FACULTY SENATE

MEETING MINUTES

FOR THE YEAR

2003-2004

MEETING MINUTES FOR 08-29-03

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting August 29, 2003, at 1:30 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Paul Hatley (Treasurer), Peter Macpherson (Senator, Applied Technology), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences)

Guest: Dr. Ray Brown

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on April 25, 2003, and the Faculty Association meeting of August 12, 2003, were approved.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS:

Faculty Workload: Results of the faculty workload survey were discussed. Returns were scant, and the limited window for reporting made the data potentially unrepresentative.

Old and New Issues:

Safety: Correspondence re the safety plan between the previous chair and Dr. Boyd indicates the plan is under consideration. The Chair will check on status.

Folding: Folding of on-line and on-ground classes into one class is still occurring.

Class limits for on-line classes: The faculty has queried class limits for on-line classes.

Communication: There is still a need for clear communication.

Password protection: Faculty are still asking for password protected data/resources for student access.

Grades due: Faculty have asked that grades not be due for two business days after finals. (See motion below.)

Martin Luther King Day: Faculty have requested that Martin Luther King Day be an observed holiday. (See motion below.)

Calendar: The faculty has queried how the calendar is made. For example, the Fall 03 calendar does not meet the required number of days for those classes only meeting on Thursday. The Chair will query the process.

Campus beautification: A sidewalk from Health Science toward the city pool has been suggested.

Advising paperwork: Faculty continue to query the amount of paperwork required of the faculty in advising, in particular the degree checks. It has been suggested that general education checks be done for transfer students on their entry to RSU.

Dr. Brown discussed the forthcoming economic survey and asked Faculty Senate to encourage faculty participation.

MOTIONS:

Grades due: It was moved, seconded, and passed to send a memorandum to Dr. Wiley asking that grades not be due for two business days after finals. (See attached.)

Martin Luther King Day: It was moved, seconded, and passed to send a memorandum forward to Dr. Wiley requesting that Martin Luther King Day be an observed holiday. (See attached.)

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Friday, September 19, 2003, at 1:30 in BH 203.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary
APPROVED 26 Sept. 2003

ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES

-----Original Message-----

From: James Ford
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 10:13 AM
To: Richard Boyd
Cc: Emily Dial-Driver
Subject: Final Exam Deadlines, Martin Luther King Day

Dr. Boyd-

Good morning. Attached is the information on the grade schedules and MLK Day observances for various Oklahoma institutions. The only thing we do not know is the time at which grades are due-- in most cases, the schools simply listed the date, so whether grades are actually due at the close of the day or at noon is unclear.

The Senate is requesting at least two full business days between the close of the final exam period and the deadline for submitting grades. Particularly in the spring, when commencement activities occupy most of the weekend (and intersession courses begin Monday at 8 a.m.), having the weekend is insufficient for grading most exams. Writing-intensive final exams are especially time-consuming. The Senate recommends a 5 p.m. Wednesday deadline (assuming finals finish on the previous Friday).

The Senate is also requesting that Martin Luther King, Jr., Day be observed as a school holiday. Since this request was first made last fall, Oklahoma State University has joined the list of schools observing the holiday.

As we discussed, both of these policies were first requested by the full Faculty Association in Fall 2002. The Senate decided that both issues were important enough to warrant further consideration.

Thank you.

Jim

MEETING MINUTES FOR 09-26-03

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting September 26, 2003, at 1:30 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Paul Hatley (Treasurer), Carole Burrage (Parliamentarian), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science),

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on August 29, 2003, were approved.

BUSINESS:

The Chair reported on his **discussion with Dr. Boyd:**

Safety Plan: The administration will check on the status.

Folding Classes: The administration needs more information on occurrences. Senators will check. Distance Education committee should handle a policy.

Dates Grades Due: A memo requested two full business days after close of finals.

Martin Luther King Day: A memo requested this as a holiday.

Calendar: The academic calendar will take into account once a week classes in order to ensure required minimum contact hours are met.

Faculty awards: The Faculty Awards are at Faculty Development.

General Ed Position: General Education will be reviewed on a regular basis, just as programs are reviewed. Dr. Boyd queried if Assessment and Curriculum want additional members in order to handle tasks.

Query: The Senate will invite Dr. Boyd to selected Senate meetings.

Committee Chairs: Dr. Boyd will invite committee chairs to workshop.

OTHER ITEMS:

Committee List: Some committees have lost members through illness, etc. New members are needed in Academic Policies (Patrick Seward will serve); Assessment (Math/Science should appoint a member); Enrollment Management (Barbara Hannah will be queried as to her service); Faculty Development (Barbara Hannah will serve). If Harry Stege not a permanent faculty member, he will be replaced on Marketing by a member of SBS.

Committee Guidelines: Chair will e-mail committee chairs as to whether the current procedures are still accurate; all committees will be asked to respond to the queries so that guidelines and procedures may be included in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.

NCA Report Status: Coordinator is meeting with section chairs to apprise them of status.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Friday, October 24, 2003, at 1:00 in BH 203.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED October 10, 2003

MEETING MINUTES FOR 10-10-03

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting October 10, 2003, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Peter Macpherson (Senator, Applied Technology), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on September 26, 2003, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Dates Grades Due: A memo to Dr. Boyd requested grades be due two full business days after the close of finals. Dr. Boyd sent the Senate a proposal about grade dues dates, substantially proposing that grades for each class be due two business days after the day of the final. (See attached.) See motion below.

Job Search Applications: More than one faculty member has suggested that job applications be directed to the head of the department in which the faculty position is located. At this time applications go to Human Resources. Faculty have suggested that applications to departments would streamline the process, save copying costs, and be perceived more like a university process than a business model. The Chair will query the administration on this matter.

Use of Statistical Data in Development/Evaluation: A faculty member has raised the question of use of statistical data compiled by the university in the faculty development/evaluation process. For example, the percentage of students failing or withdrawing from class has been collected and listed by instructor name. Some instructors who have more than a 25% rate on this list have been told that they must "address this problem" or their request for a category above proficient will be "red-flagged." See motion below.

"Folding" of Classes: It was reported that in the Department of Applied Technology, in Spring 2003 two of seven faculty had folded classes and in Fall 2003 four of seven faculty had folded classes.

MOTIONS:

Grades Due: It was moved and seconded to vote on the proposal for grade due dates sent to the Senate by Dr. Boyd. The proposal was unanimously rejected.

Use of Statistical Date in Development/Evaluation: It was moved, seconded, and passed that the Faculty Senate state that the Senate is opposed to a listing of failures and withdrawals listed by faculty name and that the Senate is vehemently opposed to such a list being used in the faculty development/evaluation process.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Friday, October 24, 2003, at 1:00 in BH 203.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED October 24, 2003

MEETING MINUTES FOR 10-24-03

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting October 24, 2003, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Paul Hatley (Treasurer), Peter Macpherson (Senator, Applied Technology), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on October 10, 2003, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Dates Grades Due: The Chair discussed grades due dates with Dr. Boyd. The new proposal from Dr. Boyd is attached. (See motion below.)

Use of Statistical Data in Development/Evaluation: The Chair discussed this issue with Dr. Boyd, who said the list of percent of failures/withdrawals is not designed to be used in the faculty development/evaluation process. The list is of classes, not faculty members, and is designed to evaluate student preparation on coming in to classes. Faculty will not be asked to justify their ratings.

