



Southwestern Oklahoma State University
SWOSU Digital Commons

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate

12-5-2014

December 5, 2014 Minutes

SWOSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

SWOSU Faculty Senate, "December 5, 2014 Minutes" (2014). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 189.
<https://dc.swosu.edu/fsminutes/189>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

Approved Minutes
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
FACULTY SENATE December 5, 2014—2:00 pm EDU201

- I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Faculty Senate President Evette Meliza called the December meeting of the SWOSU Faculty Senate to order at 2:04 pm in Education 201.
- II. **ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM:** The following members were in attendance: Jimena Aracena, Arden Aspedon, John Bradshaw, Ric Baugher (for Brad Bryant), Tommie Davis (from Sayre), Stacey DiPaolo, Jerry Dunn, Jared Edwards, Fred Gates, Edna Patatanian (from OKC for Tiffany Kessler), Doug Linder, Jim Long, Scott Long, Kris Mahlock, Tom McNamara, Evette Meliza, Kristin Montarella (from OKC), Bo Pagliasotti, Kevin Collins (for Cynthia Pena), Linda Pye, Les Ramos, Ann Russell, Karen Sweeney, Wayne Trail, and Lisa Friesen (for Trisha Wald).
- III. **CERTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES:** Ric Baugher attended instead of Brad Bryant, Kevin Collins took the place of Cynthia Pena, Lisa Friesen replaced Trisha Wald, and Edna Patatanian served in place of Tiffany Kessler.
- IV. **PRESENTATION OF VISITORS:** There were no visitors at this meeting.
- V. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the November meeting were approved following a voice vote.
- VI. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
 - A. **President Evette Meliza**
 1. The next Executive Council Meeting will be January 12, 2015.
 2. The next Administrative Council Meeting will be January 12, 2015.
 3. Kathy Brooks is retiring at the end of this month. She has been at the SWOSU Sayre Campus for 34 years teaching science courses and advising pre-nursing and medical laboratory students.
 - B. **Secretary/Treasurer Tom McNamara**
 1. **Roll Sheet:** Please sign the roll sheet.
 2. **Treasurer's Report**
 - a. BancFirst Checking Account: November Meeting Balance: \$1865.94
CURRENT BALANCE: \$1865.94
 - b. University Account: November Meeting Balance: \$105.01
CURRENT BALANCE: \$105.01
 - C. **President-Elect Jared Edwards:** Nothing to report at this time.
 - D. **Past President Fred Gates:** Nothing to report at this time.
 - E. **Student Government Representative:** There was no Student Government Representative present.
- VII. **REPORTS FROM STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES:** There were no new committee reports.
- VIII. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**
 - A. See Appendix A for the report from the University Policies Committee on Proposed Revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Review Process.
Faculty Senate Motion 2014-12-01: The changes to the Tenure and Promotion Review Process suggested by the University Policies Committee shall be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

The motion passed via voice vote following a minor amendment. The amended version is found in Appendix A.

IX. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. See Appendix B for proposed changes to the Teacher Education Council, a Faculty Standing Committee.

Faculty Senate Motion 2014-12-02: The changes proposed in Appendix B shall be added to the Faculty Handbook.

The motion passed after a voice vote.

X. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

**Next Meeting 2:00 pm
Friday, January 30, 2015**

Respectfully Submitted,
Evette Meliza, Faculty Senate President
Tom McNamara, Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A
Faculty Senate University Policies Committee
Proposed Revisions to the Tenure and Promotion Review Process

Based on faculty recommendations and open discussion, a Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee proposed revisions to the tenure and promotion review process. The proposed revisions were distributed to all faculty in the form of a survey. The results of the survey were analyzed to determine which revisions were supported by a majority of respondents. The Faculty Senate then discussed the survey results and agreed upon specific revisions. These versions were sent to all faculty in order to provide an additional opportunity for comment. The final proposed revisions are listed below. The insertion of these proposed revisions into the pertinent sections of the Faculty Handbook follow (sections B.2. and B.4., POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION/TENURE OF FACULTY, p. 104-115). Note that revisions are represented with ~~striketroughs~~ and **bolded/underlined insertions**.

