MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY COUNCIL

MINUTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2007
3:15 p.m., Radiology Building Auditorium


The meeting began at 3:15 p.m. with a Bass quorum. A full quorum was reached at 3:20 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:
The agenda was approved as distributed.

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of April 10, 2007 were approved as distributed.

Provost’s Remarks:
Provost Wilcox noted the President was in Washington, D.C. at the AAU President’s meeting where the discussion is focused on the Federal oversight of Higher Education. The President will also be meeting with the Research University Association and delegates from Michigan. President Simon regrets not being able to attend this meeting but has worked with the Provost and Professors Youatt and Potchen on her response to Task Force 2 Report which is on the agenda.

Provost Wilcox reported that a web site has been created on campus that is a central repository of a series of information and advice as a follow up to the incident at Virginia Tech. This site brings together resources for special challenges on campus for students and faculty.

The Provost reported, as a follow up to earlier discussion, that a planning meeting has taken place for a system to recognize faculty who have served twenty-five years. This recognition will take place in the fall, 2007. There are also a series of planning meetings which will take place over the summer on the issue of Program Review, a Task Force 3 recommendation. It is hoped that a Program Review system is fully up and running by fall.
Executive Committee Chairperson’s Remarks:
Professor Potchen noted that much had been done this year. At this time we are trying to move Task Force 1 Report forward. Professor Potchen reviewed the work on the other Task Force Reports. We now have a College of Music and action has been taken on Lyman Briggs to become a College. Over the summer work will be done on the areas of the task force recommendations that need further work, for example Task Force 4 and Task Force 2. We will continue discussion on Task Force 1 at this meeting and over the summer. There are also two initiatives which will be discussed today that will need work this summer, the Civility Task Force and the Faculty Committee to Study Rules for Discussion.

Faculty Leadership in Civility Issues:
Professor Potchen referred to Professor Tims to present a proposal to members. Professor Tims noted that faculty have been silent and it is the time to discuss the issue of civility. The following motion was presented: That the Faculty Council resolves to support and formally endorse the efforts of the “I Stop Hate: MSU United” initiative to foster a more inclusive environment on campus and to promote better understanding of diverse viewpoints. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued. A member spoke in favor of the motion but was questioning the interpretation that certain kinds of events could be precluded. For example, someone coming to campus to speak on an issue that some members of the community might see as unacceptable. The statement has to make very clear what is being implied. We do not mean to exclude contrary or unpopular voices. Another member noted that a hallmark of academia is the opportunity to have freedom of speech on any issue at any time.

A motion to give voice to the student representatives was granted to discuss the “I Stop Hate United” initiative. Eric Hinojosa, ASMSU Chairperson of Academic Assembly, explained the “I Stop Hate” initiative is a student led initiative to get behind the President’s statement on inclusion which asks all members of the MSU community to be respectful of each others views and to do things that would create a more diverse and inclusive community. The Initiative has been supported by 60 student groups on campus from different backgrounds, including ASMSU. Lauren Beech, student member of Academic Council, explained the purpose of the Initiative is to promote an atmosphere on campus where people feel safe and comfortable. The group has developed some visible signs for the Initiative which includes shirts, wrist bands and banners. All freshmen will receive the I Stop Hate wrist bands in the fall. Students are asking Faculty Council to get behind the Initiative and provide a visible push to say that inclusion is important to all on campus. A question was asked, if a group was deemed by a meaningful segment of the MSU community as a hate group, would the I Stop Hate United support their exclusion from campus? Lauren responded that the I Stop Hate group would not support exclusion of any group from campus and that free speech and academic discourse is accepted. There was further discussion clarifying the support of free speech and the intention of the Initiative. The following amendment was proposed to the proposed motion: The sentence be added at the end of the motion, “The faculty in no way supports exclusion of any viewpoints from campus.” Discussion continued regarding the application and formally endorsing something where the
understandings of the implications are not clear. The question was called on the amendment and the amendment passed.

