

Faculty Senate Meeting
February 4, 2004

Members Present: , Angela Boswell, Marty Campbell, Martha Dale Cooley, Carolyn Eoff, Henry Perez (for Keith Fudge), Michael Miller (for William Henshaw), Catherine Leach, Lynn Leggett, Charles Leming, Laura Lockwood, Herbert Matthews, Harold McAfee, , Blair Olson, Connie Roberts, Phillip Schroeder, Brett Serviss, Joyce Shepherd, Bruce Smith, Glenna Sumner, Carol Underwood, Don Wells, Hank Wilson, and Fred Worth.

Members Absent: Aneeq Ahmad, Lea Ann Alexander, Betsy Fulmer, and Marielle McFarland.

Call to order: The February meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by President Fred Worth and the minutes from the January meeting were approved.

Special Guest:

Dr. Julia Hall, Chair of the University Fringe Benefits Committee, was invited to address the Faculty Senate regarding potential changes to the sick leave policy for faculty. She advised that changes to the policy need to be cautiously and carefully considered and conveyed the sentiment of the Fringe Benefits Committee inviting the Faculty Senate to participate in the deliberations.

The following motion was considered: The Faculty Senate requests that the Fringe Benefits Committee allow the Senate to make recommendations and consider any proposal on the sick leave policy before that committee presents a proposal to the President. Motion passed with 14 in favor, 8 abstentions.

The President thanked Dr. Hall for attending the meeting and informing the Senate about the issue.

President's Report:

Dr. Worth reported a discussion with David Epperhart about the students' evaluations from Fall 03: "The 13 year old scan that is used to scan these stopped working so there was a delay while we had the scanner fixed. We scanned the last evaluation on Friday and now I have to run the data through our analysis program."

Dr. Worth reported that he asked John Choate what liability we had because the student handbook is only "virtual" (i.e. online). John Choate said that there was no legal liability, but morally he would like to see a hard copy given to each student with a notation that updates will be sent out via mass email.

Regarding the change in the deadline for final grades in the Fall 2003 semester, Dr. Worth reported on his conversation with Jo Holland. She and the registrar requested the change in deadline because offices were closed on December 23rd, grades must be computed by Stan Quarles at night, and if grades were in on Monday, Quarles would run it Monday night, giving only one day to get information out and check scholarship/grant recipients' eligibility. Holland and Quarles came on Saturday and got reports done, checked, sent out on Monday and Tuesday. Last year there was not enough time after Christmas to notify students so they would have time for plan B on scholarship. Also their office lost two employees on July 1. When asked, "Couldn't they have let us know earlier?" Holland said she wants more communication with other units of university to avoid this in future. She appreciates all of the faculty for their help in getting it done.

Dr. Worth then reported on his meeting with Dr. Dunn.

Regarding the current state of funding for Arkansas higher education, Dr. Dunn is not confident that a sales tax increase for higher education funding would be likely to pass. Much will depend on the recommendations of the governor's blue ribbon commission on higher education. Dr. Dunn feels like the governor is supportive of higher education but believes that a strong proposal from the blue ribbon commission will be vital in any chance of substantial changes in funding.

John Choate is currently working on adding the faculty senate academics committee chair to the UAC on a permanent basis beginning in next year's committee handbook and on an interim basis for

this year. The faculty senate academics committee chair is in process, Dr. Schroeder may start attending the meetings now.

In the Dr. Dunn's salary proposal reported at last month's meeting, the categories referred to "Ph.D." and "without Ph.D." Dr. Dunn said "yes, absolutely" that "Ph.D." was meant to include Ed. D., and other terminal degrees (including MFA w/thesis) in that proposal.

That proposal regarding adjunct salaries showed no increase despite a senate recommendation in October 2003 for an increase to \$2000 for non-HSU with a Master's degree and HSU faculty with Master's degree and \$2250 for retired HSU faculty regardless of degree, and HSU faculty with terminal degree. Dr. Dunn said he was open to considering that proposal but he also mentioned that he is interested in trying to do something that would increase the salary for adjuncts who have taught for us for long periods of time. He is not sure how that might be structured but he felt that long term adjuncts should be more highly paid than new adjuncts. He has asked the deans to make such a proposal but so far no such proposal has come forward.

