# MSB FACULTY SENATE MEETING 7 MARCH 2003

**ATTENDEES:** (See attached Appendix A)

**<u>CALL TO ORDER:</u>** President Nielsen called the meeting to order at 1010AM.

#### I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: MSBFS MEETING 19 DECEMBER 2002:

Professor Vemuganti made the motion that *the minutes be accepted!* Professor Dutt seconded the motion.

MOTION PASSED UNAMIOUSLY

### II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (APPENDIX B):

Professor Trotter asked for a motion to include an action item on the question of the retroactive application of new standards.

#### THE AGENDA, AS AMENDED, WAS ACCEPTED BY UNAMIOUS VOTE

#### III. DEAN'S REPORT:

<u>AFPR-Professor R.</u> Bento asked the Dean to clarify the procedure to be followed in handling the Annual Faculty Performance Review. The Dean said that the Management Committee would discuss the reports next week. It would then go back to the faculty member to approve. The final AFPR would then go back to the Dean for merit. The process should be done by May.

Professor Sigler asked if there would be merit money available. The Dean indicated that there would be none this year and probably none next year.

<u>AACSB</u>-The Dean raised the question about whether the Merrick School should continue to seek AACSB accreditation. She talked about the pros and cons of AACSB. She challenged the faculty to discuss the issues involved and come up with a position statement.

A discussion took place about various issues regarding AACSB. In regard to teaching, learning objectives have to be spelled out and steps need to be taken to measure the attainment of these objectives. There were comments made about what other schools are doing and about how the market would view our decision to abandon AACSB. The issue of student perception of accreditation was raised. The Dean pointed out that universities around the world were seeking AACSB accreditation, and that this has to be considered when standards are being considered.

## <u>FACULTY DEVELOPMENT- (See Appendix C, Professional Development... 6</u> <u>March 2003)</u>

**SABBATICAL LEAVE** There will be additional sabbaticals available for next year. The sabbatical time frame has been extended. Nominations are due by March 21<sup>st</sup> and applications are due by April 14<sup>th</sup>. Guidelines are available from the Awards Committee. The Dean indicated that the purpose of sabbatical leave is to support research.

**SUMMER RESEARCH**-The Dean announced that \$30,000 would be available to support research projects this summer. The money will be paid out in the form of an expense account. A proposal submitted by one faculty member would be worth \$3,000. Two faculty members may submit one proposal and each would receive \$3,000. A two faculty member per proposal is the limit. The maximum number of projects would be 10 and the minimum number 5.

The Dean said there would be a committee set up consisting of 4 faculty members (those sitting on the committee would not be eligible for grants). Proposals should be 5-8 pages in length and contain no names or biographical information. The deadline for submission will be either May 1<sup>st</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup>, and a final decision should be forthcoming by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

**<u>BUDGET CUTS</u>**-The Dean said that the 4% cuts for this year have been achieved, and that we are close to the 3%-6% cuts for 2004.

JOB SECURITY- the Dean indicated that retrenchment is not likely.

#### IV. ELECTION OF THE MSBFS NOMINATION COMMITTEE FOR 2003-2004:

Five candidates were available for serving on the committee: A. Aggarwal, S. Isberg, S. Lynn, K. Singhal and R. Trotter. Professor's Singhal and Aggarwal withdrew.

Professor Vemuganti made a motion that the MSBFS approve the selection of S. Isberg, S. Lynn and R. Trotter to serve as the Nomination Committee.

Professor K. Singhal seconded the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED BY UNAMIOUS VOTE

#### V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT-S. ISBERG, CHAIR

Professor Isberg reviewed the work that had been done by the committee. He indicated that there would be no coverage of the undergraduate core today. He said the discussion would focus on the undergraduate specialization's (See Appendix D)

Professor Isberg made the following motion: *THE MSBFS ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DIVISIONS REGARDING THE UNDERGRADUATE SPECIALIZATIONS.* 

Discussion on the motion covered several issues. There was some concern that some of the material on specialization's actually covered the core. There were some special concerns related to the accounting specialization. It was pointed out that accounting is different in that they have to abide by standards set profession.

There was some concern about Service and Manufacturing, but professor Mersha said that this issue would be held off until the April 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Some felt that they did not enough time to go over the material. Professor Isberg said that programs had come from the divisions and that input was possible there. In addition, he pointed out that all Curriculum Committee meetings were open.

