TO: Dr. Clara Krug, Chair, Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Brooks A. Keel, Ph.D., President
DATE: June 29, 2012
SUBJECT: June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate Recommendation:
Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Votes of No-Confidence in
Department Chairs

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of June 7, 2012, I am DEFERRING this motion to the Council of Deans (CoD) for discussion and recommendations and charge the Provost with responsibility to carry forward a recommendation to the Senate from the CoD. There is nothing to preclude votes of no-confidence at the present time, but I am also very concerned that codifying procedures for votes of no-confidence into the Faculty Handbook sends a very wrong message related to civility and collegiality. I am also concerned that codifying such a procedure may in fact significantly hamper a Dean’s ability to effectively manage a college. Because the Deans are charged with responsibility for appointing and overseeing the various department chairs, it seems appropriate that they be provided an opportunity to provide input into this motion before the President takes action.

gm

c: Dr. Jean Bartels
    Dr. Mike Smith
    Ms. Candace Griffith
TO: President Brooks Keel
FROM: William T. Moore
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
DATE: June 14, 2012
SUBJ: June 6, 2012, Faculty Senate Recommendation:
Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Votes of No-Confidence in Department Chairs

I recommend disapproval of the motion presented by the Senate Executive Committee at the June 6, 2012, Senate meeting. There are alternative remedies for the situations intended to be addressed by the motion.

MOTION:

In the interests of shared governance and consistency across academic departments, The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook.

A vote of no-confidence may be called for at any time during a Chair’s term. To call a vote of no-confidence, the faculty will meet in the absence of the chair to determine the level of confidence in the chair. If 30% of the eligible tenured voting faculty believe the evidence warrants a vote of no-confidence in the chair the faculty will petition the Dean of the College to call the question. The Dean must then meet with the department in the absence of the chair to discuss the petition and, if it is deemed necessary at that time by the faculty, to oversee a vote of no-confidence. Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. A simple majority of the eligible voting faculty will be required to pass a vote of no-confidence in a Chair. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultations deemed appropriate, the Dean will either allow the chair to continue in his/her term as Chair or begin the process to select a new Chair.

If the Dean decides to continue the term of the Chair after a faculty vote of no-confidence, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing a summary of the complaints that were made against the Chair and an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment. Further, the Chair, in the interest of departmental cohesion, will provide a written plan to address the complaints brought forth by the faculty in the vote of no-confidence.
Dr. Mike Smith
Dr. Jean Barten
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TO: Dean, A. Keel, PhD., President
FROM: Dr. Clara King, Chair, Senate Executive Committee
complaints brought forth by the faculty in the vote of no-confidence. The Chair, in the interest of departmental operation, will provide a written plan to address the cause and an explanation of this decision to continue the Chair's appointment. Further, the Chair will provide the faculty with a summary of the complaints that were made against
If the Dean decides to continue the term of the Chair, a faculty vote of no-confidence,
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determined by the faculty. If 30% of the eligible faculty believe the evidence

A vote of no-confidence may be called for at any time during a Chair's term. To call a vote of

process in the Faculty Handbook.
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To the Provost for further review and action.

If, after consideration of the Dean's and the Chair's response, the faculty is dissatisfied with the results, upon a vote of 70% or more of eligible faculty, they may appeal the decision of the Dean.

June 14, 2012

Memo to President Brooks Keel
RATIONAL:

Review and action:

If, after consideration of the Dean's and the Chair's response, the Faculty is dissatisfied with the results, the "Rationale" will provide a written plan to address the complaints brought forth by the Faculty in the event of no confidence. This plan will provide a written decision to continue the Chair's appointment. Further, the Chair, in the interest of departmental confidence, will provide a written summary of the complaints that were made against the Chair and an explanation of the Chair's response. This summary will be passed to the Dean. If the Dean decides to continue the term of the Chair after a Faculty vote of no confidence, the plan will provide a written decision.

The Chair is committed to this process by the Faculty and will follow any additional procedural steps as deemed appropriate. The Dean will either allow the Chair to continue in this interim term as Chair or begin the process to select a new Chair.

