

Faculty Senate Minutes, March 2, 2018

Call to Order

**Previous minutes:**

King moved to accept previous minutes with minor revisions, Babb seconded, motion passed.

**Our guest was Provost Shaffer, his remarks and discussions:**

**X-drop issue, academic integrity cases:** Need to clarify that you can report to Registrar that you can prevent drop until the process (academic integrity) plays out. Will need to contact registrar to prevent drops, we need instructions about this in faculty handbook. (*Don't* have to have student do form first, etc.) Faculty would need to lift drop prevention afterwards if that is appropriate when using another penalty than immediate F for course.

Will need to add language about this to handbook.

**Davis:** What are logistics issues with this (very near in time with drop deadline, etc.)?

**Shaffer:** Not sure about logistics. There is trepidation that we are making a precedent, since we have decided before that we cannot drop students as faculty.

**Seward:** Can we do this now or does it need to be in the handbook?

**Shaffer:** Would need to be in both faculty handbook and student handbook before implemented. Deans have already approved this.

**Lust:** can we prevent them from coming to class if they refuse to drop? What is policy on removing them from classroom due to academic integrity? Legal situation?

**Shaffer:** I don't know.

**Lust:** There is a potential for classroom disruption.

**Shaffer:** UPD will remove a student for disruption, there is a standard procedure for this.

**Shaffer:** Also need to point out that the grade will be assigned at the end of the class, so it will avoid some financial aid issues before semester end, etc.

I can look into it and see if there are legal ramifications. Important to discuss with student. The student may demand to stay until appeal resolved, as long as behavior is appropriate.

**Ambrose:** What about issue of colleges setting APS percentages differently, and the way that different departments assign them? Can we change our percentages toward the end of the year instead of in February?

**Shaffer:** Reiterated that standard way of doing it in February, etc. was originally to be to benefit faculty by allowing them to plan ahead of time. Intention was to help faculty, but it is correct that we have no crystal ball. From my perspective if senate would like to make change, there needs to be an indication that weights can be set no later than some date. You may get pushback from dept. heads and supervisors. Weights are static in college of business, for example.

**Babb:** It does make it a predictable chain of events.

**Ambrose:** Some departments are different.

**Pinkham:** Ours are set in meeting with supervisor, but changed by supervisor later (Shaffer & Ambrose: presumably to benefit faculty member?).

**Shaffer:** It is much preferable that procedure be uniform, needs to be taken back to deans to see what is being done.

**Davis:** I disagree---if others are adjusted and mine aren't that is no benefit to me.

**Fiaud:** There is a lot of variability among faculty.

**Davis:** Needs to be consistent across faculty. College of Business voted to set percentages at fixed values.

**Craig:** Numbers shouldn't be in such evaluations at all, speaking as a "numbers" person.

**Ingrassia:** If one sets numbers early, then that limits one's professional activities with changing conditions, there are disadvantages to setting percentages later

**Shaffer:** Was meant to be planning, reflective system. Was meant to keep faculty active in all areas. Open to conversations about this. Has been useful for reaffirmation of accreditations.

**Babb:** One issue is have a cumulative effect on tenure, etc. but it can't vacillate because it affects appearance to people outside the field, etc.

**Craig:** Could have supervisor write sentences? A narrative evaluation, etc.

**Pinkham:** We don't know averages, number is often sort of floating and you don't know where you stand. (Seward: similar remarks; didn't get numbers this year)

**Shaffer:** Also have changes when departments/supervisors change.

**Lust:** How are minimums set? System? Where does this system come from?

**Shaffer:** Assume it was a decision made by university as appropriate for tenure track faculty. Can look at it, but think any changes made would include all three areas.

**Lust:** Is a similar three-way evaluation common to other institutions?

**Shaffer:** Universal (in TX) but of course sometimes evaluated in the breach. Your department (Ag) is only one that puts percentages in the appointment letter.

**King:** Sometimes put percentages in ours, but not usually.

**Lust:** Usually works but sometimes they are not noted by faculty.

**Fiaud:** There are systems with different ways of doing it, such as evaluation of department where other people can take part of distribution of activities as chosen by the department. Merit can be determined at department level (Pinkham made concurring comments.)

**Shaffer: Instructor proposal:** Want to think more deliberately about it, think there is path forward but need to think about it. Have original and updated proposal. Will send something to Bill soon on path forward to meet objectives.

(Further discussion ensued.)

**Old business:**

**System update emails:**

**Burnett:** Handout on March 2, 2018 **System Rules**

Biggest issue: Nepotism rules have been made more explicit. Burnett can send full version via email if faculty may have an issue.

There are also new rules on foreign nationals. Sharon Burnett can give formal documents and can answer some questions.

**Data on Merit issues** (from Blake Decker): Plans to have data and will present it at Apr. 6 meeting.

**IT issues:** Two factor authentication will apply to students for off-campus FERPA-sensitive logins: This will apply to Blackboard; Datatel, etc. will go to two-factor for faculty. Also for non-smart classrooms on-campus you will need two-factor authentication.

**Tenure & Promotion language:** Meeting is still set for March 6 (Ambrose). So update will come after that.

**Magister Optimus Award:** (qualifications handout) please prepare nominations, but remember it needs to be kept secret until award.

**Other New Business:**

Dean Hawkins funeral services tomorrow

Lal Almas will be interim Dean for Agriculture & Natural Sciences.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Craig, Secretary.