Proposed Revisions

1. Only those members of the faculty with at least associate professor rank shall be eligible for membership on the FUPTRC.
2. FUPTRC members shall serve two year terms.
3. Terms on the FUPTRC shall rotate with 4 of the eight members being replaced each year.
4. The chair of the FUPTRC shall be in their second year of committee membership or have previously served on the FUPTRC.
5. The practice of ranking (numbering) candidates in order of preference for tenure and promotion shall be eliminated from the duties of the FUPTRC.
6. The practice of rating candidates relative to their individual suitability for tenure and promotion shall be adopted by the FUPTRC.
7. Individual academic units shall be encouraged to submit standing documents describing scholarly activity in their field to be used as a reference by the FUPTRC.

Insertions into Pertinent Faculty Handbook Sections

(p. 106 of the Faculty Handbook)

2. Scholarly Activities

Scholarly activities associated with the applicant's teaching and/or professional discipline shall be a part of each evaluation. Applicants receiving release time for scholarly activities must document a higher level of scholarly accomplishments, which will be properly weighted in their evaluations.

Presentations in this category should include descriptive summaries of the applicant's scholarly achievement *(The ordering of items is alphabetical and not meant to suggest priority of*

importance. The items are listed as examples and not intended to be an exhaustive listing, candidates should document all activities they deem relevant).

Acceptance of original works of art, musical compositions or arrangements, architectural designs, poetry and other literature, dance, or other of the Fine Arts.

Curriculum development and innovation

Editing (including newsletters and the description and preservation of historical and/or scholarly resources)

Grants Funded/Unfunded

Performances or exhibits involving the various Fine Arts

Presentation of papers before professional groups

Professional development, activities in professional organizations appropriate to the teaching field or areas of responsibility including committee appointments, session chair, discussant or consultant performances, workshops, exhibits, or seminars which relate more to scholarly development than to teaching activities

Publications of original journal articles with abstract or first and last page of journal (includes web publications)

Reviewing of materials submitted by others

Submission of original journal articles (include abstract or first and last page of journal)

Textbooks (authored)

Monographs

Poster Presentations before professional groups

Each department or academic unit committee may designate other specific activities which are unique to a certain field as being appropriate within this category. **Individual academic units are encouraged to submit standing documents describing scholarly activity in their field to be used as a reference by the Faculty University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (FUPTRC).**

Responsibility for establishing the importance and scholarly nature of all activities rests with the applicant. The applicant should not assume that all members of the evaluation committees are familiar with comparative values within each discipline, such as the relative prestige of journals, whether or not journal articles are refereed, whether or not the work has been published, or the importance of audiences and locales for exhibits or performances. All activities should be those which have been presented for the judgment of the applicant's academic peers.

(p. 112-116 of the Faculty Handbook)

4. The Faculty University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

The committee shall be composed of three (3) faculty members each from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional and Graduate Studies, one (1) faculty member each from the College of Pharmacy, and one from the College of Associate & Applied Programs or the SWOSU Libraries. The College of Associate and Applied Programs will fill this committee seat in even-numbered years (e.g. 2016, 2018, etc.) and the SWOSU Libraries will fill this committee seat in odd-numbered years (e.g. 2015, 2017, etc.).

The members shall be selected in the following manner:

The Senate Executive Committee (with assistance, if needed) will compile a list of faculty eligible (by college) for SWOSU Promotion/Tenure Review Committee by the August Senate meeting. The Faculty Senators of each college will meet following the September Senate meeting and select from among the list of eligible and willing faculty who meet the minimum requirements of tenure, rank of ~~assistant~~ **associate** professor and seven (7) years of experience at SWOSU and may not be a departmental chair during the current academic year. The Faculty Senate President (or designee) will forward the names to the Chief Academic Officer by the end of the first full week of October. The names may not include any faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure. If these requirements prohibit a college from submitting a slate of eligible faculty, the requirements will be lowered in the following order:

1. If eligible candidates from the College of Associate & Applied Programs and the SWOSU Libraries are unable to meet the requirement of rank, this requirement will be waived for the College of Associate & Applied Program and the SWOSU Libraries.

