

## **Faculty Senate Minutes**

November 5, 2021

**Attended:** Ambrose, Bell, Brown, Butler, Clark, Correa, Crosman, Denton, Fairweather-Leitch, Gill, Hoffman, Humphreys, Issa, Manfredi, Medlock, McCauley, Pinkham, Ramos Salazar, Spencer, Tarpley, Tyrer, Yarbrough

**Absent:** Brooks, Farren, Whaley

**Guest(s):** Nancy Garcia (for Brooks)

---

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 by President Anne Medlock. Minutes of the October 22, 2021, meeting were approved as corrected. (Bell)

- Motion to approve as corrected: Humpherys
- Second: Yarbrough
- Motion passed

### **CURRENT BUSINESS**

#### **Visit by Dr. Wendler**

Rescheduled for Spring 2022 semester.

#### **Piper Professorship**

Caroline Bouma's nomination materials for the Piper Professorship have been forwarded to administration.

#### **Handbook Committee**

No report.

#### **Joint Student/Faculty Committee on Academic Affairs**

Clark reported on a textbook discussion in which students stated they were willing to buy books that they would continue to use after college, e.g. engineering texts. Little additional discussion ensued over textbook costs, etc. A survey over class schedules elicited about 1200 responses with students not in favor of MWF classes, but willing to take more 8:00 am classes over 3:00 pm classes. Many were willing to register for 12:30 classes. The student committee would like to visit Senate and arrangements will be made for them to do so.

#### **Travel Equity Committee**

No report.

### **Magister Optimus Guidelines**

The following guidelines were submitted for review.

#### **Process:**

Call for nominations sent to all faculty	by January 15 <sup>th</sup> of each year
One-page letter of nomination sent to the department's/college's Faculty Senator to be deposited in Senate folders on Blackboard	By March 1 <sup>st</sup> of each year
Senate convenes to review the nominations.	March Senate meeting
Senate President forwards the nominee to the Provost/VPAA	By April 1 <sup>st</sup> of each year

#### **Caveats:**

- Must not be a sitting Senator
- Must be teaching at the time of nomination.
- Self-nominations are not permitted.
- Nominations are open to full-time instructors, tenured, and tenure-track faculty.
- Candidates should have been teaching at WT for a minimum of 4 years.

#### **Criteria:**

Faculty Senate considers the following attributes to be indicative of outstanding teaching. This list should not be considered required nor all inclusive.

- Masters of their subject area
- Exhibit expertise in their subject
- Continue to gain new knowledge in their field
- Present material in an enthusiastic manner
- Instill a hunger to learn in their students
- Committed to life-long learning
- Innovative and flexible
- Clear and organized
- Uses evidence-based teaching methods
- Inclusive of student diversity in their pedagogy

After a short discussion and minor edits, the guidelines were adopted by the Senate. (Bell, Clark, Holland, Clark, Humphreys, Pinkham, Tyrer, Bell)

- Motion to approve: Humphreys
- Second Yarbrough

- Motion: Passed

### **Problems with hiring student workers for grading**

Medlock reported that Human Resources is in the process of relocating and thus Glendis Villasmil is not available. Medlock will contact Villasmil next week for the results of the inquiry into revising the process for hiring student workers and report next meeting with the proposed changes for spring.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Technology Advisory Committee**

An additional representative is needed from BUS. Lin Xiaolin, Assistant & Gensler Professor of Computer Information Systems was nominated by Humpherys and McCauley.

#### **3<sup>rd</sup> Year Review Proposal**

A proposal was submitted to the Senate for review and discussion by Laura Bell on behalf of COESS:

This proposal for a change to the Faculty Handbook concerns the timing of the third-year review for tenure track faculty in pursuit of promotion and tenure. Currently, the third-year review occurs at the beginning of the fourth year, with results/recommendations not provided until well into the fourth year. The third-year review is intended as an evaluation of a tenure-track faculty's progress toward promotion and tenure, allowing faculty time to address any deficiencies or gaps in their record prior to submitting their tenure portfolio. The current timeline leaves little time for faculty to correct any deficiencies. Thus, moving third-year review from the beginning of the fourth year to the middle of the third-year (with recommendations by the end of the academic year) provides tenure-track faculty a more reasonable time frame in which to address any deficiencies in their portfolio.

A lengthy discussion occurred concerning the changes suggested including, but not limited to (1) concern that less time would be given to assemble the portfolio; (2) department heads should be alert to potential issues prior to 3<sup>rd</sup> year review; (3) the change would give individuals an additional six months to prepare; (4) potential issues might be incurred with faculty service on review committees; (5) if approved, the time between 3<sup>rd</sup> year review and preparation of the APS would be considerably shortened; and (6) reducing the time shortens time for research and publication.

Ultimately it was decided to gather additional information and input from the colleges and report those findings to Bell to re-visit the proposal in January. The following Senators are assigned to

contact colleges; other Senators should contact their individual departments and inform Bell of results. (Bell, Butler, Clark, Crosman, Denton, Gill, Holland, Medlock, Pinkham, Yarbrough)

College Assignments:

ESS: Bell

NHS: Brown

AHS: Holland

ECSM: Gill

COB: Humphreys

- Motion to gather additional information: Humpherys
- Second: Manfredi
- Motion: Passed

### University Handbook proposed changes

Current language in the Faculty Handbook (page 56):

5.5.5.2 A “Yes/No” vote on tenure, if required, shall complete the voting process. A candidate must receive a majority of affirmative votes to be recommended for tenure to the next level of the process. Upon the completion of its review of the candidate’s Portfolio, the committee’s recommendation shall be forwarded to the next level of the process.

Proposed new language (highlighted):

5.5.5.2 A “Yes/No” vote on tenure, if required, shall complete the voting process. A candidate must receive a majority of affirmative votes to be recommended for tenure. Recommendation for tenure is only for candidates who meet or exceed the requirements for teaching, intellectual contributions/creative work, and service to date, and whose receipt of tenure is in the best interests of the program, college and University. Upon the completion of its review of the candidate’s Portfolio, the committee’s recommendation shall be forwarded to the next level of the process.

Discussion ensued with general agreement that the highlighted language is both redundant and that adding this language might cause delay based on a potential arbitrary requirement. (Butler, Clark, Holland, Humpherys, Medlock, Pinkham, Tyrer)

- Motion to reject the proposed change: Tyrer
- Second: Holland
- Motion: Passed

### Other New Business

## **Faculty Advising**

A suggestion was introduced, for consideration by the Senate, to assess the University's advising processes. Several issues were discussed including the reduced number of students being advised by Advising Services. Transfer students and those with college hours achieved in high school are being referred directly to faculty advisors. Much of the advising is dedicated to administrative issues rather than course and career counseling and could more easily be done by Advising Services who routinely direct students to their faculty advisors for such processes. Because advising is time-intensive, many faculty are overwhelmed by administrative duties taking time away from teaching, research, and publishing. It was noted that some departments decide when students should be moved from advising services to faculty advising. Additionally, it might be possible to assign a single faculty advisor to handle the routine administrative advising, freeing up other faculty for specific course and career advising. Although Advising Services does offer monthly presentations on various aspects of advising, it was suggested that individual faculty might benefit from training in the logistics of advising. Medlock and Butler agreed to reach out to Advising Services to discuss individualized training and potential options available to assist faculty advisors. (Butler, Clark, Crossman, Holland, Medlock, Pinkham)

- Motion to Adjourn: Bell
- Second: McCauley
- Motion: Passed

The meeting was adjourned at 1:21 pm.

Respectfully,

Pat Tyrer, Secretary