Administrative Withdrawals: Administrative withdrawals of students for disciplinary problems were discussed. The Chair will discuss the procedure with Dr. Boyd.

Spam Filter for E-Mail: The possibility of a spam filter for e-mail was discussed. Senators will poll their department faculty for opinions on instituting such a filter, recognizing that some e-mails will be lost with this process.

0-Level Courses: The status of UPA teachers was discussed. Ken and Emily will report on what classification teachers in the UPA hold, to whom they report, what the "chain of command" is, what evaluation process of teachers is required, the number of people teaching, how many classes each teaches, how many students in each class, whether teaching evaluations by students are required, etc.

MOTIONS:

Grades Due: It was moved, seconded, and passed to thank the administration for the new grades due date for Spring 2004; to accept the new proposal for the 2003-04 academic year; and, in our acceptance, to express hope that the Tuesday 5 p.m. deadline will become standard for all future semesters.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Friday, November 7, 2003, from 1-2:00 in BH 203.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED December 5, 2003

ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES

-----Original Message-----
From: James Ford
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2003 9:08 AM
To: Richard Boyd
Cc: Emily Dial-Driver
Subject: Senate Update

Dr. Boyd-

Good morning. I wanted to let you know about two actions from the most recent Faculty Senate meeting. The first regarded your counter-proposal regarding grade submissions; the second regarded the "list" that has been much discussed recently, the list of courses and/or faculty for which at least 25% of students withdrew or failed. The specific motions are delineated below.

Aside from those two items, I only know of a couple of minor issues we need to discuss. Please let me know if there is anything else we need to cover.

Thank you. I will see you at 11 am in your office.

Jim

Grades Due:

It was moved and seconded to vote on the proposal for grade due dates sent to the Senate by Dr. Boyd. The proposal was unanimously rejected.

Use of Statistical Data in Development/Evaluation:

It was moved, seconded, and passed that the Faculty Senate state that the Senate is opposed to a listing of failures and withdrawals listed by faculty name, and that the Senate is vehemently opposed to such a list being used in the faculty development/evaluation process.

An e-mail communication from a faculty member on the Distance Education Committee said the following:

Emily

FYI ... the Distance Education Committee addressed the issue of folding classes last year, drafted a proposal/statement against such practice, and forwarded the recommendation to the administration via our committee chair, Doug Grenier ... I have no idea what happened after that, but wanted you (and the Senate) to know that we did address the issue last year.

MEETING MINUTES FOR 12-05-03

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting December 5, 2003, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Peter Macpherson (Senator, Applied Technology), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on October 24, 2003, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Distance Education Courses Folding: The Distance Education Committee recommended to the Academic Council that distance education classes populations not be combined with on-ground class populations to count as one class (a process known as "folding"). The recommendation was rejected. No compromise committee was formed. The Senate will monitor further developments.

Faculty Development and Evaluation System: The faculty evaluation system and the Faculty Development Committee report on that system (see attached) were discussed. (See motion below.)

Faculty Mentoring System: The faculty mentoring system proposed by the Faculty Development Committee (see attached) was discussed. (See motion below.)

Faculty Development Committee: The Chair will query the committee about status of the awards proposal.

Department Heads: Senators will query their departments about search procedures.

Ratemyprofessor.com: Ratemyprofessor.com website was discussed. Some faculty have objected to the posting of a notice about the site negatively worded about professors. The Chair will query Student Activities as the origin of a posted notice, which seems to be under the aegis of Student Activities, and express the Senate's concerns.

Meeting with Dr. Wiley: The Senate will meet with Dr. Wiley early in the Spring 2004 semester.

MOTIONS:

Faculty Development and Evaluation System: It was moved, seconded, and passed to ask the Faculty Development Committee to begin the process of review of the faculty evaluation system.

Faculty Mentoring System: It was moved, seconded, and passed that the description and goals of faculty mentoring system proposed by the Faculty Development Committee be endorsed and that the suggested revision of options be proposed (Revised Option: Selections are made from a pool of available mentors (developed on a faculty volunteer basis) by the department chairs. In the candidate's offer letter, the department chair will assign a temporary mentor to each newcomer. The new faculty member may remain with this original mentor indefinitely or may add another mentor at any time. Mentors may be changed without need to state a reason. Together the mentor and new faculty member will develop a mutual plan for the semester. The mentor and new faculty member may set their own schedules depending on the needs of the new faculty member. This may include an exchange of classroom observations. The mentor/new faculty member relationship is informal and reflects an attitude of colleagues helping each other. It is never a supervisory relationship), and that the Faculty Development Committee be encouraged to develop a manual for new faculty.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be Friday, January 9, 2004, from at 1:00 p.m. in Meyer Hall.

SUBMITTED BY: Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED: Jan. 9, 2004

ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES

The following document represents the results of the "Faculty Evaluation System Satisfaction Survey" conducted by Myra Haulmark and the Faculty Development Committee. As indicated by the results, there are obvious indicators of desire for change. The Faculty Development Committee submits this information with the intent to determine whether the Faculty Senate would like any further action on this charge (e.g. would you like us to begin the process of review of the Faculty Evaluation System based on the information below, so that we can make recommendations for change).

Faculty Evaluation System Satisfaction Survey. Describe your overall satisfaction with the current Faculty Evaluation System. Satisfaction with System.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 – very dissatisfied	9	28.1	28.1	28.1
	2 - somewhat dissatisfied	9	28.1	28.1	56.3
	3 – satisfied	10	31.3	31.3	87.5
	4 - somewhat satisfied	2	6.3	6.3	93.8
	5 - very satisfied	2	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Statistics - Satisfaction with System

N	Valid	32
Mean		2.34
Std. Deviation		1.15

Add any additional comments:

- "If it ain't broke, don't fix it"
- Does not seem to be objective enough.
- It is a useless exercise in generating paper.
- Evaluate yourself, and then the administration changes the evaluation, or requires ridiculous "support" data.
- There is no clear distinction between development and evaluation (two separate (sometimes competing) goals); the system is not consistently followed; and it is often difficult to know how the information is being used.
- Feedback does not seem to be there. More a going through the motions. Evaluations are a tricky business even in academic environments. Hard to get them "right".

- Too many qualities, such as committee work and dept. contributions, are not rated; the issue of national, regional, etc., contributions or recognition is still being used as a discriminator by some evaluators
- The system was not well-implemented and not well conceived (borrowed from SEOSU). It proceeded top down, should have been developed by faculty for faculty. There was much confusion and misunderstanding of what the criteria really means. Not being interpreted uniformly across academic units. Will having a preponderance of "Proficients" across the categories allow one to get promoted or tenured? Not clear, ambiguous.
- Research is funded on a limited basis by RSU. Makes research potential limited.
- I am considered proficient unless I am willing to gather the evidence to prove otherwise—but I am standing here in the light and my department head can see how hard I am working. Why do I have to prove it? Let him do his job and evaluate me.
- It makes no sense at all to have tenure reviewed by faculty and have these evaluations done by administration.
- Lack of department follow up.

