

MINUTES  
TROY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
30 June 2010

1. Dr. Shelton called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm.
2. Mr. Jim Davis completed the roll call for the meeting. Attendance was as follows:

a. Members present: Catherine Allard  
Tammy Esteves  
David Hollingsworth  
Tom Kolasa  
Jim Davis  
Regina Gaillard  
Sam Shelton  
Robert Kitahara  
John Jinright  
Johanna Alberich  
Frank Browning  
Eddie Clark  
Frank Hammonds  
Djuana Burns

b. Members absent: Brian Webb (with notice)  
Marty Olliff (with notice)  
Scout Blum (with notice)  
Tim Buckner (with notice)  
Allen Jones  
Zhang Jun  
James DeLoach  
Larry Fogelberg  
John Irwin (with notice)  
Jim Ryan (with notice)  
Chan Roark (with notice)  
Mary Battaglia

3. The minutes for the April 27 meeting were approved as submitted.

7. Dr. Shelton notified the Senate that Dr. Roach had requested time to address the Senate about proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook that were to be presented to the Board for approval. As Dr. Roach had a 4:00 o'clock commitment, Dr. Shelton asked that the agenda be adjusted to allow Dr. Roach to address the Senate at this point in the meeting. There were no objections.

E. Dr. Roach presented to the Senate as an information item the proposed revisions to the Faculty Handbook to be proposed to the Board at their July meeting. He explained the process used to arrive at the revisions: Each year at the conclusion of the promotion and tenure process, the URC does a post-mortem of the P&T process, and this year Dr. Roach felt that he also should do some updating to the handbook to reflect some changes that have occurred since the last revisions, such as changes of titles and some clarification issues. The post-mortem meeting took place on 24 March, then on 16 April there was a special meeting of the URC, which is named in the handbook as the body which examines the handbook for updates and revisions. Volunteering for a subcommittee to collect input regarding revisions were Dr. Lee Vardaman, Dr. Lance Tatum, and Dr. Henry Stewart. On 17 June there was a meeting to discuss the input that had been received.

This morning, 30 June, the Cabinet met and approved the recommendations to be presented to the board, and afterwards the Academic Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the revisions, which will be taken officially to the board in July, so that the revisions can be approved in time for the following academic year.

There are three types of changes. One new section was created for the handbook, Section 1.5.1, Academic Curriculum/Discipline Oversight. This was needed in the handbook to reflect actual current practice, especially for the benefit of SACS. Dr. Roach read the paragraph: “The Dean of each academic college will establish and maintain discipline curriculum committees or comparable discipline groups in order to provide appropriate academic oversight and management of the college, its academic curriculum, and programs. The discipline committees will include, as established by the college dean, representative discipline faculty, who will convene committee meetings throughout the academic year to review curriculum modification recommendations, new programs/degree proposals, assessment items germane to program offerings within the college, and other appropriate and approved activities.” There was some renumbering of paragraphs as a result of putting this new item into the handbook.

The remaining changes are clarifying language and name changes, such as changing the references in the previous edition of the handbook to a “Faculty Council,” changing “University College” to “Global Campus,” et cetera.

There was also a good deal of feedback from CRC’s and previous deans who had worked with CRC’s. Section 3.5.3, concerning the beginning date for the probationary period for promotion and tenure, states that the probationary period “shall commence with the initial fall term of continuous service.” To this has been added “the initial fall contract that begins August 1.” This change was made to more precisely follow AAUP guidelines.

The following paragraph was added: “Faculty members who elect to apply for tenure prior to the mandatory sixth year and who are supported by the appropriate academic supervisors but are denied tenure may elect to reapply at the next eligible review cycle if the next available review cycle will not exceed the sixth year of service.”

Having also to do with criteria for tenure, to the sentence “Faculty members who have the qualifications outlined above may apply for tenure after completing three consecutive years of full-time teaching service for Troy University,” has been added the clarifying statement, “with the support of their academic supervisors as determined by the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost.” Again as a result of comments gathered from across the University, it is evident that, because the University is evolving structurally, sometimes in Global Campus or elsewhere it is unclear who the supervisor is. So if there is any ambiguity, the judgment as to who is the supervisor will be made by the Provost’s office.

