

**Faculty Senate
HH 119
November 19, 2002
Minutes**

Present: E. Curtin, N. Hopson, V. Hutchinson, R. Long, D. Marshall, D. Mathews, P. McDermott, R. McKenzie, K. Milner, D. Mullins, M. O'Loughlin, D. Parker, D. Rieck, D. Rotondo, D. Whaley

Absent: J. DeRidder, M. Mitchell, B. Talbert

Announcements - Rich McKenzie, President

Dr. McKenzie noted the recent problems with groupwise and asked permission to add discussion of that topic to the agenda as the first item under New Business.

Remarks from the Provost - David Buchanan or Representative

Dr. Buchanan was attending a Human Subjects Committee meeting. He came to the Senate meeting after that meeting, but had no announcements.

Approval Of Minutes: Nov 12: approved with no changes (attached)

Committee Reports

Membership and Elections –

David Rieck submitted the following:

M&E revised its procedures document (this document has now been approved by the senate), and filled sabbatical vacancies for several positions.

Long Range Academic Planning –

David Rieck submitted the following:

The only issue that LRAP has dealt with is the University's Strategic Plan. The members of LRAP felt the need for broad input and requested that the Provost appoint a larger Strategic Planning Team that includes all LRAP members. This team will ultimately present a plan to LRAP, which will then consider it, perhaps revise it, and forward it to the senate. During the process we will seek to involve the campus community as much as possible. We are planning to activate a discussion board where people can participate in threaded discussions, and we will hold open meetings; however, we are still in the very early stages of the process.

Faculty Development Committee -

Don Whaley submitted the following:

The subcommittee of the Faculty Development Committee that selects the Distinguished Faculty Award has suggested that the committee establish a Faculty Lifetime Achievement Award. The committee was not clear what criteria would be used for such an award or how this award would not simply be given to the people who had won the Distinguished Faculty Award in the past. The committee decided to send this proposal back to the subcommittee for further explanation and clarification.

The FDC reaffirmed its position on the uses of the Faculty House, that we were opposed to giving up the space at this time but remained open to discussions as to whether other space might better serve the needs of the faculty.

At the president's request, the FDC met with her and the provost to discuss ways to build a better sense of community among the faculty, the possibility of a faculty club, and ways to recognize and celebrate faculty research and publications. The committee will be meeting this month to hammer out its response to the president on these issues.

Mr. Whaley added that at a subsequent meeting with the president and the provost, there had been discussion of the Faculty House and other initiatives. The access problem with the house can be solved easily, but the committee wants to look at other spaces as well. The president is interested in finding new ways for fostering community and recognizing faculty achievement, for example, celebrations for those who publish books or articles within a year or opportunities for faculty to present their sabbatical projects.

The Distinguished Faculty Award committee had asked FDC to consider adding a Lifetime achievement award since the current award focuses on the last three to five years. The FDC has asked the DFAW to provide more guidance and criteria for recipients of that award.

The FDC is exploring the possibility of a Faculty Club and is interested in faculty reaction to that.

Retrenchment Appeals =

Deborah Matthews submitted the following:

The Retrenchment Appeals Committee is a dormant committee that is only called upon to meet should the University experience retrenchment activities. The acting chair of that committee is Amy Meekins from the Education Department. There is nothing to report on the activities of this committee at this time.

Dr. McKenzie and Dr. Rieck asked if the committee had considered re-writing its By-laws so that the committee could be moth-balled until needed.

Faculty Welfare -

Elizabeth Curtin submitted the following:

Lisa Seldomridge was elected chair.

The committee has been examining the proposed policy on benefits to Full-time, Non-tenure Track instructional faculty and its implications for different departments. We will be reporting back to the Faculty Senate on November 19. We have reviewed sabbatical reports as they have been sent to us. We still need to revise the proposal on high merit that the committee submitted last year.

Promotions Committee

Rich McKenzie submitted the following:

The committee elected Jeanne Whitney as its chair for the fall semester and Elisha Venso as chair for the spring semester.

The Promotions committee met twice during the Fall semester. The meetings were largely devoted to planning how to carry out the Senate directives regarding a study of possible school promotion committees.

We decided to

- 1) ask the departments to give input on promotions criteria and what they think a school promotions structure should look like,
- 2) form, by election, ad hoc (mock) school committees to review and debate the department responses and then to offer suggestions about school committees to us.
- 3) submit a report to the senate based on the responses in the above items.

The original deadline for accomplishing #1 was set as Dec. 1, 2002. This has been extended to Dec. 15, 2002. Due to difficulties in holding an election in mid-year, it has been tentatively decided not to form the ad hoc committees mentioned in #2. Instead, the Promotions Committee may, itself, review the department's submissions and write the report to the Senate based on its own findings.

