

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting

September 12- 2000 - 3:30 PM - 309 Ferguson

Uncorrected Minutes

In Attendance: Pat Bauch, Norm Baldwin, Steven MacCall, Rob Ingram, Steve Miller, Don DeSmet, Marcia Barrett, Bill Keel, Bing Blewitt, Dexter Gordon, Deborah Martin, Keith Woodbury, Bob Sigler, Margaret Garner, Cornelius Carter, Wythe Holt, Scott Bridges, Debbie Novak

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from August 22 Steering Committee Meeting.

President's Report - (*Pat Bauch*)

Dr. Sorensen addressed the last Faculty Senate meeting but did not have time to address budget issues, campus construction or the Master Plan. Pat asked if the Steering Committee would like to follow up on that. A task force was formed to look into Faculty Travel Reimbursement Policies. A list of points from Norm Stein was distributed since he was working on this last year. This has been given to the Finance Committee (Deborah Martin) to follow up on what changes were made to the reimbursement policies. A letter was received by Steering Committee members written by Dr. Sorensen stating that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee would be made a Standing Committee of the University. This was a clerical/secretarial error and should certainly not be considered a problem.

Jeff McNeil, Vice President for Advancement, is scheduled to speak at the Senate meeting next week. Pat asked if the Steering Committee would still like for him to come to speak. After some discussion, it was decided that Dr. McNeil could come and make a brief statement about his duties. Since he is new on campus and it would be an opportunity for the senators to meet him. At some later date, it would be preferred that he meet with the Finance Committee to determine issues, strategies and planning that he would need to address. The committee could then decide what would need to be brought forward.

Vice President's Report - (*Norm Baldwin*)

Copies of the survey to prioritize issues were handed out to those that had not filled it out and returned it to Norm. Norm is serving on the Distance Learning Ad Hoc Committee and some problems and issues have come out of those meetings. Most of the members of this committee are staff members and Norm is the only faculty member on this committee. Some concerns are: a need for a better method of capturing distance education workload especially for those spending a lot of time developing those courses, being given credit toward tenure and promotion for efforts on distance education, these efforts being factored into faculty evaluations and being given perks or benefits from their participation in distance learning efforts. There are greatly varied amounts of monies generated from those courses and there is a wide disparity among departments as to the dispensation of those funds. The general consensus was that there should be some incentives for faculty to work on distance education. Some faculty members have been pushed into this effort and then have problems getting promotions. Problems considered by this committee are very technical. There are ten members on this committee with one faculty member. There are many germane side issues to this situation. Some departments are rewarding those that work in distance learning with travel expense, state-of-the-art computers, etc. How does distance education affect residency of doctoral students? Those courses could be taken, for example, in Huntsville, other locations, etc. Another question would be who has ownership of those courses?

The report on the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee given by Norm concerned the complaints about the allocation of football tickets this year. The number of tickets allotted to faculty this year was more than last year. The request for tickets was a great deal more than last year. The allotment to faculty was up by 286 tickets. Norm ask what the Steering Committee felt about the faculty allotment being cut by 2 per member to give more tickets to staff members. The consensus was that there should be sacrifices by everyone, not just one group. Tickets for donors and lettermen were down but faculty allotment was up. There were more tickets needed for Auburn and the President's office and legislators receive an allotment of complimentary tickets. The point was made that faculty representation should be included on all decisions made by the Athletic Department. Pat and Norm will analyze the charge to this committee and find out what kind of decisions they are involved in and not involved and in what they should be involved. There

is a meeting on Friday. The final consensus was that staff deserves tickets and that the sacrifice should not be made by only one group to make those tickets available.

Committee Reports

Faculty Life Committee - (*Rob Ingram & Wythe Holt*)

Proposed Committee Charge: The Faculty Life Committee will examine issues of faculty concern, which are not primarily academic, financial or student matters but which are germane to faculty welfare or the ability of the faculty to fulfill its responsibilities.

The Committee met on September 8 and considered four issues:

1. Mediation Committee Recommendations - Wythe Holt agreed to summarize the issues and provide a follow-up analysis for the Faculty Life Committee. We will examine the summary and provide a recommendation to the Senate on possible changes to the mediation document.
2. Faculty Mentoring System: The Committee agreed that it would be useful to consider a mentoring system for new faculty. We will pursue this issue in coming meetings.
3. Diversity Issues: The Committee is dedicated to pursuing ways of extending faculty involvement in these issues. We discussed several ideas about additional activities the Senate might promote. WE will continue to examine these issues, to monitor University progress on diversity matters, and to consider what we might do to follow up on the workshop planned for October 1.
4. Domestic Partners Benefits: The Committee is prepared to provide input on this matter at the appropriate time. We assume we will receive a request for consideration of this issue from those proposing the policy and circulating a petition.
5. The Committee plans to meet again on October 24.

