

Longwood University Faculty Senate
**PROPOSAL/POLICY COVER
SHEET**

This cover sheet is intended to provide information to members of the Faculty Senate about a new proposal/policy or about revisions to an existing proposal/policy. **If you are proposing a new policy, then attach the text of the policy to this form. If you are proposing a change to an existing policy, then attach the text of the current policy with any deleted language marked by a strikethrough and with new language marked by an underline. If you are deleting a policy, then attach the text of the policy to be deleted.**

COMMITTEE(S) that authored or sponsored this proposal:

Faculty Status and Grievances (Please contact Melanie Marks with questions.)

TOPIC:

The FPPM is in need of updating. The majority of the language dates back to 1980 with some smaller changes made more recently.

BACKGROUND (Provide a brief statement describing the origins of this proposal, the nature of the problem it addresses, and the work completed to devise the proposal):

After conducting the voting process this year, the committee feels that the FPPM has inaccuracies. For example, the voting process is not technically accurate when terms are staggered because it does not take into account the departments represented by those continuing on the committee. Furthermore, the committee had to use tiebreakers in multiple situations, and there is no language for this in the FPPM. Finally, the committee feels that it is time to streamline the process. It is a substantial process to conduct two different votes, especially since the committee has to go down the list of vote getters, in order, waiting to see if someone will serve before contacting other people in the same department and/or college. Only 35% of voters participated in the balloting vote this year, despite reminders being sent.

UPDATE: WE ARE RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM SENATE MEMBERS.

SUMMARY OF NEW POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES OR DELETIONS TO AN EXISTING POLICY (Provide a brief list or statement describing the content of the policy or the proposed changes or deletions):

Changes are suggested in order to:

- 1. Streamline the process so that there is only one round of voting with a ballot containing names of all eligible tenured faculty members. Then, the committee will determine winners, while taking into account restrictions related to departments and colleges.*
- 2. Allow for slightly more flexibility in that 2 alternates could be from the same department. We retain the rule that a department can be represented only once with respect to regular committee members.*
- 3. Better articulate who is ineligible to serve. Current language says that anyone holding an administrative position may not serve, but that includes a lot of people who do not have a*

conflict of interest.

4. *Add that there are staggered terms (and this makes the voting procedure clearer.)*
5. *Add a tie breaker process, because this was needed 3 times this year.*
6. *Add language about what happens if a college is not represented after the voting and invitation to serve process.*
7. *Provide more clarity, remove irrelevant language, and update language.*
8. *Added language about eliminating conflicts of interests if person filing the case feels it is warranted. This new language is in PINK.*

NOTE THAT EXPLANATIONS ARE OFFERED (HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW) IN THE DOCUMENT THAT DETAILS THE REVISIONS.

RATIONALE FOR THE POLICY OR PROPOSED CHANGES (Provide a brief statement as to why the new policy, the changes, or the deletion is needed):

After conducting the elections this year, the committee feels that the process is very cumbersome and can be streamlined. Current language for determining the election outcome does not factor in the idea that some people will return to the committee. The language is written as if there are no returning members. Clarifications are needed throughout. It is our understanding that the bulk of the language dates back to 1980.

NOTE: THIS DRAFT HAS BEEN DISCUSSED WITH ASSOCIATED PROVOST SHOENTHAL AFTER A DISCUSSION WITH PROVOST SMITH.

UPDATE AFTER SENATE MEETING:

It was suggested that we consider a ranking style vote. Our investigation suggests that Survey Monkey cannot give us a sum of the ranks. It can only give an average rank. That is problematic. One person ranked as #1 by only one person (receiving no other votes) will be higher on the list than someone who received 50 votes with ranks 1 and 2. To make a ranking style vote work correctly, we would have to do our own programming in Excel. But generally, Academic Affairs handles the Survey and gives us a ranked Excel spreadsheet. While it is possible to do our own programming, if we have a case at the time, it would be better to not make the voting process more complicated.