Rate your understanding of current Faculty Development/Evaluation categories, criteria, and ratings. Understanding of System.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 - poor	3	9.4	9.4	9.4
	2 - limited	5	15.6	15.6	25.0
	3 - fair	9	28.1	28.1	53.1
	4 - good	12	37.5	37.5	90.6
	5 - excellent	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

Statistics - Understanding of System

N	Valid	32
Mean		3.22
Std. Deviation		1.13

Add any additional comments:

- I am still a little unclear about what constitutes "outstanding".
- I have worked closely with a number of people on this subject, so I think I understand and know the system; but since the rules change from one day to the next, that understanding is not worth much.
- It is interesting that I have been through it several times and still don't know really how the system works. I also do not see any merit based on the evaluation thus defeating the purpose of the evaluation. If I said to my students, here's your test but no matter what you get a B, how much effort will be put into the test?

- It appears that the criteria for the "outstanding" category, which requires the faculty member to be "internationally" recognized more closely relates to faculty evaluations of a "research" university. Our mission is teaching, so I don't understand why the criteria for this category is grandiose.
- I am not sure there actually are any defined criteria.
- Number of forms (which have a whole plethora of names) are excessive. Would be nice if we could consolidate to one form. The names are not intuitively named, thus adding to confusion. Emphasis on quantitative measures is narrow minded and ignores current thinking (e.g., scholarship is more then "number of publications".
- On a vitae, scholarly activities are usually separated. According to our current system, three different faculty members that deliver a paper at a bad national conference, another publishes an article in an international journal, and a third publishes a book, all get the same rating: outstanding. You can't honestly believe these all deserve the same praise.
- This is my first year to be evaluated as a teacher.
- I have a bit of trouble understanding what qualifies a person for each "level" (e.g. outstanding).

If you could add any additional evaluation criteria, what would it be?

- Collegiality (? but I am afraid it would be difficult to quantify)
- I am not sure I have enough experience with the process yet to adequately answer this area.
- Have someone sit in my class and observe my skills as a teacher. Last time I checked, we were supposed to educate.
- More emphasis on scholarly publication.
- Plays nice with others (collegiality, being a good citizen of the department and university).
- Evaluation of contributions to dept. and to institutions, which would include committee work in the dept and at the university level.
- Collegiality & Community involvement.
- Can't think of any.
- Advisement of students.
- Specific contributions to the program/department such as curriculum development, leadership within the program/department, etc.
- I would not add any criteria, as that would make the form longer and would cause the form to take longer to fill out.
- We are often told teaching is our #1 and advising our #2 priority. Teaching is not on the list, just the "classroom", which is only one dimension of teaching. Advising is absent, but it is our #2 priority?
- Perhaps a category on "collegiality", although I know it would be difficult to quantify
- Simplify the process.

If you could take away any evaluation criteria, what would it be?

- I don't have enough experience with the process yet to address this area.
- Service to the University. Much of what we, as faculty, deem important is excluded by the administration.
- Less emphasis on student evaluations
- Publications/Research when no time is grated to do research.
- The criteria for "outstanding." I like the idea of the category, but the criteria to identify oneself "outstanding" is ridiculous.
- Research
- Under teaching, if you fail more than a ¼ of your class, you must address that or you can't earn higher than proficient. If you require your students to learn something in your class, you will probably have a higher failure rate than someone that spoon feeds or gives away grades.
- The "justification" is redundant. "Needing attention" and "plans for improvement" overlap each other and are also redundant. What is the difference between these sections and the next faculty development PLAN?

What improvements, if any, could be made to the Faculty Evaluation system?

- A bit more clarity, but all in all I believe the system works
- Clarify objective measurements.
- Have the chair or peers visit classes to evaluate effective classroom teaching. Student surveys are a poor mechanism. Have the process actually mean something such as pay increase/decrease rather than waste everyone's time.
- Remove self-flagellation portion and have us evaluated by Dept heads, and deans.
- Use the same system for everybody.
- I would prefer two separate systems: one that helps faculty develop (which should kept at the department level ONLY- no one else's business); and one that focuses on the evaluation, which is seen by the dean and the higher-ups. Meaningful

development is extremely difficult with the current process; why should I point out what needs improvement, when it might hurt my chances for tenure, advancement, or even just continued employment? Also, anyone rating faculty should be rated by them (i.e., department chairs). Good luck.

- Again, tricky business.
- Let's get clear on what's needed in teaching and scholarship.
- Change the word "proficient" to something more positive, if we have to continue with FIVE categories, which look to academics like A-F, meaning proficient gets to "C," and no one likes "C"s. OR change it to four categories and then there can be no correspondence to grade levels.
- Top to bottom review by a faculty committee.
- Allow other areas of evaluation to supplant the research.
- There needs to be a more consistent and better defined system of ratings.
- Equity. We have people not assessing classes and not handing out student evaluation forms in class. They are earning proficient and so am I!!! Why don't the department heads speak up?
- I would like to see more emphasis placed upon the quality of teaching. While this can be brought into the evaluation by the individual faculty member writing to those components, I would like to see a University wide emphasis on teaching being the most important part of our faculty activities. I would also like to see more emphasis on assessment activities including the use of assessment findings in curriculum planning, etc.
- The explanation of what counts for "Proficient," "Outstanding," and "Commendable" seems to me in need of revision. The instructions say that to be "Outstanding" one must achieve national or international notoriety. Then the instructions state that for teaching and service, national or international notoriety is unlikely to occur. Except for administrators, however, teaching and service comprise 2 out of 3 categories, so the "standard" definitions of outstanding and commendable only apply to research. I think that either two separate criteria or definitions should be created or at least, the definition of outstanding and commendable should be fit to match the majority of the categories rather than to fit only research. This seems especially important since—given faculty teaching loads—research is not a primary focus at RSU.
- Create one that follows a UNIVERSITY model and not a COMMUNITY COLLEGE model.
- Nothing in addition to the above comments.
- Ensure department follow up.

Note: This proposal of a new faculty mentor program has been developed from a variety of university sources. The below information is a compilation of those sources.

Description: This is a voluntary program through which experienced faculty at Rogers State University knowledgeable about the campus and academic life are matched with new faculty to orient them to RSU, inform them about campus support services, and assist them in the early stages of their academic careers at RSU. This program will be supported and coordinated by the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Goals of the Mentoring Program

Help new faculty members to:

- Learn about RSU, its facilities, and support resources.
- Adjust to the new environment and become active members of the university quickly.
- Address questions, concerns, and special needs in a confidential manner.
- Gain insight about teaching and career development from a seasoned veteran.
- Network with other faculty and develop a personal support system within RSU.

Encourage senior faculty to:

- Share their knowledge and experience with new faculty and gain professional satisfaction.
- Assist new faculty to quickly adjust to the campus and address their special needs, concerns, or questions, if any.
- Help shape the careers of new colleagues and enjoy opportunities for self-renewal.
- Provide a valuable service to the university by promoting collegiality through mentoring.
- Contribute to the overall improvement in teaching, research, and service at RSU.

