

2012

Faculty Senate Minutes, May 16, 2012

Faculty Senate
Eastern Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes, May 16, 2012" (2012). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 29.
http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/29

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Materials by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Approved as amended Minutes for Faculty Senate May 16, 2012 3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: M Peters (AAS), M Reedy (ART), B Winning (BIOL), T Brewer (CHEM), K Stacey (CMTA), M Evett (COSC), S Hayworth (ECON), J Koolage (H&P), W Zirk (M&D), P Koehn (P&A), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), M Millan (WL), J Carbone (HS), T Moreno (HPHP), M Bombyk (SW), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS), D Barton (MKT&LAW), P Francis (L&C), L Lee (SPED), P Smith (TED), K Kustron (TS), R Baier (LIB), R Longworth (Provost Office)

Not attending:, S Norton (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Cohen (MATH), E Martin (PS), S Nelson (NURS), K Banerji (MGMT), J Texter (ET),

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 4/18 meeting (attached) (approved as amended) (one abstention)
3. (3:10) Bookstore closures and availability of textbooks (have you heard anything from students?)
 - a. No
4. (3:20) Committee Appointments
 - a. Elect the new faculty co-chair of EEFC [Eric Owen, LIB; Patrick Koehn, CAS] [Eric Owen appointed]
 - b. Next year's FSEB (This is informative, only, as appointments will be made in September. If you might be interested in any of these positions, please let Matt know)
 - i. Academic Issues
 - ii. Budget and Resources
 - iii. Institutional Issues
 - iv. Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee
 - v. Student Issues
 - vi. Honorary Degree and Distinguished Faculty
 - vii. Procedures and Elections
 - viii. Technology Issues
5. (3:25) Report from the AAUP Bargaining Council [Matt Evett] (see below)
 - a. (End of page 4, continuing on page 5 of agenda)
 - b. URSLC members will be named by the colleges, not the Senate.
 - c. Matt and Suzanne met with the heads of the college councils, talked about the two proposals that the CAC put forward, one pertaining to appointments to the URSLC, the other concerning appointments to all university committees (except the URSLC)

- d. Discussed a compromise, where the college councils will appoint URSLC members.
- e. At the Bargaining council meeting, discussed the proposal and passed it – it will be part of the negotiations.
- f. Question: Will the original charter still be used, and if it is going to change, who will write the charter?
 - i. Likely the Senate, but we'll need to check things out with the AAUP, etc.
- g. Question: It would be good to include one FS member to the URSLC to report back the events of the meetings.
- h. Comment: This is the second occasion that the Senate has been bypassed by the AAUP. The first was changes to the FS bylaws,
 - i. The president of the Senate was there, and there are many senators on the Bargaining Council. The BC only bargains what they are presented.
 - 1. The timing was such that the FS could not vote on it.
- i. Comment: Who was at the meeting at the AAUP?
 - i. Council heads, Suzanne Gray, Matt Evett, Susan Moeller.
- j. Note: At the Senate, we voted on the broader proposal, never the URSLC proposal.
- k. Motion: To ensure some measure of reporting, we should amend the URSLC proposal to include one additional member appointed by the FS on the URSLC committee.
 - i. Discussion: Why does it need to be one of the FS members? It seems that there is a problem with having an FS member deciding sabbaticals, etc. Maybe the member could be *ex officio*?
 - ii. That senator would also be from a particular college, potentially adding another vote to a block. Could we have an alternative motion that the Chair of the URSLC writes a report once a year, apprising us of activities?
 - iii. The communication is the important part – regardless, we must have an FS appointee on the committee to maintain a connection to the FS.
 - iv. 18 for, 4 opposed, one abstention. Motion carries.
- 6. (3:35) Statement regarding the draft resolution on the appointment of the associate provosts [Matt Evett]
 - a. Statement read.
- 7. (3:45) Consider creating a committee to formalize a resolution process and its scheduling
 - a. We need to do a better job with our process for generating resolutions.
 - b. We want to keep the transparency, and keep the “resolution machine” running quickly.
 - c. Suggests that we form a committee to formalize the process.
 - d. If members are interested in being on this committee, they should contact Matt.

