

Faculty Senate Business Meeting Minutes, March 24, 2025

Meeting called to order at 3:35PM.

Present: Michael Allen, Megan Atkinson, Scott Christen, Melissa Comer, Kristine Craven, Mark Creter, Andrew Donadio, Ciana Bowhay, Mary Lou Fornehed, Jerry Gannod, Rene Grimes, Syed Hasan, Colin Hill, Amy Hill, Alfred Kalyanapu, Krystal Kennedy, Christy Killman, Matthew Langford, Jennifer Mabry, Ann Manginelli, David Mann, Holly Mills, Michael Nattrass, Linda Null, Brian O'Connor, Hyewon Park, Yi Peng, Mustafa Rajabali, Steven Seiler, Lee Ann Shipley, Sandi Smith-Andrews, Amber Spears, Leslie Suters, Thomas Timmerman, Kristen Trent, Kyle Turner, Lenly Weathers, Brenda Wilson, Kexin Xu

Absent: Teddy Burch, Wei Chang, Yun Ding, Joshua Field, Melissa Geist, Richard Le Borne, Jeannette Luna, Twanelle Majors, Joseph Ojo, Dennis Tennant, Hannah Upole

1. Approval of agenda.
 - a. Motion from Senator Donadio and second by Senator Mills.
 - b. No discussion. Agenda approved.
2. Review of Policy 205 & 206. Presented by Dr. Lisa Zagumny.
 - a. Both of these policies will go to councils in April. Please send any comments or questions to Senate President Rajabali. This is the version that will go to both councils. They are solid and clear. Thank you for input that has already been given. Please provide an additional input by Friday.
 - b. Questions/Discussion: Will the councils be meeting same time? (Administrative Council meets on April 2, and Academic Council meets on April 9.)
3. Review of Policy 207. Presented by Dr. Bedelia Russell.
 - a. Review committee composed of members from faculty across campus. All members were tenured faculty. Focus for the review was on clarity. Approach: each member of committee asked to identify areas needing clarification; review divided into sections 1-6, 7, 8; full committee meetings held then several working sections. This is first review in faculty senate. We will continue to gather input on councils meeting on April 2 and 9. We can meet in fall as well, if needed. The policy goes to the board in June or September. Context of revisions: alignment of practices, editorial changes, and language cleanup; added definitions for clarity and replaced dates with timeframes; retained peer review component with scope and step; alignment with revisions in Policy 205. Please gather questions and comments to share with committee, after senators have the opportunity to review.

- b. Questions/Discussion: It seems this policy could be two different policies – a policy on just section 8, it seems to be a lot. (There has been a lot of discussion on that.) Anything pertaining to lecturers? (This policy is only pertaining to tenured faculty.) In light of the first comment, the policy may need to be retitled to reflect this with a qualifier or descriptor perhaps, maybe if section 8 is separated out. Thanks to Bedelia for all her work on this policy. Please provide comments and questions within the next two weeks.
- 4. Approval of amendments to the Faculty Senate Procedures. Will defer this approval to the next meeting. Question: The budget committee used to have five senators on it, but now there are three? Senate President Rajabali will verify this and make changes. President Oldham changed budget advisory committee, so it is not according to faculty senate procedures.
- 5. Selection of next Faculty Senate President-elect and Secretary by Senator Cravens.
 - a. One candidate for each position. President-elect candidate is Megan Atkinson. There are no additional nominations. Motion to close nominations elect by acclamation by Senator Donadio, second by Senator Smith-Andrews. Motion passed.
 - b. Secretary candidate is Amy Hill. She has accepted the nomination. There are no additional nominations. Motion to close nominations and elect by acclamation by Senator Smith-Andrews, second by Senator Allen. Motion passed.
- 6. Such Other Matters.
 - a. Questions/Discussions on proposed changes to policies: thoughts about changes to these policies? Would like to have more of a sense of what the senate thinks about changes. Was prior service credit for promotion/tenure put into the policy? Does it count toward promotion? That is in current 206 revisions. The role of peers in the process: seems to be a weakening of this. What is the influence of departmental faculty? “Promotion devolves from the peers” was in policy before and this was mentioned. Removal of word “devolved” recommended for negative connotation. Role of department has been minimized in the tenure/promotion process. Cases have been overturned.
 - b. How can we shape the process, so that departmental faculty feel like they have a say? Can we have guidelines for this as part of policy? There has been some pushback. There is a lack of conversation when something gets overturned. If there is a denial, we have an appeals process; but if someone is overturned at the chair or department levels, we don’t have as clear a process for those appeals. Perhaps a second peer review as part of the process? Are faculty interests being looked out for or is it coming from top down? Interpretation of policy should not be left to one person.

- c. Did the provost say she had additional reviewers of dossiers? Reviewers are associate provosts, and they look at peer comments/reviews after they have come to a decision.
- d. Provost requested meeting with senators on Wednesday. Meeting will be held in Bell Hall, room 260 at 3:30PM.

Motion to adjourn by Senator Donadio and second by Senator Atkinson. Meeting adjourned at 5:05PM.

Calendar Reminders: Senator meeting dates (business and other) can be found here: [Faculty Senate Meeting Dates for 2024.docx](#)