

MINUTES

Faculty Senate Meeting

March 1, 2002

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

Next University Faculty meeting May 16, 3:00 p.m., DBH Brock Forum

3:00 PM DBH 216

Dr. Stephen Chew, presiding

Prayer, Condit Steil

Senators present: **Officers:** Stephen Chew, Steve Ruble, Richard Dendy **Arts & Sciences:** Linda Ables, David Garza, Randolph Horn, Ginger Frost, Jane Hiles, Ellen McLaughlin, Sandra Willis, **Business:** Jennings Marshall, Tom Woolley, **Divinity: — Education:** David Finn, Ralph Gold, **Law:** Howard Walthall, **Performing Arts:** Randall Richardson, **Pharmacy:** Roger Lander, Kimberly Benner, Marshall Cates, Condit Steil, **Nursing:** Rebecca Warr, Gretchen McDaniel, Darlene Mathis, **Library:** Elizabeth Wells

Committee chairs present: **Committee on University Curriculum — Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare:** David Little **Committee on University Learning Resource — 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 —**

Also present were Brad Creed and Bill Mathews

I. Approval of minutes

The chair reminded everyone that the slides pertaining to the data for the Faculty Opinion Survey could be found on the web. Motion to approve the minutes of the February 1st senate meeting. Motion seconded. Minutes approved.

II Handicap Access: Bill Mathews (see page 3)

III. Committee Reports

A. Committee on University Curriculum: Jeanie Box

David Little announced that the next meeting will take place Tuesday, March 19 at 10 am. Curriculum reports revisions should be submitted by March 11. Forms for submitting curricular changes can be found on the Samford home page under Working at Samford — Forms.

B. Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare: David Little (See pages 4 and 5)

C. Committee on University Learning Resources: Tim Banks No Report.

D. Committee on Elections: Tina Duffey

E. Committee on Athletics: Ralph Gold (see page 6)

F. Committee on Students Affairs, Religious Life, and University Relations: Randolph Horn (see pages 7 and 8)

H. Committee on Academic Affairs: Steven Epley Report presented by Greg Jeane. (See pages 9 and 10)

IV. Old Business

Gender Equity: Sandra Willis (See pages 11-13)

A motion was made to adjourn at 5:15 p.m. The motion was seconded and passed.

Handicap Access: Bill Mathews (see page 3)

Comments from Stephen: Due to the necessity to relocate classes and make appropriate accommodations for the handicapped on campus, it was felt that this was an issue which should be discussed in the Senate.

Comments from Bill: The policy of the University is to try to address issues as buildings are renovated. Russell Hall will next be addressed, then Brooks Hall. We are addressing individual situations if feasible. The University was built on a hill before ADA and accessibility, as a result is limited. It is very difficult and expensive to retrofit. Marcia Hamby and Kathleen Troiano provide information regarding access problems. If you know of any specific problems, I would be happy to entertain possibilities for solutions.

Question; Which buildings on campus are fully accessible?

Reply: The Science Center.

Question: Is there a requirement or plan to bring the other buildings up to code?

Reply: When major renovation occurs, the University is required to bring that building up to code. We have done renovations that don't meet code — Homewood or ADA. Interim measures are taken for accessibility, but meeting code is not required. When we renovate we will bring the building up to code. DBH has been adjusted without meeting code.

Question: Is there any way to provide a floor of access?

Reply: We try to make adjustments as problems are brought to light. We can't just set about to renovate buildings or floors. It is too expensive.

Comments: If you never find out about shifting classes then you can't respond to the need.

Reply: Are we shifting classes due to access? Some, but others, no. It isn't only wheel chair access. Classes may need to shift to accommodate a blind or deaf student. If you know of a problem, run it by me, I have to rely on Marcia Hamby and Kathleen Troiano

Question: Should I go to Marcia with a problem?

Reply: Its up to you. I'm happy to work with faculty.

Question: For large public gatherings such as those at the Law School's Moot Court, access is just not viable. The stage at the chapel is not accessible. Can we make an effort to provide access to all publicly attended areas. This can be embarrassing.