Another amendment to the original motion was proposed: “That the Faculty Council resolves to support efforts to foster a more inclusive environment on campus and promote better understanding of diverse viewpoints. The faculty in no way supports exclusion of any viewpoints from campus. This deletes “formally endorse the efforts of the “I Stop Hate: MSU United” initiative”. Following discussion there was a motion to table the original motion and amendment. The motion failed. Discussion continued and the question was called on the amendment. The amendment passed. The question was called on the original motion as amended, the motion passed.

The following motion was proposed: That in order to promote faculty involvement in finding ways to educate the MSU community in how to create and maintain an inclusive environment of civility on campus and how to reach out to individuals having symptoms suggesting trouble, we create a Faculty Council Civility Task Force to begin discussions on this matter over the summer and to report back to the Faculty Council on their findings and recommendations at the first Faculty Council meeting of the Fall 2007 Semester. This Civility Task Force should be composed of at least three Faculty Council members who volunteer for this important work. The motion was seconded. Clarification was requested related to “how to reach out to individuals having symptoms suggesting trouble”. The Council member noted this is a much broader discussion of civil rights on our campus and that this is a very different issue than civility and inclusiveness. The following amendment was proposed: Delete the words “how to reach out to individuals having symptoms suggesting trouble”. A question was asked as to what the Administration is doing in this regard? Provost Wilcox indicated MSU is well positioned in this regard. MSU has a host of expertise from the Student Health Center, Counseling Center, Psychological Center, the Medical Colleges and the Health Team. The Provost also noted the highly integrated group in DPPS that works with the groups mentioned. One of the most important groups is the Resident Hall Staff and the training that is done with the mentors on the floors to help identify the students who are struggling in one way or another and provide resources for them. There was a sense from the group the University was doing what was needed. A member then noted that the goal of the Task Force appears to be to find ways to educate in how to create and maintain an inclusive environment in the community. The amendment to the motion was passed. There was no further discussion on the amended motion. The motion was passed.

Faculty Committee to Study Rules for Discussion in Faculty Council:
Professor Hughes, member of ECAC, raised a number of questions related to the previous discussion and our knowledge, like granting voice, etc. Professor Hughes noted it would be desirable to know what the rules are for conducting Council meetings and attempt to abide by the rules. The most commonly used guide for conducting meetings is Robert’s Rules of Order which is used at MSU. There are other rules that may be adopted for example, the Bass Quorum used
by Faculty Council. When a motion is made comments should be directed to the Chairperson rather than members engaging in across the room arguments. Professor Hughes proposed that Faculty Council appoint an Ad Hoc committee of three or more members to study and evaluate the existing rules which regulate discussion and other matters in Faculty Council. The information developed by the committee should be used by Faculty Council, along with the information gained from the upcoming faculty survey (the result of Task Force 4), to ensure that members are encouraged and enabled to discuss matters brought before the Council. The motion was supported. A member noted that there seems to be multiple purposes behind the motion. One, that people be informed of the rules and second, to have a mechanism to change rules that may depart from Robert’s Rules if decided. Some concern was expressed about departing from Robert’s Rules and that there did not seem to be a time when Robert’s Rules had been violated. A question was asked if there is a problem. The purpose of the motion is to take a look at what we have been doing but at times we have deviated and particularly with the issue of granting voice. This year we have been trying to get as much input as possible from many sources but the result has been much of the meeting time has been taken by non-members which has slowed the ability of the body to get things done. For example, today, one of the reasons for this meeting was to discuss Task Force 1 Report and we have run out of time. Professor Hughes noted an example of not following Robert’s is the use of friendly amendments, according to Robert’s there is no such thing. Professor Potchen noted if we had a clear understanding of the rules we need to follow we can function more effectively. One of the associated issues identified with the proposed motion was the idea of considering a time for “public access” where non-members of Council may comment on issues. Following this discussion the motion was passed.