Suggested Mentoring Activities: Mentors and new faculty members are encouraged to meet face to face at least once a month during the first two semesters and keep in touch frequently through phone or email. Suggested mentoring activities:

- Guide and encourage development of the Teaching Portfolio

- Discuss short term and long-term career goals and professional interests.
- If appropriate, assist in the development of a detailed research and publication plan.
- Attend the programs offered by the Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center or other campus units.
- Share information on academic and student support services on campus.
- Discuss effective instructional techniques, course development and curricular issues.
- Explore research and sponsored funding opportunities, and writing publications.
- Discuss academic policies and guidelines, and university governance structure.
- Attend campus events such as ball games, theater productions, and cultural programs.
- Share information on instructional resources and Websites useful to new faculty.
- Discuss student issues such as advising, motivating, and handling academic dishonesty.
- Share experiences on managing time, handling stress, and balancing workload effectively.
- Discuss preparing for tenure and promotion and career advancement.
- Explore professional development opportunities available to new faculty.
- Address special needs, questions, or questions and help in troubleshooting difficult situations.
- Be aware of scheduled training events and facilitate attendance of new faculty member. Check with the new faculty member after the training to obtain feedback.
- Invite to and encourage participation in campus and college activities. Be sure to introduce new faculty members to others at these events.
- Invite to and encourage participation in the Faculty Senate and the Center for Teaching and Learning activities.

Mentoring should center on the primary position responsibilities of the faculty member.

Research Mentors share information about professional opportunities internal and external to the university (funding sources, potential collaborators, publication outlets). Several mentoring relationships have provided joint authorship opportunities including writing papers, articles, and grants. Mentors frequently review research and provide advice on placing the results of research.

Teaching Mentors provide advice on preparation of a syllabus and on teaching strategies. They often visit the new faculty member's classrooms and laboratories. Some mentoring pairs have team-taught classes.

Outreach Mentors help establish external contacts and assist new faculty in understanding the external audience - its needs and expectations. They provide advice on preparation of materials and formal presentations.

Professional Achievement Mentors provide guidance for documenting activities and professional achievements. They assist in goal setting and provide advice for the various review processes of the pre-tenure years.

Advising Mentors assist new faculty members in understanding the prevailing departmental and institutional cultures. As advisors and counselors, they can be relied upon to provide information about time management, institutional procedures, computing, budgeting, working with graduate students, testing and grading.

Shared Benefits Mentors benefit from the new insights and expertise of the new faculty. In many cases enduring professional ties develop. Mentors have reported becoming more aware of the pressures that their new colleagues face today at ISU and at other research universities.

Matching Mentors with New faculty members:

Option 1: Selections are made from a pool of available mentors (developed on a faculty volunteer basis) by the department chairs. The mentor contacts the new faculty member during the first week of the semester to set up a planning meeting. Together a mutual plan is developed for the semester. The mentor and new faculty member may set their own schedules depending on the needs of the new faculty member. This may include an exchange of classroom observations.

The mentor/new faculty member relationship is informal and reflects an attitude of colleagues helping each other. It is never a supervisory relationship.

Option 2: The Center for Teaching and Learning will match new faculty at their request with volunteer senior faculty mentors from the same department, college, or outside the college. If a new faculty's department or college has assigned a mentor from within the department or college, the new faculty members can still request mentors from outside the department or college. Mentors are usually identified through personal contacts, recommendations of the deans, chairs, and colleagues.

Option 3: in the candidate's offer letter, the department chair will assign a temporary mentor to each newcomer. The new faculty member may remain with this original mentor indefinitely or may add another mentor at any time. Mentors may be changed without need to state a reason.

Other Options:

- New faculty members frequently prefer working with a mentor in the same professional or disciplinary subfield.
- Mentoring may have a focus on teaching, research, grant writing, or a combination of these areas.
- A faculty member in another department might be a good match because of common interests and responsibilities.
- A good mentor is a colleague who is a good listener ---someone who will share information, listen to ideas, and assist with difficulties.
- Two mentors may divide the responsibilities. This option is especially useful when the new faculty member is involved in interdisciplinary teaching and research activities or expresses an interest in working with someone with whom he or she shares particular personal characteristics or interests. Involving two mentors requires good communication and additional planning. The professional development support is divided between the two.
- Newly tenured Associate Professors are valued because they are close to the contemporary realities of the tenure and promotion process.

As the research on successful mentoring has suggested, mentors assigned will be of the same gender as the new faculty member. However, mentors of particular gender, race, ethnicity, or background can be requested for multicultural development or other professional development reasons.

Duration of the Mentoring Process

No set duration is required for the mentoring relationship between a mentor and a new faculty member. It is recommended that mentors and new faculty members interact frequently during the first two semesters. At the end of the second semester they can decide if it is necessary to continue the mentoring relationship at the same pace, or on an as needed basis, or conclude it if individual goals have been met.

At any point during the mentoring process, if a mentor and/or new faculty member feels that the relationship is not productive, the Center for Teaching and Learning should be informed so that a different mentor or new faculty member can be assigned. Due to the voluntary nature of the program, the Center cannot monitor the mentoring relationship closely or guarantee the outcomes of individual mentor-new faculty member relationships.

Mentors and new faculty members will be requested to provide feedback on the progress of their relationships at the end of the second semester so that the Center can evaluate the program and use the feedback to improve the program in the future.

Roles and Responsibilities of Mentors

Mentors can take on various roles, such as coach, friend, champion, advocate, career guide, role model, instructional resource, or confidant depending on the needs of their new faculty members and the nature of their mentoring relationship.

Mentors are responsible for:

- Taking the initiative for contacting their new faculty members and staying in touch with them.
- Devoting time to the relationship and be available when requested.
- Assisting new faculty members with their various questions, needs, or concerns.
- Sharing their knowledge and experience to benefit their new faculty members' and following up on their progress at RSU.
- Maintaining confidentiality of the information shared by their new faculty members.

Roles and Responsibilities of New faculty members

New faculty members can take on various roles such as friend, protégé, new colleague, or junior faculty depending on their needs, academic experience, and the nature of their mentoring relationship.

New faculty members are responsible for:

- Devoting the time to the mentoring relationship and interacting with the mentor often.
- Making use of the opportunities provided by the mentor.
- Keeping the mentor informed of academic progress, difficulties, and concerns.
- Exchanging ideas and experiences with the mentor.
- Seeking help and support when needed.

Both the mentors and new faculty members have the responsibility for gaining each other's trust and confidence, interacting in a collegial manner so as to value each other's time, and professional and personal commitments, and engaging in activities that support the mission of RSU.

The 10 Commandments of Mentoring[1]

1. **Don't be afraid to be a mentor.** Many mentors underestimate the amount of knowledge that they have about the academic system or their organization, the contacts they have, and the avenues they can use to help someone else. A faculty member does not have to be at the absolute top of his or her profession or discipline to be a mentor. Teaching assistants can mentor other graduate students, graduate students can mentor undergraduates, and undergraduate majors can help those beginning the major.
2. **Remember you don't have to demonstrate every possible faculty role to be an effective mentor,** but let your new faculty members know where you are willing to help and what kind of information or support you can give that you believe will be particularly helpful. Be clear about whether you are willing to advise on personal issues, such as suggestions about how to balance family and career responsibilities.
3. **Clarify expectations about how much time and guidance you are prepared to offer.**
4. **Let new faculty members know if they are asking for too much or too little of your time.**
5. **Be sure to give criticism, as well as praise, when warranted,** but present it with specific suggestions for improvement. Do it in a private and non-threatening context. Giving criticism in the form of a question can be helpful, as in "What other strategy might you have used to increase student participation?"
6. **Where appropriate, "talk up" your new faculty members accomplishments to others in your department and institution,** as well as at conferences and other meetings.
7. **Include new faculty members in informal activities whenever possible** – lunch, discussions following meetings or lectures, dinners during academic conferences.
8. **Teach new faculty members how to seek other career help whenever possible,** such as funds to attend workshops or release time for special projects.
9. **Work within your institution to develop formal and informal mentoring programs** and encourage social networks.
10. **Be willing to provide support for people different from yourself.**

[1]Taken from: Sandler, B. 1993. Women as Mentors: Myths and Commandments. Chronicle of Higher Education. March 10, 1993.

