

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting

October 5, 2001, 3:00 p.m., DBH 216

Dr. Stephen Chew, presiding

Senators present: **Arts & Sciences** Linda Ables, Steven Epley, David Garza, Randolph Horn, Ginger Frost, Jane Hiles, David Shipley **Business** Jennings Marshall **Divinity** Kenneth Mathews **Education** Ralph Gold **Law** David Smolin, Howard Walthall **Performing Arts** Randall Richardson **Pharmacy** Roger Lander, Kimberly Benner, Marshall Cates, Condit Steil **Nursing** Rebecca Warr, Gretchen McDaniel **Library** 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:** Jo Dohoney, Morgan Ponder, Sonya Stanley, Sandra Willis **Business:** Marlene Reed, Tom Woolley **Divinity:** Lewis Drummond, **Education:** David Finn, Dan Sandifer-Stech **Law:** Albert Brewer, William G. Ross **Performing Arts:** Don Sandley, Edward Tibbs **Pharmacy:** Roger Lander **Nursing:** Darlene Mathis **Library:** Becky Hutto

Others in attendance: Joe Lewis and Brad Creed 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 Ralph Gold

Opening remarks

Stephen Chew requested that reports from committees conform to two categories: one category of information, upon which the faculty senate need not act, and a second category for items requiring senate action or response.

I. Approval of Minutes

Motion for approval was made by Stephen Chew, seconded by Jennings Marshall. Approved

II. Committee Reports

A. Committee on University Curriculum: Jeanie Box

1. Motion on January Term: (Presented by Elizabeth Wells)

Floor was opened for discussion of motion to change maximum course number and credits allowed for Jan. term. It was stated that the average credit number during Jan. Term is 2.7 hours. A Curriculum Committee member stated that consensus of the committee was that one four hour class was easier than two, two hour classes. Concern was expressed that some departments were already offering two, two hour courses instead of the single one hour course, and possible UCFH two hour or a one hour PE. This new wording would no longer allow them to offer two courses. It was noted that the current policy did not allow for more than one course plus a one hour PE. Question: Can the two two hour classes be converted to one four hour class? No response to the question. A Curriculum Committee member stated that the committee specifically wanted to focus on one course only, with the additional PE credit. One senator representing Education and PE questioned why one particular course (UCFH) was designated as the exception. It was also noted that enrollment data on UCFH might be particularly informative regarding any potential decrease in Jan. term enrollment.

Question: Will this cost the university money? Response: Due to the 2.7 credit average it didn't seem eminent, but data would need to be reviewed. It was stated that the primary goal here was to make it possible to take an additional two hour course. There was concern that this change by the Curriculum committee might hurt enrollment, It was stated that one JMC was already enrolling 20 to 25 students in

two, two hour courses during Jan. term Concern was voiced about the restrictions placed upon courses of differing credits. It was noted that Music offered one credit voice classes during Jan. term, and after a proposal that the motion be changed to read two courses maximum six credits, it was stated that Business offered three credit courses. Allowing two three credit courses would not be what was intended by the Curriculum Committee

The motion was amended to read “The maximum load allowed in the January term is two courses not to exceed a total of five credits”.

Discussion: There was some concern that this might be too restrictive. Response: As in any term, if a student wishes to take more than the maximum load, they may ask permission from his or her dean.

Motion for approval was made by Stephen Chewy, seconded by Jennings Marshall. Approved.

2. Motion on Course Proposal Form (Presented by Elizabeth Wells)

Discussion; Concern was noted about ambiguity in language of the motion. Another senator commented that accrediting boards would hold departments accountable for like classes taught on campus, and that each department should be responsible for knowing both the courses and faculty who are teaching classes which are similar to those it offers. Comment from a Curriculum Committee member: Someone is ultimately going to have to do this research of possible duplication. A lot of people are already doing this. There are very few on the Curriculum Committee and a very large number of faculty. It would be easier for the individual faculty to research this for his or her own courses than to ask the committee to do this. Another comment was made that this could actually provide an opportunity for a faculty member to explain the need for a course, which might seem to duplicate another.

Question: Will all schools be affected by this? Response: The University Curriculum Committee should review all schools. Law and Divinity have never submitted courses for approval. The Committee is in place to help all schools. Law and Divinity have both been invited to participate, but have not responded.

