

January 2008 Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Minutes 1-23-08

Members Present: Clint Atchley, Lea Ann Alexander, Mitzi Bass, Angela Boswell, Aaron Calvert, Steven Carter, James Duke, Linda English, David Evans, Marty Halpern, Catherine Leach, Jack Meadows, Patti Miley, Richard Miller, Brett Serviss, Anna Smith, Gary Smithy, Mike Taylor, Pat Weaver, Patrick Wempe, Hank Wilson, Sandy Denning Staff Senate Representative

The meeting was called to order by President Dr. Angela Boswell at 3:15 pm.

A motion was made, seconded, and passed to postpone approval of the December minutes until the February 6th, Senate meeting.

The following officers were elected for the 2008 Faculty Senate year:

President-Elect: Clint Atchley
Webmaster-Elect: Brett Serviss
Secretary: Catherine Leach
Representative to the Board: Martha Dale Cooley

The Faculty Senate now has a representative on the Graduate Council and the Staff Senate has allowed the Faculty Senate to send a non-voting representative to Staff Senate meetings. The following were elected to serve in those capacities:

Representative to the Graduate Council: Pat Weaver
Representative to the Staff Senate: Linda English

President's Report:

Dr. Boswell stated she is looking forward to an exciting and important year for the Faculty Senate. She met with each of the Academic Deans, the VPAA, and the President of the University. She asked each one about the role of the Faculty Senate and for advice on how the Senate could be more effective. Boswell told the Senate she read the minutes of the Faculty Senate for last 10 years in preparation for the upcoming Senate year. With a new administration in the fall, Boswell stated that the Faculty Senate should begin working on changing the process of top-down University policies and their implementation. She encouraged the Senate to be proactive rather than reactive. Boswell also mentioned several issues coming up that Faculty Senate should propose solutions to first: post-tenure review, the University Academic Honesty Policy, and the extent of technology in the classrooms.

Boswell then stated several goals for the upcoming Senate year:

1. For Faculty Senate to work on processes as much as issues in order to establish a more effective shared governance in preparation for a new administration.
2. Participate effectively in the selection of the new administration. This means encouraging as many senators as possible to take part in the Presidential interviews, but also playing an active role in the search for the new VPAA whenever that search is conducted.
3. To spend some serious time and work prioritizing the many issues and concerns before us so that we can present the new administration with that which is most crucial and most important to the faculty and to academics on this campus.

Dr. Boswell handed out a form for each senator to indicate on which Senate committee he/she would like to serve. She described each committee and some of the issues that will be assigned to each committee.

Academics Committee :

1st order of business: Plagiarism and Academic dishonesty policy
2nd order of business: Transitional Student Program

Buildings and Grounds Committee:

1st order of business: Security issues
2nd order of business: Prioritize

January 2008 Faculty Senate Minutes

Finance Committee :

- 1st order of business: Elect Chair and Chair-elect
- 2nd order of business: Prioritize, prioritize, prioritize

Operations Committee :

- 1st order of business: Post-tenure review
- Possible further business: Internal Review Committee for Animal or Human Research

Procedures Committee :

- 1st order of business: Determine alternates for several Senators
- 2nd order of business: Hold Faculty Excellence Awards elections immediately

Executive Committee:

- 1st order of business: Make committee assignments

Old Business: none

New Business:

The Senate discussed the proposal made by the University Summer School Committee. Dr. Boswell asked the Senate secretary to take detailed minutes of this discussion. The following describes the concerns expressed by members of the Senate.

- Why will the 2009 summer school budget be based on the 2007 initial course offerings? A member of the Summer School Committee told the Senate that the Summer School Committee thought the changes would take place in 2008, so they used 2007 as the new base line.
Discussion included :
 - the fact that some departments couldn't offer certain courses in 2007 that were usually taught in the summer because of faculty searches and wanted to know if this would hinder the 2009 course offerings;
 - the 2007 initial course offerings refers to the number of courses in the printed schedule not specific courses, such that if a department offered six courses in 2007, the 2009 budget would be for six courses for that department
- How will this affect the graduate school rotation of courses? There are currently eighty-two candidates who receive a pre-set program when they enroll. The summer courses are ten-day all-day courses. Is the proposal for both undergraduate and graduate courses? It is not stated in the proposal.
- Senators expressed confusion about the memo from Dr. Dunn concerning summer school.
Discussion included:
 - Senators said it was too vague at this point and that we need an investment in summer school in order to turn it around.
 - Students need to be able to count on the courses being offered or they will go elsewhere.
 - Why adopt only the non-costly aspects of the proposal in 2008 and postpone the other issues until 2009. Dunn will not be president of the University then. It was expressed that it appears Dunn wants to implement the entire summer school proposal; however, most of the implementation would be after he is no longer president.
 - Dunn's suggested implementation of the proposal is modest at best. Using 2007 data is far from a serious approach. Maybe we should go back approximately ten years to look at course offerings in order to set the summer offerings.
 - If we are forced to limit the number of courses offered in summer school, then each department should be consulted before the summer school schedule is finalized.
- Will less than thirteen students in a class still cause a decrease in pay in 2008 or will averaging be done ?