Handbook:

Committees move that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook:

In the interest of shared governance and consistent academic departments, the Faculty Senate hereby moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook:

MOTION:

Committee at the June 6, 2012, Senate meeting

I am pleased to report that the Senate recommendations approved of the motion presented by the Senate Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate, after due consideration, approved the following motion:

Faculty Senate will approve the Committee Motion Regarding VOTES of No Confidence in Department Chairs
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Minutes: 6/6/2012:
DEAR REVIEWING this motion to the Council of Deans (COD) for
my presentation at your meeting of June 7, 2022, I am
following the recommendation adopted
by the Faculty Senate at the June 6, 2022, Faculty Senate
meeting.

Amended motion was approved.

Amended motion: The recommendations were approved; the
paragraphs and striking these were added to the
statement (Class) proposed or more "eligible" in the final
form. The "eligible" to be struck in the succeeding line: Read
department and to the dean. The latter noted a second
member of the department and the result is presented to the
committee. In the second full paragraph, the word
"someone" is omitted. In the fourth line of the paragraph, the word
time during a chair's term, but no more than one per
year should read. A vote is not necessary may be delayed for at any
committee: In the second full paragraph, first sentence is
amended to state: Based on comments from the Senate Executive
Committee, the chair will distribute several proposed
changes to the process for further review and action.

Dean to the process for further review and action: They may appeal the decision of the
deference of eligible faculty to the dean and the chair's recommendation. If
after the motion of the chair, the vote of no confidence, or the chair
brought for the consideration of departmental composition,
future's chair, the chair in the interest of departmental composition,
continue the chair's appointment.

Against the chair, and an explanation of his/her decision to
faculty in writing a summary of the recommendations that were made
faculties, vote of no confidence, he/she will provide to the
dean to decide to continue the term of the chair after a
new chair.

Continue in his/her term a chair or begin the process to select
demanded appropriate; the dean will either allow the chair to
follow any additional consultations.

The vote of the faculty will be published by two members of the
vote will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or
oversee a vote of no-confidence.
Please let me know what you think,

Hoc committees to consider these two specific important issues. However, according to Faculty Senate Bylaws, the SEC may be included on an agenda of the Faculty Senate.

Secondly, I believe that the Senate should express its approval of the procedures for the upcoming a meeting. The SEC considers any recommendation by an administrative body before they are presented to the Senate. I don't find any position of the Faculty Senate in the minutes of the standing Senate Committee; however, if do not request of a standing committee, the Senate web site and announced to the University by the Faculty Senate, that is, the Faculty Senate Committee.

Furthermore, from the appropriate standing committee of the College of arts and sciences for implementation enhancement of the University and the Faculty Senate Committee. The procedure of a unit's request to implement an enhancement consideration of these two issues differs from that of the University and the Faculty Senate in the minutes of the minutes of the HOC.

My Response re: this particular item in terms of the incoming Executive Committee is the same as the one re: the item in the minutes of the Executive Committee and the incoming Senate Executive Committee.

7/14/2012: Dear Brooks,

President takes action. In order to provide input into this motion before the department chairs. It is an opportune time for them to present their concerns to the President. As the Dean of Students to effectively manage those college, the Department Chairs. I am also concerned that changes to the Bylaws and policies reflect the responsibilities of the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as the message from the College of Arts and Sciences. I am also very concerned that the College of Arts and Sciences is not taking into account the concerns of the faculty involved in the decision-making process.
As indicated earlier, Dr. Barlesi and I have discussed how to this discussion work together to determine the best path forward related to secproposals. I will ask moderators, Murned, and Provost Bates to together on proposings new language that might be more appropriate in standardizing Chair Review, and therefore Provost Bates and I both agree that there is room for improvement in standardizing Chair Review. However, having said that, overviews of the discussion below, I agree with their discussion by the CDG, and I am including Provost Bates’s vetoes of motions discussed by the CDG, and I am including Provost Bates’s vetoes of motions that do not pertain within this time frame, and I had no choice but to deny those motions. These motions have been fully taken action on such things within 30 days, this review by the CDG for their input. Because the Faculty Senate Rules require me to interpret these motions to the Council of Deans (COD) and no confidence votes for chairs. I initially indicated that I and no confidence votes for chairs. I initially indicated that I committee passed two motions regarding evaluation, evaluation and no confidence votes for chairs. I initially indicated that I committee passed two motions regarding evaluation, evaluation and no confidence votes for chairs. I initially indicated that I committee, and the ASCC will proceed with this. Since the final decision came forth after the 30-day deadline, I

7/14/2012: Thanks, Brookes.