The amendment reads “Indicate any course with similar content at Samford and show how this proposed course will not duplicate existing coursework”

Motion was made for approval. Approved

3. A new item to report: A policy for extraction of courses (Presented by Elizabeth Wells)

The Curriculum Committee is reviewing a process by which courses, which have not been taught for five years, might be extracted from the catalog. Question; Would this remove Law school Classes? Under current conditions, it would not. It was noted by a Law School senator that there was in place in the law school, a procedure for relocating courses - not eliminating - courses which had not been taught for a period of time. One senator expressed his concern and personal experience regarding schools who falsely advertise classes which they no longer offer.

It was understood that this process, when put in place would require review of each course and would not automatically eliminate the course. It was suggested that a dormant course could be revived rather than submitted as a new course to the Curriculum Committee.

Stephen Chew asked that the Curriculum Committee take the senate discussion into account. Response was affirmative and that this was not intended as a motion for approval by committee.

- B. Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare: David Little
The committee met, but had nothing to report.
- C. Committee on University Learning Resources: Tim Banks

The committee had not met at this point, but would very soon meet electronically.

D. Committee on Elections: Tina Duffey

All committees were functioning properly, so there was nothing to report.

E. Committee on Athletics: Ralph Gold

The committee met September 20. No action was taken in committee. Items discussed: cancelled football game and possibility of rescheduling, NCAA representative to the committee was appointed, an SGA member was placed on the committee. The committee meets every third Thursday. Next meeting date is October 18

F. Committee on Students Affairs, Religious Life, and University Relations: Randolph Horn

1. Motion on Political Stands

The committee addressed the issue of resolution on resolution regarding political comments. The committee did not want to address the particular language of the policy. It was stated that a super majority of the university faculty be required to make a declaration or resolution of political stance. It was again noted that the faculty should, avoid statements which are endorsements.

The committee meets again 10/23/01

G. Committee on University Writing: David Dedo

No report.

H. Committee on Academic Affairs: Steven Epley

1. That faculty be required to provide midterm progress reports for all freshmen and all other students in 100-level courses. Faculty would assign a mark of "S" or "U" to each such student. An "S" would mean that the student is performing "A," "B," or "C" level work, while a "U" would mean that the student is performing "D" or "F" level work. This assignment of "S" or "U" can be done through the on-line grading module and will thus require no additional paperwork.

The Committee further recommends that the process begin in Spring 2002.

Steven stated that this would require no paper work, and would be a minimal burden to all concerned. This was largely a student retention consideration. Student satisfaction teams are being established to address student concerns and needs. This would only involve freshmen 100 courses. Question: Would this review go to only the parents of students who signed waivers. Response: yes. Question: Would a senior transfer student taking Psych. 101 be reviewed at midterm? Response: Yes. Question: Is there any place for remarks in this evaluation form? Response: Yes.

Motion for approval. Approved

- 2) The committee approved a change in the application procedure for Faculty Development Grants.

Each applicant is asked to submit one copy of the application containing the applicant's name and department (or school). The other fourteen copies of the application should be "blind"; that is, they should not contain the applicant's name and departmental or school affiliation, either on the cover sheet or in the discursive portions of the application itself.

This marks the first year that the committee has attempted blind submissions. We have decided to do this in an attempt to ensure the fairest and most level possible playing field for all applicants.

III. Handbook Revision: Guidelines

Stephen Chew cited the proposal regarding the division of Faculty Handbook information into two distinct entities: An Information manual and a Policy Manual. He clarified the time table for procedures. The senate executive

committee will meet Tuesday the 9th and will, then convene various committees in charge of separating information from policy. This research should be complete and acted upon by the Senate by the November 30 meeting, so that it may be presented to the university Faculty for approval at the December 6 meeting. This should provide time for administrative review and ultimately the April meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Questions can be emailed to Stephen Chew slchew@samford.edu

IV. Faculty Forum

Stephen Chew explained that the faculty forum was, he hoped, an opportunity to candidly address faculty concerns, as well as strengths, and weakness of the university. Question: Will this information be passed on?

Response: with the advent of the Faculty Opinion Survey, this information can be tied into an existing format.

Question; How frank can we be? Response: If the Faculty Opinion Survey is used as a basis for discussion, it may provide a more categorical initiative regarding questions and answers and will hopefully encourage a more vigorous and more anonymous discussion.

V. Faith and Learning Statement

Stephen Chew acknowledged Jim Barnette, and thanked him for attending his second senate meeting in order to address the Faith and Learning statement. Jim provided a brief history of the Faith and Learning statement. Citing a statement made by Calvin college, then Provost Hull asked if a similar statement might be developed for Samford. A draft was made and tabled. The draft was revived and revised in 1995 and reviewed by a Cross-functional team, David Chapman, the President, SGA and student groups, and Student Affairs.

