III. Approval of the Minutes from 3/14/03: Senator Weiss moved to approve the minutes as amended. Senator Keeling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- IV. Approval of the Minutes from 3.28/03: Senator Bradie moved to approve the minutes as amended. Senator Weiss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

V. Committee Reports

- A. Post-tenure Review Procedures Committee: Chair Ron Mollick spoke on the work of the committee. The committee had three administrators and four faculty members. They worked together well and there was a great deal of agreement. The examined post-tenure review processes and procedures from around the state and tried to devise principles. What has been provided is not intended to be handbook copy. The ideas need to be examined by all appropriate bodies before handbook copy is prepared. It is important to stress that this is a performance review process, not a dismissal process. The dismissal process is separate. The Faculty must have a role in this process if it is to be valid. The PTR committee would judge performance, they would not make dismissal or retention recommendations. The process begins with the Eval-6's. Every faculty member will go through full dossier review every six years. This is not meant to be a punitive process. The every six-year review would take place in the Spring. Non-scheduled reviews could be initiated only if the faculty member had unsatisfactory annual reviews for 2 out of 3 years. The process would be initiated in the Fall and the review would begin in the Spring. This would be a class B review as outlined in the University Handbook. The faculty member would be told specifically why this non-scheduled review was being initiated. The committee welcomes feedback on the proposal. The hope is to have a Handbook copy ready for next year's Handbook changes.

Senator Game arrived at 4:34 p.m.

The senators pointed out that there needs to be language that indicates the inter-relation between the scheduled and non-scheduled reviews. This process seems to be fair to faculty and administrators. There are more issues that need to be addressed, but overall this document provides a clear and fair procedure. There needs to be strong language indicating that all reviews of tenured faculty must follow all and only these procedures. The issue of outside reviewers and how they are to be selected if they are to be used must also be addressed. We will discuss this matter again at the next meeting and make a recommendation then.

- B. Nominations Committee: The Senate needs to reappoint people for committees after elections are complete.
- C. Committee to Determine the Criteria for Distinguished Professor: Senator Wheeler spoke on the work of the committee. The CNU Handbook went from 1/3 page of criteria to one sentence in 1990 to nothing at the present. They used earlier CNU criteria and looked at information from other schools with Distinguished Professors.

There was little uniformity. It ranged from one sentence to extremely detailed sets of criteria. They used those as springboards. They wanted the criteria to reflect an extraordinary rank - a rank of honor not a basis for salary adjustment. The criteria blended service, teaching and scholarship. The qualified candidate would be exemplary in all of these areas. It is to be a limited rank (no more than 3% of the faculty.) Self-nominations are not accepted. They removed the 1976 language requiring specific service time requirements. The second change was more specific and exemplary language. The review procedure is very different from the ordinary review process. This process will assemble general acclimation from the university community. (A senator pointed out that outside reviewers are very appropriate in these cases.) Maybe this should be a reward for distinguished, long-time CNU service - not as a potential recruiting tool. There are other recruiting tools - endowed chairs etc. University constituency refers to the committees involved in the review process. This needs to be clarified in the proposal. President Marshall recommended that we look at this again at the next meeting.

- D. Faculty Reception Committee: Senator Keeling indicated that all faculty have been invited. Reactions have been varied. It is important to have a respectable showing. There is enough money for about 120 people to come. She requested that we encourage our peers to attend. Please encourage donations for the gifts. These should be sent to Senator Keeling. All money donated will go toward purchases for the reception and faculty gifts.

VI. Old Business

- A. There was no old business.

Senator Gray left at 5:30.