January 2008 Faculty Senate Minutes

- The Senate was told that no averaging will be done. It will take thirteen students for a class to make. For eight to twelve students, the faculty member will receive the option to teach the class for 75% of his/her pay.

Other discussion included:

- The more students we have the more income is generated. Some felt that averaging the number of students should be done university wide, not just within the departments.
- ○ Departments should not be allowed a lot of small classes, but if at least five students enrolled, the University should show a commitment to teach the course. This would increase students' confidence in summer school and enrollment should increase.
- ○ If less than thirteen students causes a decrease in pay then why shouldn't faculty who teach large classes be offered a bonus. For example, in the past faculty who taught classes with more than forty students received the same pay as those with thirteen.
- Senators expressed concern that if a course is needed, it should be taught regardless of enrollment.
 - The Summer School Committee's proposal is the answer to this concern. The departments can decide what to offer. The departments will be given a budget based on the 2007 course schedule. If a course has a small enrollment, the course could still be offered. However, if the department offers the course again the following year, the dean may ask for justification for offering the course.
- Why have there been so many summer school budget problems in the last five to six years? In previous years the University offered the courses needed and the students came. We did not have so many budget problems then.
 - One response was that the administration said having a minimum number of students per course is the way other universities handle summer school.
 - Summer school will not be important until the administration decides it is important.
- Have students lost confidence in summer school? Do they go elsewhere?
 - Some faculty stated that students are asking if certain courses from other universities will transfer to Henderson.
 - Some expressed the opinion that summer school enrollment began dropping approximately ten years ago when the minimum enrollment was implemented.
 - If one course is dropped for lack of enrollment, students often don't take the other course they had planned to take.
- Why isn't summer school promoted? It was stated that while other universities publish their schedules in newspapers, it seems Henderson institutes policies to drop enrollment. The summer school proposal should build in a method of promotion.
- Will the twelve check option really be an option?
 - Several senators expressed concern about not receiving the full amount of their contracts within the current academic year. They asked why they would not be able to earn interest on the money instead of the University keeping the money longer and earning the interest. The response from a member of the Summer School Committee was that if faculty received 12 checks, the summer school check would be more of a bonus than a necessity.
 - Some senators thought faculty already have the option of receiving twelve checks.
 - One senator said this issue had come up before and the faculty voted against it.
 - If the University decides to make new faculty receive twelve checks, how long would it be before everyone would be forced to receive twelve checks?
- What is the budget for course development?

January 2008 Faculty Senate Minutes

- The following example was given: If a department has budgeted for eight classes but believes another course would make if they had the money, the department could go to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and request the additional funds. The vice president could use the money in the course development fund to offer the additional summer school course.
- Someone asked why the \$20,000 would not be used to fund summer school in the first place.
- Is the four-day two hour and fifteen minute class length detrimental to the students comprehension of the material?
 - One class period is approximately one week's worth of material in the regular semester. This is sometimes hard on the faculty to teach two courses.
 - The four day week is better because students need the three day weekend to catch up.
 - It is better because of gas prices.
 - The 3:15 – 4:30 time slot was left blank since it is so late in the afternoon. The committee believed more students would come at 4:30 after work.

Dr. Boswell encouraged the Senate to talk to their colleagues and asked that senators email other comments and/or concerns to her before her meeting with Dr. Dunn the following week.

Other new business included:

- An update on the presidential search. A schedule for each of the candidates' interviews was given to the Senate. The meetings with the faculty are scheduled for 3:30, the meetings with the faculty, staff, and students are all open meetings. If someone cannot make the 3:30 meeting, they are encouraged to attend one of the other meetings if possible. A survey will be handed out at the end of each faculty, staff, and student meeting. All attendees will have an opportunity to comment on each candidate. The results will be given to the Board of Trustees. The Board has expressed an interest in our input.
- The Senate was asked to report any errors, broken links, etc. on the HSU web page to Reid Joiner.
- Other technology issues included problems with Tegrity and Angel. Computer Services sent messages to those using Angel, but students who cannot login could not get the messages. Also, other areas of campus, such as the library, were not sent the notices. It was suggested that these messages be sent to everyone

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.