Professor Laric offered a Friendly Amendment that said THE MSBFS ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REGARDING THE UNDERGRADUATE SPECIALIZATIONS SUBJECT TO COSMETIC CHANGES AND THAT ANYTHING RELATING TO THE CORE BE COVERED AT A LATER DATE.

Professor Isberg accepted that Friendly Amendment.

Professor Randolph called for a vote on the motion.

THE VOTE WAS TAKEN TO ACCEPT PROFESSOR RANDOLPH'S MOTION. IT PASSED:

24 FOR 5 AGAINST

# THE MSBFS THEN VOTED ON PROFESSOR ISBERG'S MOTION AS AMENDED:

THE MOTION PASSED:
25 FOR
2 AGAINST
3 NOT VOTING

#### VI. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION-R. TROTTER

Professor Trotter raised the issue of the retroactive application of new standards when evaluating performance.

A discussion followed regarding the standards for promotion. It was pointed out that the Faculty Handbook was vague on some issues dealing with promotion and tenure.

Professor Zacur recommended that the MSBFS support a Sense of the Senate Resolution. *The MSBFS unanimously agreed.* 

Professor Zacur then proposed the following resolution and that it be sent to the Dean, the Provost and the President. The Resolution says:

IN ALL DECISIONS REGARDING PROMOTION AND TENURE, CRITERIA TO BE APPLIED SHOULD BE PRESENTED TO THE CANDIDATE WITH SUFFICIENT NOTICE SO THAT THE CANDIDATE CAN ACT ACCORDING TO THOSE GUIDELINES AND PREPARE DOCUMENTATION ACCORDING TO THE CORRECT CRITERIA. NEW CRITERIA SHOULD BE PROSPECTIVELY APPLIED AND NOT RETROACTIVELY APPLIED.

#### THE MSBFS UNAMIOUSLY ACCEPTED THE RESOLUTION

#### VII. FACULTY HANDBOOK REVISIONS-

Changes if the Faculty Handbook were presented. It was pointed out that the changes should be reviewed and that a vote will take place at the next MASBFS meeting.

It was pointed out that there is a difference in numbers between A and B on the Faculty Handbook Changes material (Appendix E)

Professor K. Singhal made the following motion:

# THE SIZE OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE SHOULD BE INCREASED IMMEDIATELY TO NINE MEMBERS, EACH REPRESENTING ONE OF THE NINE ACADEMIC AREAS.

Professor Zacur seconded the motion.

Professor Isberg offered a *Friendly Amendment* that added **CURRENT CURRICULUM COMMITTEE** to the motion, and that was accepted.

A discussion followed covering problems relating to staffing committees, procedures for removing committee members, what to do about members not fulfilling their duties, problems that arise in scheduling meetings for committees with large numbers, and other issues.

#### PROFESSOR SINGHAL'S MOTION WAS PASSED:

26 FOR 1 OPPOSED 3 ABSTENTIONS

<u>**P&T-Professor Ford Covered Changes 10**</u> to the T & P Committee. She indicated that the decision to reduce the number of members from 9 to 6 was based on the fact that 9 was too large, was difficult to manage and created scheduling problems. She pointed out that the MSB only had the 9 areas for a very short period of time.

President Nielsen said that the administration was interested in having external reviews for promotion and tenure. She passed out Dean McCarthy's memo titled "External Letter Review For Tenure and Promotion Cases" (Appendix F)

**FACULTY EVALUATIONS-**Professor Rollier requested that any comments on Faculty Evaluation be sent directly to him.

AWARDS COMMITTEE-Professor White went over the Awards Committee material. She pointed out the important dates: March 21<sup>st</sup> for nominations and April 14<sup>th</sup> for applications. She informed everyone to see her for Sabbatical Leave Forms.

#### VIII. ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION-R. TROTTER

Professor Trotter passed out the forms (Appendix G) for everyone to review. Comments should be e-mailed to Richard.

Some felt that in the past the results of these evaluations had not been made public. Professor Trotter said that this year's results would be made public.

#### IX. TIGER TEAM AWARDS-C. NIELSEN

President Nielsen let it be known that there were two awards that were available for interested faculty.

• Travel Awards (2)-{See Appendix H}. The support is available for those presenting a paper on International Business at a conference.

• Summer Research Award-There is money available for a summer research project. The deadline for submission is May 1<sup>st</sup>. Decisions will be made by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

## **X. ADJOURNMENT-**The meeting was adjourned at 12:36PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter M. Lynagh, Secretary