Under “Evaluation and Documentation,” the list of six items to be included in the portfolio is clarified so that item three specifies “curriculum vita.”

Under the section “Procedural Guidelines” for the Promotion and Tenure Process, in the Action and Notification Requirements, under “Further Action,” if an individual was not recommended for tenure by both the CRC and the Dean, the type of notification would be written, and the wording was “Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost notified on the summary sheet.” This has been changed to say the application would be denied “unless a timely appeal is filed.” Again this is clarifying language added to conform the handbook to established usage.

In Section 3.7.7, the University Review Committee, the following wording had been seen as ambiguous in the past: “Faculty members on the URC serve as elected members on their respective CRC’s and are elected by their CRC voting members at the conclusion of the CRC review of candidates. They serve alternating two-year terms.” This was changed to read, “Faculty members on the URC serve as elected members on their respective CRC’s and are elected by their CRC voting members.” Also under the URC, the clarifying language “the application denied unless a timely appeal is filed” was added as it had been under the CRC section.

Under Section 3.8.5.1, Hearings, the wording was “Tenured faculty members and probationary faculty members proposed for dismissal before the end of their appointments shall be notified in writing.” However, because some do not receive this notification, the wording has been extended to read “shall be notified in writing via certified or registered mail at the employee’s last known residence.”

In Appendix B a change was made having to do with Graduate Faculty Membership checklist. One section, 3.2.5, read “submissions for all categories must be within seven years of the application date.” This was changed to read “five years” to be consistent with other sections. Other wording was changed to reflect current usage.

Dr. Roach reiterated that the handbook is a living document and will continue to be updated as needed, and these are just the current, not the final changes to be submitted to the Board. Dr. Roach himself will not be in the country at the time of the Board meeting, so Dr. Vardaman will submit the changes and be prepared to answer questions at that time.

7. Dr. Federinko also had an issue to bring before the Senate. Due also to time constraints, Dr. Shelton asked that the agenda again be amended to allow Dr. Federinko to speak at this time. There were no objections.

F. Dr. Federinko announced the annual Safety and Security drill this fall will include more local providers of Safety and Security services than ever before. He also lauded the new, stricter admissions standards, especially due to the fact that of the conditional transfer students from other universities who will no longer be admitted, 52% were disruptive to the campus in some way, so the raised admissions standards will improve campus life in that respect. There is also a campaign to discuss Safety and Security with parents at the Impact sessions, and with RA's and others, concerning Safety and Security. Specifically, the new Trojan Way initiative, while not a dress code, will require that students “be appropriately dressed for the particular occasion” which they are attending, whether classroom or academic function or academic ceremony. The Oracle has been updated to reflect the Trojan Way initiative, in order to give faculty and staff the administrative support necessary for enforcing the policy. Enforcing the policy is voluntary on the part of faculty and staff, but the intent is to rid the campus of inappropriate dress or violent or inappropriate behavior. We want to mentor these students on how to be prepared for the world of work, on how to act, dress, and behave appropriately. The key is whether the student's dress or behavior is deemed by the person in charge of that academic environment to be disruptive. We want to coach or influence the student without embarrassing them. The campus-wide initiative involves every aspect of University life—peer pressure, etc.

In answer to a question from Dr. Allard, Dr. Federinko replied that this matter is presented to parents and students at each Impact session. Dr. Kolasa asked whether this is a University-wide campaign, and received a positive answer, and commented that such matters are a nationwide concern, as chronicled in the Chronicle. Dr. Allard asked whether the policy is a formal, official University policy, in that the students will be formally notified that the University has a policy against such behavior. Dr. Federinko answered that

yes, as part of the admissions package, each entering student is required to sign a pledge to adhere to specific items of behavior, more detailed than he has discussed here today. Parents are made fully aware of the policy ahead of time, so they can choose to send their children elsewhere if they don't think this policy is right for them. Dr. Allard asked whether there is equivalent notification on the other campuses and to students registering solely on-line. The answer is that every applicant receives the information as part of the application package, but the equivalent of the Impact session information session will have to be developed. There was a comment from the Phenix City campus that such a program stressing proper business attire has been a concerted effort on the part of students and faculty, in this case at the College of Education. Dr. Federinko stated that the SGA is "excited" about this topic, and that Dr. Schmidt has proposed having a Dress-for-Success day or something similar. The intent is to subtly get some traditions started. Dr. Shelton suggested that this is something that could and should be stressed in Troy Orientation courses.

