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2011-12 Faculty Senate motions passed and their current statuses

June 2011

2011-6-01: motion passed and approved by the Administration, enactment begun during the 2011-12 academic year, to be completed during 2012-13 academic year:

It is proposed that the University administration explore the feasibility of placing automatic external defibrillators in all occupied campus buildings.

2011-6-02: motion passed and approved by the Administration, enacted during the 2011-12 academic year:

The Provost should appoint the Director of Distance Learning as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Development Committee.

July 2011

No motions passed

August 2011

2011-8-01: motion raised during June 2011 meeting and referred to Senate Personnel Policies Committee was reported at the August meeting; motion passed and approved by the Administration for enactment in 2012-13:

At the request of the Provost, the Personnel Policies Committee investigated the subject of student mentoring by faculty as it pertained to the tenure and promotion process. The Committee surveyed University department heads and associate deans and with near universal agreement—there was one dissenter—department heads and deans agreed that student mentoring fell under the category of teaching for the purpose of tenure and promotion. The survey also revealed one exception: if the faculty member’s name appeared on the project as co-author or contributor, then mentoring should count as scholarship as well, but only in the case of co-authorship/contributor.

Upon consideration of the matter and based upon the results of the survey, the Personnel Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate endorse the findings of the Committee, that the mentoring of students should be considered as part of the teaching accomplishments of candidates for tenure and/or promotion unless the faculty member’s name appears on the project as co-author or contributor in which case mentoring would count as scholarship as well.

September 2011

2011-9-01: motion passed and enacted by the Senate; no administrative action required:
The SWOSU Faculty Senate permits Mr. Jason Henderson to observe Faculty Senate Meetings in October, 2011 and November, 2011 in order that Mr. Henderson may successfully complete coursework toward fulfilling the requirements for a Master’s Degree in Library and Information Studies from the University of Oklahoma. As a guest of the Senate, Mr. Henderson accepts the obligation to strictly adhere to this body’s rules concerning the confidentiality of Senate discussion and debate.

2011-9-02: motion raised during August 2011 meeting and referred to an ad hoc committee of senators was reported at the September meeting; motion passed, approved by the Administration, and enacted during the 2011-12 academic year:

The University Distance Learning Committee develops and promotes technologies for and policies and procedures related to distance learning across campus. The committee shall be composed of the Director of Distance Learning, six (6) faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate, with two (2) representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, two (2) representatives from the College of Professional and Graduate Studies, one (1) representative from the College of Pharmacy, one (1) representative from the College of Associate and Applied Sciences, one (1) representative from the Library and up to four (4) additional members from faculty, staff, and students across campus as deemed appropriate by the Director of Distance Learning. Terms shall last two (2) years.

The initial FS appointment shall be based on the following to allow a rotating system of expiration:
- CAS—One member term expiring S12; one member term expiring S13.
- CPGS—One member term expiring S12; one member term expiring S13.
- COP—One member term expiring S12.
- CASS—One member term expiring S13.
- Library—One member term expiring (not determined)

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Long, Scott Long, Ralph May

2011-9-03: motion raised in August and referred to the University Policies Committee was reported at the September meeting; motion passed and forwarded to Administration; enactment pending:

Based on a survey of regional and national grade change policies, discussion with faculty members and chairs in the respective departments of committee members, and discussion with Daniel Archer, Registrar, the University Policies Committee recommends the following:
1. The total number of grade changes for a student in a course should be limited to one (1).
2. The time limit for instituting a grade change should be one (1) semester (i.e., by the end of the next regular semester) after the semester in which the grade was assigned.
3. Students requesting a grade change should submit the request on a designated form with the student’s signature and the specific reason(s), in writing, for the grade change request. The University Policies Committee asks the Senate to consider requiring the department chair’s signature on this form.
4. Given that SWOSU does not currently stipulate a time limit for changing an Incomplete
(I) to a traditional grade, the committee recommends a time limit of one (1) semester for a student to complete any remaining course requirements, unless extenuating circumstances prevent the student from completing the course.

5. The University Policies Committee requests that the Senate consider Registrar Daniel Archer’s major concerns and recommendations regarding grade changes (see Addendum).

