

Minutes from the November Meeting of the Faculty Senate

The regular monthly meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Monday, November 12, 2018 at 3:30 P.M. in the Faculty Senate Chambers, 100 James Union Building.

Attendance

Present: Tyler Babb, Vishwas Bedekar, Kathryn Blankenship, Alan Boehm, Nita Brooks, Larry Burriss, Nancy Caukin, Laura Cochrane, Rick Cottle, Trevor de Clercq, Andrew Dix, Jackie Eller, Tricia Farwell, Justin Gardner, Joey Gray, Shannon Harmon, Pippa Holloway, Paul Kline, Marcus Knight, Rachel Leander, Darren Levin, Melissa Lobegeier, Alfred Lutz, Pamela Morris, John Mullane, Susan Myers-Shirk, John Pennington, Joshua Phillips, Ariana Postlethwait, Deana Raffo, Joan Raines, Michael Rice, Patrick Richey, James Robertson, Mary Ellen Sloane, Nat Smith, Donald Snead, Rajesh Srivastava, Sherri Stevens, Moses Tesi

Excused: Angela DeBoer, Bob Gordon, Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand, Stephen Salter, Elizabeth Wright

Absent: James Chaney, Mamit Deme, Rebecca Fischer, Preston MacDougall

Patrick Richey moved to approve the October minutes. The minutes were approved with amendments.

Reports

- Rachel Leander reported on the Senate's budget. The Senate had at its disposal \$1,600 for the purpose of travel and \$3,532.60 for other expenses. At the start of this academic year, \$1,600 and \$5,380 were budgeted for travel and other expenses, respectively.
- Susan Myers-Shirk reported on behalf of the Academic Affairs, Student Life and Athletics Committee.
- John Pennington reported that the Finance Committee is preparing three reports. The first will study full-time temporary and adjunct faculty; the percent of classes these faculty members teach and the CUPA data available for them. The second will study phase two of the salary adjustment and the resources it will require. The third will describe how expenditures for professional administrators have changed over time.
- Tricia Farwell reported that the Audit and Compliance Committee has drafted a revised ethics statement for the faculty handbook. The University Counsel confirmed that the handbook is more or less an enforceable policy.

Motions

- John Pennington moved on behalf of the Finance Committee to invite Provost Mark Byrnes to the Senate to discuss how the newly modified workload policy has fared. The motion was adopted.
- John Pennington moved on behalf of the Finance Committee that Faculty Senate President, Pippa Holloway, contact the Chair's Council to learn what factors have challenged the fair and equitable implementation of the new workload policy. The motion was adopted.
- Pippa Holloway moved on behalf of the Steering Committee that the Faculty Senate join the Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics. The motion was adopted.
- Joey Gray moved that the Senate adopt guidelines for the formation of a committee to administer the Outstanding Teaching Award. The guidelines were adopted after amendment. The guidelines are included in the appendix.

Discussion

- The role of the Senate in shaping phase two of the salary adjustment was discussed. It was proposed that the Senate make proactive recommendations to the President. Potential issues for the Senate to address included (i) the relation between rank and target salary as a proportion of the midpoint of market salary, (ii) the possibility of making market adjustments at promotion, and (iii) means to improve the salaries of full-time temporary and adjunct faculty. Resolutions related to phase two should be ready in time for the next meeting of the Steering Committee.
- The food service contract is up for bid. Focus groups will provide faculty members with opportunities to make recommendations. A committee will help determine which vendor will be awarded the contract. Pippa Holloway will serve on this committee and pass information along to the Senate.
- The Chair's Council will submit a resolution to recommend that MTSU hire an external enrollment consultant. The Chair's Council has asked the Senate to endorse their resolution. It was decided that Pippa Holloway should write a similar resolution on behalf of the Senate.
- Senators expressed dismay that classes were cancelled on Friday, November 5 with less than 72 hours notice in order to accommodate a football game and the associated festivities. Senators felt the administration should make such decisions in concert with the faculty, the deans, and the Provost. Moreover, for planned events such as a football game, these decisions should be made a semester in advance.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:01 P.M.

Submitted by Rachel Leander, Faculty Senate Recording Secretary.

Outstanding Teaching Award Committee Guidelines

The materials presented will be reviewed by the Outstanding Teaching Award Committee (OTAC) and the winner(s) will be determined by the committee. The recipient(s) of the award will be announced at the Annual Fall Faculty Meeting.

The overall funding budget for internal grants is determined by the MTSU Foundation, based on several factors. Therefore, the actual annual budget for the Outstanding Teaching Award(s) may vary from academic year to academic year.

Teaching portfolios are reviewed each spring semester (March). Deadlines and guidelines for teaching portfolio preparation instructions should be carefully observed. This committee consists of faculty members from various colleges who are selected by the Faculty Senate. Specifically, two faculty members from each cohort (8 voting members) to serve a term of three years.

Review Process/Committee Meetings: The OTAC is headed by a chair, who shall be appointed by the Provost for inaugural meeting and then shall be elected by the outgoing committee in the previous academic year during its final Spring meeting. The first full committee meeting will be held immediately after the Spring academic session starts. Committee members will then receive an email showing which portfolios each member has been assigned to read.

Review: Each teaching portfolio will be assigned a primary and a secondary reviewer. Once assigned to a teaching portfolio, the members review them in accordance with various review criteria including the funding priorities issued in the beginning of the funding year. Each reviewer will score the teaching portfolios based on the award criteria.

Once reviews are complete, the committee will meet and rank the teaching portfolios. The reviewers will also assign a designation for each teaching portfolio:

"A" - Recommend for award

"B" - Suitable for award

"C" - Decline award

It is noteworthy to mention that applicant's rank or tenure status will not be used to determine the final score of a teaching portfolio.

Final Decision: In the final meeting, the members will deliberate and create a compiled ranking of the teaching portfolios. It is worth reiterating that all of the teaching portfolios will be discussed regardless of the applicant's sub-committee rank.

The following are a few typically observed scenarios:

If all of the teaching portfolios that received an "A" rating can be funded within the set forth budget for the session/cycle, then the chair will entertain a motion to recommend funds for those teaching awards. If excess funds are available after funding the ones with "A" rating, then the members may either consider top "B" teaching portfolios for funding or they may table the funds for the subsequent session/cycle. If the budget is less than what is required to fund all the teaching portfolios with "A" rating, then additional deliberation will be conducted at the convened meeting.

Scenarios 2 and 3 listed above will open additional deliberations by the members. To determine which of the teaching portfolios would receive approval for an award, the members will use comments provided by the teaching portfolio reviewers and other details from the application packet to further evaluate the portfolio submission. Subsequent to the deliberation, a final priority list will be generated to determine the awardees. In addition, the members will also finalize their recommendation through a committee-wide vote. It is noteworthy that a teaching portfolio that received "A" rating from the reviewers may not be voted for award recommendation if the applicant did not present a strong case for the entire committee to support the submitted portfolio.

Notification: The results and OTAC recommendations will be provided to the provost via email and announced/awarded at the following Annual Fall Faculty meeting.

Rebuttals and Appeals: All OTAC decisions are final and applicants may not appeal or request for additional review once a determination has been made.