

MINUTES
TROY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
17 November 2009

1. Dr. Shelton called the meeting to order at 3:00 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
Brian Webb
Marty Olliff
Scout Blum
Jim Davis
Regina Gaillard
Sam Shelton
Larry Fogelberg
John Irwin
Robert Kitahara
Jim Ryan
John Jinright
Johanna Alberich
Frank Browning
Chan Roark
Mary Battaglia

b. Members absent: Tim Buckner
Allen Jones
Zhang Jun
James DeLoach
Eddie Clark (with notice)
Frank Hammonds (with notice)
Djuana Burns

3. The minutes for the October 28 meeting were amended with the addition of a paragraph added to the end of Dr. Roach's presentation in Section 6C. The wording of the Montgomery campus report by Dr. Kolasa was also changed. for the October 28 meeting. The minutes were approved as amended.

4. President's Report

A. Dr. Shelton reported that he had met with Dr. Roach prior to today's meeting.

5. Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee—Dr. Shelton reported that the Executive Committee met the previous Wednesday. The committee approved the agenda for today's meeting and went over the progress being made by the matters before the various committees.

B. Committee on Committees—Dr. Allard was not present, so there was no report.

C. Elections Committee—Mr. Davis had no report.

D. Academic Affairs Committee—Dr. Shelton (in place of Dr. Hammonds) reported that the AAC is re-examining the idea of adopting a plus-minus grading system. In addition, the committee is looking into the role of Lecturers in the system regarding their use and the voice that they have in the academic area, as well as their status and protections.

E. Faculty Welfare Committee—Dr. Roark reported the committee is finalizing the draft of letters to the deans on forming joint faculty-administration committees to look into the salary structure at the University.

F. Campus Reports

i. Dothan Campus—Dr. Olliff reported that he had been asked if Dr. Dew was going to have another listening session on the Dothan Campus, and that he did not think one was scheduled. He also asked if the compilation of the questions and responses to the previous listening session had been distributed yet. Dr. Shelton said that Dr. Dew was not present, but that he would contact Dr. Dew about those two questions. Dr. Shelton also said that no additional listening session was scheduled, but that he would ask Dr. Dew if one could be scheduled. The results of the listening sessions are due to be posted on-line, but that is an extensive process and might take a while.

ii. Global Campus—Dr. Esteves had no report.

iii. Montgomery Campus—Dr. Kolasa reported that the History and Social Sciences Association had been recognized by the campus and could begin activities and fund raising. Dr. Kolasa said that he had contacted Dr. White, the vice-chancellor, on possibly forming a Montgomery-campus SGA. Finally, Dr. Kolasa said the students were responding well to the New York Times reading program, and asked why it had ended on November 1, and whether it would continue in the spring, Dr. Saltiel

suggested he contact Dean Eleanor Lee, who is in charge of the QEP newspaper program. Mr. Davis said that the Times delivery was scheduled to stop on November 1.

iv. Phenix City Campus—Dr. Hollingsworth reported that the 2015 listening session with Dr. Dew went well.

v. Troy Campus—Dr. Allard had nothing to report.

vi. Library—Mr. Webb had no report.

6. Old Business

A. Contract Procedures—Dr. Roark reported that she had been told the contract with Sodhexo-Marriott has five years remaining, and that the Senate Faculty Welfare Committee will follow up when the time approaches.

D. Joint Administration-Faculty Senate Committee on Compensation—Dr. Shelton asked Dr. Roark whether she had anything to add that she had not covered in her FWC report, and she said she had not.

7. New Business

A. Dr. Shelton introduced Dr. Iris Saltiel to discuss the Quality Enhancement Institute. He encouraged everyone to respond to the questionnaires she had already sent out to the faculty. Dr. Saltiel explained that the QEI is a new venture by the University, which was a part of the 2005-2010 strategic plan. It is being launched to help faculty and staff and enhance their (inaudible). Her first major initiative is to assist faculty. She said the best way to get started would be to ask faculty, through a survey, in which areas they needed assistance, and in what ways they wished to receive assistance. This will be a faculty-helping-faculty initiative. She is forming several advisory boards. Part of the QEI's initiative is to enhance QEP, which is the focus on building a culture of reading, primarily geared toward undergraduates. But the main focus of the QEI is the faculty, so she is very interested in partnering with the Faculty Senate. In response to a question from Dr. Shelton, Dr. Saltiel said that the Senate had representation on the Quality Enhancement Implementation team, the overall steering body over the entire QEP. In response to concerns expressed by SACS, the QEI has instituted four Faculty Development teams with responsibility for different areas: the traditional student, the college reading initiatives, the adult student, and the on-line student. Those teams will conference to determine the best ways to help their particular populations. Then in the spring the teams will come together in an e-colloquium to share and pool their ideas. Dr. Shelton said he had been concerned that the Senate be represented on these teams, but that did not seem to be a concern since Dr. Saltiel said that she was overwhelmed with

responses to her call for faculty volunteers. She said that she could make sure that a Senate member was on each team.