Useful Links on Mentoring

Mentoring Experienced Faculty Members (from the Journal of Veterinary Medical Education)
Empowering the Faculty: Mentoring Redirected and Renewed
Empowering the Faculty: Mentoring Redirected and Renewed
Faculty Mentoring Program Guidelines Stanford University
Faculty Mentoring Program for Teaching (Penn State)
Faculty Mentor-New faculty member Program (Portland State University)
Faculty Mentor Program (Arizona Western College)
Faculty Development Partner Program (California State University, LA)
Mentoring Resources (Portland State University)

MEETING MINUTES FOR 01-09-04

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting January 9, 2004, at 1:30 p.m. in OMA Conference Room, Meyer Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Paul Hatley (Treasurer), Carole Burrage (Parliamentarian), Peter Macpherson (Senator, Applied Technology), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

GUESTS: Dr. Joe Wiley (President, Rogers State University)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on December 5, 2003, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Math/Science Senator: The current Math/Science Senator has departed and the department should elect a Senator to fulfill the 2003-04 term.

Issues to Be Discussed: The following issues (Department Head Selection Process, "25% List," New On-Line Class Limits Policy) will be discussed with Dr. Wiley. (See attached.)

MOTIONS:

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be announced.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED January 30, 2004

--ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES--

Dr. Wiley's Comments, January 9, 2003

General Comments

Dr. Wiley said that primary focus is the upcoming NCA visit, scheduled in November 2004. Dr. Wiley hasn't seen the current NCA report draft, but doesn't anticipate any problems. He does anticipate lots of work on the report in the spring and summer, with minor tweaking in the fall.

Construction continues on the new library. Completion dates were Dec. 4, Dec. 20, and Jan. 5. Current completion date is Feb. 1, 2004. The library and some faculty offices are impacted by date changes. The first floor, with spaces for offices and classes, may be completed for move-in prior to the date the second and third floors, library floors, are completed. The library may move during Spring Break if the completion date slips farther.

18 dorm rooms behind Herrington Hall have been renovated into efficiency apartments for family (married or single with children under 11) housing and 10 are already rented ($425/month, bills paid, telephone, cable, high speed Internet) for spring. Some parking spaces will be identified as resident parking.

Other major initiatives include relocating the 3-D art laboratory from the south library parking lot to west of the equestrian center and the Board-directed moving of the equestrian center (space is needed in the central campus). Fund raising activities for the equestrian center will kick off at the end of January with hopes of raising $2 million ($1 million for the center and $1 million endowment for operations and maintenance.

The state Regents and the Presidents' Council are working on a $500 million bond issue to submit to the legislature and then to the people. This will include a possible $12-15 million for RSU renovation and construction.

The arts center at Claremore High School will include an auditorium but not a performing arts center so RSU's performing arts center initiative is still current.

With any new capital dollars, Post Hall will be completely renovated to include a larger banquet facility, the Thunderbird Library will become a Student Union with possibly two floors, and a new building is possible for the Kiddie Kollege.

Financially RSU is in good shape because of growth and tuition increases. New faculty searches are going forward and no cuts are anticipated.

Department Head Selection Process

The Senate told Dr. Wiley that the department head search and selection process, adopted for the *Academic Policies and Procedures* manual in Spring 03, had not been followed in searching for department heads in 2003-04. The first step of the process was to be the dean and VP, after consultation with the faculty, deciding whether to do an external or internal search. In the case of this academic year's searches, the consultation was not perceived to have occurred. The decision was made to do a national search and to allow internal candidates for department head to apply in that national search.

Dr. Wiley asked if there was a process that allowed faculty to express dissatisfaction with a department head. The response was that such a process exists. Dr. Wiley said that the dean and VP may feel that only someone from outside can fill the position, but in order to follow procedure the department should be consulted to determine the wishes of the department, and that individuals in the department should be looked at. It appears, he said, that, in this case, the department's wishes were not solicited in any formal manner. When queried about the job description not mentioning the head is evaluated every three years, Dr. Wiley replied that the job description did not specify a term limit because the term limit is simply a time at which the job performance of the head is evaluated. The faculty handbook describes the process so the job posting does not need to delineate the process. Dr. Wiley further added that, if a candidate exists in the department, that candidate should be evaluated before a national search is launched. Looking at that candidate, even if that candidate is not accepted, allows the department to know exactly what characteristics are needed for a head. He said, RSU has formal processes and procedures to allow meaningful, substantive input from the faculty. The administration must make judgments on what is in the best interests of the institution but it must also follow established procedure.

"25% List"

The Senate stated that it was concerned to hear that the list of faculty members whose classes had 25% or more <u>W</u>s and/or <u>F</u>s has been used during the process of faculty evaluation. The issue had been raised with Dr. Boyd, who had assured the Senate that the list was designed to investigate appropriate prerequisites and curriculum needs and that the list was not to be used in faculty evaluation. However, subsequent to that assurance, the issue had been raised with at least one other faculty member. Dr. Wiley said the list should be part of institutional assessment and curriculum assessment, an instrument for student success, and not a basis for faculty evaluation, and that he will address this issue.

Class Limit Changes

The Senate said it was concerned that class limits had been raised 10% for on-line courses and that faculty members involved had not been asked for input on the changes nor notified of the changes. Dr. Wiley said he had identified the problem of students enrolling in on-line classes and then being dropped for non-payment, leaving smaller numbers in the classes and many students unable to enroll in classes because of space being taken by persons subsequently dropped for non-payment. The problem had been addressed by raising class limits. While the specific policy may be a good idea, communication with each department should have occurred. In addition, the "wait list" for enrolling in on-line classes should remain for at least one week instead of being dropped the first day of classes.

Further General Comments

Dr. Wiley said he had been queried by administrators at other institutions proposing to change from two- to four-year status. They saw problems of new faculty, explosive growth, and a nascent "community college mindset." These problems, said Dr. Wiley, have been alleviated at RSU by faculty committed to the same goals.

The major problem he perceives at RSU is still communication.

MEETING MINUTES FOR 01-30-04

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting January 30, 2004, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Paul Hatley (Treasurer), Carole Burrage (Parliamentarian), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), Beth von Buchwald (Senator, Health Sciences), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on January 9, 2004, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Math/Science Senator: The current Math/Science Senator will be Leon Lundie.

Issues Discussed with Dr. Wiley: Dr. Wiley responded to issues of Department Head Selection Process, "25% List," New On-Line Class Limits Policy. (See attached.)

