

MINUTES
TROY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING

June 24, 2009

1. Dr. Blum called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM.
2. Dr. Mark Walker completed the roll call for the meeting. Attendance was as follows:
 - a. Members Present: Dr. Scout Blum (T)
Dr. Dianne Eppler (GC)
Dr. David Hollingsworth (PC)
Dr. Marty Olliff (D)
Dr. Timothy Buckner (T)
Mr. Jim Davis (T)
Dr. Sam Shelton (T)
Dr. James DeLoach (M)
Dr. John Jinright (T)
Dr. Mark Walker (T)
Dr. Frank Browning (PC)
Dr. Eddie Clark (M)
Dr. Frank Hammonds (T)
Dr. Chan Roark (T)
Dr. Bud Borders (D)
Dr. Tish Matuszek (M)
Ms. Alyssa Martin (M)
 - b. Members Absent: Dr. Catherine Allard (T) – with notice
Dr. Kris Kimbler (M)
Dr. Al Glover (T)
Dr. Allen Jones (T) – with notice
Dr. Nirmol Podder (T)
Dr. Larry Fogelberg (T) – with notice
Dr. Mary Battaglia (M) – with notice
Dr. Djuana Burns (T)
3. The minutes of the April, 2009 meeting were reviewed, and passed as revised.
4. Dr. Blum recognized and welcomed the incoming members of the Senate. She also thanked the outgoing members for their service and assistance over their terms.
5. Old Business.
 - a. There were no reports from the Faculty Welfare Committee or the Academic Affairs Committee.
 - b. For the Elections Committee: Dr. Sam Shelton noted that there will need to be a special election to fill Kris Kimbler's spot as Montgomery at-large representative, as he is leaving his position at the university.

- c. For the Committee on Committees: Dr. Blum noted that there are two spots open to represent the Faculty Senate on Standing Committees for the University. One position is open for the Personnel Advisory Committee, and there is also a position open for the University Review Committee. Senators interested in these spots should contact either Dr. Blum or Dr. Shelton.
 - d. Senate Officer Elections. The slate of candidates for elections is as follows: Dr. Sam Shelton, president; Dr. Catherine Allard, vice president; and Mr. Jim Davis, secretary. The motion to approve the slate of candidates was approved.
6. New Business
- a. Chancellor's Address: Dr. Blum welcomed Dr. Hawkins to the Senate, noting that this was the first time he had addressed the body since the move to OGU. She hoped that he would continue to be able to address them each year.

Dr. Hawkins: Dr. Hawkins first invited the Senate to a luncheon at his Troy home on August 26th. He noted that on March 31, 2009, the legislature had officially approved Troy's OGU status, and that was good for the students and an important reinvention in the state of the university. He noted that the state was going through some financial problems, and that the university wanted to make sure that no individual staff or faculty member was hurt financially with the change, since that would reflect the high value the university places on students and those who serve them. He noted that several universities had to cut positions, including Syracuse at 119 positions cut, FSU at about 500, Tennessee at about 300, and Alabama at about 300. Troy has not done that. Regarding funding, Dr. Hawkins mentioned that 2008 was the high point of our funding levels at \$62 million. With the budget cuts, Troy will be dealing with a \$14 million real cut in funding over the next 2 years. In addition to that challenge, we also have a challenge in dealing with the SACS recommendations. The SACS team noted the need for additional full time faculty (especially on global campus). They also felt it was important to certify qualified faculty at the international locations. SACS also felt that the QEP submitted was too much for us. This is a good thing, really, as now the QEP can be more focused. SACS also wanted the university to change how we measured institutional effectiveness. SACS recognized that eCampus was a positive for the university, and commented that we were about 3-4 years ahead of our counterparts in distance learning. Dr. Hawkins also wanted to credit Dean Stewart and the library, as the library had moved from being one of the university's "Achilles heels" in 1992, to a strength. He credited the change with Dean Stewart's able leadership. Dr. Hawkins felt that we need to turn the SACS report into a positive to help the university grow. He said he has a lot of faith in the accreditation process, as it is peer driven and non-governmental.

