FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 27, 2001 – 3:30 PM – 309 Ferguson

This was a special called meeting of the Faculty Senate with a one-item agenda to provide a public forum for discussion of Strategic Planning Initiatives Task Force #3. Dean John Dolly conducted the meeting.

Meeting was called to order, roll was called and one guest was present – Joanna Hutt, Dialog

ABSENT: Bill Chaplin, Catherine Davies, Marvin Johnson, Cecelia Laurie, James Otteson, Terry Royed, Gary Taylor, Anup Agrawal, Sharon Beatty, Subra Chakraborti, Benton Gup, Jeremy Butler, Mark Nelson, Ashley Evans, Carol Donovan, Laura Pedersen, Jerry Rosiak, Paul Ray, Dan Filler (illness-excused), Lee Pike (emergency-excused), Mitch Shelton

The Strategic Planning Initiatives Task Force #3 committee decided to modify time lines, insert simplified language and determine clearer definitions of the areas of responsibilities in the document. The main concerns are the lack of monies and people to implement these initiatives.

Initiative Number One – "Provide information on activities and service ventures involving P-16 education." Discussion revealed that the majority of this initiative is already being done but the information is not in a format that could be shared.

Initiative Number Two – "Provide information when available to P-12 education about potential sources of funding from foundations and other business-related enterprises interested in supporting the public schools and higher education". Distributing this information – sources of funding from external sources - would possibly be the responsibility of the Development Offices of each campus if they chose to share that information. The concern expressed by faculty would be possible negative impact on University funding. There is an inconsistent statement of businesses and foundations in number II and government stated in number IV. Dean Dolly determined that "government" should be deleted in number IV. The Systems Office conception was that the entire campus would be involved in these initiatives but the determining factor should be "mutual benefit."

Initiative Number Three – "Expand and Enhance Partnerships with Elementary and Secondary Schools and Develop Rural School and Urban School Initiatives". The main issue with this initiative is funding and faculty to do the work. There are grants available, however, applying for these would take time from faculty teaching and research schedules. Including this in faculty workload and release time would be a compromise. There was a strong response from faculty that service should not take precedence over teaching or research. The point was made that this enhancement with elementary and secondary schools is ongoing but is not considered a part of faculty workload and does not include rewards or merit pay. It would be good to include mutual benefit in the expected outcome statement.

Initiative Number Four – "Expand and Enhance Partnerships with Elementary and Secondary Schools and Develop Rural School and Urban School Initiatives with Partners." To implement the models called for in this initiative would be very expensive. How would

this be funded? Our faculty is already involved in statewide initiatives. Funding would be critical to implementing any directives in Initiative Number Four. The timeline of one to three years would be difficult to apply since a five-year cycle is the norm for our campus. The new reading initiative funded by the Legislature is $10 million a year. Charles Nash is promoting science, math and technology initiatives and it is assumed that the same funding will be sought. It is not known how involved the University will be. These initiatives will be implemented, however, there is no available funding at this time. It was suggested to include faculty release time and the point was made that faculty receive no training to participate in these projects. The state board has placed four-year science and math requirements with testing and now feels that the quality of teaching should be enhanced. Teachers are compensated for attending workshops but faculty stipends are minimal. The proposal to NSF for funding optimistically will be available, however, the University has to match those funds. That match could possibly be faculty time.

Initiative Number Five – "Expand and Enhance Partnerships with Elementary and Secondary Schools and Develop Rural School and Urban School Initiatives with Partners." Discussion included enabling or providing professional development for faculty who might be interested in participating. There was very little negative comment from faculty about this initiative. This would basically be faculty choice. It was suggested the phrase "seek external funding" be added.

