

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting

September 7, 2001, 3:00 p.m., DBH 216

Dr. Stephen Chew, presiding

Senators present: **Arts & Sciences:** Linda Ables, Steven Epley, Jo Dohoney, David Garza, Randolph Horn, Ginger Frost, Jane Hiles, Sandra Willis, David Shipley, Sonya Stanley. **Business:** Jennings Marshall, Tom Woolley, Marlene Reed. **Divinity: — Education:** Dan Sandifer-Stech, David Finn, Ralph Gold. **Law:** David Smolin, Howard Walthall, **Performing Arts:** Edward Tibbs, Don Sandley. **Pharmacy:** Kimberly Benner, Marshall Cates, Condit Steil. **Nursing:** Rebecca Warr, Darlene Mathis. **Library:** Becky Hutto, Elizabeth Wells.

Committee chairs present: **Committee on University Curriculum:** Jean Ann Box. **Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare — Committee on University Learning Resources:** Tim Banks **Committee on Elections:** Tina Duffey. **Committee on Athletics:** Ralph Gold, **Committee on Stud Affairs, Relig Life, & Univ Relat:** Randolph Horn, **Committee on University Writing: — Committee on Academic Affairs:** Steven Epley,

Senators absent : **Arts & Sciences:** Morgan Ponder **Business:** **Divinity:** Lewis Drummond, Kenneth Mathews. **Education:** **Law:** Albert Brewer, William G. Ross **Performing Arts:** Randall Richardson, **Pharmacy:** Roger Lander, **Nursing:** Gretchen McDaniel, **Library:**

Others in attendance: John Harris representing the Office of the Provost, Lee Insko representing, University Relations
Cindy Kirk representing Metro College, Jim Barnette representing University Ministries

The meeting was opened with prayer by Steve Ruble.

Opening remarks

Stephen Chew asked everyone present to introduce themselves .He also explained that while observing Roberts Rules of Order, he hoped that there would be a sensible and effective balance between parliamentary procedure and open and frank discussion.

I. Approval of previous minutes May 4, 2001) <http://www.samford.edu/groups/facsen/minutes,%2005-01.htm>
Motion for approval was made by Sandra Willis. Seconded. Approved.

II. Election of Executive Council Members
Stephen Chew opened the floor for nominations. Sandra Willis nominated Jane Hiles. Steve Ruble nominated Jennings Marshall. No further nominations. Council was elected by acclamation.

III. January Term proposal: Cindy Kirk
Motion to change Catalog (p. 34) from "The maximum class load allowed in January Term is one four-credit course and one additional phedycial education activity course (including UCFH 120)." to "The maximum class load allowed in January Term is a total of four credits and one additional physical education activity course (including UCFH 120)." The change will take place immediately, in time for this Jan term.

Motion introduced for discussion of a change in jan term 6hour specifications. Seconded and moved for discussion. Cindy Kirk reviewed the request by saying that this was a plan to offer more flexibility in the six hour maximum credit for Jan term. a single class which may be four hours and specifically, UCFH 120, a two hour phedycial class. There was discussion regarding the subject and nature of 2 hour classes. Career Development, Human Behavior and the Arts Appreciation courses were cited.

It was emphasized that the London program Jan term was unique due to greater contact with teachers. Two 2 hour classes can be taken in the London program, but they are concurrent enrollments by requirement and meet as a four hour class would. It was stated that mass Communication was already allowing two 2 hour classes as part of the enrollment limit. One senator expressed the concerns of her constituents, that six hours in a three week course was too great a load, and that one class at four hours was very different from two two hour classes. Concern was expressed about course content. It was suggested that only special or elective type courses would be included in Jan term due to the limits of time. It was suggested that time conflicts alone might prohibit students from overloading their schedules. There was some question regarding the specification of one particular course (UCFH 120) and the content of that course, One senator asked about the homework and academic content along

with physical activities. Another senator responded that the homework was not overwhelming.

Discussion was redirected to Cindy Kirk and her need for a decision before submission deadline of catalogue information. The discussion focused greatly on pedagogical issues, and Stephen Chew moved that the motion for discussion be considered by the Curriculum Committee in its October meeting. A motion to table until the Curriculum Committee could discuss the issue and report back to the senate was made by Jennings Marshall the motion was seconded and approved.

IV. A Proposed Revision of the Course Proposal Form: Jo Dohoney "Indicate any courses with similar content at Samford and show how this proposed course will not duplicate existing coursework."

Stephen Chew felt that this was a discussion better suited specifically for the Curriculum Committee. Jo replied that she had submitted two previous requests for discussion, and that she had received no response from the Curriculum Committee. Discussion took place regarding the nature and extent of overlapping course content. A Senator noted the burden this might place on individuals who proposed new courses and the responsibility for knowing the content of all classes on campus. Jo responded that the nature of the content should limit the possible areas of redundancy. She also stated that the curriculum committee now reviews all possible duplication. One Senator felt that this requirement put an extraordinary amount of pressure on the curriculum committee to check all courses. It was then stated that if this were not part of the curriculum committee's responsibility, "what would prohibit someone from simply saying that there was no course duplication?" A motion was made by Stephen Chew to refer it to the Curriculum Committee and that they should return with a proposal by the October Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

V. Committee Reports

1. Committee on University Curriculum :

Jean Ann Box said that there had been no prior meetings but there was a meeting scheduled for September 14 at 3:00pm. Successive meetings would take place on the 3rd Friday of each month.

2. Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare:

David Little absent. Steve Ruble was asked by David to report that the committee would meet on September 27 at 10:00 (during the convo hour).

3. Committee on University Learning Resources:

Tim Banks stated that they would meet by virtual means as well as physically. Some topics for the committee to review ATNET research and recommendations, and the hacking of servers compelling the need to limit servers on campus.

4. Committee on Elections:

Tina Duffey, said that she believed all elected positions were filled. Stephen Chew noted the addition of Don Sandley to the newly formed Performing Arts roster of senators.

5. Committee on Athletics:

Ralph Gold reported that the committee had agreed to meet the third thursday of each month. The first meeting will be held September 21, at 10:00 am.

6. Committee on Students Affairs, Religious Life, and University Relations:

Randolph Horn, reported that his committee had not met at this point.

7. Committee on University Writing:

David Dedo was attending an Arts Retreat

8. Committee on Academic Affairs

Steven Epley reported that the committee will meet but had no specific dates or times.

VI. Handbook revision

Stephen Chew proposed that the senate set about to divide the handbook into two major sections: Policy and Information.

Rearrange the sections, without considering major changes. Stephen presented a review of the handbook and noted areas in need of review. A sign up list for Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees for:

Sections 1 and 2: David Finn, Steven Epley, Condit Steil, Linda Ables

Sections 3, 4, 5: Don Sandley, Marshall Cates, Kim Benner, Randolph Horn, Ralph Gold, Elizabeth wells

Section 6, 7: David Shipley, Ginger Frost, marlene Reed, Tom Woolley, Darlene Mathis, Becky Warr

Section 8, 9, 10, and 11: David Smolin, Dan Sandifer-Stech, Howard Walthall, Ted Tibbs, Becky Hutto

Specific Changes

The University-wide Committee on Faculty Development and Evaluation needs to be listed under section 1.9.5. A listing is needed of its purpose, procedure and membership.

Faculty Senate terms should be changed to 3 year, staggered terms.

The definition of Part-time voting faculty has to be streamlined. See 1.7.1.

Under item 1 on page 9, there is a "his."

See the typo in 1.5.1, p. 8, second line: "Provos." Section 7.1.2, page 52, end of the first sentence, "eaching."

We must have a proposal ready by February for the President. I would like the whole faculty to approve it.

VII. Faculty Position on Constitutional Reform:

Motion: Ask Academic Affairs for a proposal to revise policy 1.25 to define conditions under which faculty can take a position on a political, economic or social issue. The proposal should take into account the fact that faculty and staff are often asked to make public statements based on their association with Samford University as experts in their areas and clarify Samford's position on this practice.

A senator addressed the question of whether we are precluded from supporting constitutional reform. He cited the 3rd paragraph, first line of the policy regarding faculty positions, and said that legally, there was no restriction. He noted that, by policy, Samford does not normally take a position on political issues. The 501C3 status of Samford did not seem to be a problem. Another senator expressed concerns that there seemed to be no criteria for judging the proper exception to Samford's normal position or lack of position. How would we as faculty determine if we should support an issue such as opposition to Apartheid? It was suggested that supporting the Constitutional Reform might not be a Senate issue. Another senator suggested that this is a very good issue for the Senate, and thought it was a good opportunity to expand the role and perhaps visibility of the Faculty Senate. It was then asked how we could support this without procedures in place. There was some discussion regarding the role and responsibility by the Senate to the Faculty body. It was stated that, unless there is a 2/3 majority vote by the Faculty in opposition to the Senate's stance on an issue, the Senate is, effectively the Faculty. It was suggested that a resolution be put in writing and circulated. This suggestion was amended that a report be referred to the Committee on Students Affairs, Religious Life, and University Relations.

<http://www.samford.edu/admin/humanres/oncampus/policy/Web/012500.pdf>

The Senate adjourned at 4:30 without considering the rest of the agenda.

Old Business

None

New Business

None

Next meeting: October 5, 3:00 p.m., DBH 216

Items on the agenda which were not discussed:

Motion: A special faculty meeting be called in order to allow faculty from across campus to discuss their concerns about their respective schools and the university. The purpose of this meeting is to 1) provide a faculty forum for frank discussion about where we stand as a faculty and as a university, and 2) provide administrators with a faculty perspective from across campus.

VIII. Faculty Forum

Motion: A special faculty meeting be called in order to allow faculty from across campus to discuss their concerns about their respective schools and the university. The purpose of this meeting is to 1) provide a faculty forum for frank discussion about where we stand as a faculty and as a university, and 2) provide administrators with a faculty perspective from across campus.

IX. Faith Statement

Ask SARLUR to review the statement and compare it to statements from other schools. Consider the implications of the statement for recruitment of prospective students and faculty. Consider whether the statement should be modified in some way, and whether the faculty should endorse a particular statement.

<http://www.samford.edu/distinction.html>