Old Business:

FTNTT Benefits Report - Lisa Seldomridge (Faculty Welfare)

The Senate had charged the Faculty Welfare Committee with examining the policy on providing benefits for Full-Time, Non-Tenure track faculty, proposed by a task force, including K. Kimmel, B. Price, C. Thomas, A. Selser, B. Crockett

and sent to the Provost. Dr. Seldomridge acknowledged hard work and good intentions of committee, who had pulled information together from a variety of sources. The FWC had met with Kimmel, Price and Thomas. Although the plan seemed to be on the right track, the FWC had some serious concerns and wanted guidance from the Senate about where to go from here. Below are listed the features of the policy and the concerns the FWC continues to have.

Features of proposed policy:

1. Purpose: to provide comprehensive state benefits (health insurance, retirement, tuition waiver etc) to FTNTT faculty
2. Attempts to determine what a “standard teaching load” would be for a FTNTT faculty member who has ONLY teaching responsibilities.
 - a. Uses 8 course equivalents to account for 65-75% of the FTNTT workload, with remaining time in professional development and scholarship.
 - b. Determines that a full time equivalent teaching load for FTNTT faculty would be about 10 course equivalents per year in order to be eligible for consideration for benefits.
 - c. Acknowledges that FTNTT faculty would have a different evaluation from FTNTT faculty.
3. Offers an implementation plan for faculty currently employed as FTNTT faculty
 - a. Offers some flexibility in determining what is included in the load (advising in one’s specialty/advising student organizations, writing lab manuals, coordinating multiple section labs)
 - b. Offer of benefits is tied to availability of funded PINs and based on seniority of FTNTT person
4. Suggests that all NEW hires who come after adoption of the policy would have to wait until a PIN became available AND teach 10 course equivalents to be eligible for consideration for benefits.

Concerns:

1. Staff were offered comprehensive state benefits and were not asked to increase their workload
2. FTNTT faculty would have to increase their teaching load to 5 course equivalents/semester to be eligible for consideration for benefits.
3. While FWC believes that people should have the choice to increase their teaching loads to be eligible for consideration for benefits, we believe there needs to be flexibility in the definition of “load”.
4. FTNTT faculty are used in a variety of ways across campus. Some teach exclusively, while others have responsibilities for academic advising beyond the scope of their courses, advising student organizations, coordinating programs or minors, coordinating multiple lab sections, and are engaged in professional development.

We believe that flexibility in implementing a plan to offer benefits is essential to meet the differing needs of departments. This should be negotiated at the school level through the deans.

5. The plan for implementing this proposal suggests two phases, one for FTNTT faculty currently employed by the university and one for new hires. While it seems that there will be flexibility for currently employed FTNTT in determining a 5 course equivalent (with advising, scholarship, lab setup etc), we are concerned about the quality of people who might be attracted as new hires if the assignment is exclusively teaching (5 courses/semester).

6. In this proposal, eligibility for consideration for benefits is based on the availability of PINs. Since the number of funded PINs is limited, we are concerned about what will happen to a PIN when it becomes available,

1. how will the decision to allocate the PIN to a department be made and by whom?
2. how will the decision to fill the PIN with a FTTT faculty versus a FTNTT faculty be made and by whom?
3. what is the likelihood of any current FTNTT faculty ever becoming eligible for benefits under this proposal
4. what is the impact across the university of hiring (cheaper) FTNTT faculty into PINs over (more costly but perhaps more qualified, terminal degree, scholarship etc) FTTT faculty?

7. The proposed plan does not offer the flexibility to recognize the differences that might exist in workload as represented by courses offered in alternative formats such as lab, studio or clinical.

Dr. Jones and Dr. Parker both suggested that the difficulty was with the System arrangements with the universities that had been part of the old State College system. The universities that were always part of the System have no difficulty offering benefits. Dr. Buchanan said that although there will be no new money, we might be able to begin conversions if we were willing to take money from another source.

The Senate Executive Committee will draft a response to the proposal.

New Business:

I. Groupwise problems

Dr. McKenzie noted the problems with Groupwise over the last few days. People are confused about all of the causes of the problems but expressed concern that IT seemed to be blaming faculty. The 48 Gigabytes seem insufficient to serve the needs of all faculty and staff. After extensive discussion the Senate decided to ask Jerry Waldron, Ken Kundell, and Jonathan Isett to attend a Senate meeting so that they could explain to faculty their concerns, and senators could explain theirs.

Discussion: Improving Faculty Participation in Shared Governance - Rich McKenzie

Dr. Parker presented the results of a brief questionnaire that he sent to Henson faculty asking them if they were aware of a recent action of the Senate.

Responses indicated that some people were not because of lack of interest in unapproved minutes or difficulty with attachments. Dr. Curtin reminded the Senate that minutes are sent out unapproved to keep communication with faculty up-to-date. She asked that Senators also alert the people they represent to check for changes. Any format can be opened by right-clicking on it and viewing it.

Dr. McKenzie expressed concern that some faculty feel intimidated about talking in sessions with tenured faculty. He asked that Senators tell their faculty that they are welcome to bring their concerns to their representatives, who will keep the concerns in confidence if necessary.