

**Unapproved Minutes of the Regular Meeting
of the Faculty Senate, APSU
September 26, 1996**

Senators Present: Patrick Bunton, Art Carpenter, Wayne Chaffin, Bruce Childs, Don Dailey, Thomas Dixon, Sue Cloud Evans, Deborah Fetch, Daniel Frederick, Mark Ginn, James Goode, Charles (Buddy) Grah, Kay Haralson, Carlette Hardin, Tom King, Larry Lowrance, Kathy Martin, Ramon Magrans, Maureen McCarthy, Bruce Myers, Stephanie Newport, David O'Drobinak, George Pesely, Michael Phillips, Jennie Preston-Sabin, Steve Ryan, William Renkl, Abu Sarwar, Paul Shaffer, Lori Slavin, Linda Thompson, David Till, Viktor Ukpolo, Mickey Wadia, Nancy Wright

Meeting Called to Order: 3:20 pm

Agenda Approved.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 29, 1996 were approved with amendments.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

President Sal Rinella reported:

1. The Board of Regents meeting and the THEC meeting have both been good meetings.
2. An appreciation and information luncheon will be held with heads of the media: local newspapers, T.V., radio, etc.
3. The showing of the APSU video to the Faculty Senate today will be the 4th showing of the video. The video was made by Cummings Productions in Nashville with the help of Dennie Burke and Wendell Gilbert. The video took close to a year to make, and went through many drafts. Only faculty, students and alumni are in the video. The video focuses on all the outstanding aspects of APSU. The video was a big hit with the Regents.
4. Our campus is being noticed by TBR, THEC and the media, due in part to enrollment increase.
5. The THEC meeting focused on the cost of technology, gender equity in athletics, facilities, operating budgets that will be necessary after the new building projects are completed. A controversy facing THEC is a new formula funding situation where all schools would be funded at 95% level.
6. Question and Answers: none

Vice-President Steve Pontius reported:

1. The search committee for the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has been finalized, with the exception of a student member. A list of committee members and a time-line for decisions of the search committee was distributed to FS members. Announcement of new Dean will be by April 14.
2. Draft of time-line for actions needed by Faculty Senate, Colleges, Departments and the Deans' Council was distributed. A response to TBR by the Faculty Senate on post tenure review is needed by October 15. The report will be taken with him to the TBR subcouncil meeting on October 17.
3. The Faculty Senate's summer school recommendations, looking at budget issues and creative ways of dealing with summer school are needed by December 6.
4. Statement concerning the Developmental Studies Program: On registration day at the Dunn Center, things that had traditionally been handled by DSP were coming to the Vice President's office. A decision was made on the spot to have DSP report to Dr. Barbara Tarter on an interim basis. The Enrollment Management Task Force will be looking at issues concerning advising and retention. Many things done in DSP deal with retention, therefore the Task Force will evaluate the situation with DSP, make a recommendation to Dr. Tarter, who will then make a recommendation to Dr. Pontius. Developmental Studies will be in College of Arts and Sciences if that is the best home for it. Because of the situation a quick decision was made. Some people are not happy with the situation. This decision to relocate DSP on an interim basis will not impact tenure or promotion and faculty will continue on the same college committees as before. The decision was made for the benefit of the students at the time.

5. Questions and Answers:

Q: Who will chair the COAS Dean Search Committee?

A: This will be decided by tomorrow.

President Rinella and Vice President Pontius depart.

TBR Subcouncil - Dr. Dolores Gore, ex. officio:

1. She will be at TBR working the whole week, will meet Oct. 17 with the subcouncil concerning the tenure review process.