President Simon’s Response re: Task Force 2 Report Tabled Item at Faculty Council 3/13/07:
Professor Potchen referred the item to the Provost. A motion to remove the item from the table for discussion was passed. Provost Wilcox presented a document (attached) that lays out a set of commitments by the President and Provost’s office (distributed to members). In review, the Task Force 2 Report proposed a system of Administrator review which was viewed by the President and Provost as important in eliminating concerns but at the same time proposed a parallel system that was in place. This was discussed with ECAC and Professors Potchen, Youatt and the Provost worked with the President to create a plan which was brought for discussion to Faculty Council which was tabled after some discussion. The Provost met with ECAC and has identified some elimination of existing policies along with some implementation commitments. The Provost reviewed the set of commitments regarding the Administrator review.

A motion passed to give voice to Professor Teahan who noted that the commitments presented were good but that the Task Force 2 Report proposed a web based faculty evaluation of administrators and urged Faculty Council to consider. A Council member suggested a step be added for faculty to be directly consulted for opinions on the operations of the unit and direct faculty involvement in any review. A motion to refer the set of commitments and the Task
Force 2 Report to UCFA to sort through the issues and report back to Faculty Council in fall semester 2007 was moved. The motion passed.

**Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report**
The Provost noted the time was 5:00 p.m. and the next agenda item was to address the Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report and go to the Committee of the Whole. Professor Weber requested members who have input from their constituency to send these to the Chairperson of ECAC. Professor DeJong reported that an ANGEL site is being set up for continued discussion during the summer. A motion passed to not go into a Committee of the Whole. A motion passed to continue to gather commentary from faculty over the summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\[Signature\]
Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance

**Attachment:**

Task Force Two – Administrator Review - Response from President Simon
Task Force Two
Administrator Review
Response

Academic Human Resource Policies (Section IV) currently describes the annual evaluation of Chairpersons and Directors. An assessment is to occur annually, with all aspects of performance evaluated. A copy of the evaluation instrument (criteria) used must be filed with the Office of the Provost prior to each annual cycle of evaluations, and the Dean of each college must inform the Office of the Provost that the annual performance evaluation for each unit administrator has been completed.

Guidelines for the required five-year review of academic Deans is detailed in Academic Governance By-Laws (2.1.4). Chairpersons, Directors and Deans are also subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years. The College Advisory Council of each College has shared responsibility with the Provost to determine the procedures for the review of Deans.

The concerns expressed regarding administrator review by Task Force 2 suggest that rigorous attention needs to be given carefully operationalizing the process and procedures that exist. Therefore, the Office of the Provost commits to enhancing the current process of Chair, Director and Dean review, and preparation of those responsible for conducting reviews by instituting the following:

Enhancing the Review Process for Unit Chairpersons and Directors

- The Office of the Provost will work with Deans and CAC to determine the timeline for the review of each Chairperson within the college, and these will be publicly posted on the web.
- The Office of the Provost will require each Dean provide to the Office of the Provost by November 1 of each year a copy of the evaluation instrument (criteria) currently used in annual evaluations of Chairpersons and Directors, with the assurance that the criteria has also been provided to each college or unit administrator to be evaluated.
- The Office of the Provost will require each Dean provide to the Office of the Provost by July 1 of each year written assurance in that an annual performance evaluation for each unit administrator has been completed.
**Enhancing the Review Process for Deans and Directors**

- The Office of the Provost will post on the web the schedule for the five-year review for each Dean and Director, including the date by which the preparation of the review should commence so that the review can proceed within the five-year timeline.
- Within 30 days of the conclusion of a review, the Office of the Provost will provide written feedback on the review to the College Faculty Advisory Committee.

**Enhancing Training for Reviewers**

- The Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources (Office of Faculty and Organizational Development) will provide at least one event annually that provides information to faculty and administrators on approaches to administrator performance review.
- The Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources will initiate an enhanced program of professional development support specifically tailored to the needs of department Chairpersons.
- Information on the shared responsibility for administrator reviews is an explicit part of the orientation program for new administrators and new faculty.
Annual Evaluation of Chairpersons/Directors

IV. ACADEMIC HUMAN RESOURCES POLICIES (Cont.)

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF CHAIRPERSONS/DIRECTORS

This policy was issued by the Office of the Provost on September 21, 1981.