- ~~1.~~ **2.** The years of experience will be reduced first to six (6) and then to five (5).
- ~~2.~~ **3.** Service on the committee the previous year is removed.
- ~~3.~~ **4.** If there are fewer than three (3) candidates from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional and Graduate Studies due to an eligible candidate refusing to serve, then only the remaining eligible candidates are submitted.
- ~~4.~~ **5.** If there are fewer than three (3) candidates and all eligible candidates have agreed to serve, then the Faculty Senators from that college shall submit a plan to the Chief Academic Officer for filling the vacancy(ies) to attain a list of three (3) candidates from the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional and Graduate Studies. Once an acceptable plan is agreed upon, the slate of three (3) candidates will be submitted.

Members of the committee shall serve ~~one (1)~~ **two (2)** year terms and shall not be able to serve consecutive terms. **Terms on the committee shall rotate, with four (4) of the eight (8) members being replaced each year.** Department chairs, associate deans, deans and applicants shall not be eligible for committee membership.

Procedures for FUPTRC

Confidentiality

All deliberations and records of the committee are confidential. All members of the committee are to maintain this confidentiality.

Committee Officers

The Faculty University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee's (FUPTRC) first action is to elect a chair from its members only. **The chair of the committee shall be in their second year of committee membership or have previously served on the FUPTRC.** The chair of the committee does vote. The committee has the prerogative of deciding if it wishes or needs additional officers, for example a secretary or clerk, and fills such offices by election or appointment from among its members as it sees fit.

Documents

The Chief Academic Officer places applicants' documents in a secure location which is accessible to committee members.

Review of Documentation

The chair informs committee members of the location of documents so that committee members may begin their review of documents. The committee will decide the order in which categories will be considered. Notes are the personal property of the individual committee member and serve to refresh one's memory during full committee discussion of a candidate. Members are also urged to make a rough, preliminary **ranking rating** (**'exceeds expectations', 'meets expectations', 'does not meet expectations'**) of the candidates prior to the meeting at which a vote will be taken.

Eligibility

The first evaluation action taken by the full committee will be a review of eligibility requirements of candidates. Any candidate found ineligible will not be reviewed further. Such candidates will be so notified when the committee makes its reports at the end of the process.

Discussion and Rating of Candidates

The committee will discuss and vote on each candidate, one at a time. Decisions concerning all candidates in a category will be made before moving to a consideration of candidates in another category. The committee will decide the order in which categories will be considered. ~~The discussion, prior~~ **Prior to a vote, the committee will (1) assign a rating ('exceeds expectations', 'meets expectations', or 'does not meet expectations')** to each candidate in a category **and (2) summarize strengths and weaknesses** ~~be summarized by the chair, as aided by other committee members,~~ for inclusion in statements to be reported to the candidate.

Voting

Following discussion **and rating** of a candidate, a vote is taken on a recommendation to 'grant' or 'deny' promotion or tenure. Each vote is by separate, standardized secret ballot; ballots are prepared in advance but not distributed until discussion on a candidate is completed. Majority rule decides the recommendation. A tie (the committee has eight members) means no majority, resulting in a recommendation to 'deny'. **Following voting on all candidates within a category, the chair tabulates and reports the vote and rating for each candidate. Candidates within a category are divided into two groups, those for whom the majority position was to recommend 'grant' and those for whom the decision was to recommend 'deny.'**

Ranking

~~Following voting on all candidates within a category, the chair tabulates and reports the vote for each candidate. Candidates within a category are divided into two groups, those for whom the majority position was to recommend 'grant' and those for whom the decision was to recommend 'deny.'~~ Committee members then rank candidates within each of these groups. All candidates must be ranked.

~~This ranking will be done anonymously on a list, one list for each committee member. Individual committee members may not assign tie rankings to candidates they~~

must distinguish rankings. If these instructions are not followed, the vote will not be included in determination of composite scores.

A composite score is calculated for each candidate at an academic rank or for tenure by summing the committee members' individual rankings ratings of a candidate. The closer to '1' the composite score, the higher the final ranking reported to the Chief Academic Officer and President.

The highest ranked candidate in the 'deny' group will be given the next number following the ranking of the lowest ranked candidate in the 'grant' group.

It is possible and permissible for tie rankings in the composite final rankings. In such a case, the rank assigned the next candidate after the tie is adjusted accordingly; for example, if two candidates tie for first place, a 'one' is assigned to each, and the next highest candidate is assigned a 'three.'