#### 4. President's Report

A. Dr. Shelton announced the new members of the Senate, many of whom were attending the meeting by invitation. These new members were David Hollingsworth, Govind Menon, Ben Robertson, Mary Ann Hooten, Michael Burgan, Debra Lett, Richard Voss, Bill Heisler, and Lane Boyte Eckis. Dr. Shelton also recognized those Senators who were leaving the Senate: Tim Buckner, Allen Jones, James DeLoach, Larry Fogelberg, Jim Ryan, Frank Hammonds, Chan Roark, and Djuana Burns. Dr. Shelton thanked them for their work during their time on the Faculty Senate.

B. Dr. Shelton stated that at the request of the Faculty Senate, a letter of condolence was sent to the family of Chuck Thompson, a member of the Sorrell College of Business who died unexpectedly in May.

C. Dr. Shelton reported that he had attended the May meeting of the Board of Trustees, and said it is his intent to become a regular attendee at Board meetings, and encouraged succeeding Senate Presidents to attend as well. The most significant item was the raising of tuition and fees. Also of note was the commitment the Board has made to specialized accreditation for the Sorrell College of Business. This involves a sizable financial commitment, which the Board has pledged to meet. Coming up at the July meeting will be the recommendations for changes to the Faculty Handbook, and the recommendations for the raising of the admissions standards. Dr. Shelton says he has been given to understand from Dr. Federinko that the next step to look at raising admissions standards for the Graduate School.

## 5. Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee—Dr. Shelton reported that the Executive Committee met the previous Wednesday to approve the agenda for today's meeting, as well as to get updates on the status of reports left from the April meeting. In addition the committee recommended the meeting schedule for next year, which will be presented as a separate agenda item.

B. Committee on Committees—Dr. Allard reported the Graduate Council met online, as there was limited work to be done. For the benefit of new members, Dr. Shelton stated that the purpose of the Committee on Committees, which is chaired by the Vice-President, is to provide communication between the various standing committees so that we all know what the other committees are doing. It is important for Senators who are also members of other standing committees to let the President know of any standing committees you are on.

C. Elections Committee—Mr. Davis announced the results of the runoff for the third open position from the Sorrell College of Business, which was won by Lane Boyte Eckis. Dr. Shelton stated that the Elections Committee is chaired by the Secretary of the Senate and is responsible for running all Senate elections. It is hoped that in the future the Senate Elections Committee, along with the Deans, will be coordinating the elections of faculty members to all University standing committees. Work on this plan is in progress.

7. At this point Dr. Kolasa made a motion that the officer elections be moved up in the agenda, as several Senators had to leave early due to prior commitments. The motion carried.

A. Officer Elections—Dr. Shelton stated that as the Chair of the Nominations Committee was not present to present the slate of candidates, the election would proceed solely with nominations from the floor. Dr. Shelton opened the floor for nominations for President. Dr. Kolasa nominated Dr. Samuel Shelton, who, being unopposed, was elected by acclamation, under the leadership of the Vice-President, Dr. Allard. Dr. Allard was nominated for Vice-President by Dr. Gaillard. Being unopposed, Dr. Allard was elected by acclamation. Mr. Jim Davis was nominated for Secretary by Dr. Allard. Failing to object either loudly enough or soon enough, Mr. Davis was elected by acclamation, with one dissenting vote.

Dr. Shelton also proposed that the consideration of the 2010-2011 Senate meeting schedule be moved up in the agenda. There were no objections.