Reply: We do deal with that. For access to a restroom in Wright Center one would have to leave the building to access the restrooms. This building, even with this difficult requirement, is up to code. We have to figure out where, on the east side, we can fit a bathroom for indoor access. We have remodeled the elevator in the Student Center even though the old elevator met code. The new one is larger. We weren't required to make a new one, but we did it anyway. A number of buildings meet old, but not new code. They are grandfathered in. when new codes are enacted.

Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare: David Little

Proposal#1

It is recommended by the business affairs and faculty welfare committee of Samford University that the university senate make the following changes in the tuition benefit program.

The tuition benefit program currently offered to Samford University and staff be expanded to include:

*Retired faculty

*The spouse and children of retired faculty

(except those children adopted within 5 years prior to retirement)

*The children of deceased faculty and staff who were eligible for the benefit at the time of their death

David encouraged approval of the proposals so that they might be sent to the President and the Trustees.

A motion was made for approval of Proposal #1: Tuition Benefit Program changes.

Discussion: Question: Shouldn't this read at the time of the parent's death?

Proposal's third revision was amended to read "The children of deceased faculty and staff who are eligible for the benefit at the time of the death of the eligible employee.

Comment: I'm concerned about the distinction between biological and adopted children.

Comment: Suppose the parents died and the children were adopted by the grandparents? Shouldn't the benefit remain?

Comment: Exceptions can be made as with any policy.

Comment: I don't understand the idea that someone might adopt for the sake of a free education.

Question: If a family has a child, is the child eligible?

Reply: No

Comment: Our mission is to families.

Question: This is family leave. Why make a distinction here?

Reply: To prevent abuse.

Comment: I'm sure the committee would be very happy to amend this section.

Motion to amend by deleting the section of the second revision. Question Comments: Motion carries

Question: Aren't the benefits the same for faculty and staff? This should be faculty and staff.

Any comments?

Question: Is this retroactive to faculty who have already retired?

Reply: No, this will take affect now, and will affect those currently working at Samford.

Question: Are adopted children currently covered?

Reply: Yes. Many have attended and graduated from Samford.

Those in favor of the motion as amended?

Proposal#1

It is recommended by the business affairs and faculty welfare committee of Samford University that the university senate make the following changes in the tuition benefit program.

The tuition benefit program currently offered to Samford University and staff be expanded to include:

*Retired faculty

*The spouse and children of retired faculty

*The children of deceased faculty and staff who are eligible for the benefit at the time of the death of the eligible employee.

Motion passes.

Proposal #2;

It is recommended by the business affairs and faculty welfare committee of Samford University that the university senate make the following changes in the family and medical leave policy, number 3.22.

Tenure track faculty with absences of a semester or more covered by the Family and Medical Leave policy shall be eligible for an additional year to qualify for -tenure for each 12-month period that the employee had absences covered by the Family and Medical Leave policy.

Recommended change: Tenure track faculty with absences of six consecutive weeks or more covered by the Family and Medical Leave policy shall have the prerogative for an additional year to qualify for tenure with two years maximum allowed for extension.

Question: What is the rationale for this proposal?

Reply: This would provide a one year extension for those who may have been ill during a period critical to tenure review.

Comment: This would be his or her initiative. This could make the tenure review period eight to nine years instead of the defacto seven year period.

Question: Why consecutive weeks? Couldn't six non-consecutive weeks be more disruptive?

Comment: Would total be better than consecutive?

Comment: This lends itself to maternity rather than elder care. If we are forward looking there soon will be more parents requiring care than children. I suggest we change this to read six weeks within the academic year.

Comment: There is the problem then with leave over two consecutive academic years. suggest twelve month rather than academic year. The beginning date of the period would be determined by the leave itself.

Comment: Tenure policy states that, for those seeking early tenure, that person should not be held to a higher standard. I recommend that the policy state that a person with an extended tenure review period, due to family leave, should not be held to a higher standard.

Motion to table for further review by the Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare. Motion to table seconded and approved.

COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

5.

This committee exists, with assistance from the senior administrative athletics staff, to provide support in the external oversight and monitoring of the integrity of the intercollegiate athletics department in conjunction with the mission of the University.

The committee shall function as an intermediary communicating body, linking the Samford community of faculty, staff and student body in conjunction with the athletics department. Specifically, but not limited to, the committee will review policies and make recommendations relative to intercollegiate athletics in the following areas:•

Fiscal Integrity - Budget and Financial Planning - Athletic Building Plans

- Personnel –Active participation in the screening, interviewing and recommendation process of head coaching positions.
- Governance and Compliance - Participation in and oversight of secondary violations and rules infractions - Institutional judicial issues and student athlete values violations
- Academic Integrity – Review and oversight of:
 - Institutional admissions procedures and graduation rates
 - Academic Support Programs, Academic-Enhancement Program (AEP)
 - Missed class/absence policy for student athletes
 - Academic achievement and recognition of student athletes
- Student Athlete Welfare Issues – Review and oversight of:
 - Playing and practice seasons
 - CHAMPS/Life Skills Program
 - Gender/minority concerns
 - Emphasis on sportsmanship
- Composition:
 - Faculty:

Arts and Sciences (1)	Education (1)	Performing Arts (1)	Law (1)	Nursing (1)
Business (1)	Library (1)	Pharmacy (1)	Divinity(1)	
University NCAA Representative (1)				

Ex-Officio (non-voting)

Athletic Director

Associate Athletic Director (Compliance)

Representative from the Faculty Senate

Student

Total: 10 voting; 4 non-voting

In December the Committee on Athletics voted to change its current mission statement. The committee felt it was not adequately involved in certain critical decision and policy making processes. After review by the Senate, recommendations were made to specific language. The amended mission statement now reads as follows:

Motion to approve. Discussion:

Question: Regarding the statement specific to new personnel, is an active role in hiring implicit?

Reply: the committee should take an active role in hiring.

Question: Does this mean the committee makes recommendation for hiring?

Reply: We don't hire. We are just part of the process..

Motion approved.

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

The committee met 19 February 2002 at 3:00

The next meeting is 19 March at 3:00.

I. Items Not Requiring Senate Action:

Following a presentation by Jennifer Dunn on the need to suspend the Service-Learning for Convocation Credit program for evaluation, the committee recommended to her that the option be retained for graduating seniors during the suspension and that fall would be the better semester for a suspension.

II. Items Requiring Senate Action

A. SARLUR Committee Recommendation on The Samford Distinction

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

The placement of "The Samford Distinction" on the web site and its use by University offices indicates that its audience consists of prospective students and other visitors. Far from a creedal statement, it does provide an example of a type of dialog students may encounter here. The faculty should not move to revise, endorse, or strike the "The Samford Distinction." The committee wishes to reinforce that the document's title is "The Samford Distinction" and not "The Faith and Values Statement," which is laden with expectations of a confessional statement. Without implying a desire to direct or propose specific revisions, the committee encourages and invites the author(s) to consider strengthening the expression on academic freedom in future versions.

B. SARLUR Recommendation on Recognition of Retiring Faculty

1. Each retiring faculty member will be recognized at the December or May graduation ceremony. Faculty members retiring in August will be recognized at the May graduation.

2. A dinner for retiring faculty and their families will be held each spring. All retirees will be personally recognized by the appropriate Department Chair, Dean or Provost with a short biography of their time at Samford. The invitation to the dinner hosted by the University will include all current faculty.

3. A retirement committee representing members of the administration and faculty will plan the dinner each year. The committee will be composed of:

Two representatives from University Relations, one serving as chair Chair, Student Affairs Religious Life University Relations Committee One additional committee member from SARLUR Two senators Ex-officio: Provost President of the Senate

4. Each retiree will be given an identical gift symbolic of Samford University at the retirement dinner.

NB: Retiring faculty is defined per policy number 3.11.

