FACULTY SENATE MEETING

STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVE MEETING

OCTOBER 30, 2001 – FERGUSON FORUM – 3:30 PM

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

This was a called Faculty Senate informational meeting to also be used as a public forum to discuss the Strategic Planning Initiative Document.

ABSENT: Bing Blewitt, Bill Chaplin, Catherine Davies, James Otteson, Jeff Richetto, Terry Royed, Jimmy Williams, Anup Agrawal, Sharon Beatty, Subra Chakraborti, Benton Gup, Jeremy Butler, Dexter Gordon, Ashley Evans, Carol Donovan, Jerry Rosiak, David Arnold, Paul Ray, Michael Triche, Susan Vrbsky, Chris Nagy, Dan Filler, Peg Lyons, Debra Nelson-Gardell

GUESTS: Joanna Hutt, Dialog, Jennifer Coakley, Crimson White and a representative from Dateline.

The ad hoc committee formed to review the Strategic Planning Initiative Document included Margaret Garner,

Rob Ingram, Ron Rogers, John Dolly, Salli Davis, Roy Ann Sherrod, Bob Batson, William Dressler, Jennings Bryant, Debra Novak, Pat Bauch and Rona Donahoe.

The Chancellor put together a SPI group including representatives from all three campuses and Faculty Senate presidents. The emphasis was to explore ways to improve coordination between all three campuses and achieve economy and scale. The first year a consultant came in and brainstorming occurred. From the number of ideas that was presented, goals and initiatives were formed. Ultimately, these were formed into three task forces; (1) academic initiatives, (2) outreach and coordination in K-12 and two- year colleges and (3) technology. This ad hoc committee independently met over the course of two years and the last meeting of the task force for academic affairs was in November of 2000. The committee was asked to maintain confidentiality until a report was ready. A very short time following the November meeting, a report was submitted to the Board of Trustees with a formal resolution that implied a greater degree of awareness and acceptance by the three campuses but this was not the case in the opinion of the committee. In January, 2001, it was communicated to our Faculty Senate that it had been shared with the Board of Trustees and included the resolution and implementation. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee met with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to express their opinion that extra time was needed to review the policies set forth in the SPI document. The ad hoc committee on the Alabama campus was formed under the guise of the Faculty Senate. Three former Faculty Senate presidents were on this committee. Ron Rogers was co-chair of Academic Affairs, Task Force #1 and John Dolly was co-chair of technology, Task Force #3. Three standing committees were invited to independently review SPI and report back to the ad hoc committee. These were the Graduate Council, Undergraduate Programs and Services and the Information Technology committees.

It is important to note that the SPI document originated in the Systems Office and prior knowledge was limited, therefore now the only course of action is to modify the document.

A preface containing guidelines for the interpretation of these initiatives at each campus

and at the systems level was written by Rob Ingram and the ad hoc committee. Each of the three campuses has unique missions and should be respected. Implementation cost of these initiatives was a concern expressed particularly during budget, proration and funding problems.

Task Force One contains seven individual initiatives with the primary one proposing evaluation of all new proposed academic degree programs to determine the possibility of collaboration. The three types of collaboration are shared, joint and cooperative. These already exist among the three campuses in a number of situations and have had varying degrees of success. Collaboration would be desirable when it is mutually beneficial to each campus and it's students. The second area encourages inter-campus participation in dissertation committees and the committee added when it is in the best interest of the student and departments can afford the time. The distance to be traveled and available time would be a concern, however, at the present time there is no policy that prevents that participation. The third deals with evaluating the feasibility of delivering programs to other campuses. The fourth addresses exploration and defining opportunities for collaboration in research. Five states each campus should develop initiatives for distributed learning that is consistent with that campus' mission. Six is to improve administrative processes (transfer, transfer of credit) to facilitate student success. The emphasis here was to look at ways to minimize administrative barriers and processes that impair or impedes student success. Seven recommends exploration of collaboration opportunities in continuing education offerings of executive education programs.

The committee proposed that nothing in the first initiative regarding evaluation of all new academic degree programs for collaboration is intended to suggest that collaboration is required for programs when the campus of origin believes collaboration will have a negative effect on the quality or success of the proposed program. There have been instances when the attempt at collaboration has delayed unnecessarily the progress of that program. It should be the in the hands of the originating campus to determine if collaboration is viable. Plans for new programs should be communicated early in the process. The committee added thirty working days response time from other campuses to form a time frame for that response.

