**Minutes of the Fall All Faculty Meeting**

September 22, 2016

Classroom Building 309

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm. Kelli Shuman and 30 faculty members attended.

A brief agenda for this meeting was:

* Anonymous Complaint System (Kelli Shuman and Dr. Rice)

An Anonymous Complaint System is required by the state Office of Civil Rights. This is not the same as the Advocate Complaint Reporting System (Title IX and Student Misconduct). The system follows “Best Practices” employed by universities across South Dakota and the nation and is not a police or court system. BoR policy 1:18, Human Rights Complaints, contains guidelines for the procedures to be followed, applies to all students, faculty and employees, and outlines duties, rights, including non-confidentiality rights.

The procedure begins with the filing of an anonymous complaint. Anyone, even those unaffiliated with SD Mines, can file a complaint. Once a complaint has been received, HR has a duty to investigate all complaints. The duty begins with an impartial investigation into the anonymous complaint. The investigation begins with a discussion of the complaint with the accused. If the complaint is denied, no further action is taken unless the complaint is of such significance that it would be imprudent not to investigate further. For routine, denied complaints, no information is filed, although a private record of the complaint and denial is kept for term of two years required by state law.

* New dossier preparation documents update (Dr. Rice)

The revised guide to candidate dossier preparation is available on the Faculty Senate website. The Senate reviewed this document on September 8, 2016 and the tenure guide was posted June 2015, 2016. New requirements for promotion within lecturer ranks have been created.

Third year review for new, tenure-track faculty has not yet been implemented campus wide, but is done in some departments. The Provost would like to extend this to a campus wide requirement.

* Institutional Workload Committee (IWC) update (Dean Jensen, Keith Whites, and Rod Rice)

The COHE IWC members reported on their initial meetings. Changes were made to the Workload Model proposed by the 2015-16 Draft Workload Committee, although most of the features of the January 2016 draft were retained. Added metrics have been proposed related to allocations for work week, advising, scholarship and service. A more extensive workload worksheet has been proposed as well. The worksheet will be tested via a usability study and survey administered to each department. Once the results are tabulated and analyzed, the data will be provided to the faculty.

*Questions*:

1. How will this balance discipline differences?

The answer is unknown currently. The intent of the worksheet is to provide transparency and consistency with respect to workload among disciplines. Whether it achieves these ends remains to be seen. For now, the usability study may provide some useful input.

1. How do the metrics added and the more extensive workload worksheet not just become a bean counting exercise, as the faculty mostly did not desire a metric heavy system?

See response to previous question.

1. Who will get and use this information?

Unknown. Most likely the Provost and Department Heads, and the information may be used for departmental allocations.

1. What if the faculty member does not have Excel?

Other methods can be used, such as obtaining a printout or converting to another type of document.

1. Will this be evaluated after a few years?

The current plan is to evaluate every three years.

Dr. Rice adjourned the meeting at ~4:56 pm.