

3-11-2010

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Richard Flynn
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Flynn, Richard, "Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance" (2010). *Faculty Senate Index*. 537.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/537>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 3/22/2010
Not Approved by the Senate:
Approved by the President: 3/24/2010
Not Approved by the President:

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

Submitted by Richard Flynn

3/11/2010

Motion:

That the Senate Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the extent to which colleges and departments practice shared governance as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 110.01, with special attention to the development and revision of promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies. The committee will be charged with gathering and evaluating data on shared governance and with making recommendations to ensure that faculty in all colleges and departments have the structure and mechanisms that allow them to play a meaningful role in the development and implementation of the policies delineated in section 110.01.

Rationale:

The recent faculty forums with President Keel, in which he stated that the development of tenure and promotion criteria resided in the departments, brought to light a number of reports from faculty in more than one college that new policies are being developed without sufficient faculty input. Furthermore, the SEC has received several reports that policies are being imposed by deans rather than being developed at the department level in a way consistent with President Keel's belief that the tenure criteria should come from the departments. The SEC believes these reports warrant further investigation.

Response:

Minutes: 3/22/2010: Motion Request: Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance – Richard Flynn (CLASS). “That the Senate Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the extent to which colleges and departments practice shared governance as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 110.01, with special attention to the development and revision of promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies. The committee will be charged with gathering and evaluating data on shared governance and with making recommendations to ensure that faculty in all colleges and departments have the structure and mechanisms that allow them to play a meaningful role in the development and implementation of the policies delineated in section 110.01.”

Flynn moved that the Senate approve this motion. Pat Humphrey second.

Bob Cook (CIT) Senate Parliamentarian: “According to the Bylaws, each ad hoc committee has a specific charge, which you just read, that outlines measurable objectives and appropriate time constraints. I just wanted the Executive Committee to be aware that there should be a time constraint, but that can be determined by the Executive Committee at the appointment of the committee, as approved.”

Clara Krug (CLASS): “I have a friendly amendment which I have discussed with Richard Flynn. In the motion which he just read, ‘with special attention to the development and revision of,’ and add third-year review to the promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies. So the sentence would read, ‘That the Senate Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the extent to which colleges and departments practice shared government as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 110.01, with special attention to the development and revision of third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies.’”

Discussion ensued about whether the motion should read “third-review review” or “pre-tenure review” or both. The decision was made to include both terms. Flynn pointed out that the language in the motion doesn’t restrict the duties of the committees to these, but instead [calls for] “special attention” to them.

Gary Means (Provost) asked if the word “investigate” could be changed to “study or examine.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) made a friendly amendment to change the language from “investigate” to “examine.”

Gary Means (Provost) asked if the third-year review should be placed in a separate section from the tenure and promotion section in the motion. Richard Flynn (CLASS) said, “the section in the Faculty Handbook that this refers to is called Shared Governance, under the heading Faculty Governance, so it’s not particular to the section of the handbook that’s mentioned is not particular to tenure and promotion. The motion asks that special attention be paid to these matters; it seeks to examine faculty governance overall in addition to those particular matters.”

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked if a deadline should be set for the committee. Moore said that when the SEC appoints the committee and charges it, the SEC will set a deadline. At the next Senate meeting the Senate can approve that deadline.

Bob Cook (CIT), Parliamentarian, pointed out that, according to the Bylaws, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee can appoint an ad hoc committee independent of the Faculty Senate, so in essence this is a courtesy on their part as well as judging the mindset of the Senate in terms of the formation of this committee, so the setting of a deadline can be done by the Executive Committee without coming back to the full body. The motion passed.

Brooks Keel (President) commended the Senate for creating the committee.” Having gone through the promotion and tenure packets just this past time,” Keel said, “it seemed to me that there were some differences in the way things are done across campus. perhaps, and I think now is a great opportunity to take a look at that to make sure that the form and format and structure of the review is done with some consistency from one college to the next, but at the same time keeping in mind that the actual metrics that are to be used for determining if an individual has met a certain bar of scholarship is to be extremely discipline specific.”

Gary Means (Provost) asked the committee to consider clarifying the procedures in the Faculty Handbook.

Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator asked the Senate to send him nominations for this committee.