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph Horn

Current (March 1st) discussion:

The faculty should not move to revise, endorse, or strike the "The Samford Distinction." The committee wishes to reinforce that the document's title is "The Samford Distinction" and not "The Faith and Values Statement," which is laden with expectations of a confessional statement. Without implying a desire to direct or propose specific revisions, the committee encourages and invites the author(s) to consider strengthening the expression on academic freedom in future versions.

As requested, the senate did not act upon this.

Randolph thanked the committee and the subcommittee for their work pertaining to this retirement issue.

Discussion:

Comment: I think there should be a distinction made at the dinner for years of service. Members of the faculty who have served served Samford for 40 years or more will be retiring this year. This should be distinguished. I believe a biography should be read.

Reply: The Committee felt that there were other venues for specifying years of service. Departments are, upon request given an amount of money specific to years served.

Question: How would one determine what constitutes a distinguished period of service? What would be the determining number of years for not recognizing some faculty while recognizing others at this dinner?

Comment: from the Chair: I sense there is enough concern regarding this issue that I make a motion to table for further discussion among the committee and for the next senate meeting. I recommend that Jennings and I work with the committee to find some means for providing an appropriate award at the retirement ceremony.

Question: Does the person receive money?

Reply: Monetary gifts are awarded at the service luncheon. Gifts may be purchased with the money, or money may be given.

Comment: Large gifts would not be given at the dinner. there would be no large , physical gifts awarded at the dinner. This provides avenues for awards in addition to our current policy. There are three venues for recognition in place: the retirement dinner, service awards luncheon, and departmental recognition.

Question: Who will ultimately deal with this?

Reply: We should leave this to administration.

Comment: Since there was a call for review of this issue by administration, it would be assumed that they would find revisions favorable, however budget problems might preclude a change.

A motion was made to send the proposal back to SAMLUR for further discussion and presentation at the next senate meeting. Motion was seconded and approved.

The academic Affairs Committee in its regularly scheduled meeting of 14 February 2002 submits the following two recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Senate:

1. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the mid-term progress reports policy be expanded to include both 100- and 200-level courses.
2. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the last day to withdraw from a course without academic penalty be extended from the 30th to the 35th day of the semester.

Question: Some faculty may teach only 200 level courses. This seems like a great deal of extra time which must be directed to providing midterm evaluations. How about a “no new is good news” policy? If a student isn’t informed that he or she is failing then they know that they are passing?

Question: 200 is the lowest level I teach, so I don’t know the particulars of this process. Would 100 get a grade sheet and then submit it through CICS? Do you do this through campus pipeline, do it online?

Reply: Yes, online.

Comment: It is a big deal. If you have two sections participation is quite extensive.

Reply: Ten percent or more of grade. If a student has no substantial grade at all, he or she has no idea of how well they are doing. Students are simply asking for some measure to make a decision. There is need to know.

Comment: With regard to Web CT Grading, the problem should take care of itself. Students have access to grades at any time.

Reply: If the faculty provide grades in a timely fashion.

Comment: I don’t know if this is going to solve this.

Comment: You would put on Campus Pipeline a pass or fail grade.

Comment: if your 200 level classes are based upon clinical experience, There may be no grade to give.

Response: There is nothing at the end of 7 weeks or midterm to provide assessment?

Question: Is the primary purpose of the drop policy to avoid a bad grade? If so this seems misguided.

Reply: The initial drop period of ten days should be considered a shopping period to determine compatibility and desire to take a course. the withdrawal does show up on the student’s record, so one could see if a student had a habit of withdrawing.

Question: Does it show up as WP or WS?

Reply: No. Just W.

Comment: For someone who teaches only 100 and 200 level courses for their full 3 course load, this is a great deal of work.

Reply: I will be teaching all 200 level classes and I think we owe it too our students to provide them with a midterm assessment.

Comment: When we fill out a form, there is nothing binding that would make us differentiate. You could put S on all , and think, I’ve done nothing wrong.

Reply: Perhaps not legally, but perhaps morally.

Question: can we just put it in the student’s hands? If they request a grade then we provide one.