Admission began passing out the statement during the 01 Summer, in general recruiting packages.

Stephen Chew stated, that by reviewing it in the Senate, there might be some sense of how the Faculty as a whole, felt about the statement. He noted that the David Baines Rhodes Group had reviewed it this semester. Stephen noted that it was already on the web.

Question; Could you tell me about the general feedback. Response: Generally very positive.

Some concern was addressed regarding a less than welcoming feeling for those outside the Christian faith. A counter to this concern was that it served as a high standard for Samford's faculty and students.

Stephen recommended it to the SARLUR committee. Randolph asked what they were to do. Stephen showed on screen proposed reviews.

VI. Old Business None

VII. New Business

Stephen wanted to make sure that everyone was aware of a special shoptalk on October 24th 3:30 pm. The subject is "Osama bin Laden: Serpent or Hydra?". He reminded everyone that he had sent them an email regarding this.

VIII. Announcements

Next meeting: November 2, 3:00 p.m., DBH 216

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Dendy, Faculty Senate Secretary

SAMFORD UNIVERSITY

EFFECTIVE: 11/98

REVISED: 07/00 POLICY NUMBER 1.25 Page 1 of 2

APPLICABLE TO: All Units

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION: Vice President for Business Affairs

TITLE: Political Activity

Samford University, as a tax-exempt public charity described in Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3), is subject to certain restrictions regarding carrying on propaganda or attempting to influence legislation. Any employee anticipating engaging in such activities should first present a summary of such activities to the Vice President for Business Affairs, who may seek legal advice regarding the scope of allowable activities under the circumstances.

Samford University is also subject to certain restrictions regarding participation in political campaigns for public office. Section 501(c)(3) prohibits tax-exempt public charities from participating in, or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office. This restriction includes the publishing or distributing of statements on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.

Samford University, as an institution, does not normally take official positions on political, economic and social issues. The University adheres to a management philosophy that emphasizes high standards of ethics and morality. As a religious guide, it follows the Baptist Statement of Faith and Message of 1963, without amendment. The University seeks to reach out to all persons in a spirit of Christian civility and love, without condoning lifestyles and/or behavior inconsistent with Biblical Christianity.

This policy is not meant to interfere with an employee's own personal political activities.

Employees of Samford may fulfill their civic and political rights and responsibilities as private citizens by seeking and holding public office so long as they make it clear that they are acting in a private and individual capacity and that their activities have neither University sponsorship nor support.

When speaking or writing as a citizen, an employee should be free from institutional censorship or discipline. However, an employee should remember that the public may judge the profession and Samford University by his/her words and actions. Hence, the employee should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others and should make every effort not to be viewed as speaking for Samford University.

In writing "Letters to the Editors" and in making public statements as a citizen, employees are expected to exercise discretion and sensitivity in using the Samford University name. Such opinions should be clearly presented as the viewpoint of the employee acting as an individual. They should not be written on University stationery and the University address should not be used as an identification.

Any employee who anticipates seeking election to public office or accepting appointment to one must confer with the employee's immediate supervisor to explore the possibilities of conflict of interest or interference with the ability to devote sufficient time and energy to employment responsibilities. The supervisor should then forward a memo to the President, through appropriate reporting channels, which includes the following: 1) any conflict of interest anticipated or the belief that no conflict would exist, 2) recommended provisions if it appears that the office would interfere with the carrying out of the employee's University responsibilities.

Dividing the Faculty Handbook into University Policy and Faculty Policy & Information Sections

The goal is to re-organize the Faculty Handbook into two parts. The first part will be called the University Policy Manual (UPM) and it will contain all policies set by the Board of Trustees that govern faculty activities. The second part will be called the Faculty Policy and Information Manual (FPI) and it will contain policies and procedures which govern faculty activities that are set by the faculty. Furthermore, it will also contain information items that will be useful for faculty to know, but have no direct bearing on policies and procedures.

The main distinction is that the approval of the Trustees will be needed to change the University Policy Manual and the faculty will be able to change the Faculty Policy and Information Manual on its own. As you go through the handbook, think about what the Trustees would want to retain the right to approve. That is likely to belong in the University Policy Manual. On the other hand, think about policies that govern the day to day work of the faculty that faculty are in the best position to determine. These would go into the Faculty Policy and Information Manual. Think about policies that need to remain flexible in response to new or frequent developments, innovations, changes and constraints that faculty may encounter. Where it would be impractical or cumbersome to have the board act every time these policies need changing, that would be a candidate for the Faculty Policy and Information Manual. Included in this would be cases where accepted pedagogical practice is at odds with the current policy in the Faculty Handbook.