Draft Reports

The chair will prepare a summary list of committee recommendations (**i.e., grant or deny**) and **rankings ratings**, by academic rank and tenure, which is submitted to the full committee for final approval. Additionally, the chair will prepare a draft statement for each candidate with statements of strengths and/or weaknesses to support the committee's decisions.

If the applicant decides to move their application forward, the chair shall prepare an evaluation and recommendation and report the decision (i.e., grant or deny) to the applicant on the Cover Sheet for promotion/tenure documents. If denial is recommended the chair shall provide the applicant with a written summary response explaining the reasons for denial. In the letter to the applicant, the chair shall include a request for written response from the applicant stating that the summary was received. If no response is received within a week following the mailing, the chair shall contact the applicant to confirm receipt.

Those applicants receiving unfavorable recommendation (vote to deny) may respond on the Cover Sheet with options which accompanies each application and return the form to the individual of the next level. The options shall be (1) to hold a conference with the Chair in the event of a no vote, (2) to withdraw the application, and/or (3) to forward the application to the next level.

If the applicant decides to continue, the summary report from each level shall be sent to the Provost. The summary will include the opinions and statements related to the applicant's qualifications for tenure or promotion.

Applicants who are off campus related to their primary position assignment, i.e. College of Pharmacy faculty, may request to have the recommendations faxed to them for their signature indicating their choice of options. A faxed copy of their signature holds the same weight as their original signature.

Report to the Chief Academic Officer

The chair will send the committee's summary list of committee recommendations and ~~rankings~~ **ratings**, by academic rank and tenure of those faculty who desire to continue the process, to the Chief Academic Officer. This summary list reports only the committee's majority decision and candidate ~~rankings~~ **ratings**, not the numbers of votes to 'grant' or 'deny.'

Communication Between the Committee and Others

The Chief Academic Officer, President of SWOSU, and any other agency with a right to further information will direct their comments to the Chair of the FUPTRC, who shall be its only spokesperson; confidentiality of individual committee member comments shall be maintained.

Maintenance of Candidates' Documents

All documents of all candidates shall be maintained by the Chief Academic Officer until the entire university process, through appeals and final decision by the President following the appeals, is concluded. Candidates are advised to maintain a duplicate copy.

Maintenance of Committee Records

The Chair of the FUPTRC shall keep secure all committee ballots, ~~ranking lists~~ **ratings**, comment sheets, and copies of reports until notified that the entire university process, through appeals and final decision by the President following the appeals, is concluded. Unless notified in writing to keep them, all committee records are to be destroyed following notification, in writing (non-electronic), by the Chief Academic Officer that the entire process is concluded.

Final Reports

The Chair of the FUPTRC, with approval of the committee, shall report in writing to the Chief Academic Officer on procedural problems encountered and/or recommendations to improve the procedure. The Chief Academic Officer shall report in writing to the chair when the entire university process, through appeals and final decision by the President following the appeals, is concluded.

Faculty member **recommendations and** ~~rankings~~ **ratings** from the Faculty University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee should be retained by the Chief Academic Officer.

Respectfully submitted,
University Policies Committee

Dedicated to the memory of long-time committee member, Dr. Dennis Widen.
Requiescat in pace.

Appendix B

Teacher Education Council – Develops and recommends general policy for the ~~undergraduate~~ Teacher Education Program.

The Council is chaired by the Department of Education Chairperson and is composed of all Department of Education full-time faculty ~~fifteen (15) members of the faculty~~, the Chair of the Department of Education, one representative from each secondary, K-12, and graduate teacher certification area, and the Presidents of Kappa Delta Pi and the Student Education Association. Faculty appointees serve a three year term. Members are nominated by the Associate Dean of the School of Behavioral Sciences and Education who chairs the committee. Members are appointed by the Provost and the President.

Rationale:

The changes requested are related to NCATE/CAEP accreditation requirements for Standard 6, Governance of the Unit.

The change to graduate teacher certification would be included due to accreditation requirements to supervise the assessments for candidates seeking certification along with a Master's Degree.

The change in group membership from “15 members of the faculty” to campus faculty who are directly involved with the preparation of teacher candidates will allow the Teacher Education Council to manage the program in conjunction with other departments and stakeholders on campus.