

MINUTES

Samford University Full Faculty Meeting

February 12, 2002 DBH Brock Forum

Devotional by Marlene Reed

I. Approval of minutes

The Chair reminded everyone that the December minutes were posted on the web for review. He introduced a motion to amend the minutes (regarding guidelines for taking public stands on political issues, specifically item number 3. see II. below). The motion to amend the minutes was moved and seconded. The motion was made to approve the December 6, 2001 Faculty meeting minutes as amended. The minutes were approved.

The minutes were distributed by email and can be found on the Web. at

<http://www.samford.edu/groups/facsen/>

Motion was seconded. The minutes were approved.

II. Revised Guidelines for taking public stands on political issues.

Special Rules Required for the Passage of

Such Resolutions:

- 1) Resolutions shall require passage in a meeting of the full faculty by a vote of 2/3 of the members present.
- 2) Resolutions should make it clear that the faculty do not speak for Samford as an institution.
- 3) The faculty, as a whole, is discouraged from endorsing particular candidates or legislation.

III. Committee on Elections:

Stephen Chew reminded everyone that the positions for Senate Officers were still open and to please contact Tina Duffey with their nominations. He also reminded everyone to consult with the prospective nominee before entering his or her name.

IV. Review and discussion of Faculty Opinion Survey

For specific slides and data, please revisit the Faculty Senate minutes from February 1. To help you find these in your list of emails, these were emailed Feb. 4th. If you cannot find your Senate minutes and would like to revisit the data, just reply to me and I will send you the pdf that accompanied the email. Also note that the slides have been posted on the Senate web page, url listed above.

Stephen Chew cited Zoomerang as the source of some confusion. 15 to 20 people responded in an alternate form. The questions were taken from a national survey.

There were no questions regarding rank. The survey contained no question asking about the rank of the respondent, so we don't have that information, which weakens our ability to interpret the results. There was a question about years of service, but it isn't quite the same thing.

Stephen extended thanks to Jim Eck and Human Resources. The data were sent directly from Human Resources and Jim to Stephen and the committee, who were in complete control of the analyses.

Randolph Horn reported on the Quality of Life questions. There were no questions or discussion.

Sandra Willis reported on the Work questions. There were no questions or discussion.

Tom Woolley reported on the Leadership questions. Tom started by stating that it is often said that data can be made to say anything, but in the case of the leadership data it seemed one can't say anything at all. The breakout by colleges showed no issues at all. Generally the Faculty felt respected by the Administration. There were no questions or discussion.

Stephen Chew reported on the Teaching questions.

Question: Regarding the Academic Freedom : Was there any data regarding tenure and non tenure status? This might be a reason for the more negative responses of the 3 to 5 and 5 to 10 year groups.

Reply: The only qualification was in range of years at Samford. Tenure was not a criteria, but it might be a clear indicator regarding issues such as academic freedom.

Stephen Chew reported on the Recognition questions. There were no questions or discussion.

Comment: Regarding Striving to Provide Competitive Pay: How can 1/3 of participants be neutral? What does neutral mean? Neutral is not clear.

Reply: Maybe it is a lack of knowledge regarding a particular issue or question, or we are unclear about salaries provided by other colleges and other universities.

Randolph Horn reported on the first set of open-ended question, specific to Other Institutions At Which One Might Teach (the Dream School). There were no questions or discussion.

Sandra Willis reported on the open-ended question specific to Making One's Role At Samford More Rewarding. There were no questions or discussion.

To Woolley reported on the open-ended question specific to Suggestions For Improvement There were no questions or discussion.

Stephen Chew reported (on behalf of Jim Eck and Steve Ruble) on the Departments of Service question. There were no questions or discussion.

Stephen Chew then provided an overview saying that there would be a complete report available to anyone who wished to see it. most of the data and slides are in the senate minutes and you can go back and review that information as well. Generally, the faculty feel respected and are committed. A large number feel however that they have very little affect, many feel that teaching is not adequately funded. A large number feel there is academic freedom at Samford. A large number feel tenure and promotion guidelines are clear. And, morale is generally high.

Stephen thanked Randolph Horn, Sandra Willis, Tom Woolley, Steve Ruble, and Jim Eck for their analysis of the survey data, noting that all this work was completed in a week and a half.

Stephen called for questions and discussion.

Comment: Data are available by college and could be extracted to make more sense at the college level.

Comment: There is a contradiction. Regarding the diversity issue and the call for diversity. Recent hires would be assumed to be a diversity oriented question. maybe there is concern that there might be too much diversity.

Reply: We do have conflicting drives with our link to the Baptist denomination and call for diversity. Perhaps this reflects this.

Comment: Though there is strong support for the Christian mission, there are very different views regarding the mission. There are views that the mission embraces diversity while others may support a more conventional constituency. there is a lot of ambiguity built into this issue.

Comment: There is a contradiction here. We say we want diversity, but i'm not so sure we really do want it., I believe this is why a number of new faculty leave. They are never made to feel they are a part of the university.

Question: Can the survey be repeated periodically for comparison? Can it be standardized?

Reply: We will try to improve the questions, and standardize for comparison, but we will need thorough review before committing to the questions which are made standard. It has been suggested that this might be given every three years rather than five.

Question; Is there data with which to compare faculty to staff?

Reply: There should be some basis for comparison in the data.

Question: The staff constitutes a very large number on the campus, and in many cases outside the classroom constitutes the base for activities and interaction of the university.

Comment: Like grading, all things cannot be pleasant, and the workshops serve a vital purpose.

Comment: Regarding the reference to slashing the budget for faculty funding, no one purposely diminished funds for research. The endowment was affected by the drop in the stock market and this is reflected in the current funding.

Reply: This is certainly a good clarification regarding funding.

Stephen asked if there were any further suggestions or questions. There were none

V. New Business
None

VI. Announcements
Look over the web site and look at the Senate minutes. Stay in touch with the issues.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:25pm

The next Full Faculty meeting will be held at 10:00 am, Thursday May 16, 2002, in Brock Forum.

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held at 3:00 pm, Friday, March 1, 2002, in DBH 216.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard Dendy
Faculty Senate Secretary