8. (3:55) Resolution (1st reading) on the Appointment of High-Level Academic Administrators (see below) [FSEB]
 - a. Isn't this a duplicate resolution?
 - i. No, there was one in 2008 that concerns interim appointments. This proposal has to do with permanent positions.
 - b. Comment: There needs to be a point in there that says specifically that the interim associate provosts were appointed without searches of any kind. Kim would not be in this situation if it were not for the President's actions.
 - c. Comment: Kim has gone on to appoint the Interim CoT Dean without any input whatsoever. The position was not posted. This happens very frequently here at EMU. We need to speak up!
 - d. Comment: The Dean appointment was at the college level.
 - e. Comment: This speaks to the spirit of shared governance. Our discussion was very clear that we wanted a search of some kind. "Disappointment" must be in the wording.
 - f. Comment: Is there anything else we can do? This feels a bit like the UN.
 - i. No, this is it.
 - g. Comment: Shall we include that the position criteria be viewable by all faculty members? Yes.
 - h. 18 for, 4 abstentions.
9. (4:05) Resolution (2nd reading) on First Consideration to Internal Candidates for Administrative Positions (see below) [Mahmud Rahman]
 - a. Question: How is this different from having a national search where internal candidates are welcomed?
 - i. When we talk about "national" searches, we don't really draw on a national scale – we get mostly regional college candidates. We also need some sort of opportunity for advancement. Growing leadership from within at least gets us people that know the university. Our current Provost and President grew within their own institutions before coming here.
 - b. Comment: EMU's administration is very incestuous. "The EMU Way" seemed to be to maintain the status quo. This resolution seems to call for the cutting off of external searches. We should promote internal searches, but we must include national searches.
 - c. Comment: We need to have a consistent voice when looking for leadership
 - d. 2 yea, 16 nay, 2 abstain
10. (4:15) Resolution (2nd reading) on the Appointment of Department Heads (see below) [Mahmud Rahman]
 - a. Comment: This is a different proposal. Department Head is the "first crack" that faculty members have at moving into administration. National searches for DH are a backdoor way to bring in faculty members.

- b. Comment: Some people may be members of departments where there are internal factions that disagree on certain things. Internal searches could result in one faction dominating another.
 - c. Comment: This is just advice to the Dean.
 - d. Comment: Faculty replacement is part of the decision making process.
 - e. 6 yea, 8 nay, 7 abstention
11. (4:25) Provost Office's "Minutes"
- a. Status of BA/BS nomenclature
 - i. No significant update. We are preparing a policy to present to the Board of Regents. Trying to work through implementation issues. Ultimately, the type of degree will be driven by the departments awarding them.
 - b. Possible changes in Accreditation systems
 - i. Provost is asking for input on a recommended change to move from AQUIP to OpenPathways
 - ii. Handout attached to minutes.
 - iii. AQUIP seems more suited to small colleges, OpenPathways is geared to larger organization.
 - iv. We discussed this at length in our November meeting, now would like to make a decision.
 - v. Question: How many institutions are using OP?
 - 1. 200 under AQUIP, all smaller than us. 1100+ are moving to OpenPathways. All institutions must choose which program they are using.
 - vi. Question: Was OpenPathways available when we chose AQUIP?
 - 1. No, it's newer.
 - vii. Question: There was a disconnect under AQUIP between where the projects were and where the faculty were. Hopefully this will improve with the new system.
 - viii. Motion made and seconded, unanimous vote. Motion carries.
 - c. Interim COT dean
 - i. Wade Tornquist has been appointed for a 2-year term
 - ii. Wanted the CoT faculty to be able to work on their 'to-do' list, so wanted an internal person
 - d. COB dean search
 - i. 4 finalists on campus over the last few weeks.
 - ii. Provost has met with the CoB to get good input from the departments.
 - iii. Search might be concluded by the end of next week
 - e. Faulty e-mails discharging students from EMU
 - i. Provost sent e-mail explanation and response.
 - ii. Academic Service part of the University has not received the attention it deserves.
 - iii. Question: Why is the Athletics Department continuing to use the GradesFirst service?