The board recently approved limiting faculty/staff to taking 3 hours per week of classes. That would keep someone from being able to take a 4 or 5 credit class. Dr. Worth suggested that this seems like something we should allow, not prohibit. Dr. Dunn replied that with faculty we are very flexible with that. Staff, due to the nature of scheduling the work day, can't be offered quite the same level of freedom on that. He said exceptions can be made in the case of staff who are working towards degrees and a particular 4 or 5 credit class is required for their degree program.

Dr. Dunn was very agreeable to the idea and was hopeful the senate would send forth a proposal allowing exceptions to the policy that prohibits students from taking 3000+ level courses unless they have completed all required remediation, especially for staff or community members who are not seeking degrees.

Regarding the hiring of LaTrisa Jackson in the athletic department through an NCAA grant, the grant pays 75% of her salary this year, 50% next year and 25% the third year. HSU is obligated to continue the position for a fourth year with full salary responsibility for that year. At that point a decision would need to be made whether to continue the position.

A few years ago Dr. Dunn had said he was going to be more visible around campus, visiting departments, etc. Dr. Worth suggested that for a little while that happened but then it stopped and wondered what happened. Dr. Dunn said he felt like he is out and around on campus a good bit. He acknowledged that he hasn't been to visit regularly with departments though he said he never turns down an invitation. He also pointed to the monthly lunches he has with small groups of faculty at Newberry House as a means of having good interaction with some faculty. The coffee and conversation meetings were mentioned though Dr. Dunn admitted those were not as successful as he had hoped at providing opportunity for significant discussion. He mentioned that the external aspects of his job (travel, meeting with potential donors, the blue ribbon commission on education, visiting with legislators, etc.) have begun to take a much larger part of his time than they had previously. As an example, he mentioned that he had been out of town on 10 of the previous 14 days and was heading to Little Rock. He mentioned particularly the amount of time it takes to "cultivate donors."

Regarding the proposed changes in the sick leave policy, Dr. Worth informed Dr. Dunn that there was significant discontent among faculty on the issue, focused primarily on three areas. First, the lack of proportionate faculty representation on the fringe benefits committee that would be making any recommendations. Secondly, that our salaries, while barely keeping pace with inflation over the past few years, have effectively been reduced due to the increased cost and decreased benefits in our medical coverage. Lastly, many faculty are concerned at the blurring of the distinction between faculty and staff. Dr. Dunn said there are two main reasons behind the proposal. It is possible that legislation would be passed that would allow faculty, upon retirement or resignation, to apply for reimbursement of some portion of their unused sick leave. Dr. Dunn was concerned that this could be a very expensive issue for the university. Secondly, Dr. Dunn felt that in all areas of benefits except this one, faculty and staff are treated essentially the same so he views this as an equity issue. He pointed out that he only gets one day per month sick leave. Dr. Dunn also mentioned his concern that some academic departments do not do a very good job of accounting for used sick days. Whether the 120 accrued days of sick leave and the 180 days before long term disability would be in effect were calendar days or work days, Dr. Dunn said his understanding was that the 120 days were work days and the 180 were calendar days but he was not certain on that. If that is the case, then if a faculty member has accrued

120 sick days, those sick days would carry the faculty member to the time when long term disability went into effect. Dr. Worth also shared that faculty members are concerned that an attempt to make sick leave equitable would put faculty at a disadvantage in the area of days accrued per calendar year, how portions of sick leave are charged, and use of sick days from a pool if a person's accumulated sick days had all been used. Dr. Dunn said there was "room to negotiate" on the issue and that he "wasn't going to fall on his sword" over this issue.

Dr. Worth assigned two issues to committees. The issue of adjunct salary increases (especially for long-term adjuncts) was sent to the Finance committee, and the Operations Committee was charged with considering new wording in the faculty handbook for faculty members taking courses.