Cara
and continuous Procedural flows that make it inappropriate.

The proposal is written in a Department. They further elaborate that the need to support a Chair is a clear statement to make sure that the faculty of the Dean and that of those, if may be critical to the position of the Dean. Thus, noted that Chairs work at the direction of the Dean. Alternatively, those not except faculty that have to be met, and these issues needs to the Dean's concern. In the event that issues brought to the Dean's express their expectation for faculty to voice any concerns, and provide input on chair performance whenever there was an express their expectation for faculty to voice any concerns.

The Dean of the University voiced Philosopher's opposition to the proposal. No confidence for Chairs:

Votes of No Confidence for Chairs:

The proposal met with faculty every 4 years to discuss the chair's performance, the proposal, and their confidence in the chair. The proposal also provided a subjective statement regarding the chair's performance. In the absence of the chair, performance needs special attention, and provide the recent annual reviews of Chairs

Recommends the council of Deans met on Wednesday, July 27th to discuss the proposal.

\[7/27/2012: Books\]

Books

Thank you for your time, focus, and dedication. I greatly appreciate your patience, and look forward to working with you. Many thanks.

[Signature]
Motion Request

**MOTION(S):**
(please write out your motion in the exact form/wording on which you want the Senate to vote.)

Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Votes of No Confidence in Department Chairs

In the interests of shared governance and consistency across academic departments, The Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook. A vote of no-confidence may be called for at any time during the term of the Chair. To call a vote of no-confidence, the Faculty Welfare Committee will, in the absence of the Chair, determine the level of confidence in the Chair. If 30% of the faculty respond to a call for a vote of no-confidence in the Chair, the Chair will meet with the department and the faculty to discuss the petition, and, if necessary, provide written notice of the intent to continue in his/her term as Chair. A simple majority of the eligible voting faculty will be required to pass a vote of no-confidence in the Chair. After considering the vote of the faculty and the Chair's response, the faculty may appeal the decision of the Chair to the Provost for further review and action.
The following message was provided on July 13, 2012 and articulated in the president's remarks.

The following motion was provided on June 6, 2012.

Motion: Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the June 6, 2012, meeting, The Senate Executive Committee voted unanimously to include this motion on the agenda of the June 6 meeting.

Response:

Approved
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Welfare Committee passed two motions regarding review, evaluation and no confidence votes for Chairs. I initially indicated that I intended to defer these motions to the Council of Deans (CoD) for their input. Because the Faculty Senate rules require that the CoD not take place until the first week of the Fall semester, and the CoD could not take place within this timeframe, I had no choice but to deny both motions. These motions have now been fully discussed by the Welfare Committee. I have included Provost Bartels' overview of the discussion below. I agree with their assessment and have therefore withdrawn both of these motions passed by the Welfare Committee. However, having said that, I agree with Provost Bartels and I urge both the Council of Deans and the Faculty Senate to work together on proposing new language that might be more acceptable. I will ask Senator Myrland and Provost Bartels to work together to determine the best way forward related to this discussion.

The Council of Deans met on Wednesday, July 11th to discuss two motions approved by the Faculty Senate: Evaluation of Chairs: VOTES OF NO CONFIDENCE in Chairs. Their recommendations were as follows: The Deans unanimously voiced philosophical opposition to the proposal for creating a policy which formalizes votes of no confidence. Ineffective Chairs are a concern for all Deans. Deans expressed their expectation for faculty to voice any concerns and provide input on Chair performance whenever there was an issue or concern. In the event that an issue was not resolved, Deans expect faculty to bring this to the attention of the Dean. Deans noted that Chairs work at the pleasure of the Dean and that, at times, it may be critically important to support a Chair who is positioned to make/sustain needed change in a Department. They further believe that the policy as written is outside the scope of faculty responsibility and contains procedural flaws that make it inappropriate.