Comment: I worry about the legal implications of telling a student they are passing and then they fail the course.

Comment: Students are not getting feedback. this is a real problem.

Comment: Policy should be in place that requires feedback already. Shouldn’t the department chairs and faculty, by evaluation, be aware of the student’s concern that they are not being evaluated on a timely basis? Shouldn’t the department chairs be handling this problem?

Comment: this policy wouldn’t necessarily fix this problem of evaluation, but it might make the faculty legally culpable.

Comments: This could increase the withdrawal rate.

Comment: What I hear requested from students, even after evaluation, is some reassurance of how well they will do, which is entirely different from this evaluation. Predicting how a student will eventually fare cannot be done. Only the student can ultimately determine how well he or she will do.

Comment: It becomes increasingly critical that it is clearly stated in the syllabus that the student is responsible for his or her grade, and calculation of that grade according to clearly defined

guidelines. This may be more time than is necessary, to do what the students should be doing themselves.

Motion to return the motion to committee.

Comment: Some action on this would be a very good gesture to the SG. There is a perception that the faculty do not care about this issue. I think we can go ahead and revisit this, but I want to encourage everyone to address this issue.

Comment: Most are returning grades in a timely fashion. A few may not be. We need to address the issue of those not returning evaluations on a timely basis.

Motion to table seconded.

Point of order.

A vote was taken for those opposing tabling and those supporting.

The motion to table passed.

The vote to table the mid-term grade proposal was 10-8.

Gender Equity: Sandra Willis

Faculty Senate:

Last year the Faculty Senate Executive Council had a charge to examine gender equity issues. Though many of you were Senators last year and most likely remember these events well, I'd like to provide a recap in preparation for our meeting tomorrow:

From the minutes of October 2000:

Paul Blanchard reported that an original report on the Status of Women published in 1992 recommended that there should be an annual review of gender issues, including faculty salaries, rates of promotion and tenure, and hiring practices. Ellen McLaughlin reported that the last data collected was in the 1995-96 academic year. She suggested that current data should be acquired to determine what progress has been made since the last report. Concern was expressed that the Women's Advisory Council hasn't met for several years and that its existence isn't widely known. A motion was made to have the executive council meet with the provost to discuss reconsideration of the issue. The motion was passed unanimously.

The Executive Council, Hugh Floyd, Bill Raabe, George Keller, Becky Hutto and I, met with Joe in early December to request release of faculty statistics for our review. He said he would consider our request, although he expressed concern about the constraints of the pending lawsuit. It did not appear favorable that he would be able to release this information.

Hugh asked me to continue working with Joe on this matter, and within the council and senate, we discussed the need to gauge the opinion of faculty women.

In following up with Joe in January, he mentioned the need to meet with legal advisors to find out what format they recommended for releasing information. In the meantime, he recommended previously published sources (Academe and CUPA) of Samford data.

from the Minutes of Feb 2001 meeting:

Sandra Willis reported on reactivating Women's Advisory Council. The Senate Executive Council met with Joe Lewis about gathering data on hiring and salaries. Dr. Lewis stated that data are released to two organizations (AAUP and CUPA) that have different reporting criteria and, therefore, the statistics are difficult to compare without compromising the privacy of individual faculty members. The Executive Council will approach the existing Women's Advisory committee to determine whether the committee should continue to operate or whether a new committee should be appointed by the Faculty Senate Chair.

I met with some women faculty members, spoke with others by phone who expressed their support for reactivating and maintaining the Women's Advisory Council and for the regular monitoring of equity issues. Women were interested not only in salary and T&P equity, also in matters of campus climate. Many women were reluctant to discuss these matters openly (not unlike the reluctance to respond to the Faculty Opinion Survey).

From the minutes of the March 2001 Senate meeting:

Report on gender issues

Sandra Willis gave an update on gender issues. She reported that faculty women show clear and strong interest in reactivation of the Women's Advisory council and would like this group to have a twofold purpose.

1) Examine concerns about campus "climate" for both women students and faculty: visibility, acknowledgment, of women's activities, and more opportunities for leadership.