Dr. Worth then reported on his meeting with Dr. Houston

Last month Dr. Houston had mentioned that he was concerned by the fact that a number of faculty had been calling to find out if we had Martin Luther King day off since on three separate occasions an email had been sent out indicating that we did. Dr. Worth pointed out to him that this day off was not in the semester course schedule which is what many faculty use to plan their calendar. He made a note of that and will be sure it is listed there in coming years.

Regarding Monday night classes not meeting for the first time until the third week of classes (due to Labor Day in the Fall and Martin Luther King, Jr., Day during the Spring), Dr. Houston said he would look into some kind of solution to that problem and later said that this shouldn't be as big a problem for the next semester or two since the calendar falls a bit differently than it has recently.

Where the new computer testing center will be located and when it will be available are still not clear. There may be a reexamination of the current contract with Sylvan testing and, since they provide those computers, any change in that contract could change our plans.

Dr. Houston expressed some concern about allowing students to nominate faculty for teaching excellence awards. His concerns involved politicking for awards possible coercion or abuse of authority. He suggested that he would be pleased if SGA decided they wanted to institute their own teaching awards.

Regarding the moving of the Teacher Center Laboratory/Media Services to computer services control, Dr. Houston said the dean of Teachers College, Henderson was supportive of the change. He also mentioned he would be meeting with Teachers College, Henderson faculty about the issue.

Committee Reports

Academics Committee:

Dr. Phillip Schroeder, chair of the Academics Committee, reported that the committee will be sending a general guideline regarding the Student Advising policy before the next Faculty Senate meeting. He would like to foster an open discussion of the policy at the next meeting, but not any final decisions or resolutions then.

Dr. Schroeder passed out copies of the proposal by the deans to amend the student handbook dealing with issues of plagiarism (see Attachment 1). The deans had asked for the Faculty Senate to consider endorsing the proposal.

Motion: The Faculty Senate expresses its general support of the ideas in the proposal but would like to have an opportunity to further address a few concerns. Motion passed with 23 in favor, 1 opposed, no abstentions.

The proposal was sent to the Academics Committee for further consideration. Dr. Schroeder asked that Senators PLEASE send concerns about the proposal to him or the other committee members.

Finance Committee:

At a January 20 meeting of the Finance Committee, Carolyn Eoff was elected to chair and Mike Matthews to chair-elect. Dr. Eoff reported that the Budget committee has only met one time. Dr. Dunn informed the

budget committee that Faculty salaries are a priority and that he is interested in raising salaries as well as base salaries, but is concerned about compression.

Procedures Committee:

No report.

Operations Committee:

At a February 3 meeting of the Operations Committee, Hal McAfee was elected chair. Dr. McAfee distributed minutes of the Operations Committee meeting to the Senate (see Attachment 2). He asked that if anyone had concerns about the issues being addressed by the committee to please contact the Senators responsible for each issue as indicated in those minutes.

Building and Grounds Committee:

At a meeting of the Building and Grounds committee, Brett Serviss was elected chair. Dr. Serviss reported that the committee discussed several issues, especially signage and lighting around campus. He reported that he also talked to Bobby Jones who is interested in meeting with the committee. Bobby Jones is planning to walk around problem areas with the SGA.

Regarding security, Dr. Serviss learned that HSU is one officer short because an officer left and has not been replaced. Dr. Serviss also reported that he has asked John Choate multiple questions regarding safety-wide issues but has not yet heard from him. The committee had asked if in the process of assessment, the overall quality of the grounds was being assessed. Dr. Serviss was referred to Wrenette Tedder. Carolyn Eoff recommended to the committee that they look at the issue of insuring that every building on campus has an elevator. The problem with doors closing (and locking) securely in buildings was also discussed.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

A resolution regarding changing deadlines for final grades was considered (see Attachment 3). Passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1

Proposed Code of Conduct Amendment

Section 12. University Academic Discipline Policy

Paragraph 1. An instructor may dismiss or suspend from a class any student who is disruptive, is violating a university regulation, or is engaged in academic dishonesty. If deemed appropriate, the instructor may refer the student to the Office of Judicial Affairs for University disciplinary action.

