

Academic Structure & Faculty Committee
Strategic Planning Committee
Tuesday, September 29, 2015
Minutes

The Academic Structure & Faculty Committee met on Tuesday, September 29, 2015, in RPL 326. Members present: Jon Clements, John Freeman, Eric Lovely, and Lesley Snider, Lucas Maxwell, Pat Edmunds, and V. Carole Smith.

Items discussed:

1. Discussion
 - a. Ozark
 - i. We need a list of courses form Ozark that will not match to a course on the Russellville campus.
 - ii. General Education
 1. Do we need to pursue changing Ozark campus from a work force campus to a 2 year community college? Can Ozark retain certificates if it becomes a community college? Ozark is only 1 of 2 2-year institutions that offer certificates.
 - b. Ozark is unique in that it is really 2 things in one and we need to stress that.
 - i. Chancellor at Ozark and President at Russellville
 - ii. Should President use her time for fund raising or be available to campus?
 - c. Suggested Russellville campus needs a Provost.
2. Promotion & Tenure – Dr. Jeff Woods
 - a. Website:
 - b. Survey – 40% participation so far and hope to have higher percentage
 - c. The survey is based on a combination of issues from the committees: Dean’s Council, Faculty Senate, etc.
 - d. Push for clarification of what is needed for promotion and tenure
 - i. Specific forms need to be developed.
 - ii. Provide clear examples
 - iii. Radical changes not needed
 - iv. Example of clarification needed: classroom visitation.
 - v. This is an open/transparent process.
 - vi. Need to include room for greater contribution of scholarly activity for service component
 - vii. Role and Scope
 1. Those who teach graduate courses should be required to conduct research and the evaluation system should be fair.
 2. Currently 30% is counted toward scholarship but need to leave flexible so that those who want to have a higher percentage of teaching can do so.
 3. Will need to bring in an attorney when the Promotion & Tenure Committee enters the drafting stage.

- viii. Handbook – Promotion & Tenure is spread throughout the Faculty Handbook and it needs to be all placed in same area in handbook.
 - ix. Focus groups
 - 1. Several sessions will be held and will meet without bosses being in the same group as the employees they supervise.
 - e. Next task is to help interpret data that is received from survey and draft around mid-October and then provide time for feedback; will then repeat the process.
 - f. Final draft goes to President and Board of Trustees then on to the state department in August 2016.
 - g. It is anticipated to take effect in September 2016. It can get stalled and then it will go back to the ‘drawing board.’ It is anticipated that it will be in the handbook in January 2017.
 - h. Does this have to align with new contracts? Jeff Woods stated he didn’t know if it would be ready in time for contracts.
 - i. This will not impact those who are currently in the process of promotion & tenure.
 - j. Scholarly activities is a concern across all fields.
 - i. It is imperative that the service of faculty working with school districts continue to be counted as scholarly activity.
 - k. Scholarship determined at department level but as it goes up the chain some may not see as scholarly activity.
 - i. Departments may need to better define what they consider as scholarly activity and then the P/T Committee will need to document.
 - ii. Peer Review of colleagues in field needs documentation so that it helps with reputation of institution.
 - l. Glad the process is transparent and will be clearly defined. In the past, some who have received 4s and 5s on evaluations have not been supported for promotion and tenure so received a terminal contract.
 - m. A clearer 3rd year review is needed so that it defines clearly the direction that the faculty member needs. Third year must be a warning if a problem exists then it needs to be addressed here. It is a must to define what the numbers assigned during review mean (5, 4, 3, 2, etc.).
 - n. Support letters must contain specific examples of why or why not the supervisor is support or not supporting the promotion/tenure.
 - o. These letters need to be based on collegiality and professional growth.
 - p. Instructor positions are considered more in line with 100% teaching and it is not clearly defined in the handbook how to evaluate the instructors.
3. Portfolios
- a. Moving toward electronic portfolios
 - b. Portfolios are intended to provide input into the evaluation process.
 - c. Are portfolios the best way to accomplish this?

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Johnette Moody