Department Heads: When the three-year terms for department heads begin is a question. The Chair of the Senate will meet with the deans and vice presidents to determine when terms for current heads begin. One issue related to terms for department heads is evaluation of heads. A committee to propose evaluation forms for department heads and deans was formed: Peter Macpherson (Chair), Emily Dial-Driver, Patrick Seward.

Faculty Search Procedures: A proposal to revise the faculty search procedures was tendered. (See attached.) (See motion below.)

Faculty Committees: The Chair has received updates from committees on their progress this academic year and reports that things are going well. The Distance Education Committee has asked for a compromise committee in relation to "folding" classes and that committee is being formed. Replacements for committee members were announced: Phil Sample—Marketing, Leon Lundie—Faculty Senate Senator for Math/Science. Math/Science needs a member for Academic Integrity; Applied Technology needs a member for Enrollment Management and Marketing.

Honors Task Force: Dr. Boyd has requested an honors task force (see attached). The task force will consist of Carolyn Taylor (SBS), Doug Grenier (Math/Science), Pam Fowler (Health Science), Emily Dial-Driver (CFA). Business and AT Senators will inquire for volunteers. The task force will make a proposal to the Senate, which will act on it and forward a proposal to Dr. Boyd.

Emergency Action Plan: RSU has such a plan. The Chair will inquire as to its distribution.

Spam Filter: Senators will poll their departments on whether faculty want a spam filter that may lose some e-mails.

MOTIONS:

Faculty Search Procedures: It was moved, seconded, and passed to recommend the attached proposal to revise the faculty search procedures. (See attached.)

NEXT MEETING The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be announced.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED

HONORS TASK FORCE

TO: Faculty Senate, Dr. James Ford, Chair
FROM: Richard Boyd, Vice President for Academic Affairs
RE: Honors Program
DATE: January 25, 2004

When I arrived on campus in July of 2002, the President and I discussed several areas for which he hoped I would take a leadership role. One of those areas was to assist the university in developing an honors program. As a result of my investigation of honors programs and my desire to begin the dialogue within the faculty community, I propose that we establish an "Honors Program Task Force" to provide specific recommendations related to the establishment of such a program at Rogers State University.

I have developed a notebook of sample honors programs that will help provide a context for the discussion. Additionally, I have included a cover page that should provide some grounding for the deliberations and recommendations. I would recommend that we include on this task force a member of the Recruitment Staff (they have some awareness of why students select this or other universities), Wanda Baker (she has the data that will provide the committee with statistical support on the potential impact of such a program), two faculty members from each School, a member of Student Affairs (this person can suggest those student activities and services that will help enrich such a program), and a member of the development staff (who can assist in identifying potential revenue sources for program development and student scholarships). This ten-member committee will be asked to provide a recommendation to the Office of Academic Affairs by September 15, 2004.

Dr. Minks and I pledge our support and assistance in completing this task. I thank the Faculty Senate in advance for its deliberation on this matter and assisting in identifying the specific individuals recommended for service on this committee. Once those individuals are identified, I will notify them of their selection and have the President and me meet with them to charge the committee.

Task Force Charge:
The task force is charged to develop a recommendation concerning the development of an honors program at Rogers State University. The recommendation should address the following points:

- Ensure that the honors program is consistent with the mission, purposes and goals of Rogers State University,
- Ensure that the honors program has a clearly stated mission statement,
- Ensure that the honors program provides curricular flexibility and uniqueness so that students in multiple programs (majors) may participate,
- Ensure the requirements for selection and/or participation clearly identifies a process by which outstanding students with high school records of distinction can participate,
- Ensure that the program provides opportunity for participants to engage in scholarship/research activities,
- Ensure a process by which students may withdraw, be dismissed, or be retained in program membership beyond the Freshman Year, and
- Ensure a curricular process by which courses may be developed or modified for inclusion in such a program,

Task Force Investigation:
The task force should ensure that it reviews: admission and selection requirements, course opportunities, campus/community activities for honor students, housing opportunities, learning communities, seminar potential, co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities, service-learning or civic engagement activities, value-added dimensions of participation, recruitment processes, scholarship opportunities, faculty participation, honor advisement, internship/travel opportunities, mentoring, recognitions and priorities for honor students, and implementation process for the program.

Task Force Time-Line:
The task force will initiate its work immediately and will present its recommendation to the Faculty Senate by September 1, 2004. The draft will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs by September 15, 2004. The Faculty Senate in its letter of transmittal will include any faculty senate recommendations related to the task force report. The Vice President will review the report and submit a recommendation concerning the report to the President of the University by October 30, 2004. The Vice President's recommendation will be copied to the Faculty Senate and Chair of the Honors Program Task Force.

Changes to Job Search Hiring Practices

Proposal:
The Faculty Senate proposes changes in the job search process for RSU in order to shorten the time between receiving and evaluating applications and to ease the burden on Human Resources.

Job Search Changes:
The changes proposed by this resolution include the following:

1. All materials—including but not limited to initial application letters, curriculum vitae, transcripts, and letters of recommendation—be sent to the department conducting the job search and not to Human Resources.
2. As such, job advertisements will include departmental addresses and a contact person (either the department head or the hiring committee chair) to whom applicants will send materials.
3. After receiving applications, departments will send out a form (see attachment #1), to be returned to Human Resources so that appropriate Affirmative Action data may be gathered.

Reasons for Change

The proposed changes will:

1. Streamline the process in terms of time. Currently, hiring committees must wait for Human Resources to deliver applicant materials in order to evaluate them. In some cases, this time period can be significant. During a recent job search, for example, an application dated in February did not reach the committee until June. While this time period is exceptional, a delay of even a week slows the hiring process and makes it more difficult to interview and hire candidates before they take other positions.
2. Provide a contact person with direct knowledge of the position. While Human Resources can answer questions regarding application materials in a general sense, a contact person within the hiring department will be able to answer potential questions more specifically and more accurately.
3. Ease the burden of paperwork on Human Resources. Instead of having to keep track of application letters, curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, and transcripts for every job search on campus, Human Resources would only need to track Affirmative Action forms for the job searches.
4. This reason is especially pertinent as recent experiences have shown that it can be difficult to keep track of such information. One applicant for RSU has had to order transcripts on three separate occasions because previous copies of transcripts were "lost" or "misplaced." Such an occurrence is not an isolated occurrence; there are at least two other cases where applicants had to resubmit transcripts or letters of recommendation. In addition to easing the burden on Human Resources staff, the proposed process will cut down on copy costs as HR will not need to photocopy information from every candidate before sending materials to the hiring committee.
5. Improve the quality of RSU's hiring process in several ways. First, the changes reflect standards that are practiced in four-year institutions throughout the region (see attachment #2). While many community colleges effectively utilize Human Resources departments for job searches, RSU has grown beyond its community college roots and now—with 17 searches taking place this year alone—has overwhelmed that department such that the hiring process is slowed down considerably. Additionally, the proposed process will increase the "faculty-driven" nature of the hiring process in accordance with goals articulated by NCA. Finally, in reducing the lag time between the time when a person applies and when the hiring committee views his or her materials, the chances for hiring the best candidate are increased.

-- Attachment #1--

Affirmative Action Form - Draft/Subject to Revision

This form would be sent by the hiring department to all applicants once their materials have been received by the department. The form would be returned to Human Resources to ensure the collection of Affirmative Action data. Using a separate from such as this also helps keep information regarding gender and race separate from other application materials. Lastly, sending this form will serve as a confirmation for applicants that their materials have been received by RSU, something the university does not currently practice.

