

## **Faculty Senate Minutes**

December 11, 2001

Approved 2/12/02

**Senators Attending:** E. Curtin, J. DeRidder, G. Ferrence, K. Fox, V. Hutchinson, K. Khazeh, R. Long, D. Marshall, J. McCallops, R. McKenzie, D. Parker, D. Rieck, D. Rotondo, K. Shannon, D. Whaley

### **1. Announcements:** Rich McKenzie

Rich sent out requests for volunteers to fill a number of committee appointments, he has volunteers for all but the service awards committee. This would be a committee to oversee the event where employees are recognized for years of service. We still need a volunteer.

The Drug and Alcohol Policy is being studied.

Our next meeting will be scheduled for January 29.

### **2. Provost Comments:** David Buchanan

The provost thanked the senators and others present for their help in "bringing him up to speed." He also thanked us for our leadership during a particularly (in light of 9/11) difficult semester and thanked the faculty in general for "keeping several balls in the air," supporting students, etc.

The Provost gave another update on the budget situation. Academic department budgets have been "off the table" for budget cuts required this year, including the 700K contingency funds being held in case there are further cuts. The administration is looking at possible contingencies for next year. We have no idea at present what next year's budget will look like.

All vacancies for exempt and non-exempt staff are currently frozen except, those in upper administration, like the deans or those involved in health or safety. No faculty positions are affected by the current freeze, neither are contingent staff positions. Only state-line staff pin positions are effected.

The academic deans and the provost would like to know if there is a group, e.g. senate, Promotions committee, Other committees, looking into linking tenure and promotion, whether combining the processes or keeping them separate but changing the system so that they both occur the same semester. He would also like to see a discussion of some kind of checklist which makes it easier to verify that necessary components are included in tenure folders. He volunteered to bring us a preliminary draft of such a checklist. Harry

Womack mentioned the need for the Provost's office, the senate and the promotions committee to work together on this.

Further discussion of the budget shortfalls included suggestions to the provost that he consider increasing other forms of revenue, such as tuition or fees and that he investigate what happened during the budget shortfalls in the early 90's as an example of what strategies to avoid. Others suggested that care needed to be taken in deciding to raise tuition or fees as students are also existing in a recession and do not have deep pockets to make up budget shortfalls.

### **3. Regent Staff Awards:** Linda Beall

Linda Beall made a presentation asking us to consider nominating staff for the Regent's awards and to encourage others to do so. We have not had as many nominations go forward as we should given some of the outstanding staff we have. Rich will scan the call for nominations and send it to the senators. Linda said she asked each staff senator to nominate someone and asked if the faculty senators could do the same.

### **4. Academic Freedom and Tenure:** Doug Marshall

Doug Marshall brought the latest version of the proposed policy for faculty on threats of violence back to the Senate. After some discussion, we endorsed the policy. Doug will forward it to the Provost.

### **5. Faculty Welfare:** Elizabeth Curtin

On behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, Elizabeth Curtin presented a revised form for sabbatical applications and a revised form for final sabbatical reports. There was considerable discussion of the later including the following points:

Where should final sabbatical reports be housed. Should they be in personnel folders? They used to be kept in the library where interested faculty could access them. Can we do that again?

Is it necessary that the President sign them? The committee had felt that those who signed approving the proposal should see the final report.

Can we indicate that these reports should be relatively short, one or two pages not lengthy dissertations?

Should we encourage appending, where appropriate, reprints, copies of conference programs or other supporting documentation to these reports?

The final report was referred back to the committee to address these questions. We then approved the application form and asked that it be sent electronically to all faculty with an indication that those applying for sabbaticals for next fall may use either form.

#### **6. Faculty Development Committee: Dave Parker**

Dave Parker informed the senate that the Faculty Development Committee was also discussing principles for awarding high merit, including the following:

Only a relatively small number of faculty 7-8 per year should be recognized.

Although faculty should be recognized in any of the three categories, teaching scholarship or service, those recognized should be very good in all three.

Recipients should be publicly recognized, although the size and nature of the monetary award may not be public.

No one should apply for this, the Provost and deans should collaboratively select individuals who clearly stand out.

No discussion of this was allowed.

#### **7. Bylaws Recommendation: Kashi Khazeh**

Kashi Khazeh recommended that we amend our bylaws so that the webmaster is a member of the senate executive committee. It was pointed out that the only reason the webmaster is not in the bylaws is that at the time the bylaws were created faculty did not have the ability to launce web sites at the university. After some discussion, the senate voted 12 in favor and 2 abstaining to ask the executive committee and the webmaster to draft the appropriate bylaws change so that it could be sent out with all the proposed committee changes in the spring.

Membership and elections: The membership and elections committee presented two possible changes to their procedures regarding reporting of results of bylaws referenda. The senate voted 12 for and 2 abstaining to accept the proposed change 2 that actual vote counts would be reported for bylaws change questions. Jill Caviglia-Harris then asked if maternity leave replacements could be appointed in the same manner as sabbatical replacements and the senate unanimously approved.

#### **8. Instructional Technology Committee: David Rieck**

David Rieck presented proposed bylaws including a name change to the learning technology committee (to avoid confusion with the information

technology committee of the forum.) David Parker volunteered to edit all proposed bylaws for committees with regard to membership so that they would all be in a consistent form. All committees should get their proposed bylaws (either to change membership if so desired or to add old forum committees to the senate bylaws) by February 15. We will then take care of approving sending them out for a full faculty vote at an early spring meeting.

David Rieck also reported that the aforementioned committee is looking at the technology proficiency requirement that the regents have mandated and will be reporting on that and making a recommendation for implementation at SU soon. It is anticipated that there will be a university wide statement but that each program would have different specifics and a different way of assessing competency.

## **9. Administrative Support: Mark Holland**

Mark Holland asked to be on the agenda to discuss faculty input into evaluation of support services. He stated that there were three reasons that he felt such feedback for mid-level administrators was needed:

1. Expectations for faculty have changed and faculty are doing a number of things they never used to be expected to do such as getting external funding, working at other locations, etc. Our administrative infrastructure is not adequate to support these activities. It is virtually impossible to find out what you have to do in order to get simple things done (e.g. a phone call made to order something, purchase something off the web, etc.) There are rules written in numerous documents all over the place and there is no way a faculty member can know what all the rules are. Also responsibilities for administrative offices keep changing. Too often you call an office you think should handle something and the response is "we don't do that any more." Or that's your department's responsibility (although department budgets and staff have not been adjusted to incorporate this added responsibility).
2. There is a proliferation of administrative offices that are taking on functions that either impact or determine curricula. This should be a faculty responsibility.
3. He has gotten increasing numbers of complaints from students who have not been able to get the support they need and frequently have not even been treated courteously.

There was considerable discussion of how best to approach this issue. Rich asked whether the senate as a whole should take it up, a subcommittee of the senate should be formed or we should refer this to a

committee. Kashi asked that Richard send an e-mail asking us this so that we can think about it and decide at our next meeting. Rich agreed and the meeting adjourned as it was considerably past 5:00.

Respectfully submitted by Kathleen M. Shannon