Dr. Hawkins then turned to list 10 “guiding principles” of the university. These are being developed as a way to begin the process of a new strategic plan for 2010 to 2015, as well as a way to satisfy SACS. The guiding principles are as follows: (1) We are tuition driven. We need to continue to recruit and retain good students. This is not easy, and we need to maintain high standards. (2) We must attract quality students. We used to be almost an entirely open door university at the Montgomery campus, for example. We have been raising our standards and need to continue to do that. (3) Hire more full-time faculty. Dr. Hawkins noted that they have approved the hiring of 72 more full time faculty positions at a cost of about \$6 million. Many of these are to be placed in global campus. It’s not enough to have just numbers of faculty, but we need faculty to be able to teach online and understand their evolving role. (4) Our full time faculty must focus on quality teaching and research. Dr. Hawkins said that the administration is looking to reduce or completely eliminate overloads, partially in response to SACS. (5) We will cut costs. This is a part of good stewardship. We will try to feed our strengths and starve our weaknesses. (6) If you cannot document progress, progress didn’t occur. For student progress in particular, we need to do more than just measure quantitatively, but also qualitatively. Academic programs must work to document their progress. (7) Distance learning is here to stay. Students are changing and eCampus is one of our strengths. We need to stay in front of our competition, and maintain a high tech, high touch reputation. (8) We will freeze all on-ground expansion in global campus while we conduct a review of our academic programs, financial viability and value to the university. The one exception to this will be that we will continue to follow through with our ongoing/existing plans in Saudi Arabia. There may be some of the offices that get shifted to more of an administrative function, with small support staff to support e-campus activities only. (9) Every academic program we offer must also be available on line. This should happen by 2015. It is a massive undertaking, but is important to the health of the university. (10) Create a paperless university. Dr. Hawkins believe we “kill too many trees” and that we need to work toward not using paper as a part of stewardship. He noted that he would say more about these issues at convocation in August. For the future, he noted several things, including that the university has been growing, including adding our first doctoral program; we will be developing our first professional school; we hope to increase student admission standards; increase the international activities per college; and also build new facilities, including the renovation of Bibb Graves, new dining facilities with a faculty lunch area, new fraternity houses, and an honors college.

Dr. Hawkins then answered several questions from Dr. Blum. She asked what role the faculty would play in the 2015 vision document. He noted that there would need a lot of stakeholders contributing. Dr. Blum and Dr. Olliff asked about the statement about reducing or eliminating overloads.

Dr. Hawkins noted that this was in response to SACS. Dr. Blum noted that this might generate substantial problems for distance learning and as a pay issue for faculty.

- b. Proposed Resolution 3, the meeting schedule for the next academic year, was passed by the Senate as proposed.
- c. Dothan Campus News: Dr. Marty Olliff expressed some concern with a recent report from the Wiregrass Foundation that indicated that the Dothan campus was not involved in the community in Dothan as much as it should have been. He noted that the committee that issued the report had some political reasons for their opinions, but that it was important to understand that some in Dothan did feel this way about the university.

Dr. Roach was recognized to address the issues in the report. He expressed some concern about who the Wiregrass Foundation represented or spoke for. One of the members had an “axe to grind” as he was a former Troy Dothan dean. The report apparently noted that there was a “brain drain” from Dothan, which Dr. Roach noted went far beyond just Troy’s responsibility. In addition, he stated that Dr. Hawkins takes the progress in Dothan very seriously, and works to build partnerships in many different ways. Dr. Roach noted that some felt that Dothan might become another campus with athletics, residence halls, but the campus has a different role to fill. It can’t be all things to all people. Dothan will focus on working adults and serving the community. He noted again that there was an agenda behind the report, and that when looking at it, one must consider the author. He also noted that the university is working to migrate several programs to Dothan at this time.

- d. Agenda Suggestion: Dr. Olliff suggested that the campuses each make individual reports to the Senate on a regular basis.
- e. SACS Update. Dr. John Dew was recognized to update the Senate on the response to the SACS concerns after their visit in April. Dr. Dew noted that the SACS team was very complimentary of the students that they interviewed while they were on the various campuses. He also said that the students were very complimentary of the faculty, and specifically had mentioned that they felt they had unique opportunities here. SACS also felt that everyone was very open with them during the on-site visit, which reinforced the integrity of the process. Dr. Dew said he would send Dr. Blum a copy of the executive summary of the SAC suggestions. He asked for faculty help with the SLOs and institutional effectiveness issues. Dr. Shelton asked that the university website be updated with the SACS report so that the faculty could have access to it.
- f. Tenure/Promotion Comments: Dr. Roach noted that the tenure and promotion process is a “living document.” He has initiated a built-in post mortem review each year after the process ends. The deans ask for comments and get feedback with the colleges, and the same process is true for the URC. Dr. Roach feels that T/P is a very inclusive process because

faculty can submit suggestions to the deans. He would welcome feedback on the ways in which the T/P process can be improved.

- g. Other issues. Dr. Roark was recognized regarding standing committee elections. She noted that the colleges may not have been handling the elections process correctly, as sometimes it seemed that the Deans were selecting particular people rather than having the process be an open election. She felt that this might have the effect of narrowing opportunities for some people. Dr. Richardson noted that there were two types of committee memberships – some are appointed by the deans, others are elected. He noted that if he sees two people who are equally qualified for a position, he tries to pick someone who hasn't held a position, to help them with tenure and promotion. Often, he noted, the problem was not that the deans were controlling the process, but that it was difficult to get faculty to volunteer for such positions without some arm twisting. Dr. Roach then noted that he was not trying to limit opportunities for anyone. He felt that the problem was trying to get people to come forward to fill the spots. He noted that he and Dr. Hawkins spent a lot of time with faculty, and want them to have the opportunity to get tenure and promotion. If a faculty member wants to serve in some capacity, he should let Dr. Roach or their dean know. In response to Dr. Roark, Dr. Roach asked that Dr. Tatum be contacted directly to speak to him about the process in the College of Education and what was going on.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.