Student Affairs Committee - (*Dexter Gordon & Rob Ingram*)

The Committee met with staff of the Office of Student Affairs on September 6th. The purpose of the meeting was to meet the staff members and make them aware of the Student Affairs Committee. We indicated an interest in working with OSA during the year and asked to be kept informed of issues, activities, and events that might be of interest or concern to faculty.

We asked for information about any issues that we needed to know about at this time. The only issue raised was a continuing interest on the part of the SGA to make student evaluation summaries available to students. We informed the staff that the Senate had examined a variety of issues related to the Evaluation and Reward of Teaching and that it might be appropriate to have someone from that committee discuss this issue with SGA. The Student Affairs Committee is willing to be involved in this discussion as needed.

Scott Bridges - Dean Evaluation -

A letter to Dr. Barrett written by Scott along with the evaluation form was handed out to the Steering Committee members. It states in the Faculty Handbook that deans should be evaluated every five years. Each department and division may adopt more specific formal procedures provided that these procedures are consistent with the University policies and guidelines stated herein and provided that they are approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or the academic dean, as may be appropriate. The problem encountered was that there was no access to the previous review information. A committee was formed with the following members: Dean Rogers, Dean Clark, Dean Barger, Chairs Robert Lymon, (ask Pat this name -- Kispert?) , Pat Bauch and Scott Bridges. A meeting was held last September to consider models of an evaluation form. A form from the University of Florida was used as a base for the current evaluation form. This review by faculty and appropriate personnel would take place in October. The Provost's concerns about this are the psychological effect on the deans and it might "stir the pot". All members of this committee have agreed on this procedure. Norm made the point that the form is not a good evaluation instrument. Wythe made the point that the evaluation form should be the minimum and that eliminations or alterations could not be made to the evaluation form after the final draft. The committee was not formed correctly. There should be four faculty members

from a list provided by the Faculty Senate, two deans, two department heads, and the chair should be a faculty member and there should be a majority of faculty on the committee. Pat will check on the membership of this committee. It has taken three to four years to make this progress. Margaret recommended that the Faculty Senate endorse the form and procedure and that the form be the minimum. Wythe made the motion that this committee be composed as it legally should be. Rob stated his opposition on behalf of the School of Commerce and Business Administration with the points being made about the expense of administering this process and there being no feedback from the entire faculty before this is put into effect. The faculty members do not have to participate in the evaluation process. If any changes are made to the form, the process would regress to the point of delaying it at least another year. The committee would have to be reassembled, get their approval, take it back to the Provost for approval and this would be assuming that approval would be granted. Dexter made the statement that he did not feel the problems with the evaluation instrument would delay its implementation. Pat stated that the approval of the Steering Committee should be granted and the committee could work on any technical improvements later. Margaret made the motion that the Steering Committee endorse the recommendation stated in the letter to Dr. Barrett and recommend that the form in its initial form be the minimum. The motion was seconded. Rob requested that an amendment be added that faculty and individual colleges have the option of not participating in an evaluation. Scott Bridges stated that this would not be a good message to send - to vote yes to do this and then state you do not have to do this. The vote on the amendment: Favor 6 Against 6 Abstention 2 -- the vote of the president should only be in the event of a tie. The adoption of the amendment failed. (Steven - please check the numbers on the vote - it was confusing) The vote on Margaret's motion was: Favor: 12 - Against 1 No abstentions.

Wythe made the motion to instruct our members on CQI to pursue the application of the evaluation form to vice presidents and provosts and athletic directors. Pat will e-mail that the Steering Committee requests they become knowledgeable and support the recommendation of the committee on the Selection and Evaluation of Deans and Chairpersons proposal to Dean's Council and bring up at the Quality Council meeting and that this be applied to vice presidents, provosts and athletic directors.

Academic Affairs - (*Don DeSmet & Steve Miller*)

This committee would like to divide their issues into four separate committees. They should so note on the web page.

Financial Affairs - (*Deborah Martin & Keith Woodbury*)

This committee has expectations that after the Domestic Partnership Benefits proposal goes through proper channels, it will come to their committee for some type recommendation. The delay is that the petitions are not ready and will be presented to the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee at their next meeting by Susan Lucas. Following action by the Faculty & Staff Benefits Committee, this proposal would go to Bob Wright and then to Dr. Sorensen. The action during the summer by the Steering Committee was to recommend that the proposal go through proper channels before any action is taken by the Faculty Senate.

Pat reminded the committees to look at the agenda and report on the issues they are considering.

She is also addressing the Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday, September 13 and the Board of Trustees on the 14th. A theme that she would like to add to that address is "Unity with Diversity" after some irate phone calls from some donors who complained after a remark she made about "balance between academics and athletics." Rob suggested she ignore any such comments and she should not make an issue out of it.

Pat's idea is that we want to provide a unified front in view of the funding problems and other problems facing the University.

Norm has the results of the priority survey for anyone that would like to see them. This is on the forms that have been turned in to this point.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Posted 10/10/2000