VII. New Business

- A. Intellectual Properties Committee: The Senate will nominate to the Provost, and the Provost will make selections. Senator Keeling moved to forward the list of nominees to the Provost. Senator Bradie seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. SGA Issues: Senator Purtle moved to table the issue. Senator Underwood seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
- C. Certification of graduates. Senator Schell moved to certify the graduates. Senator Keeling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The graduates are certified.
- D. The Provost wants the Faculty Senate to consider the issue of Winter graduation. The SEC encouraged the Provost to move the date from the 20th of December to the 13th. The Provost wants us to consider

what percentage of each department should have to attend. This is a terrible time. We should make a strong recommendation to push it to the 13th. We should move the date and keep the usual expectations for attendance.

VIII: Other Issues

- A. President Marshall is unhappy that we can't get a quorum for our General Faculty Meeting, but wonders if it is in part a function of all that has happened over the last few years. Senator Siochi moved to go into closed session. Senator Weiss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. All visitors left the meeting.

Senator Underwood left at 5:55 p.m.

IX. Adjournment:

Senator Siochi moved to adjourn. Senator Keeling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The Senate adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Lori J. Underwood, Faculty Senate Secretary

Faculty Senate Membership Status 2003-2004

<u>Member Name</u>	<u>College/School</u>	<u>Area</u>
Cartwright, Kelly	CLAS	SSPS
Colvin, Robert	CLAS	SSPS
Donald Hicks	Business	BUS
Doughty, David	CLAS	S&T
Doyle, Cathy	CLAS	LA
Grau, Harold	CLAS	S&T
Gray, Robert	Business	BUS
Kidd, Quentin	CLAS	SSPS
Knipp, Peter	CLAS	S&T
Purtle, Virginia	CLAS	SSPS
Schwarze, Tracey	CLAS	LA
Underwood, Lori	CLAS	LA
Wheeler, Rebecca	CLAS	LA
Whiting, Gary	CLAS	S&T
Winder, Robert	Business	BUS

Distinguished Professor

The rank of Distinguished Professor is an extraordinary honor that may be accorded those few teacher-scholars who have attained the rank of Professor and who have excelled to an exceptional degree in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Distinguished Professor is a rank of honor*. Specific criteria for this rank include:

A record characterized by

1. superior teaching skills of recognized breadth and depth in the discipline
2. creative and extensive scholarly publication, establishing the nominee as a scholar of exemplary national or international reputation,
3. a distinguished record of public service exemplified by the application of scholarship and/or creative and artistic endeavors in addressing the needs of the University, local, regional, or national communities.

No more than 3% of the faculty may hold the rank of Distinguished Professor. Self-nominations will not be accepted.

Review Procedures for Distinguished Professor

1. The person initiating a nomination for Distinguished Professor will inform the nominee and submit to his or her Department a letter of nomination accompanied by the nominee's current CV.
2. The Department
 - a. The Department will review the letter of nomination and the CV, and
 - b. will request supporting materials from the nominee if needed.
 - c. If the Department supports the nomination, the Chair will write a letter of support and forward this along with the nominee's dossier to the Faculty Senate.
3. The Faculty Senate
 - a. The Faculty Senate will form a peer committee. This committee is to be comprised of five sitting Distinguished Professors. If not enough Distinguished Professors are available, Full Professors will complete the committee.
4. The peer committee
 - a. The Peer Committee will seek input from the Dean and the Faculty Senate, in its evaluation of the nominee's dossier.

- b. If the Peer Committee affirms that Distinguished Professor rank is to be awarded, it will forward that recommendation with the dossier to the Provost.
 5. The Provost will make a recommendation to the President, who will make his/her recommendation to the Board of Visitors.
 6. If at any point, the Department, Peer Group, the Provost, or the President does not support the award of Distinguished Professor status, the dossier review process will cease, as the rank of Distinguished Professor is intended to represent a university-wide (and faculty-driven) accolade.
- The rank of Distinguished Professor has no effect upon the salary base of any individual awarded this honor.