Initiative Number Six – "Enhance working Relationships with Two-year Community, Junior, and Technical Colleges" The primary direction of this initiative is not clear. Student evaluations are already being done but there is not a computer system in place to communicate that information. There was faculty concern about sharing course and program expectations with community colleges. It was felt that better information on performance expectations for transfer students and better preparation of transfer students would be a good idea. Transfer students do not have the prerequisites, generally do not perform well and have a difficult time maintaining an acceptable GPA. More information could be posted on the web, however, it is difficult to keep that information current.

Initiative Number Seven – "Assist in Providing Distance Education Opportunities to K-12 Institutions: Identify and publicize all current, available distance education opportunities for students, both P-12 and higher education". The committee felt these directives were already being followed. There could be some improvement in communicating exactly the extent of the University's outreach. Typographical errors were noted and will be changed.

Initiative Number Eight – "Assist in Providing Distance Education Opportunities to K-12 Institutions: Decide the role the University System campuses wish to play in the offering of courses for dual enrollment and dual credit to high school students in the state." There was debate concerning the role the University would play in providing courses to high schools. The Provost feels the University should be more involved at the high school level. This would have to be discussed at the department and program level. The argument for allowing bright students dual enrollment would be that the connection would prompt enrollment at the University. The down side would be "A" students in high school might not be on that level in college. It was felt that the intent that this initiative apply to high school students only. If a legitimate course is offered on campus for high school students, transportation and logistics would be a great problem. Community colleges would have available faculty without research demands on their time. The phrase "enrollments in courses offered" was deleted because the committee felt it would involve a "numbers game". Inflating enrollment numbers with non-qualified students has been done and this deletion would eliminate that possibility. Another point was made that there was no measure of success stated.

Initiative Number Nine – "Assist in Providing Distance Education Opportunities to K-12 Institutions: Encourage more faculty to develop courses and programs that take advantage of technology enhanced instruction". This presented the idea that more graduate students would enroll in our courses and programs and would provide closer links to Alabama communities where these courses are offered. The committee felt that much of number nine was already in place. It was suggested to add the word "faculty of" K-12 institutions. A method of measuring success is not stated. It was also suggested to add release time for faculty developing courses.

Initiative Number Ten – "Ensure the Delivery of Effective Teacher and Administrator Preparation Programs: Maintain and continue to support high admission standards for all teacher and administrator preparation programs". The main concern here is that admission standards not be undermined in any way.

Initiative Number Eleven – "Ensure the Delivery of Effective Teacher and Administrator Preparation Programs: Provide in-service opportunities for administrators and provide linkages to university faculty in the areas of education, business and law". The State and the Systems Office asked that the possibility of providing more support for business and law be reviewed. The State Legislature passed a mandated period of training and preparation for all school administrators and superintendents in the state in the area of fiscal responsibility. These programs would be held at four or five different sites across the state. Funding would have to be provided for this program. "Teachers" should be added to the phrase "provide in-service opportunities for administrators" and "teachers" added to "Enabling Conditions (b) support business, law and education faculty in the development of workshops for P-12 'teachers' and administrators." The points were made that statements concerning funding and faculty release time be added and that since it is a University of Alabama Systems Office document, the implication is that the UA system would provide funding unless otherwise stated. The faculty did not want any responsibility of legal or financial problems in P-12 schools/districts. This is a proposed deletion in the document.

General Comments included the opinion that these initiatives would be a drain on the University resources and faculty and that an office or department should be created to oversee implementation. The final draft will come before the Faculty Senate with the final response to the Systems Office deadline of February 20 with an accompanying request for a response from that office. Emphasis is placed on the preface stating the manner which should govern the interpretation of these initiatives. Many of the directives are already in place and a better job should be done communicating the University's efforts to the appropriate parties. UAB and UAH have not gone through a formal process of review of this document. This is the time to make any changes and to have an impact on the implementation of these directives. The goal of this committee was to preserve the mission of this University as a research institution.

The last section, **"Responsibility and Timeline Matrix (Summary)"** aims at consistency with the language changes proposed and places reporting responsibilities at the Provost level.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 PM