Respectfully submitted,
University Policies Committee

Addendum: Concerns and Recommendations from Daniel Archer, Registrar

From the standpoint of the Office of the Registrar, the major issue is regarding the open system of changing traditional grades to withdrawal grades. SWOSU is the only university in the Regional University System of Oklahoma (RUSO) that does not have a system to regulate grade changes. Aside from Incomplete (I) grades being changed to traditional grades, all other RUSO Universities (East Central University, Northeastern State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Southeastern Oklahoma state University, University of Central Oklahoma) as well as Cameron University and the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma require at least one signature (chair/dean and/or a vice president) before a grade change can be processed.

Additionally, none of these universities permit faculty to change a grade to a Withdrawal (W) after the grade has been processed at the conclusion of the semester in which the course was completed. After discussion with registrars and personnel at other universities, this type of grade changing practice has not been allowed because altering a grade to a W significantly changes the student’s academic history and creates federal reporting inconsistencies that will likely result in federal compliance violations involving financial aid, veteran aid, and international student regulations. By having an open system where grades can be changed without limitations, the university is placed in jeopardy of receiving unfavorable federal compliance audits.

Like the other university personnel that I spoke with, I am very concerned with an open system where grades are changed to W’s because this process leads to inconsistencies in how grades/completion rates are reported to the federal government at the conclusion of the semester in which the course was completed. The federal government does not view a W as a complete grade, so when a complete grade is changed to a W, it can lead to reporting problems and significant financial issues for veteran students and financial aid students, as well as legal immigration issues for international students. This is particularly problematic at this point in time because the federal agencies overseeing these areas have each indicated that their compliance audits will be more detailed and will ultimately result in negative consequences when inconsistencies in reporting are found.

I feel completely comfortable having our office openly change I grades to traditional grades because I grades are more transitional in nature; however, I think that it would be advantageous to follow the precedence that other regional universities abide by when it comes to changing one assigned traditional grade to another assigned traditional grade.

In an effort to have a consistent and fair system across campus, I think all requests to change a grade to a W should go through a committee with at least one representative from the registrar’s office. This committee would only consider cases where documented extenuating circumstances (medical issues, death in the family, etc.) would have prevented the student from
withdrawing. The committee could also check if changing a grade to a W would impact financial aid, veteran student assistance, or an international student’s legal immigration standing and would only process the change in cases where it would not have an impact on these areas. I want to reiterate that all of the other RUSO Institutions have grade change policies in place as a preventative measure to insure that there is a system where grades are not continually changed and federal guidelines are consistently followed. I believe there is a place for grade changes in our university; however, the open nature of the current grade change system puts the Registrar’s Office, Financial Aid Office, and the entire university in a position where we could potentially lose credibility and ultimately lose financial resources.

Respectfully submitted,
Daniel Archer, Registrar

October 2011

2011-10-01: motion raised during the September 2011 meeting and referred to the Senate University Policies Committee was reported at the October meeting; motion passed, approved by the Administration, to be enacted during the 2012-13 academic year:

1. Students requesting a grade change must submit the request in writing on a designated Grade Change Request form to the instructor of record. The student must state the specific reason(s) for the grade change request on the form. The form shall require the student’s signature. For each course, the number of grade change requests shall be limited to one (1). The student must request the grade change by the end of the next regular semester (Fall or Spring) after the semester in which the grade was assigned. A grade change request shall not be granted after the student graduates from the university. If the instructor of record approves the grade change, the instructor shall forward the grade change to the Registrar. In the event that (1) the student requests a change of a grade to a Withdrawal (W) or (2) the student requests a grade change after the end of the next regular semester, the instructor of record shall forward the request to the Academic Appeals Committee, which shall decide whether to allow the grade change. This policy does not apply, with the exception of changing a grade to a Withdrawal (W), in the event that the instructor of record initiates the grade change. The same time limit noted above applies to this situation.

2. The Registrar shall serve as an ex officio member of the Academic Appeals Committee in order to provide guidance in respect to the impact of grade changes on regulatory compliance by the university.