Annual performance evaluations to assess unit administrator performance have been formally instituted in each college and separately reporting unit. Annual performance evaluations generally occur near the end of the academic year, may be combined with the annual assessment of unit administrators for merit salary adjustments, and the results of each individual evaluation should be shared with the unit administrator evaluated. All aspects of performance, including equal opportunity/affirmative action, should be evaluated for each unit administrator. No specific procedure is required for these annual performance evaluations, as approaches may vary in the colleges/separately reporting units. A copy of the evaluation instrument (criteria) currently used by each dean (director) in annual evaluations must be filed with the
Office of the Provost prior to each annual cycle of evaluations. Annually, each dean or separately reporting director will be asked to inform the Office of the Provost that an annual performance evaluation for each unit administrator has been completed. Deans and separately reporting directors will retain documentation on file in their offices concerning the process and outcomes of these annual performance evaluations.

Next: Extension, Medical Care and Other Faculty/Academic Staff Service Activities

Previous: Salary, Appointment, and Faculty Status of Faculty Members Who Assume Administrative Responsibilities

Index: Faculty Handbook Index

TOC: Faculty Handbook Table of Contents
Section 2 - Academic Governance in Schools, Colleges, and other Academic Units

2.1. UNIT ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS

2.1.1. Academic units are those departments, schools, colleges, and other administrative units whose primary function is education, research, or creative endeavor.

2.1.2. An academic administrator is a faculty member who has authority and responsibility delegated by the President and the Board of Trustees for the administration of a unit.

2.1.2.1. A department chairperson or school director serves as the chief representative of his or her department or school within the University. He or she is responsible for educational, research, and service programs, budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction, taking into account the advisory procedures of the unit. The chairperson or director has a special obligation to build a department or school strong in scholarship, teaching capacity, and public service.

2.1.2.2. Deans and directors of other academic units separately reporting to the Provost are responsible for educational, research, and service programs of the respective college or separately reporting unit. This
responsibility includes budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his or her jurisdiction taking into account the advisory procedures of the college or separately reporting unit.

2.1.3. Faculty and students shall advise or consult in the appointment of unit academic administrators.

2.1.3.1. The voting faculty of each department or school shall have shared responsibility with its dean to determine procedures for the selection of chairpersons and directors to be nominated to the Provost.

2.1.3.2. The voting faculty of each college shall have shared responsibility with the Provost to determine procedures for the selection of deans to be nominated by the Provost.

2.1.3.3. The selection of assistant and associate administrators to be nominated to the Provost shall be the responsibility of the academic administrator to whom they directly report (2.1.5.2.).

2.1.4. Chairpersons, directors, and deans shall be subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years.

2.1.4.1. The College Advisory Council of each college shall have shared responsibility with the Provost to determine procedures for the review of deans.

2.1.4.2. At intervals of not to exceed five years the dean shall review the reappointment of a chairperson or school director.

2.1.4.3. A department or school faculty shall have shared responsibility with their dean on procedures for review of a chairperson or school director.
2.1.4.4. There is no limit on the number of times an individual may be continued in the position of dean, chairperson, or school director. The same principle applies to deans and directors of separately reporting units.

2.1.4.5. At any time during the term of office, the appointment of a dean, chairperson, or director, as dean, chairperson, or director may be terminated either by resignation or by action of the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the President and the Provost.

2.1.5. Academic administrators shall participate in academic governance as part of their administrative responsibility.

2.1.5.1. They shall inform faculty and students of administration policies through the academic governance system as well as other channels they deem appropriate.

2.1.5.2. They shall receive the views of faculty and students through the academic governance system, as well as other channels they deem appropriate, in determining policies and in advising other administrators of the University.

2.1.5.3. They shall comply with these Bylaws and the bylaws of their academic unit.

2.1.5.4. They shall assist and encourage the efficient and effective operation of academic governance.

2.2. UNIT ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

2.2.1. The voting faculty of each academic unit shall have shared responsibility with the administrator to adopt and publish bylaws, provided they are in