Academic Council - Dr. Mike Phillips:

1. First meeting was yesterday. The scope and role of the Academic Council was discussed, no additional business.
2. **Remarks by David Till concerning Academic Council:** Thanks for the timeliness of everyone involved in the Academic Council elections for COAS and Education. Richard Gildrie is the new COAS representative and Donald Luck is the new representative from the College of Education. Jeremy Faulk, Amy Spiceland and Tabitha Vires are student representatives on the Academic Council. Concern was expressed that there are subcommittees of the Academic Council with no COAS members, there is no teaching faculty of COAS on the subcommittee looking at the Liberal Arts Core, Dr. Joyce is serving, but is not a teaching faculty. Someone from COAS will be joining the committee. In the Chair's meeting of COAS it was voted unanimously to extend the time frame for decision on the Liberal Arts Core to the middle of spring semester. This indicates the confusion and uncertainty of what types of courses should be offered and who should offer them. It was very clear that the chairs of COAS were acting responsibly to see that things will be done in a manner respectful of students and academic integrity. This means the decision will probably not be made in time for the new bulletin, but people are trying to expedite the process.

3. Questions and Answers:

Q: What is the deadline for the bulletin?

A: Late February or early March.

Q: Is the committee trying to finalize by early spring?

A: Must be earlier to meet the deadline.

Q: Can the bulletin be extended for another year?

A: With an insert calendar for 97-98? Bulletin is for 2 years.

Q: What is the sense of the cultural diversity course? At first it looked like it could be offered in every department, now it looks like it is more specific, both courses should be part of the core, not part of major.

Q: There seems to be very specific guidelines, looks like top down management.

A: The role of the Liberal Arts Core Subcommittee is to make recommendations, not mandates. The cultural diversity course guidelines are suggestions. We need to receive input from the faculty in this regard.

4. **David Till:** Steve Anderson and Robbie Robison worked on this. There does not seem to be much in the way of guidelines for the cultural diversity course. It seems a sensible decision for COAS chairs to ask for more time to think about this. I encourage all to participate in the core revision attempts, to make sure it is done in an academically respectable way.

5. **Mike Phillips:** It is the attempt of the committee to provide guidelines, not mandates. We do not want to do anything to impede the process. The Liberal Arts Core revision process is to be driven by the faculty, not the subcommittee. Please E-mail with any questions, concerns or comments. These will be relayed to the committee for action.

Deans Council - Dr. David Till:

1. Faculty Senate needs to choose how to involve itself in the COAS Dean search. In the past, after the

interviews the FS took straw poll of its membership. This was not done in the Academic VP search. We might want to do this again. As in the past, the dossiers of applicants will be made available in the library, please read, attend the interview, etc.

2. Stephanie Newport has been chairing the committee on faculty development funding.

Report: The final working draft is in the hands of committee members to be shared with as many faculty as possible. The committee was asked to develop a new procedure to handle distribution of faculty development funds and to develop a new instrument to apply for funds. A major point of the procedure is to provide equity, making sure all faculty have a good chance to receive faculty development funds. These funds will be made available quarterly. There is no limit to the amount which can be requested. The application requires requests for development funds be linked to university goals and how the activity will contribute to your development as a faculty member. A university committee made up of faculty will review the proposals. The committee will be appointed from a list of faculty members solicited from the faculty by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Executive committee will give Dr. Pontius at least seven names from which to appoint the committee. The application must be signed by another faculty member supporting your request. The application goes to the dean, to the committee and then to the VPAA. Applications will be reviewed on a quarterly basis, with the quarters breaking along semester dates. Application can be made up to two decision cycles before it is needed. For example, if you find out in early April you have been accepted for a presentation in November, you can apply in the next cycle (July-Sept) and/or the next cycle if the proposal isn't funded on the first try.

Q: Why must the form be signed by a fellow faculty member, but the endorsement of the department chair is not required?

A: We did not want to overload the chairs with paperwork.

The faculty member endorsing must be in the same discipline. Committee members will not always know the quality of the proposal if no one from the department is on the committee. The quality of the proposal will be the criterion used in making the decisions about funding. The university committee will have to decide how convincing the proposal is, thus the process will be more competitive than it has been in the past.

Q: Will faculty endorsement add any quality to the proposal?

A: The proposal should be written carefully so that its contribution to faculty development is clear. If a faculty member endorses a poorly conceived proposal, it will probably not be endorsed by the University Committee, and in the event that such a proposal is funded, it will reduce the amount of money available for other faculty members, very possibly the one who endorsed it in the first place. I would expect that faculty would be careful about gratuitous endorsements. Faculty endorsement was our best attempt at keeping the process as open as possible.