B. 2010-2011 Meeting Schedule—The resolution setting the schedule for the upcoming year was approved by the Executive Committee. It calls for maintaining the alternating Tuesday/Wednesday meeting days. However, the schedule calls for moving up the meeting time to 2:00 pm . This

recommendation results from numerous suggestions from Senators, in order to reflect the global nature of Troy University and the fact that Senators are in many time zones. There was no input suggesting that the earlier time would prevent participation in meetings for anyone. There was no discussion, and the resolution was approved.

C. The resolution expressing appreciation to outgoing members of the Faculty Senate for their service, and directing the President to send letters to them with copies to the appropriate academic and personnel files, expressing the appreciation of the Senate, was approved.

Dr. Kolasa requested permission to deliver his Montgomery Campus Report out of order because he had to leave. There were no objections.

5.F.iii Montgomery Campus Report—Dr. Kolasa stated that the earlier meeting time is good for Montgomery Campus because most of their classes begin at 5:00 or later. Also, the parking structure was repainted, which caused short-term problems but has resulted in better parking than ever. The inclusion of some classes beginning earlier than the usual evening starting times is going well. The History and Social Science Association is sending a volunteer team to the Gulf coast to help clean up.

Dr. Shelton suggested that the meeting get back onto the approved agenda. No one laughed.

## 5. Committee Reports

D. Academic Affairs Committee—Dr. Hammonds reviewed the projects handled by the AAC during the past year. There were three main issues, two relating to the role of Lecturers. First, a proposal to recommend that the Senate add an elected representative to represent Lecturers, and this proposal was defeated by the Senate, the reasoning being that Lecturers are already represented by the current Senate structure. The AAC also discussed the larger issue of the University's use and treatment of Lecturers as the number of Lecturers increases, but that issue has since been taken over by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Lastly, the AAC discussed the possibility of the University moving to a plus/minus grading system. This resulted in the AAC sending a recommendation to the Senate that the Senate recommend to the Chancellor the formation of such a study committee. The recommendation has been sent to the Chancellor and is awaiting further action.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee—Dr. Roark not being present, Dr. Shelton provided an overview of the work of the FWC. The major project underway is an examination of the Lecturer position, and how it is utilized, and what protections the Lecturer class has at other institutions. This is especially vital considering that the bulk of the 2010-2011 hires at Troy are Lecturer

positions, not tenure-track positions; it is necessary to study what impact this fact might have on faculty responsibilities, especially tenure-track responsibilities, because there are many things that Lecturers are not authorized to do in the Faculty Handbook, because as enrollment increases, and the pool of tenure-track faculty remains static and decreases as a percentage of the overall faculty, what impact will this have not only on the faculty, but also on the students and our service to them. There has been a preliminary report, but the FWC needs more research into the practices at other institutions. Dr. Allard added that a change to the Handbook that Dr. Roach did not mention was under 3.2.2.2, Lecturer, was the addition of a sentence: “In addition, depending on the needs of the College, Lecturers may be expected to participate in research and service activities.”

#### F. Campus Reports

i. Dothan Campus—Dr. Olliff being absent, there was no report..

ii. Global Campus—Dr. Esteves reported that the Global Campus faculty conference was held June 21-24 in Montgomery. One hundred forty-six employees attended, including one hundred twenty-five faculty members and twenty-one administrators. Attendees came from all over the country, with one from Malaysia. Breakout sessions by college were led by Deans Edwards, Tatum, Fulmer, Andrew, and Cochran. The conference was a big success, and proved extremely useful.

iv. Phenix City Campus—Dr. Hollingsworth having left, there was no report.

v. Troy Campus—Dr. Allard reported that there is much construction underway on the Troy campus, including a new basketball arena and new dining hall, making travel around campus difficult and time-consuming. She also reported that she attended the Global Campus conference, and lauded the conference as a unique and valuable opportunity for the Troy family to gather and learn to see ourselves as one University.

vi. Library—Mr. Webb was absent. There was no report.

G. Constitution Review—Dr. Allard reported on the duties of the Constitution Review Committee in reviewing the Faculty Senate constitution every five years, and asked for volunteers to serve on the committee.