The other two campuses are concerned about the SPI but have not initiated a formal response or plan. The committee will share a progress report with the Faculty Senate Presidents of the other two campuses. The deadline for a response from all three campuses is February, 2002. The original document with a resolution was presented to the Board of Trustees and they voted for implementation. This should be viewed as an opportunity to be responsive to our faculty, to be respectful of our faculty governance and to be open to ways of collaboration to enhance our university and system but also be practical that burdens are not imposed that defeat the very purpose originally intended. To not review these initiatives is not acceptable. Another public forum will be held in November for vitally needed input. The SPI will be brought back to the Faculty Senate in December or January.

The issue of increased breadth of expertise of thesis and dissertation committees drew a lot of discussion. There is nothing in present policy to impede this process and the committee recommends utilizing the present procedures but this not be imposed or mandated for faculty. The opinion expressed was that this is not necessarily needed. It imposes a burden of time, extra work and expense on the participating faculty and if the initiative were mandated, compensation or reward would certainly be needed. The terms "intra-campus and intercampus" were questioned and deletion be considered in Strategic Initiative Number 2. A question concerning utilizing existing procedures for graduate faculty appointments between campuses was answered with the example of UAB faculty member

with the student and committee here, our processes would be used for a temporary appointment to the graduate faculty. If the faculty member was here and the student and committee were at UAB, UAB's process would be used. The term "campus based" would be appropriate.

The SPI Number three which addresses campus-wide degree programs delivery to other UAS campuses drew a committee recommendation that each program will evaluate the feasibility of delivering that program to other campuses in the regular cycle of program reviews. The meaning of the word "delivery" was questioned. Does that mean available or replication or another meaning? Delivery is an open window for whatever the need is and this is not described but would have to be worked out. Travel expenses would certainly be a problem with funding limitations now in place. It would present the problem of faculty not being available to students for mentoring, etc. Further discussion included methods of delivery, shared distance teaching and shared programs. It was suggested to state in the preface that the Systems Office provide funding for implementing these initiatives but the point was made that it is one and only one budget for the whole system. The Faculty Senate has gone on record advocating more funding for higher education and implementation would depend on available funding.

The SPI Number four concerns exploration and defining opportunities for collaboration in research as well as in cooperative and shared academic programs. A typographical error was pointed out "at the there campuses" should be "three campuses". The committee felt the addition of "cooperative and shared academic programs" was not appropriate. The major discussion was to have the System Office take the lead in having a workshop that involved faculty from all three campuses that could fertilize collaborative efforts. Some collaboration already exists. Faculty work best with those they develop relationships with in related fields and is a natural outgrowth of that working relationship. The recommendation was made to add the word "feasible" to "B. Collaboration is recommended when beneficial and feasible to each of the participating institutions". It was suggested that faculty time was better spent in professional meetings they already attend. It was also suggested that the word "seminar" might be better than "workshop". As already noted, "there" should be "three" campuses.

Number five initiative drew discussion and the point was made that we do not have accountability systems in place to determine the success or failure of how well our students are learning and this should be addressed in the initiatives. It was expressed that we are moving toward teaching more students with less faculty without realizing the effect it will have on student learning. A written statement will be forwarded to Margaret Garner concerning this issue. It was suggested to spell out SREB - Southern Regional Education Board. It was suggested to change the wording of Recommended Strategic Initiative Number 5 to "Each campus should develop initiatives for distributed learning when they are appropriate and consistent with that program's mission."

Number six initiative concerning administrative processing which is aimed at reducing or eliminating administrative barriers to facilitate student needs in a timely and efficient manner. The suggestion was made to talk to students and the SGA to determine what the main problems are and propose solutions to those problems. Each campus has their own process of transfer and transfer of credits and other administrative processes that students have to go through.

Initiative number seven concerns the exploration of collaboration opportunities in continuing education offerings of executive education programs. The ad hoc committee did not have any recommendations for change in this initiative. The committee was looking to the deans and program faculty level to initiate any exploration of collaboration.

The next forum will concentrate on Task Force Three led by Dean John Dolly. Everyone was encouraged to talk with colleagues about these issues and forward any suggestions and input to Margaret Garner or a member of this committee.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05PM