Mr. Davis asked if the college reading initiatives were going to be instituted in every college this year. Dr. Saltiel said that was the plan, but each dean was responsible for the individual colleges, and she could not report on their progress.

Dr. Shelton asked what the next step was after the responses to the faculty questionnaires were tabulated. Dr. Saltiel said that she would determine from the questionnaires what the faculty most wanted, and to try to deliver that help. There will be a QEI web-page available on which to check on what is going on. She also said that she has contacted Auburn University, which has a long-established faculty enhancement program, and they have agreed to partner with Troy to share ideas.

Dr. Shelton asked what financial commitment the University has made to the QEI. Dr. Saltiel said she still has no budget worked out, but that her salary is 60% as QEI director, and 40% as faculty. She says there is other money in the QEI, but she knows no details.

B. Jonathan Davis, the president of the Troy Campus SGA, was not present to deliver his update on Higher Education Day and other SGA issues.

C. Dr. Dianne Barron reported on the new Research Council that is under development. She began by discussing the SACS principles that were the motivation behind developing the Research Council. She said the SACS principles before 2008 covered sections 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2, and 3.3.1.3, and that those were the only elements that had a requirement for assessment. The 2008 edition of the SACS principles added 3.3.1.4 and 3.3.1.5. Today she was discussing 3.3.1.4, which concerns research within a university's educational mission. Because the University mentions research in its Mission Statement, it is responsible for assessing research across the institution as a part of its mission. The purpose of the Research Council is to act in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice-Chancellor and the Provost on matters relating to research as it relates to the mission of the University. The purpose of the standing committee is to provide leadership in increasing awareness of the University's research mission, and to assist in the coordination and assessment of research outcomes. The RC will prepare an annual outcomes report for the Chancellor and for SACS.

In the area of increasing awareness of the University's research activity, examples would be to generate ideas to support research activity on all campuses, to provide and enhance opportunities for professional development for faculty and students.

To coordinate these activities, Dr. Barron said that the RC would use current standing committees, such as the Institutional Review Board, the Faculty Development Committee, and also our academic leadership.

The RC is also responsible for facilitating sponsored venues, to include presentations, exhibits of scholarly activities, and web-hosting of these

activities. This could also possibly include a research calendar to announce all the activities going on in this area on all campuses, in all colleges. This could also include a research week that could be hosted across all campuses for faculty and students to present their works.

The RC would also be responsible for developing and maintaining a research website. This would not only be a place to post the central research calendar, but also to centralize research training, information on grant opportunities, possibly share research results, and all perhaps posted in some type of e-journal.

The RC would also report annually on the outcome and results of research throughout the colleges and campuses. Other suggestions that the council could come up with about improving our outcomes and possibilities could also be included later.

As for the membership of the RC, Dr. Barron said that they looked first at the standing committees, such as the Faculty Senate, the GAC, the UGAC, the IRB, and the FDC, the committees that would interrelate with the RC, and that they wanted to mirror the makeup of those committees. They started with the five colleges, and decided to start with roughly 15 members, with one elected and one appointed from each of the colleges, plus the chair of each of the above-mentioned committees. The appointment of members gives the deans a chance to include people who are actively engaged in research or who otherwise might be able to add greatly to the makeup of the committee. Non-voting members would include deans, campus vice-chancellors, etc., people who interact with the RC to assist the RC, and to include global campus. Ex-officio members would include the Provost and Dr. Barron as Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School.

Eligibility criteria would be consistent with the eligibility of other standing committees, i.e. full-time tenure-track faculty, minimum of three consecutive years service, with possible exceptions such as new faculty member without the three years employment who has a lot of experience with research, grants, etc.

Dr. Barron said that she is excited about the creation of the RC. It would be able to coordinate all the information about number of thesis classes offered, the outcomes of those classes, the outcomes of FDC grants, etc.

Dr. Shelton commented that he was intrigued by the possibilities of coordinating research efforts with faculty from other campuses. He also asked for clarification that this is not to be an approving body, but an advisory body and clearinghouse for information.

Dr. Allard asked whether the plan for appointing members was to make sure that all campuses are represented. Dr. Barron replied that that was one concern, that elected members might all come from the Troy campus, for instance. Dr. Allard asked if there is a plan for a percentage of graduate faculty and undergraduate faculty to be included in the makeup of the RC. Dr. Barron said that she would prefer that the RC be all graduate faculty, but this is not going to be the case. She did say that this is one thing that will be considered by the deans as the appointments are being made.

Dr. Barron urged all faculty to participate in the RC. She said that we are turning the corner as an institution, and this is a major first step.

Dr. Shelton said that he will invite Jonathan Davis, the SGA president, to attend a future meeting to present his ideas about Higher Education Day. He also urged members to provide their input into the FWC efforts to help form the college committees to look into the salary issue.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 pm.