**POST TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE
SUMMARY FOR FACULTY SENATE MEETING APRIL 18, 2003**

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. PTR exists because faculty are accountable for their performance with respect to Departmental and University standards.
2. PTR should be a helpful process aimed at improvement.
3. The process should not be allowed to weaken academic freedom.
4. PTR should focus on the performance of individual faculty and not institutional needs.
5. PTR is a performance review process and not a dismissal process. The dismissal process is separate from PTR.
6. Faculty, via the Chair and Peer Group, will have a role in the process.
7. If a faculty member's performance is finally judged to be unsatisfactory (for example, incompetence, neglect of duty or academic misconduct) a later administrative decision will likely lead to sanctions possibly including dismissal.
8. Entering the PTR process does not imply immunity against dismissal for reasons other than those stated for PTR.

THE PROCESS

1. begins with the existing annual review process (EVAL-6 and EVAL-AR)
2. there will be a full dossier review (the ~~s~~cheduled review=SR) every sixth year (the dossier is owned by CNU and stored by the Chair)
3. Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean in (1) above, or as part of a peer group as in (2) above
4. the peer review is a class B review (see HB p. 106, line 5); class C reviews will be eliminated from the HB
5. peer reviews will take place in the Spring semester (SR and non ~~s~~cheduled reviews = NSR) and will be full dossier reviews; if a full dossier review took place in the Fall semester (for example, for promotion), then a Spring SR would not be necessary and the six year clock would start with

- the last full dossier review; in a NSR process there may also be a fall peer review (see sample schedule, next page)
6. non-scheduled reviews (NSR) would be initiated by two unsatisfactory EVAL-AR's within three years
 7. unsatisfactory performance ratings in the area of teaching alone could be an initiator **or** problems in both professional development and service **or** problems in all three areas
 8. the peer committee will consist of tenured faculty, one chosen by the evaluatee, one is the Department Chair (who might not be tenured), one chosen by the Dean, and two chosen by the Department Chair (class B review)
 9. NSR dossier must include
 - a) statement of developmental concerns from the Dean stating clearly and specifically why a NSR is being invoked
 - b) copies of the last three EVAL-ARs and EVAL-6s
 - c) a performance improvement plan (PIP) written by the evaluatee addressing the specifics in the Dean's statement
 10. the standards of evaluation used by the peer group will be based upon the standards produced by the Department (EVAL-4); departments should examine their EVAL-4s for utilization in the PTR process
 11. the PTR process will end with a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory; if the rating is unsatisfactory, a later administrative decision will likely lead to sanctions possibly including dismissal

SAMPLE SCHEDULE

1. Sept 2003—Faculty member's annual review is unsatisfactory (EVAL-AR) in teaching or both professional development and service; necessary steps for improvement are discussed and addressed by the faculty member in next year's EVAL-6.
2. Sept 2004 (or Sept 2005)—Faculty member's annual review is unsatisfactory (EVAL-AR) in teaching or both professional development and service.
3. Late Sept/Early Oct—Faculty member is notified that they will undergo a Non Scheduled Review (NSR).

4. Feb 2005—Full NS dossier review by peer committee which follows the step by step procedures outlined in the 2002-2003 HB beginning on p.104, line 19. A performance improvement plan (PIP) must be included in the dossier and the peer group may suggest modifications to the PIP.
5. March 2005—Faculty member is notified of results of this review; if the conclusion (EVAL-8) is satisfactory the process ends; if unsatisfactory, the process continues (step 6).
6. Sept 2005—Review of the EVAL-6 where an evaluation of progress and possible suggestions for improvement may be given. The PTR process cannot be terminated at this point.
7. Sept 2006—Full dossier review by peer committee and on up the line (see step by step procedures, HB, p.104, line 19). Progress with regards to the PIP will be noted.
8. Dec 2006—Faculty member is notified of the results of the review. Progress will finally be judged as satisfactory or unsatisfactory and the peer group disbands. If the final judgment (EVAL-AR) is satisfactory, the process ends and the professor is released from PTR. If the final judgment is unsatisfactory, later administrative decisions may lead to sanctions including dismissal.