I would like each committee to submit recommendations well in advance of the Senate meeting so that all Senators may review them and give feedback. This will also allow Joe Lewis and Brad Creed to review the proposed changes and give us their input before the Senate meeting. Since they work most closely with the Trustees, their input will be valuable and probably save us a lot of time. Here are some specific guidelines for dividing up the current Handbook. You will see, though, that some decisions will require subjective judgments on the Senate's part.

- 1) Items that are informational only, and do not dictate procedures, operations and governance belong in the Faculty Policy and Information Manual.
- 2) If items do not refer to policies, procedures or governance directly affecting faculty, it belongs in the Faculty Policy and Information Manual.
- 3) Anything relating to the fundamental composition and structure of faculty governance goes into the University Policy Manual.
- 4) Any policies that affect the entire university belong in the University Policy Manual, except in cases where that policy is already listed in the Samford Policy Manual, e.g. salary and benefits. In those cases, see number 7).
- 5) Policies that are intended to be binding on faculty with few if any exceptions, that are unlikely to change from year to year, and that, if violated, would constitute a serious transgression, go in the University Policy Manual.
- 6) Policies and procedures that have to change quickly to match or adapt to the needs and constraints of reality belong in the Faculty Policy and Information Manual.

For example, the policy that faculty must give the final exam on the scheduled exam date goes in the University Policy Manual because it is intended to be a binding policy with only rare exceptions. The policy that states that final exams should be comprehensive goes in Faculty Policy and Information Manual because there are many cases where faculty do not give comprehensive final exams for legitimate reasons.

- 7) If the policy, procedure or operation is already listed in the Samford Policy Manual or the Catalog, it can be removed from the handbook altogether. This guideline is intended to reduce redundancy among the Handbook, Policy Manual and Catalog. I think it would be appropriate, though, to have a line indicating where the information is to be found.

The Samford Distinction

Students who attend Samford University recognize that it is not like other universities. There seems to be a uniqueness here, an obvious distinction that sets it apart from other colleges and universities, large or small, residential or commuter, public or private. What is that certain distinction that causes students to apply in record numbers, to love the years they spend here and hold their alma mater dear?

That distinction has many elements, but central is Samford's dedication to rigorous academic inquiry in a Christian setting. Samford seeks to nurture students to think and act in ways that reflect the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, to impact not only their college years, but the rest of their lives.

So what does it mean to be a Christian university?

That depends. Some Christian colleges aim to defend the faith, to protect students from moral evil and to be a shield against intellectual currents not consistent with Christian belief. Others identify themselves as Bible schools where young people study and plan for vocational church work. Still others seek to offer a standard college education in a quasi-moral atmosphere, unsure of what would make them Christian, and equally uncertain as to whether they want to be considered a Christian college or university. Their main claim may be that a religious denomination originally founded them. Not so at Samford, and here is why.

A climate that nurtures faith

Up to now, other people--parents, peers, teachers, ministers and friends, have shaped your beliefs and actions. You will continue to draw from their nurture; however, during your college years, you will begin to develop your own thinking, to strengthen and fine-tune your own convictions. Samford respects your God-given abilities, so you will be encouraged to think, reflect and reason. You will be challenged to weigh differing points of view and to arrive at your own conclusions and convictions. And all of this takes place in a community of Christ-centered values. It is a place where hundreds of students gather Tuesday nights at Quest, a weekly contemporary worship service. Chapel services, Christian lectureships, Bible study groups, community ministries and outreach teams are available. It is a community where faculty members show Christlike concern for your welfare and your personal growth. Samford seeks to create a university climate that is different from most--a climate of Christlike living.

Respectful dialogue versus dogmatic confrontation

Part of this Christlike living involves realizing that every person goes through different stages along a journey of faith, especially in college. Just as Jesus encountered and befriended individuals in various faith-stages, you will find people--students, faculty, staff--in different stages of spiritual growth on any university campus. In some Christian settings, people dismiss others whose beliefs are different. A Christlike community calls for people to meet others "where they are." At Samford, a lively witness is defined by respectful dialogue, not by dogmatic indoctrination. Respectful dialogue helps create authentic friendships that, when attention is turned to spiritual matters, provide opportunities for you to sharpen and even share your faith.