Routing information and signature lines:

Date submitted to Senate Executive Committee for Consideration:
Action(s) Taken:

Date first read at Faculty Senate:
Action(s) Taken:

Date final action taken by Faculty Senate:
Action(s) Taken:
Senate Chair: _____

Date submitted to the PVPAA (within 5 working days of Senate approval):
Action(s) Taken:
PVPAA: _____
Date: _____

Date submitted to other administration:
Action(s) Taken:
Administrator: _____
Date (within 15 working days of PVPAA's signature): _____

Date submitted to the Board of Visitors:

Coversheet updated 9/2017

Q. COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STATUS AND GRIEVANCES

1. **Purpose:** The purpose of the Faculty Status and Grievances Committee shall be to act as a liaison and hearing committee between faculty members or between the faculty and administration, at the request of either, in matters affecting faculty status. The Committee shall report on the number of cases it has heard to the Senate and to a meeting of the general faculty at least once a year. This Committee shall conform to procedures as approved by the Senate and published in the *Faculty Policies and Procedures Manual*.

2. **Membership:** 5 members; 4 alternates.

3. **Ex-officio Members:** None

4. **Tenure Restrictions:** Members must be tenured.

5. **Departmental Restrictions:** The entire committee (regular members plus alternates) may have no more than two members from the same department. Only one person from a department may serve as a regular member.

(Explanation: Note that all of these changes are predicated on the idea of eliminating the first round of voting and creating a ballot from the list of tenured faculty members. As such, there will be candidates from the same department. The language above retains the restriction that a department may only be represented once on the regular committee. But it offers a bit more flexibility in alternates.)

6. **College Restrictions:** The Cook-Cole College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business and Economics, and the College of Education and Human Services will all be represented on the committee.

7. **Other Restrictions:** Any faculty member with tenure may be elected to membership on the committee with the exception, made to avoid conflicts of interest, of the following persons:

- a. Department chairs or any faculty member who also holds an administrative position, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans, Deans, Vice Presidents, Assistant Provosts, Associate Provosts, and Provosts.
- b. Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- c. Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors.

(Explanation: There are many faculty members who hold administrative positions that do not generate a conflict of interest. We are excluding only those people who are in positions that could have significant conflicts of interests. Excluding the representative to the BOV is being added so that language is consistent with current practice.)

8. **Term of Office:** The term of office for committee members shall be 2 calendar years beginning immediately after the first April Senate meeting when the results of the election are announced. In the event that a case is still in progress, the current members would end

their term when the case is concluded. An alternate shall serve for one calendar year. **Regular members may not serve consecutive terms.** ~~succeed themselves but may thereafter be elected to the committee.~~ An alternate may be reelected as an alternate or elected as a member. **Terms are staggered so that either 2 or 3 committee members will rotate off each year.**

(Explanation: Language is cleaned up and it is made clear that terms are staggered. This makes the voting process clearer, since it must take into account the colleges and departments of those committee members who are returning for their second year.)

9. **Method of Selection:**

- a. Elections shall be held annually.
- b. Those members listed in the official faculty roster and librarians who hold faculty rank shall be eligible to vote. The official faculty roster is provided by Academic Affairs.
- c. **Academic Affairs will provide the list of eligible faculty members, after removing those holding administrative positions (see above) and those regular members rotating off the committee.**
- ed. Election of members.
 - (1) During the month of February, the Committee on Faculty Status and Grievances shall provide each member of the faculty with a nominating ballot for selecting new members and alternates of the committee and at the same time shall inform the faculty as to the number of vacancies to be filled.
 - (2) ~~Each faculty member shall check the number of names equal to twice the number of vacancies to be filled (new members plus four alternates) and the checked list shall be returned to the faculty status chair who, with the assistance of the committee members, shall tabulate the results and prepare a list of nominees.~~
 - (3) ~~There shall be twice the number of nominees as there are vacancies to be filled, including alternates. The list of nominees will include at least two faculty members from each college. There may be no more than one nominee from a single department. The nominees will be contacted to confirm their willingness to serve.~~
 - (2) The election ballots shall be distributed **on behalf of** ~~by~~ the Committee on Faculty Status and Grievances to the members of the **faculty eligible to vote** ~~and shall be returned to the faculty status chair within five class days.~~ **If using electronic voting, the process will be open for 5 business days, with a similar period used for paper ballots. Faculty will be instructed to vote for up to 6 individuals.** Members of the committee will assist the committee chair in counting the ballots **determining the winners of the election.**
 - (3) ~~The faculty member from each college receiving the most votes will be on the committee followed by the next two faculty members with the highest number of votes regardless of college. The individuals receiving the highest number of votes will become regular members (two or three) except that no department may have more than one member serving as a regular member. Those departments which do have a regular member may have another member of that department serve as~~

an alternate, as long as both individuals do not serve at the same time. The alternate members will be selected in the order to be called by the number of votes they receive after regular members have been selected. Alternate members shall serve for only one year but may be reelected.