Rogers State University Affirmative Action Information

Position Applied for:

Gender: Male   Female   Decline to Answer

Race: African-American   Caucasian   Hispanic   Native American   Other   Decline to Answer

Please complete and return this form to: Human Resources, Rogers State University, 1701 W. Will Rogers Blvd., Claremore, OK 74017

Rogers State University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Rogers State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, or status as a veteran in any of its policies, practices or procedures.

--Attachment #2--

Partial List of Schools that Have Application Materials Sent Directly to Departments

This list is organized by state. Please note that the majority of schools listed, like RSU, are regional state institutions.

Oklahoma:

- Cameron University
- Oklahoma State University
- University of Oklahoma
- University of Tulsa
- Surrounding States

Arkansas:

- Arkansas State University
- Arkansas Tech University
- Henderson State University
- Hendrix College
- University of Arkansas at Fayetteville
- University of Arkansas at Little Rock
- University of Arkansas at Monticello
- University of Central Arkansas
- University of the Ozarks

Kansas:

- Benedictine College
- Emporia State University
- Fort Hays State University
- Kansas State University
- Pittsburg State University
- University of Kansas
- Wichita State University

Missouri:

- Central Missouri State University
- Missouri Western State College
- Southeast Missouri State University
- Southwest Missouri State University
- University of Missouri at Columbia
- University of Missouri at St. Louis

Nebraska:

- College of Saint Mary
- Nebraska Methodist College
- University of Nebraska at Lincoln

Texas:

- Midwestern State University
- Prairie View A&M University
- Tarleton State University
- Texas A&M University
- Texas A&M University at Commerce
- Texas A&M – Corpus Christi
- Texas A&M International University
- Texas State University
- Texas Tech University
- Texas Woman's University
- University of Houston
- University of North Texas
- University of Texas at Arlington
- University of Texas
- University of Texas at El Paso
- University of Texas at San Antonio

January 21, 2004

Dr. Ford,

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you and the other members of the Faculty Senate recently. You and your colleagues perform a significant and meaningful service to the University.

During the meeting, three issues were raised. I indicated that I would research the issues and respond to them. What follows are my responses:

Department Head Selection Process:

Issue: The Faculty Senate felt that the process described in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual was not being followed for some of the searches now underway.

Response: I have visited with Vice President Boyd and read section 3.8 of the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual entitled "Department Head Selection and Retention." The first paragraph of Section 3.8 states that the department head may be appointed from within or employed from outside the University as a result of a national search. The decision is **"… determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the departmental faculty and dean."**

It further describes the process for the selection, one for a national search and an eight(8) step process for an internal selection process.

I have three observations. First, the policy clearly states that the decision regarding whether a department head will be selected from within or through a national search rests with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Second, the Vice President's decision is to be made after consulting with the academic dean and departmental faculty. This consultation is to be a serious consideration of the wishes and views of the departmental faculty and the dean. Then, after careful consideration, make a determination, based upon his defined role, as to the best course of action. Third, the eight(8) step process described in Section 3.8 is only followed if the Vice President for Academic Affairs determines that the department head position will be filled internally.

In summary, it appears the policy has been followed. There seemed to be a concern that the "determination" referenced above took place prior to the "consultation." While most of us often have *a priori* views, we usually are able to fairly consider all factors and then make an informed decision that serves the broader interests of the University. I am convinced Vice President Boyd gave the views of the departmental faculty every consideration prior to making his final determination.

The Board of Regents place very specific expectations on the central administration relative to responsibility and accountability and I truly believe that each member of the central administration approaches every decision based upon the needs of the students, faculty, staff, and external stakeholders. I am also convinced that the views of the faculty are valued and provide meaningful input that makes this University stronger. Dr. Boyd and Dr. Minks indicate that their door is always "open" for input related to issues.

Twenty-Five Percent List

Issue: Each semester a list of the classes that had at least 25% of the students drop or fail is produced and shared with the deans and departmental faculty. There is a concern that some deans may be using this information to "de-value" a faculty member's "teaching effectiveness" on his or her yearly evaluation.

Response: I have visited with Vice President Boyd and Associate Vice President Minks about the matter. They are aware that this has happened a very limited number of times. They indicate the purpose of the list is solely for the use of academic departments and schools aiding them to identify weaknesses in curriculum, student preparation, etc. They are committed to the principle that in no way is this list to be used as a faculty evaluation tool. They have indicated that they will visit with the academic deans again, reinforcing this principle.

Class Limits for On-line Classes

Issue: Class limits for on-line classes were raised by 10% without the approval and/or consultation of the faculty member teaching the class.

Response: Immediately prior to the Christmas break, an issue came to my attention that needed action. We are having a problem with students enrolling in an on-line class and never paying for it and never dropping. University policy states that if a student has

not paid tuition or made arrangements for payment (e.g. financial aid) by the end of the second week of classes, the student is dropped from the class for non-payment. This has resulted in many students, wanting to enroll in an on-line class, eliminated from consideration because a non-paying student was holding a slot. By the time the student is dropped, it is too late for anyone else to be added. I asked Vice President Boyd to find a solution, at least on an interim basis, for this problem, for the spring term. Given the fact we were entering the Christmas break and time was short, extended consultation with departments was not possible. The decision was made to increase the limits by 10% (in most cases, 2-4 students) in order to help alleviate the problem. Dr. Boyd did indicate that he discussed the increases with the school deans and if a greater percentage than 10% seemed warranted, he, the dean or Dr. Minks visited with the faculty member teaching the class.

This issue presents a classic example where, given ample time, the faculty should appropriately help define the solution. However, given the time constraints such collaboration was not feasible. Therefore, a decision was made that served the highest interests of the University and students, without unduly encumbering the faculty's ability to provide quality instruction.

As a side note, this issue gives me an opportunity to express where some of my value system is, as President. I firmly believe that the academic administration has the right and responsibility to raise class limits a small amount in order to achieve institutional priorities and address student needs. Where time allows, faculty involvement should and does drive the process. Having said that, however, I firmly believe that the administration should never enroll a student in a class, two weeks late, without the faculty member's explicit approval.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to visit with the Faculty Senate. I always enjoy our dialogue. While we may not always agree, I believe that the Faculty Senate and administration are working together to improve Rogers State University.

I will be happy to discuss these issues further, and I am always willing to visit with the Senate when you desire.

Sincerely,

Joe Wiley, President

MEETING MINUTES FOR 03-26-04

The RSU Faculty Senate held a meeting March 26, 2004, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 203, Baird Hall.

MEMBERS: Jim Ford (Chair), Patrick Seward (Vice-Chair), Emily Dial-Driver (Secretary), Carole Burrage (Parliamentarian), Bert Tollison (Senator, Business), Ken Bugajski (Senator, Communications and Fine Arts), David Newcomb (Senator, Social and Behavioral Science)

GUEST: Pam Fowler (Health Sciences)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on January 30, 2004, were approved.