3. In order to change an Incomplete (I) to a grade, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester (in which the course is offered) after the semester in which the Incomplete was assigned, unless extenuating circumstances prevent the student from completing the course requirements within this time period. In the case of an Incomplete (I) assigned to a student in a research or independent study course, in which consecutive semesters of enrollment in such a course with the same instructor may be required to complete a project, the student must complete any remaining course requirements by the end of the next regular semester after the semester in which the instructor of record deems that the project should have been completed.

Respectfully submitted,
University Policies Committee
November 2011

No motions passed

December 2011

**2011-12-02: motion raised during November 2011 meeting and referred to Senate Personnel Policies Committee was reported at the December meeting; motion passed and was approved by the Administration, to be enacted during the 2012-13 academic year:**

The Personnel Policies Committee makes the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate regarding the wording on page 103 of the Faculty Handbook. The paragraph in question is written as follows:

**2. Review Process and Schedule for Promotion and Tenure:**

When a faculty member is to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, the department chair/associate dean shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the academic unit for a discussion of the case. The academic unit’s tenured members then elect their own chair and together form the Academic Unit Committee. The faculty member's contributions to the mission of SWOSU shall be reviewed and evaluated by Academic Unit Committee, and a poll by secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of tenure will be made. This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, alumni and administrative information from the department head. In the event that the number of tenured faculty members in the academic unit is fewer than five (5), the actual tenured members in the academic unit, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the chief academic officer or the designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members shall act as an *ad hoc* committee for tenure recommendation. For promotion purposes, the Academic Unit Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate for promotion excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for promotion to the same rank. In the event that a department is not able to form a committee of at least three members, additional members are selected by the following methods, in order, until a committee of at least three is obtained.

The Committee recommends the paragraph be split into one paragraph dealing with tenure and another with promotion as follows:

**2. Review Process and Schedule for Tenure and Promotion**

When a faculty member is to be considered for tenure, the department chair/associate dean shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the academic unit for a discussion of the case. The academic unit’s tenured members then elect their own chair and together form the Academic Unit Committee. The faculty member's contributions to the mission of SWOSU shall be reviewed and evaluated by Academic Unit Committee, and a poll by secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of tenure will be made. This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for administrative information from within the department and for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, and alumni. In the event that the number of tenured faculty members in the academic unit is fewer than five (5), the actual tenured members in the academic unit, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the chief academic officer or the designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members shall act as an *ad hoc* committee for tenure recommendation.

When a faculty member is to be considered for promotion, the department chair/associate dean shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the academic unit above the rank of the candidate for promotion for a discussion of the case. The academic unit’s tenured and ranked members then elect
their own chair and together form the Academic Unit Committee. The Academic Unit Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate for promotion excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for promotion to the same rank. The faculty member’s contributions to the mission of SWOSU shall be reviewed and evaluated by Academic Unit Committee, and a poll by secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of promotion will be made. In the event that a department is not able to form a committee of at least three members, additional members are selected by the following methods, in order, until a committee of at least three is obtained.

In addition, the Committee recommends changing the language of sentence four in the original paragraph from “This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, alumni and administrative information from the department head” to the following: “This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for administrative information from within the department and for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, and alumni.” The rationale for the change is to simply clarify the language already outlined by RUSO guidelines concerning tenure.

The committee also recommends deleting the language of this sentence from the second paragraph as related to promotion. The rationale for deletion concerns the fact that RUSO policy on promotion is much less defined and is a much more academic exercise that is largely confined to the University’s tenured community.

Respectfully submitted,
Personnel Policies Committee

The following friendly amendment was offered and accepted: strike the following language from the revised language: “The faculty member’s contributions to the mission of SWOSU shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Academic Unit Committee,” and replaced with “The faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Academic Unit Committee” in both paragraphs dealing with tenure and promotion.

As amended, the motion passed. The revised language of the Personnel Policies Committee’s report is as follows:

2. Review Process and Schedule for Tenure and Promotion

When a faculty member is to be considered for tenure, the department chair/associate dean shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the academic unit for a discussion of the case. The academic unit’s tenured members then elect their own chair and together form the Academic Unit Committee. The faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Academic Unit Committee, and a poll by secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of tenure will be made. This review may be conducted in a manner that allows for administrative information from within the department and for input from non-tenured colleagues, students, and alumni. In the event that the number of tenured faculty members in the academic unit is fewer than five (5), the actual tenured members in the academic unit, plus additional tenured faculty members appointed by the chief academic officer or the designee to form a group of at least five (5) tenured faculty members shall act as an ad hoc committee for tenure recommendation.