The following list of behaviors are examples that constitute academic dishonesty:

1. Examination Behavior – Any use of external assistance during an examination shall be considered academically dishonest unless expressly permitted by an instructor;
2. Fabrication – Any intentional falsification or invention of data or citation in an academic exercise will be considered a violation of academic integrity;
3. Plagiarism – the appropriating and subsequent passing off of another person`s work as one`s own. If the work of another is used, acknowledgement of the original source must be made known using a recognized referencing practice. If another`s words are borrowed in whole or in part and merely recast in the student`s own words, proper acknowledgement must, nonetheless, be made;
4. Other types of academic dishonesty – (a) submitting a paper written or obtained from another; (b) using a paper or essay in more than one class without the instructor`s permission; (c) using another person to complete homework assignments or take-home exams without the knowledge and consent of the instructor; and (d) sharing or using information through computers or other electronic networks without the consent of the instructor.

In order that all students are treated equally when caught in any of the above situations, the following guidelines will apply:

- a. the faculty member may assign a grade of “F” to the assignment
- b. the faculty member may drop the student from the class with a grade of “F”
(no “W” or “WP” grades will be assigned in these cases)
- c. subsequent offenses of any of the above may result in suspension from the University

Students caught engaging in academic dishonesty will be reported to the department chair and the dean, at which time a letter will be sent from the dean outlining action taken. The letter will be copied to the instructor of the course and the chair of the student`s declared major. No action by Student Services need be taken except in the case of suspension.

The Faculty Senate Academics Committee would appreciate the following be added to the Dean's proposal under "3. Plagiarism":

All writing is subject to scanning by Turnitin plagiarism software.

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

Minutes 2/3/04

All members were present: Ahmad, Campbell, McAfee, McFarland, Roberts, Smith

McAfee was elected Chair

Dr. Smith is the sole surviving member of the previous Operation Committee & he reviewed their history as well as the items under consideration. Dr. Smith had kindly supplied the Committee with a list (& discussion) of issues raised in a meeting with Dr. Worth. Committee members volunteered to investigate designated issue areas for Faculty Senate action & they are as follows:

Ms. Roberts – changes to Faculty Excellence Awards nominating process

: student nominations for Teaching Awards?

: self-nomination for Awards?

Ms. McFarland – faculty & staff's ability to take 4/5 hour courses during duty day?

Dr.'s McAfee & Ahmad – Faculty Promotion & Tenure process

: deadline date from Feb.1 to Dec.1?

: no dept. tenured faculty to write support letters?

Dr. Smith – administer course evaluations every term?

– develop a single source for all university policies?

Dr. Campbell – sabbatical leave for assistant professors?

The Committee also asked me to ask several questions of the Faculty Senate:

1. Does the Faculty Senate believe we need to address the Faculty Excellence Awards after just making alterations in the nominating policy last year?
2. What does the Faculty Senate envision the Committee taking regarding the Staff Handbook policy banning faculty or staff from taking 4/5 hour classes during the duty day?

The Committee voted to reconvene on Tues. 2/10 at 11am in Reynolds #324.

ATTACHMENT 3

WHEREAS, there have been efforts to create a culture of “writing across the curriculum” at Henderson, including encouraging the use of essay tests; and

WHEREAS, in many courses students are best evaluated through the use of more time-consuming means than multiple choice exams; and

WHEREAS, class sizes often approach or exceed fifty students even in writing-intensive courses; and

WHEREAS, faculty members frequently have multiple final exams scheduled for the same day including the last day of exams, and

WHEREAS, students deserve to have final examinations graded fairly and thoroughly by their instructors;

WHEREAS, once students are given deadlines for projects, papers, or other assignments, it is unfair to move the deadline earlier should faculty have less time to grade than anticipated;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that Faculty Senate recommends that faculty members be guaranteed at least 48 hours to grade final exams; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that no changes in the academic schedule should be permitted after the first day of classes of any semester; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Faculty Senate opposes any negative reflection attaching to faculty members who completed and submitted final grades by the advertised deadline of 8:30 am on December 22, 2003, but did not meet the belatedly announced revised “deadline” of 8:30 am Friday, December 19, 2003.