#### 6. Old Business

A. Quality Enhancement Institute—Dr. Saltiel reported that she attended the Global Campus conference and thought it was a great success, and suggested

that perhaps in future years such conferences could be held by college or campus. At the conference Dr. Saltiel held two sessions, one on the QEP and the reading initiative, the other on the QEI. Both were well attended and well received, and Dr. Saltiel thanked Dr. Allard for her work on these sessions.

Faculty orientation will remain the same as it was last year. Dr. Vardaman is in charge of developing faculty orientation, and has been working with Dr. Saltiel, Dr. Shelton, and Dr. Allard. Dr. Vardaman will be sending out communications on the topic soon. The College of Communication has surged ahead and begun its own new-employee orientation this year, and their model appears to be a good one that other colleges will be able to emulate.

B. University Review Committee Tenure and Promotion Process—Dr. Allard reminded the Senate that at the last meeting the Senate proposed, under 3.5 policies on tenure, that there be a paragraph for the Handbook on the idea that all persons seeking tenure must go through the review process, and also a paragraph under general procedures about supervisor recommendations. The proposed amendment stated that Deans, supervisors, and other administrative personnel who were seeking tenure and/or promotion could elect to bypass the CRC and submit directly to the URC to avoid being reviewed by their own CRC. Neither Senate proposal was accepted, so it is still possible for Deans or other supervisors to receive tenure or promotion without going through any review process except recommendation by the Executive Vice-Chancellor/Provost. So the situation remains that tenured faculty must go through the T&P review process, while some other people don't.

Dr. Saltiel stated that promotion and tenure is a very sensitive issue for faculty, since it is something that we work years or even decades for, and that the way it is being treated on the administrative side, as an entitlement to be bestowed, changes the meaning and value of the titles. The perception of the title is changed to that of something that can be bestowed as a favor, and was not necessarily earned.

Dr. Jinright asked what the Senate's next action on the matter should be. Dr. Shelton stated that, because the Faculty Senate, unlike the SGA, does not have a voice on the Board of Trustees, there is nothing to be done before the July meeting of the Board. Therefore the Senate should look toward what can be done in the next cycle.

Dr. Allard urged that the Senate continue to submit this language, that we continue to raise awareness that we know this is going on, and that we think it is egregious. It takes all meaning away from the years of work and preparation that faculty members must go through to prepare for evaluation by their peers in order to earn promotion and tenure. She was not suggesting that people rewarded with administrative promotions are not deserving, but the process should be maintained: if one must go through the process, then all should be

required to. She urged the Senate to continue raising the issue that the Faculty, who are supposedly, next to the students, the most vital members of the University, are being treated as second-class citizens. She stated that she is not sure that it is appropriate to move this beyond the Senate and discuss it with our constituent members, but it should not be allowed to die.

Dr. Shelton reminded the Senate that the two Senate members who are on the URC as Senate representatives are free to bring up any issues in the URC that they want, and are not restrained by instructions from the Senate.

Dr. Allard stated that a report on the matter will be in her next campus report.

C. Admission Standards Study Update—Dr. Shelton stated that the Admissions Standards update has been reported on in the AAC report and in Dr. Federinko in his statement. Dr. Shelton said that he hopes this is just a first step in an ongoing process.

D. Plus/Minus Grading Study—Dr. Shelton said the letter from the Senate is in the hands of the Chancellor, who has asked some questions and is awaiting answers. The administrators are very busy with other matters right now.

## 7. New Business

D. Other new business—Dr. Hammonds reminded the Senate that the Senate will have to find two new representatives to the URC for the upcoming year.

Dr. Shelton said that the Chancellor had been invited to address this meeting of the Senate but was unable to attend, so a new date has been set for the Chancellor's address, at the January meeting, which seems a good time because it splits the two yearly faculty convocations, and is the beginning of the state legislative session. We will try to make this the annual date for the Chancellor's presentation.

The Chancellor and Mrs. Hawkins have extended an invitation to the Senate for a luncheon on August 25. Dr. Shelton reminded those who will be traveling to Troy that the Senate has no budget for travel, so they are on their own.

## 8. The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 pm.