When a faculty member is to be considered for promotion, the department chair/associate dean shall call a meeting of the tenured members of the academic unit above the rank of the candidate for promotion for a discussion of the case. The academic unit’s tenured and ranked members then elect their own chair and together form the Academic Unit Committee. The Academic Unit Committee shall consist of all tenured faculty above the rank of the candidate for promotion excluding the chair/associate dean of the academic unit and any other candidates for promotion to the same rank. The faculty member shall be reviewed and evaluated by the Academic Unit Committee, and a poll by
secret ballot will be taken to determine whether a recommendation for the granting of promotion will be made. In the event that a department is not able to form a committee of at least three members, additional members are selected by the following methods, in order, until a committee of at least three is obtained.

2011-12-03: motion passed and referred to the Administration; enactment pending: It is moved that the university consider providing a monitored study area open 24 hours during dead days and finals.

January 2012

2012-1-03: motion passed and approved by the Administration for enactment during the 2012-13 academic year: The university should adopt an electronic grade check policy for student athletes with an option for faculty to request a mandatory face-to-face meeting with the athlete for a grade check.

February 2012

No motions passed

March 2012

No motions passed

April 2012

2012-4-01: motion raised during the March 2012 meeting and referred to the Senate Personnel Policies Committee was reported at the April meeting; motion passed and approved by the Administration, to be enacted during the 2012-13 academic year:

The committee proposes the following changes on Page 24 of the Faculty Handbook Concerning the Selection of members to the Appellate Committee on Dismissal of Tenured Faculty Members: The section on page 24 that currently states:

The committee is composed of nine (9) tenured faculty members, serving two-year terms. The Faculty Senate nominates eight (8) from which the tenured faculty of SWOSU elects four (4) members each year and who are appointed by the Provost and the President. Every even year, the President appoints the ninth faculty member to the committee.

Should be changed to:

The committee is composed of nine (9) tenured faculty members, serving two-year terms. Each year, the Faculty Senate will select four (4) tenured faculty members and one (1) alternate to serve on the committee who are then appointed by the Provost and the President. Every even year, the President appoints the ninth faculty member to the committee. No member may serve more than two (2) consecutive terms.

Respectfully submitted,
The Personnel Policies Committee
2012-4-02: motion raised during the March 2012 meeting and referred to the University Policies Committee was reported at the April meeting; motion passed, approved by the administration, to be enacted during the 2012-13 academic year:

The University Policies Committee recommends the following additions (bolded) to section IB, Criteria for Evaluation for Promotion/Tenure, of the Faculty Handbook (pp. 99-102). These recommendations are intended to illustrate examples of teaching-related duties, scholarly activities, and university services of faculty without traditional classroom teaching appointments, particularly librarians, who are eligible to apply for tenure and promotion.

B. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION/TENURE

1. Teaching and Related Duties
   a. Administrative evaluations* (chair, dean, and/or Director of Libraries)
   b. Contributions to course and/or curricula development
   c. Courses taught (e.g., including comments on size, level, degree of difficulty)
   d. Courses that include responsibilities for course administration or coordination (e.g., team-taught courses, laboratory courses; delivery of group or individual instructional programs by faculty without traditional classroom teaching appointments)
   e. Development of new teaching techniques and/or methods
   f. Peer evaluations** (Faculty Peer Observation Form)
   g. Preparation of instructional materials (e.g., including library collection development and the securing of research and instructional materials required by faculty, students, and staff)
   h. Professional Development (Include any activities that directly affect faculty’s classroom performance e.g., workshops, short courses, seminars, post-graduate study, planning for future information and knowledge management needs of the university)
   i. Development and implementation of service-learning projects
   j. Student evaluations*** (Student Course Evaluation Form or a comparable instrument for faculty without traditional classroom appointments)