Q: Can funds be applied for retroactively?

A: Yes, the first decision cycle will include July 1st through December 1 of this year, to clear the backlog and pending requests that have been waiting for the new process. The committee was extremely careful about considering equity and access issues. The process has a revision clause, and we would like to be involved in revisions.

Q: Why will the amount of money received by faculty members not be made public?

Q: If public money is being used, why can't the amounts be known?

A: Again, there are equity issues involved here. Funding is limited and publishing specific amounts would likely give rise to unrealistic and inaccurate assumptions about amounts faculty may expect for certain proposals. The category of activity that is receiving funding would be more instructive than the specific amount that was available for an activity in any one decision cycle or fiscal year.

Q: To David Till: Has this procedure been given final approval?

A: No. A thank you to Stephanie Newport for her report. The Faculty Senate will have input in this decision. [When polled, only two faculty members on the Senate had seen the draft of the document. Committee members should have disseminated the document to all colleagues by now. Stephanie will get a copy to David Till ASAP. He will see that the Faculty Senate sees the document before final approval is given.]

Q: There is a question of representation. Do people on these committees vote fairly, or by college?

A: If you have good people on the committee, this should not be an issue. The process committee would like to limit the members of the review committee to one from all colleges and two from COAS.

The committee has worked every week since August 19 because Dr. Pontius said he wanted to begin to distribute funds on October 16. The committee will finish the document and submit it to Dr. Pontius on September 30 so he will have some time to share it with faculty before it is implemented.

SLRP Report - Dr. Wayne Chaffin

1. The first meeting is next Tuesday. Three responses are needed. 1st: A draft of the plan produced by the SLRP committee in August, over 100 individuals had the opportunity to review the plan, give information and advice to the committee. The committee will take this, incorporate the suggestions and produce an additional draft of the plan to submit to the President for review. 2nd: An examination of the existing mission statement, being revised in light of new plan. 3rd: A vision statement will be provided by the President by Thanksgiving break. A reunion of the retreat group will be held in January.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Distribution of Resolution of Thanks and Appreciation for Former COAS Dean, Dr. D'Ann Campbell. Motion made and seconded to pass the resolution, resolution passed.
2. Search for COAS Dean already discussed.
3. Salary Study Committee update: Committee will meet on Oct. 1, 3:30 pm. The study will be executed by a consulting firm.
4. List of committee assignments distributed.
Faculty Red (A) [early retirement]
Comment by Dolores Gore: The decision for early retirement was turned back to the university for the President to make the decision. It will depend on the money available as to whether faculty can participate. If others are on that committee, pick up a copy of the UT system retirement package.
Faculty Red (B) [salary study review and recommendations]
This committee should respond to what comes out of the consultant's committee on faculty salary, and conduct an investigation if the consulting firm is not doing what we want done.
Faculty White (A) [post-tenure review]
Previously discussed.
Faculty White (B) [evaluation of academic administration]
Chairs should be included in this review also.
Academic Red (A) [liberal arts CORE review]
When a plan comes to the Academic Council that can be looked at and shared, a report will be made to the faculty senate.
Academic White (A) [create process for academic reorganization: to include changes in reporting lines and/or changes in responsibilities of academic "units"]
This will be addressed under New Business.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **David Till:** The faculty senate needs to develop a Policy or Process Statement concerning academic reorganization. At the end of Dr. Pontius's statement, he referred to the change in Developmental Studies. It appears there is no process involved in these changes, they happen on an ad hoc basis. Sometimes these decisions come swiftly from on high, some times there is much discussion. There needs to be a policy or process to follow. I would like a committee of this senate to develop a set of guidelines.
2. **David Till:** I received an e-mail from Tom King concerning the change in class times during the spring semester due to the common hour. Our faculty senate meetings will have to begin at 3:50 or meet during the common hour. Some departments have agreed to meet during the common hour, so this might present a problem.
Mike Phillips: The common hour has been set for spring semester only. It will be evaluated in the spring and will not necessarily be in place in the fall.
Comment: If we have 8 common hours a month, we should be able to find a time to meet.