1. The client list of the company has a large number of athletic departments.
2. Our athletics department is happy with the services they receive.
- iv. Question: How will you solve the CoT problems in two years? It was the catch-all college for departments that didn't fit elsewhere.
 1. The CoT has a clear idea of what they want to be, and that there are "spires of excellence."
 2. Hopeful that the CoT can move forward, needs to be better embraced by the university community.
- v. Question: Are we using GradesFirst for the First Years programs?
 1. We were, but we will be doing it ourselves. We want to use Banner.
 2. IT will be taking responsibility for the technology changes, there will be a much closer relationship between IT and the U.
- vi. Question: Were we the only school affected by the "upgrade?"
 1. Yes.
- vii. Question: What happens to the qualitative comments I make on the FirstAlert forms? Are they lost?
 1. They are filtered into an e-mail that gets sent to the student.

12. (4:35) Committee Reports

- a. EEFC [Patrick Koehn]
 - i. Major news – University is moving forward with new ideas about the Strong renovations.
- b. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
 - i. Budget council has closed its business, so it is now up to the Board of Regents to make their decisions. The council recommended that the Regents approve an increase in tuition that matches the governor's maximum.
 - ii. Discussion of block tuition fees.
 - iii. Portfolio investments are on their way up, gifts are increasing.
- c. eFellows/FDC [Randy Baier]
 - i. "Final" wrangling of the clause concerning committee members wishing to apply for eFellows funding.
 - ii. Motion passes

13. (4:45) President's Remarks

Resolutions

Resolution 20120516.1

Resolution on the Appointment of High-Level Academic Administrators

Whereas the provost announced at the April 4, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting that the two interim associate provost appointments would be made permanent and

Whereas in response to the provost's earlier request for input from the Senate on this matter the Senate had made clear that it strongly felt there should be a search committee, including faculty representation, involved in the selection of these permanent appointments and

Whereas the Faculty Council passed a resolution on October 15, 2008 saying, in part, "*The Faculty Council strongly objects to the practice of appointing interim administrators without an appropriate internal search. We suggest that a search committee be appointed, that the position be posted internally, and that candidates be screened according to the published criteria for the position*", therefore

Be it resolved that the Senate expresses disappointment with the provost's decision and urges that in the future whenever a permanent high-level academic position is to be filled that every effort be made to use a search committee including faculty members, that the position criteria be posted, and that candidates be screened according to the published criteria.

Resolution 20120404.1

First Consideration to Internal Candidates for Administrative Positions:

Motion: For administrative leadership positions within Academic Affairs, internal candidates shall be given first consideration before external candidates are invited.

Discussion

Recruiting mostly from outside is not facilitating growth of leadership from within, or encouraging to assume increasingly responsible positions. It merely stunts the growth of leadership from within. The best organizations are the ones who afford career advancement opportunities to their best qualified employees. The best leaders are the ones who foster the growth of their own replacements—and not be threatened by it. Our success rests not just in the career advancement for our students, but also in fostering the development of academic leaderships.

By continuously recruiting from outside, EMU forever remains a debtor to the academic community. A large campus like us should be able to reciprocate the gift of leadership. But, none among us would live up to that billing unless our own campus believes in us, and facilitates with the requisite experience.

Our top leadership positions are continually filled with external candidates. Promotion from within has been sparse, and not seem to be our default mode. That implies a belief that an exceptional leader can mostly be found from outside of EMU. Further, such external candidates are better leaders in influencing our future than one appointed from our ranks.

It never hurts to have a reality check. Our last two Presidents had short tenure with utter disappointments for all. The last two Provosts did not fare any better either. If national search is the answer to our prayers, at least one of those should have succeeded. None did.