Who is responsible for my spiritual growth?

"It sounds like you place a lot of the responsibility for my spiritual growth on me." That's right! While Samford offers many opportunities for spiritual nurture--as many as any college in America--ultimate responsibility for your spiritual livelihood rests with you. Yes, we will seek to help you be all that God desires you to be; but in the end, it's between you and God. That's how it should be at a Christ-centered university. We respect your right and ability to choose whom you will serve and how you will serve. At Samford, you are encouraged both to celebrate this freedom and to act upon it--for each person is individually responsible to God for the way that freedom is used.

Mission embodies Samford distinction

Practicing your faith is openly encouraged, and faith is invited to interact with the inquiry of academia and the harsh realities of life. The distinction is a university where students are encouraged to think holistically, to reflect thoughtfully, to relate authentically and to serve lovingly, constantly striving to embrace those values that Jesus lived and taught. The Great Commandment that Jesus stated in twofold form is the foundation for Samford's educational philosophy: "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind; and love your neighbor as yourself." (Matthew 22:37-39)

COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS: RALPH GOLD

THERE WAS NOTHING DISCUSSED AT THE UNIV..ATHLETIC COMMITTEE ON THURS

SEPT.20TH THAT REQUIRED SENATE ACTION. THERE WAS DISCUSSION REGARDING: 1. THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS 2.THE ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE3.G.P.A.'S OF THE ATHLETES 4.GRADUATION RATES5.BETTER COMMUNICATION REGARDING THE ABSENCE OF CLASS TIME 6.CLASS ATTENDANCE FORMS7.STUDY HALL QUESTIONS 8.SCHOLARSHIP INEQUITY (4-FULLY FUNDED SPORTS) 9.DATES OF FURTHER MEETINGS.OCT..18,NOV.15,FEB.21,MAR.21,& APR.18TH.

RALPH GOLD,JR.
CHAIR ATHLETIC COMMITTEE

REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS, RELIGIOUS LIFE, AND UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (SARLUR)

The committee met on Tuesday 25 September 2001.

The committee's next meeting is Tuesday 23 October 2001.

I. Items Not Requiring Senate Action

SARLUR approved four new student organizations: Samford Water Ski Club, Swing Kids Club, College Democrats of Samford, and Student Athletic Advisory Committee.

The committee also set out an agenda for the year and created subcommittees to address a number of issues including proposing a policy on faculty resolutions and drafting a resolution on constitutional reform.

II. Items Requiring Senate Action

In response to the senate's referral, the committee moved that the senate make a policy on declarations made by the faculty as a whole that would include these three principles:

- 1) that supermajority be required;
- 2) that the declaration make it clear that the faculty do not speak for Samford as an Institution; and
- 3) that endorsing particular candidates or legislation be discouraged.

Further, the committee suggests/moves that the senate adopt language like:

"From time to time the faculty may feel it appropriate to make a declaration or other statements on issues of contemporary relevance. Special rules shall be 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. For example, resolutions may include phrases such as 'We, the faculty of Samford University, as citizens and educators, wish to voice our support/approbation for' The faculty are encouraged to avoid taking partisan positions or positions that may be easily construed as such."

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph Horn

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Report of meeting on Sept. 27, 2001

Proposal on midterm progress reports:

Resolved,

That faculty be required to provide midterm progress reports for all freshmen and all other students in 100-level courses. Faculty would assign a mark of "S" or "U" to each such student. An "S" would mean that the student is performing "A," "B," or "C" level work, while a "U" would mean that the student is performing "D" or "F" level work. This assignment of "S" or "U" can be done through the online grading module and will thus require no additional paperwork.

The Committee further recommends that the process begin in Spring 2002.

Action taken by committee requiring no Senate action

1) The committee approved a change in the application procedure for Faculty Development Grants. Each applicant is asked to submit one copy of the application containing the applicant's name and department (or school). The other fourteen copies of the application should be "blind"; that is, they should not contain the applicant's name and departmental or school affiliation, either on the cover sheet or in the discursive portions of the application itself.

This marks the first year that the committee has attempted blind submissions. We have decided to do this in an attempt to ensure the fairest and most level possible playing field for all applicants.

2) The committee rejected a student's request for a course overload.

Dates for future Academic Affairs Committee meetings this semester

The following dates for meetings this semester were approved:

Oct. 25

Nov. 15

Nov. 29

All meetings will begin at 3 p.m. in Divinity North 308.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Epley

Chair, Academic Affairs Committee