BUSINESS:

Department Heads/Deans Evaluation Forms: The committee to propose evaluation forms for department heads and deans was formed offered forms. (See attached.) At a meeting with Drs. Boyd and Minks and the three deans the three-year terms for department heads were determined to start with the 2003-04 academic year. This three-year term beginning will apply to the department heads for Applied Technology, Social and Behavioral Science, and Health Science. Terms will begin for heads of other departments when those positions are filled. Dr. Boyd requested that the Senate send the draft of the department head/dean evaluation to the administration for comment. The revised form will be sent through the Senate Chair to Dr. Boyd.

Spam Filters: Senators reported on their department's stance on spam filters. The majority of departments is in favor of such a filter. (See motion below.)

Faculty Senate Officer Elections: Senators will produce a slate for officer elections. Elections will be held April 23, 2004.

Committee Assignments: Applied Technology and Health Science membership on committees will rotate this year. Senators from those departments will accept preferences from faculty in their departments and come to the next Senate meeting with suggested assignments. The Senate will then determine the assignments and any replacements necessary to fill unfilled slots.

MOTIONS:

Spam Filters: It was moved, seconded, and passed to recommend that Computing Services, in conjunction with the Tech Planning Committee, take action to eliminate or substantially reduce, spam on all campus computers.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be April 16, 2004, at 1 p.m. in BH 203. The next meeting of the Faculty Association will be April 23, 2004, at 1 p.m. in the library.

SUBMITTED BY Emily Dial-Driver, Secretary

APPROVED, as amended April 16, 2003

--ATTACHMENTS TO MINUTES--

Evaluating the Dean

The Faculty Senate has developed a process for the faculty members of each academic Department to evaluate and provide useful feedback to the administration of Rogers State University. Rogers State University believes *every* University employee deserves regular evaluation of his or her professional duties. This process should be honest, open, and forthright, including an acknowledgement of the employee's achievements, as well as an assessment of his or her ability to match the University's expectations, and a determination of areas that may require improvement. A constructive yearly evaluation of the Dean allows faculty members to have input into the governance of the School, and provides documentation of the achievements and progress of the Schools's administrators.

The academic environment of the University is the responsibility of its faculty. To this end the faculty of each Department of Rogers State University are asked to review the performance of their respective Dean by focusing on 1) Leadership 2) Administration, including Planning and Resources 3) Fairness and Ethics 4) Communication and 5) Overall Impressions.

The questionnaire will be distributed to each of the Department's faculty members. The completed questionnaire will be sent from each faculty member to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs in a sealed RSU envelope. The most important element is full participation by all faculty members. Your careful and objective response to all questionnaire items is extremely important.

This questionnaire is one means for you and your colleagues to provide regular and systematic feedback on your Dean to the administration. A tabulation of survey responses will be provided to the Department faculty of the School of _____ and to the administration. Your voluntary and anonymous participation in the evaluation is requested.

2004 Survey of the School of _____ Faculty

Dean Evaluation Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
LEADERSHIP					
1. The Dean encourages an appropriate balance between teaching, service, and research in consideration of tenure/promotion.	○	○	○	○	○
2. The Dean involves the faculty in developing academic and budgetary planning for the Department and School.	○	○	○	○	○
ADMINISTRATION					
3. The Dean promotes a favorable environment for individual faculty development.	○	○	○	○	○
4. The Dean promotes a favorable environment for student development.	○	○	○	○	○
5. The Dean supports interdisciplinary programs.	○	○	○	○	○
6. The Dean attends to administration matters in a timely fashion.	○	○	○	○	○
7. The Dean actively assists faculty in writing and editing reports.	○	○	○	○	○
FAIRNESS AND ETHICS					
8. The Dean treats all faculty fairly and appropriately.	○	○	○	○	○
9. The Dean considers faculty views contrary to his own.	○	○	○	○	○
10. The Dean exhibits high ethical standards.	○	○	○	○	○

COMMUNICATION	
11. The Dean's communication style promotes effective communication with faculty.	○○○○○
12. The Dean accurately communicates to the faculty in a timely manner.	○○○○○
13. The Dean has established appropriate methods for informing the faculty of important planning decisions.	○○○○○
OVERALL CONFIDENCE	
14. The Dean has your confidence.	○○○○○

2004 Survey of the School of _____ Faculty

15. What do you consider the Dean's assets or strengths?

16. What do you consider the Dean's areas for improvement?

17. Please present any other comments you think would be helpful to the Dean in carrying out the academic mission of the Department, School, and University.

Evaluating the Department Head

The Faculty Senate has developed a process for the faculty members of each academic Department to evaluate and provide useful feedback to the administration of Rogers State University. Rogers State University believes *every* University employee deserves regular evaluation of his or her professional duties. This process should be honest, open, and forthright, including an acknowledgement of the employee's achievements, as well as an assessment of his or her ability to match the University's expectations, and a determination of areas that may require improvement.

A constructive yearly evaluation of the Department Head allows faculty members to have input into the governance of the Department, and provides documentation of the achievements and progress of the Department's administrator.

The academic environment of the University is the responsibility of its faculty. To this end the faculty of each Department of Rogers State University are asked to review the performance of their Department Head by focusing on 1) Leadership 2) Administration, including Planning and Resources 3) Fairness and Ethics 4) Communication and 5) Overall Impressions. Even though the Department head's primary responsibility is teaching, this evaluation is designed only to measure the areas listed above.

The questionnaire will be distributed to each of the Department's faculty members. The completed questionnaire will be sent from each faculty member to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs in a sealed RSU envelope. The most important element is full participation by all faculty members. Your careful and objective response to all questionnaire items is extremely important.

This questionnaire is one means for you and your colleagues to provide regular and systematic feedback on your Department Head to the administration. A tabulation of survey responses will be provided to the Department faculty of the Department of _____ and to the administration. Your voluntary and anonymous participation in the evaluation is requested.

Department Head Evaluation Questions

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

LEADERSHIP

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. The Department Head encourages an appropriate balance between teaching, service, and research in consideration of tenure/promotion.	○	○	○	○	○
3. The Department Head involves the faculty in developing academic and budgetary planning for the Department and School.	○	○	○	○	○

ADMINISTRATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. The Department Head promotes a favorable environment for individual faculty development.	○	○	○	○	○
5. The Department Head promotes a favorable environment for student development.	○	○	○	○	○
5. The Department Head supports interdisciplinary programs.	○	○	○	○	○
6. The Department Head attends to administration matters in a timely fashion.	○	○	○	○	○
7. The Department Head actively assists faculty in writing and editing reports.	○	○	○	○	○

FAIRNESS AND ETHICS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. The Department Head treats all faculty fairly and appropriately.	○	○	○	○	○
9. The Department Head considers faculty views contrary to his own.	○	○	○	○	○
10. The Department Head exhibits high ethical standards.	○	○	○	○	○

COMMUNICATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11. The Department Head's communication style promotes effective communication with faculty.	○	○	○	○	○

12. The Department Head accurately communicates to the faculty in a timely manner.	○○○○○
13. The Department Head has established appropriate methods for informing the faculty of important planning decisions.	○○○○○
OVERALL CONFIDENCE	
14. The Department Head has your confidence.	○○○○○

2004 Survey of the Faculty of the Department of _____

15. What do you consider the Department Head's assets or strengths?

16. What do you consider the Department Head's areas for improvement?

17. Please present any other comments you think would be helpful to the Department Head in carrying out the academic mission of the Department, School, and University.