

Approved Faculty Senate Meetings for October 8, 2010

JBK Room 11, 12:15p.m.

1. Meeting called to order at 12:17p.m. by President Byrd. Members present were Ambrose, Bartlett, Bigham, Byrd, Castillo, Chenoweth, Commissiong, Davis, Dursun-Kilic, Friske, Holliday, Issa, Landram, Lee, Pendleton, Rosa, Stuntz (ex-officio), Trela, Vizzini, and Wilson. Substitute: Takacs for Parr-Scanlin. Absent: Branson and Browning
2. Moved by Davis and seconded by Friske, minutes from September 24, 2010 were approved as amended.
3. Comments from President Byrd
 - a. News item re Dr. Teweleit's contract non-renewal. Faculty committee did meet and did convey findings to Dr. O'Brien. President's office should be announcing something today
 - i. Dr. Teweleit appealed when he was turned down after 3rd. year review.
 - ii. Initial group of faculty found that the appeal should proceed to a full hearing.
 - iii. Full committee of tenured faculty held evidentiary hearing. Their recommendation was sent directly to the President's office.
 - iv. Committees are to be commended for the time that was required for the hearings.
 - v. Comment from a Senator: rules can be subjective and need to be looked at.
 - vi. Told by provost that since WTAMU does not have rules specifically for the appeal of a 3rd-year review. Therefore, used the system rules for this case. Reveals a need for additional policy and procedure that is WT specific.
 - vii. Discussion about the purpose of the 3rd year review as preparation for tenure versus annually conditional nature of employment prior to granting tenure.
4. Old business
 - a. Select missing members from Senate appointees
 - i. Faculty development – Ken Denton and Richard Rose. Both approved by acclamation.
 - ii. Instructional technology – Anand Commissiong (ESS) Approved by acclamation.
 - iii. Intercollegiate Athletics – Claudia Stuart (ESS) approved by acclamation.
 - iv. University Library – Ashley Campbell from ESS, Valecia Carter-Vaughn from NHS approved by acclamation.
 - b. Priority setting for Senate for coming academy year. Expand definition of specific actions to be taken
 - i. Need to have a review of the whole t & p policy. Specifically need guidelines on the promotion from associate to full professor. Actual expectations from the administration. Additionally, clarification on the level of documentation for the 3rd year review.
 - ii. Some time ago the process felt more organic. Issues like course load and service were acknowledged in the evaluation process. 3-4 years ago that recognition seemed to vanish and the rules become much more rigorous. 4/4 course loads and mandatory overloads have not gone away, but there is no give in the requirements for scholarly activity and/or service.
 - iii. Concern that flexibility within department may become a major issue at the college and administrative level.
 - iv. Should there be more deference paid to the decisions at the department level? Such seemed to happen in the past when there was credible support at higher levels.
 - v. Current perception among junior faculty is that the department/college findings are of lower significance than what is happening at the Provost/President level.
 - vi. How can it happen that annual evaluations are very good, but tenure suddenly becomes a dicey question?

- vii. Several years ago the statement was “teaching is the sine quo non at this university”. That appears to be in flux. What are the criteria that weight those outside factors?
 - viii. How does the process address at a university level the difficulty of weighting the value or equivalency of a book or a sculpture or a song or an article or a grant?
 - ix. Every department is supposed to have a point system for requirements. Should there be a call to ensure this? Observation that Dean’s Council has not moved on this issue.
 - x. For someone coming in a very clear, explicit statement of standards is helpful. The difficulty is that such standards often end up failing to capture notable contributions.
 - xi. Comment that if the criteria don’t recognize something, then by definition it is NOT important.
 - xii. Another option would be an explicit resolution that the administration must accept department/college recommendation, or increase the weight of the more immediate recommendation.
 - xiii. Important that representatives on the university committee should be supporting the value of the individual contribution.
 - xiv. Statement that the University- wide formula is explicit, but the interpretation of that formula is subject to interpretation.
 - xv. Consistency among units is a concern among faculty. Allegation that administration has not responded to the criteria expressed by the departments.
 - xvi. Concern that explicit standards end up being product oriented rather than process. This can limit desire to do longitudinal research.
 - xvii. If standards are changed, there should be a “grandfather clause” maintaining the standards under which an individual was hired.
 - xviii. Critical to keep in mind that the university goals are the most important and critical, and administration decisions are made to support those institutional goals. Additionally, the system goals are going to exert pressure on the final outcomes.
 - xix. Desire to know what the expectations are, and the reality is that some of those expectations are NOT written down.
 - xx. Request for data on percentage of department decisions that have been over-ruled at higher levels.
- c. Assignment from Byrd. Bring to next meeting what individual understanding of the issues from last time mean as tasks.

5. Announcements – none.

6. Meeting adjourned at 1:45p.m.

These minutes have been approved.

Respectfully submitted, Linda Chenoweth, Secretary.