2. Scholarly Activities
   Acceptance of original works of art, musical compositions or arrangements, architectural designs, poetry and other literature, dance, or other of the Fine Arts.
   Curriculum development and innovation
   Editing (including newsletters and the description and preservation of historical and/or scholarly resources)
   Grants Funded/Unfunded
   Performances or exhibits involving the various Fine Arts
   Presentation of papers before professional groups
   Professional development, activities in professional organizations appropriate to the teaching field or areas of responsibility including committee appointments, session chair, discussant or consultant performances, workshops, exhibits, or seminars which relate more to scholarly development than to teaching activities
   Publications of original journal articles with abstract or first and last page of journal (includes web publications)
   Reviewing of materials submitted by others
Submission of original journal articles (include abstract or first and last page of journal)
Textbooks (authored)
Monographs
Poster Presentations before professional groups

3. Service
   a. University Services
      1. Advising students include number per semester
      2. Assisting students in career development and employment searches
      3. Assisting with university-sponsored events (e.g., SWIM, speech tournaments, Special Olympics, summer camps)
      4. Participating in faculty career development (e.g., mentor program, faculty employment searches)
      5. Presenting in-service seminars or demonstrations (e.g., including education of faculty and students in library technology)
      6. Professional Development (Includes activities that enhance ability to perform services, e.g., training to be an consultant-evaluator, advisor, or consultant; attending workshops, seminars, or meetings relevant to service activities)
      7. Serving as a consultant in other disciplines and/or departments (e.g., including delivery of reference services by librarians)
      8. Serving as a chair or member of university committees (e.g. accreditation, self-study, departmental, school, university-wide)
      9. Sponsoring student organizations
     10. Assisting in student recruitment and retention (Freshman Orientation, Alternative Admissions, etc.)

Respectfully submitted,
University Policies Committee

May 2012
2012-5-01: motion passed and reported to the Administration, action pending:
The Senate took up a request for Senate support for a proposal by the University Benefits Committee. The Benefits Committee has requested that the Faculty Senate support a proposal the funeral leave for all SWOSU faculty be reinstated and that the faculty have the same funeral leave benefit afforded staff members as stated in the Staff Handbook. According to the Staff handbook, time required for funeral (arrangements/travel) may be charged to available sick leave up to a total of five (5) working days per fiscal year. Faculty will now have the same funeral leave policy and are to indicate on their leave forms when case-by-case basis by the President or his/her designee.
The rationale behind the Benefits Committee’s request is that at one time faculty received a funeral leave benefit of five days but the policy was not actually in the Faculty Handbook but was based upon the Staff handbook and was eliminated and faculty were forced to use personal leave which in essence limited faculty to three days of funeral leave. The reinstatement of funeral leave for faculty will place the funeral leave policy in the Faculty Handbook and will return personal leave to its original purpose.

2012-13 FS President David Esjornson took the gavel and adjourned the May meeting.
2011-12 motions considered and rejected

August: A minimum GPA in general education courses will be added to the requirements for graduation. (Matter referred to University General Education Committee, which made no report.)

October: Service on FUPTRC will be limited to full-time faculty members. (Matter referred to Senate University Policies Committee, which recommended against it. Senate approved committee recommendation.)

October: The Senate will explore the possibility of making optional the now mandatory face-to-face meetings with vendors during the Fall benefits option period. (Proposal was rejected by the University Benefits Committee.)

January: The Senate will explore the option of allowing candidates for P & T to include on their committees one reviewer within their disciplines from peer institutions. (Matter was referred to Senate Personnel Policies Committee, which recommended against it. Senate approved committee recommendation.)

February: The Senate will explore the option of allowing departments too small to form department P & T committees to supplement their committees with reviewers within their disciplines from peer institutions. (Discussion was ended by a motion to “call the question,” which was misinterpreted by substitute parliamentarian as requiring an immediate vote on the question. Robert’s Rules of Order specify that a call of the question requires both a second and a 2/3 vote to end discussion prior to a vote on the question. The matter was not re-introduced.)

Visitors to Senate meetings

July: President Randy Beutler, Vice President Tom Fagan, Provost Blake Sonobe

September: Wendy Henson, SWOSU’s Violence Prevention Program Coordinator

October and November: Jason Henderson, graduate student studying Senate procedure

January: Mary Aspedon, SWOSU faculty member who had served as outside P & T reviewer at a peer institution

March: President Randy Beutler