# ASU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes 3 p.m., October 26, 2016, Vista Verde

Kim Livengood, President	X	Erin Ashworth-King, VP	Х	Kraig Schell, Past-Pres.	Х
Michael Burnett, Secretary	Х	Andrew Siefker, Parl.	Х	Vincent Mangano	
Jeffery Boone	Х	David Faught	Х	Nicholas Negovetich	Х
Jackie Brown	Х	Matthew Gritter	Х	Kendra Nicks	Х
David Carter	Х	Dinah Harriger		Lopa Roychoudhuri	Х
Daniel Castaneda	Х	Randy Hicks	Х	Chase Runyan	Х
Jordan Daniel	Х	John Irish	Х	Marva Solomon	Х
David Dewar	Х	Richard Lawrence	Х	Andy Wallace	Х

Called to order at 3:00pm

# 1. Approval of Current Agenda

AS - MOVED

 $MG - 2^{nd}$ 

Approved unanimous

#### 2. Invited Guests

- 2.1. Dr. Brian May, President
- 2.2. Dr. Don Topliff, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs present
- 2.3. Dr. Javier Flores, VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
- 2.4. Kent Corder, Staff Senate Chairperson
- 2.5. Peyton LaBauve, Student Senate President

### 3. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting

AS – moved

AW - 2nd

## 4. Standing Committee Reports

- 4.1. Academic Affairs (vacant)
  - 4.1.1. Need someone to be chair
  - 4.1.2. EAK will set a meeting time TBD
- 4.2. Bylaws and Standing Rules (Dr. Lopamudra Roychoudhuri)
  - 4.2.1. Nothing
- 4.3. University Affairs (Dr. Kraig Schell)
  - 4.3.1. Report forthcoming (under unfinished business)
- 4.4. Student Affairs (Dr. David Faught)
  - 4.4.1. nothing
- 4.5. External Affairs (vacant)

- 4.5.1. 1 nominee for chair, 2 votes
- 4.6. Committee on Committees (Dr. Erin Ashworth-King)
- 4.7. Nothing

#### 5. Unfinished Business

- 5.1. OP 6.28 Kraig Schell powerpoint
  - 5.1.1. Process same as current policy, just revising
  - 5.1.2. Important Changes in 6.23
    - 5.1.2.1. Departments/programs set minimum expectations
    - 5.1.2.2. College committee evaluates prior to dean
    - 5.1.2.3. Increase transparency
  - 5.1.3. Purposes of Annual Evals
    - 5.1.3.1. Provide developmental feedback
    - 5.1.3.2. Encourage tenured faculty to remain active
    - 5.1.3.3. Document faculty activity over a period of time
    - 5.1.3.4. Provide high quality evidence for disagreements between faculty and admin
  - 5.1.4. Section 2 of 06.28 is directly from 06.23
    - 5.1.4.1. Reminder of the 3 areas evaluated
    - 5.1.4.2. 6.23 sets criteria, 6.28 utilize criteria
    - 5.1.4.3. Process flow essentially unchanged
      - 5.1.4.3.1. Added meeting for tenure-track/chair
      - 5.1.4.3.2. If requested meeting for tenure/chair
    - 5.1.4.4. Q tenure only participate in evaluation of T & TT faculty? Yes
    - 5.1.4.5. Q does chair participate as a T member of DPRC? No
    - 5.1.4.6. Q what to do if DPRC is less than 3 members? go outside department to add needed members. Language is in 6.23, can be moved to 6.28
    - 5.1.4.7. Q some concern about opaqueness of current language and articulation
       policies are legal documents and not philosophical...need to be this way to
       protect university and individuals
    - 5.1.4.8. Q when are 6.23 criteria due? policy in place by august, but need to be approved by BOR in February. 6.28 & 6.29 are not BOR required, but are being packaged for review
    - 5.1.4.9. Q concern & anxiety about the scale (numbers) replacing current (sat, needs improve, unsat)
    - 5.1.4.10. Appropriate for a department to have secondary criteria for promotion to full prof.
    - 5.1.4.11. Q concern that 5 point scale with 3 being satisfactory, that it would be perceived as not good enough. Suggest going to 4 instead of 5
    - 5.1.4.12. Q developmental plans can be seen as punitive not intent, but more to have a conversation about how faculty can improve in a given area. Language can be improved to reflect this
    - 5.1.4.13. Q negatives have to provide a written justification? yes

- 5.1.4.14. If credit of time is given at point of hire, can previous experience be used for T&P? not aware that you couldn't. Language needs to be added to allow for it
- 5.1.4.15. Hiring with tenure is in OP mainly for hiring Dean or Chair since they have to have tenure to serve in their position
- 5.1.4.16. Q packets due by 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday of fall semester calendars are supposed to sync within OPs
- 5.1.4.17. Q are there safeguards to keep this from becoming a punitive document? can look at language again to make it less punitive appearing
- 5.1.4.18. Q are probationary faculty given a reason to terminate prior to tenure? Currently it can be done with no reason. This policy is trying to give rationale for support or denial of continued employment.
- 5.1.4.19. DPRC not referenced/defined...open to interpretation by department one of 3 a DPRC, all Tenured Faculty evaluate, or department decides
- 5.1.4.20. Requesting feedback on the document still
- 5.2. OP 6.29 Tenure Denial or Revocation
  - 5.2.1. Was a section in old 6.23, now a stand alone
  - 5.2.2. A tenure denial appeal is now filed with campus legal/university attorney and not provost
    - 5.2.2.1. Provost is part of approval/denial chain, so appeal has to go to different route
    - 5.2.2.2. Q does tenure revocation mean fired? Means beginning of firing process
      - 5.2.2.2.1. Tenure revocation is more for bad evals, lack of service or scholarship
    - 5.2.2.3. Timelines changed
      - 5.2.2.3.1. 30 day window to file
      - 5.2.2.3.2. 30 day window to decide (once committee has been assigned)
    - 5.2.2.4. Faculty Senate responsible for constructing a Tenure Advisory

      Committee where members would be pulled to create the committee for appeal 1 tenured member from each department on campus
      - 5.2.2.4.1. Chairs and deans are not part of the TAC
    - 5.2.2.5. Concern about power of the President to revoke tenure (affecting the reputation of institution) will go back in and look at
    - 5.2.2.6. Concern about intent of document to limit the position of those denied or revoked of tenure will go back in and look at
    - 5.2.2.7.

#### 6. New Business.

- 6.1. Communication between coaches and professors—update
  - 6.1.1. tabled
- 6.2. "ASU Week for Honoring Neuro and Physical Diversity" Proclamation
  - 6.2.1. noted and tabled
- 6.3. Possibility of increasing the Faculty Dependent Scholarship

- 6.3.1. Needs a proposal, sent to Student Affairs committee
- 6.4. Senior Instructor Merit Raises
  - 6.4.1. tabled

#### 7. Roundtable

- 7.1. When and how do faculty find out their committee assignments?
  - 7.1.1. Comes out of president's office
  - 7.1.2. Can a PDF be sent out to all faculty so they can find their appointments? Yes
- 7.2. Concern about RSO and Honor Society requirements & procedures. referred to student affairs
- 7.3. History NEH grant series on the great wars

# 8. Adjournment

- 8.1. AS moved
- 8.2.  $JD 2^{nd}$
- 8.3. Adjourned at 4:59pm