To be fair, the advocates for a national search over internal candidates do have meritorious arguments. Internal candidates may be perpetuating or harboring some negative culture or office politics. A dissenting view could argue that a sense of pride, history, tradition and continuity may come from those who are vested in it. A careful internal search may save us from the practice of throwing the baby with the bath water.

Another argument is to invite outside talents. That good argument must be vetted with the reality of who we are. We are neither a world class university, nor even a national university. Neither are we a regional university. Our focus has been to serve the SOUTHEAST Michigan. So, our leaders must have vested interest and commitment to this area. A pool of 700+ tenured or tenure seeking faculty members, many of whom are also nationally recognized, and who call this region home, is where the search for leadership talent should begin.

Most of our appointments have not come from a national pool, but mostly from our neighbors like Grand Valley, UM-Flint, UM-Dearborn. Our current President and the new Provost are both from our neighboring campus of UM-Dearborn. Are we to concede then that these are the institutions that are better poised in creating top leadership for EMU, than coming from within our ranks? Could someone see a paranoid inferiority complex embedded in our recruiting process?

Consider an implication to our concept of shared governance where administrative leaders know of EMU only from the position in which they have been appointed. They have never participated as a faculty or in any other positions. And hardly any faculty members have assumed any administrative responsibilities. Would it not harden the "divide" between faculty and administrators in our campus?

Resolution 20120404.2

Department Heads to Be Filled Internally Where Possible

Motion: Department Head (DH) positions are to be filled primarily with internal candidates. Only if an internal search fails should an external search be authorized.

Discussion:

There are at least four arguments for promoting internal candidates to the DH level:

- One: DH positions are the entry level administrative positions. This is the first step into the administrative ranks. Without this experience, the remainder of the administrative ladder remains inaccessible and we do not create a rich pool of internal candidates for higher level appointments.
 - Two: The two most important missions of the university are executed at the departmental level: learning and scholarship. Faculty members are the ones primarily responsible for these. Consequently none are better qualified for leading those missions than the faculty who are already vested with an indefinite tenure in their departments.
 - Three: If DHs are hired from outside, they are usually appointed at the full professor rank with tenure. However, soon after the appointment, they may step down to assume faculty status. That has happened many times at Eastern. We are then stuck with an expensive faculty position that might have been filled with a different candidate had we been hiring a faculty member rather than an administrator.
 - Four: Promoting from within and filling the vacancy with a new tenure track position provides the best of both the worlds. We oxygenate our faculty talent pool with the latest graduates and in the area of specialization that we most need. Entry level candidates offer high productivity as they work through the tenure and promotion process. As an institution focused on teaching, this offers the best bang for our buck, and, in the process, we create a new academic leader amongst us.
-
-

AAUP Bargaining Council proposal related to the Faculty Senate:

ARTICLE XII. SABBATICAL LEAVES, RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY FELLOWSHIPS, AND OTHER AWARDS

D. Screening Committee

Paragraph 362:

“A broadly representative screening committee, consisting of six (6) Faculty Members appointed by the Faculty Senate, one (1) academic Dean, and two (2) academic Department Heads appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Provost and Executive Vice President...”

Change the highlighted language to:

New MP362:

"A broadly representative screening committee shall be constituted, consisting of seven (7) Faculty Members **appointed by the respective College Councils and the Library**: one from each of the COB, COT, CHHS, and COE; two from CAS (one from the Arts and one from the Sciences); and one from the Halle Library, shall have the following duties..."

1. **Represent the faculty as a whole in their deliberations;**

Rationale:

The current process of Faculty Senate appointments to the URSLC is to appoint one faculty member from each of the colleges and a library faculty. This change would standardize the process, with "duly elected" members. Furthermore it would increase the representation of the diversity of the CAS.

Fully 1/3 of our workload is associated with research and creative output, and the FRF and sabbatical leave system is a major source of funding for that output. It is thus essential that the process for awarding research leaves be fair. In addition, the input must be from the faculty, not with consultation from administration appointed on the committee.