In the case that all colleges are represented by returning members, the faculty members receiving the highest votes, assuming that there is not more than one person on the committee representing a department, will be invited to serve as a regular member of the committee. When at least one college is not being represented by returning members, the faculty member(s) in the college(s) receiving the highest number of votes will be invited to serve. After that, the remaining vacancies will be filled by inviting those with the highest number of votes to serve, observing the departmental restrictions noted above.

- 4) Committee members will vote if they need to break a tie that impacts the composition of the committee.
- 5) If it is necessary for the committee to function, and if for any reason, a member is unable to serve or complete their term, his the position shall be filled by alternates in order of precedence original vote tallies, while observing the college and departmental restrictions.

(Explanation: There are a number of changes here.)

A) The idea is to streamline the process so there is only ONE round of voting. The rules of voting can be just as easily applied when using one round. And with the longer list, it is not a problem if some choose not to serve or when there are duplicates in departments. There will be sufficient options.

B) If all tenured faculty (excluding administrators) are on the list, we do not need a rule that says there needs to be 2 from each college on the ballot.

C) Some of the existing language is inconsistent with there being staggered terms. The language assumes that there are no returning members. So, language is made clearer.

D) A tie breaker process is desperately needed.

E) Some of the language is redundant since similar language appears in other places.

F) Some of the language should be in other numbered items.

G) Given that the committee will always be adding either 6 or 7 members (some as alternates), we streamlined the process to always have faculty casting 6 votes.)

- (6) If no faculty members from a college receive a vote or if they all decline the invitation to serve, the committee will conduct a revote with nominees housed only in that college in the same manner as that described above. Voters will cast 3 votes.

(Explanation: A process is needed in the event that voting does not result in a college being represented.)

- (7) The committee chair will invite elected faculty members to serve. The communication should inform recipients that they will be unable to serve should they

be elected to Faculty Senate Executive Committee or as Representative to the Board of Visitors.

(Explanation: Invitations to serve are generally sent before Senate Exec is determined and before a new representative to the BOV is elected. So this should be explained to the invitee.)

(8) The results of the election will be announced at the next Senate meeting.

10. Chair and Notification Requirements:

- a. The continuing and new members of the Committee on Faculty Status and Grievances shall meet to elect a chair for the following year before the final Senate meeting.
- b. The new members, the alternates, and the new chair shall be announced by the current chair at the final meeting. This information shall be recorded in the Senate minutes.

~~11. Filling unexpired terms:~~

A ~~Moved to 9d(5).~~

- ~~b. If at any time the committee determines that it will not be able to function because of a lack of alternates, the committee will notify the faculty of the nature of this situation and will submit for faculty confirmation the name of an individual selected by the committee to serve the unexpired term.~~

(Explanation: Slightly revised language for 11a has been moved above to 9d5. And, with the ballot containing names of all tenured faculty members, 11b is not needed.)

11. Conflicts of interest:

- a. When a case is referred to the committee, the chair will provide the individual making the submission with the names of the committee members assigned to the case.
- b. If the individual making the submission feels that a member of the committee has a conflict of interest or cannot fairly judge the case, he or she may exercise their right to ask that the member be replaced.
- c. The committee member being removed will be replaced with an alternate. The chair will confirm with the individual submitting the case that the conflict of interest has been resolved.

(Explanation: There is nowhere in the process that allows people who submit cases to be certain their case will not be heard by someone who has a conflict of interest with respect to them personally. Even in honor board hearings at LU, the respondent has the right to ask that people be excused from hearing the case. We are adding this process in based on a comment from a Senator.