

Minutes of Faculty Senate
October 11, 2005
303 Education Building

Senate President Joe Riesen called the meeting to order at 12:31p.m. in Room 303 in the Education, Health Career and Family and Consumer Sciences Building.

The following members were present: Baur, M. Bond, S. Bond, Burnell, Hansen, Kelley, Kirby, Kirk, Mazure, Moore, Morphew, Poland, Reneau, Richardson, Savage, Scanlon, Schaupp, Shaver, Shields, White, Wilson and Turbanic (for Young).

The following guests were present: Sandra Woods, CTC Assembly President; Erica Harvey, Anne Patterson, Christina Lavorata, Dan Bradley

The September 13, 2005 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Riesen announced new senators, Mary Burnell and Valerie Morphew.

Moore announced that SB 603 requires a study of personnel issues. This study will update the most recent tenure study and must be completed in the next three years. Most of the study will focus on classified staff issues. The Faculty Council will meet Friday to prepare presentations for LOCEA in December.

Moore announced that the Board of Governors met last week and passed two pay raise allocations for faculty - one for raises based on merit and the other for short-term disability insurance. Faculty raises range from 0 to 6.9%. Approximately 86% of money for faculty raises was appropriated from the Fairmont State BOG and approximately 13.5% came from legislature.

Riesen reminded the members about the WebCT forum. All University and CTC faculty have access to the forum. The forum will host curriculum proposals so the departments will need to create electronic versions of the all curriculum proposals.

The deadline for catalog entries is March 1. All curriculum changes must be passed through the Curriculum Committee and the Senate by March 1 in order to be in the 2005-2006 catalog.

Kelley announced that Bob Morgenstern and Judy Hale (AFT) have been assured by Governor Manchin that AEI will be passed in the legislative session. July 26 is the anticipated date for AEI checks which will include \$50 per year for the number of years of service at Fairmont State. Kelley also noted that the AFT legislative agenda complements the ACF. Bob Morgenstern is continuing to look into the faculty leave policy.

Moore announced that Governor Manchin and Jay Cole suggested that we contact legislators in November.

Richardson will be making regular announcements related to student activities and concerns.

OLD BUSINESS

Kelley moved to open discussion on the D/ F – Transfer Policy. Poland seconded.

S. Bond moved to split the policy into two policies. Moore seconded. Motion carried. Riesen noted that the CTC Assembly voted to make an addition to the policy for information stating that students need prior approval from the registrar to take a class at another campus. The portion that is “Regularly enrolled students....” was the line that was inserted into the policy based on the current policy. Motion carried.

M. Bond moved to open discussion on the D/F Policy. Mazure seconded. Motion carried. Poland asked for clarification on a “legal repeat.” If a student makes a grade of C or better, the student cannot repeat the class for a higher grade.

Reneau moved to approved D/F policy. Poland seconded. Motion carried.

Reneau moved to table transfer policy. Shields seconded. The CTC Assembly has not made a decision regarding the transfer policy. Motion carried.

Kelley moved to suspend rules of order and to bring the Draft on using data for promotion and tenure decisions to the floor without a vote. Kirby seconded. Motion carried. E. Harvey gave quick overview of policy. Section one of the policy addresses how the policy will be phased into place. The policy takes effect in 2008. Part two addresses how the evaluation data will be used in tenure and promotion decisions. It addresses minimal values from the yearly data in addition to the tenure portfolio. Section three addresses how these values will be applied to tenure decisions. This will begin six years from the time policy is passed. Part four addresses stopping the tenure clock. Current policies do not address this issue. Part five addresses how this policy will apply to temporary full-time faculty members. Harvey’s suggestion for haste is based on the use of Section 1A. Currently new faculty members do two evaluation processes – the old probationary faculty form and the Merit Evaluation form. Concerns discussed:

- The CAFE committee is working on consistency across disciplines.
- The IDEA information does not come back in time for use by probationary faculty since the process is based on the calendar year and must be turned in by December.
- Due to inconsistencies in the evaluation formats across campus, is it fair to use the 2004 evaluation information?
- Could the 2004-2005 information be used as a pilot?

Harvey explained that provisions have been made for inconsistent evaluation data. The data is accompanied by letter from the dean/chair of your department/school that explains your score in the context of your discipline or environment.

Patterson noted that she has sent the probationary faculty forms to the appropriate departments since this policy has not yet been passed.

Hansen asked if the CAFE Committee should be determining the minimum values. Harvey noted that safeguards were built into the policy. The committee created averages to help the process. For example, if 2.75 is the score for tenure, departments have a better sense of what a tenure level work “should look like.” Harvey explained that the policy must be reviewed in 2008 in case it does not work. It is a “protective process.” In its investigation, the committee found that 60% of the faculty scored above 3.4.

Social and Behavioral Sciences used a 5 point scale rather than a 4 point scale. Those numbers were converted to match the scale used by other divisions. Shaver asked if the transfer from a 5 point to 4 point scale depressed the numbers. M. Bond noted that he used a simple formula to convert to the 4 point scale. Harvey noted that the change did not affect the distribution of scores.

Kelley suggested we discuss this information with our divisions. Baur reminded the members that the issue is up for discussion on the WebCT forum. The plan is to discuss the policy at next month’s meeting.

Savage noted her concern about the “still forming criteria.” For example, if a colleague is a prolific writer and publishes a book each year, will everyone in that department be held to that standard? Will this create an environment of competition rather than collaboration? Baur reiterated that your peers have been charged with creating the criteria. Scanlon commented that as a member of the promotion and tenure committee, he thinks it will be a helpful criterion - something from which to judge in addition to the portfolio. Savage continued that her concern speaks to the purpose of the CAFE committee and questioned if those criteria determinations will be taken from the local departments. Harvey responded that your area will have to decide what works for you. Poland added that there is a degree of autonomy when determining the weight of the score. Individual evaluations can be weighted more toward teaching so it would not be necessary for everyone to meet the standard of the colleague who writes a book every year. Scanlon asked Savage is she is worried that merit raises will drive the annual evaluation? Savage noted that she saw that happen in a research institution where one person wrote three books and that became the new standard.

Riesen asked, “What will happen if the faculty member has low numbers?” He noted that there doesn’t seem to be anything in the policy to help that person “get up to speed.” M. Bond commented that there has been discussion that faculty with low performance will be referred to the Teaching and Learning Center. Hansen questioned the amount of information that will be given to the chairs versus the deans. He questioned who would bear the responsibility for the computation and for making sure the faculty member gets help from the Teaching and Learning Center. The response was that the process was not intended to be punitive but as motivation to improve. Harvey asked that the members post their questions and concerns to the Vista forum so we can get some answers before the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Curriculum Proposal - #2005-06-01 from the School of Business. Bond moved to approve for first reading. Moore seconded. Motion carried.

Kelley moved to endorse the ACF Statement of Faculty Issues including the recommendation for funding in higher education that parities K-12 education. Burnell seconded. Motion carried.

Riesen asked that the Senate consider appointing an ad hoc committee on Community Service as requested by Donna Nuzum. Faculty can go to the Vista forum to volunteer.

Meeting Adjourned 1:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Francene Kirk,
Faculty Senate Secretary