2) Although there is no presumption of widespread and consistent inequity across campus, there are concerns about pockets of inequity in tenure status and salary, and it is important to monitor these statistics annually.

Statistics should include:

a) average salary by gender and rank between and within schools/colleges

b) average salary by gender and rank between departments

c) tenure status by gender and rank between and within schools/colleges.

The Senate Executive Council will work with the Provost to obtain the appropriate data.

A parallel concern is the possible need for more benchmark comparisons with other universities of similar size and mission with respect to salaries, number of faculty within departments, and annual salary increases. This concern should be addressed by the Committee on Business Affairs and Faculty Welfare.

Although the provost was generally supportive and was helpful in providing references for sources of previously published data, he was not able to provide us access to information that could be analyzed as I described above in the March report. Apparently, the main obstacle was the pending lawsuit.

A number of faculty members have expressed to me that it's time for the Senate to address this issue once again. The lawsuit has been settled and matters of gender equity continue to be of concern to faculty.

Current (March 1st) discussion regarding Gender Equity:

Comment: There seem to be different issues here: 1. environment, and 2. salary and rank. If all faculty in an environment are paid too little then this is a problem that should be addressed not as a gender equity issue, but through regular salary studies.

Reply: I think this is extremely important.

Response: This issue has been to Faculty Welfare, and the results were ineffective. We need to quit pushing this off.

Comment: We need someone to take this to administration. Faculty Senate should approach administration with a request for current data.

Response: We could vote over email to appoint an ad hoc committee.

Reply: No.

Response: This item should be put at the top of the April senate agenda. The senate should then request current data and establish a procedure for evaluating equity issues on a regular basis.

Reply: There is a standing committee for annual reviews.

Reply: A task force should be established to examine the status of women on campus. Ellen presented this material ten years ago. This has been a concern for ten years.

Comment: I strongly recommend that climate and equity issues be tracked > efforts have fallen apart. It would be good to get them back on track.

Question: Wasn't there an interim review?

Reply: the last data received was for 95-96.

Comment: Let's keep track of age issues along with gender statistics.

Question: Could data be made available?

Reply: Confidentiality is a concern.

Comment: The environment is as great a concern as that of salary and equity issues. The students on this campus view women differently from men. There is a misogynous attitude here. Regarding the racially biased poster incident, there was never any mention of the misogynous content.

A Motion to recommend to faculty welfare was made.

Discussion:

Comment: We must gather for specific data. This data cannot be aggregate. you must divide the data up within colleges and departments.

Question? Can we compare our data to external benchmark data?

Comment: As a department chair i have worked with twenty two females and five males for the past six or seven years. it is important that the university community show that it supports all regardless of gender> We have lost some exceptional talent because we didn't do enough to support gender equity.

Motion: There is a motion on the floor to send this to Faculty Welfare and request that they report back to the senate at the next senate meeting.

Motion was seconded and approved

Question: Can we make a friendly amendment?

Reply: No. There can be a second motion.

Question? Who gave the charge to pursue the last inquiry?

Reply: Dr. Hull sent a list of salaries by gender, school, and rank. Often there was only one person in a rank so there was a concern that confidentiality would be lost.

Comment: State schools just publish this information and make it accessible to the public. Why is it so secretive here?

A second motion was made:

Since the lawsuit was settled this year can we make a motion to ask to receive data requested last year regarding salary and gender issues?

Motion : Since the trial is over and since that was the reason given for not releasing the data requested last year by the Senate, that we again request at the administration respond to that request for salary data by gender and school etc. that was sought last year by the senate.

Motion was seconded and approved

Question: Is there another avenue for investigating the climate of gender equity?

Comment: The discussion of climate is properly placed under Faculty Welfare or Academic Affairs.

Response: Isn't this a broader issue than faculty? Perhaps we should form an ad hoc committee on diversity.

Reply: The Women's Advisory Council was the previous committee. It gave over its responsibilities to the senate and it disappeared.

Reply: I believe it still exists.

See page 2 for adjournment.