

5-1-2005

SR-05-06-(25)70-127 EAHC

Marshall University

Follow this and additional works at: [http://mds.marshall.edu/fs\\_recommendations](http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations)

---

### Recommended Citation

Marshall University, "SR-05-06-(25)70-127 EAHC" (2005). *Recommendations*. 415.  
[http://mds.marshall.edu/fs\\_recommendations/415](http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations/415)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Recommendations by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu), [martj@marshall.edu](mailto:martj@marshall.edu).

**EXECUTIVE AD HOC COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION**

**RETURNED TO COMMITTEE**

**SR-05-06-(25) 70-127 EAHC**

WHEREAS, the Executive Ad Hoc Committee was charged with formulating a definition for the purpose of voting on matters within individual academic units by faculty who hold dual faculty/administrative positions, and after careful deliberation and consideration have arrived at the following; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That

Voting on faculty matters which are only the concerns of the members of the academic unit should not be done by faculty members who hold dual faculty/administrative positions in the academic unit when their vote might imply a conflict of interest. If a person holding a dual faculty/administrative position does cast a vote on a faculty matter, and that vote raises the issue of conflict of interest, any member of the academic unit may appeal to the Faculty Senate chair and Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will determine whether the vote cast was a conflict of interest or gives the appearance of a conflict of interest.

**FACULTY SENATE CHAIR:**

RETURNED  
TO COMMITTEE:

*Larry Stibler*

DATE:

*5/11/2005*

**UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:**

READ:

*[Signature]*

DATE:

*5/3/05*

**COMMENTS:** April 27, 2006—Disapproved by the Faculty Senate. Discussion included: There currently is no mechanism to address dual role administrators who vote on faculty issues; this is a means to address a perceived conflict of interest; when could faculty use this policy—before or after a vote; provide a definition of dual role administrators; who would take action if there were a vote of conflict, the Executive Committee or Provost; would it be best to define who can vote before voting to avoid a conflict of interest; and dual role administrative positions done as a cost savings means for the university.