Minutes of
THE FACULTY SENATE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The Faculty Senate met Tuesday, May 3, 2011, at 3 p.m. in Room 325 of the Ross Pendergraft Library and Technology Center. The following members were present:

Dr. Michael Garner    Dr. Cathi McMahan
Dr. Dan Bullock       Mr. David Mudrinich
Dr. Eric Lovely       Dr. Susan Underwood
Dr. Linda Bean        Dr. Thomas Limperis
Dr. Alex Mirkovic     Dr. Robin Lasey
Dr. David Eshelman    Ms. Annette Stuckey
Dr. V. Carole Smith   Mr. Ken Futterer
Dr. Jennifer Helms

Dr. James Walton, Dr. Penny Willmering, and Dr. Gill Richards were absent.

CALL TO ORDER
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

President Bean called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the April 12, 2011, meeting.

Motion by Dr. Smith, seconded by Dr. Lovely, to approve the minutes as distributed. Motion carried.

Motion by Dr. Garner, seconded by Mr. Futterer, to add discussion on upgrading Blackboard to the agenda under New Business. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT/ACTION ON REVIEW OF FUNCTION OF FACULTY, SALARY, BENEFITS, AND AWARDS COMMITTEE

President Bean asked Mr. Futterer for a report. Mr. Futterer advised he and Dr. Watson had met to discuss a revised function for the Faculty Salary, Benefits, and Awards Committee.

Proposed Function (distributed and amended at the March 8, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting):
Review and recommend university wide salary issues, recommend institutional research grants, academic leaves and sabbaticals, establish criteria for and recommend award of emeritus rank, in combination with immediate past recipients recommend outstanding faculty awards, forward recommendations to Faculty Senate for consideration prior to transmittal to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Mr. Futterer stated Dr. Watson was in general agreement with much of the proposed wording but had noted a few areas where issues would need to be resolved. Currently, the institutional research grants are considered by this committee and to subject those to review also by the Senate would potentially slow this process. Emeritus awards are currently under the purview of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. Mr. Futterer noted that additional work on the wording needed to take place and asked for assistance. Dr. Lovely volunteered to help. Mr. Futterer stated he would try to have modified wording by the August or September meeting.

Additionally, Mr. Futterer distributed a proposed rewrite and realignment of the description of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Appeals section in the Faculty Handbook, page 34 (2010 revision).
Motion by Mr. Futterer, seconded by Dr. Lovely, to approve the rewrite and move the description of this committee to the Appointed Standing Committees’ section of the Faculty Handbook. Motion carried.

Mr. Futterer noted that moving Item F to the Appeals section of the promotion and tenure policy would necessitate some minor wording changes.

Motion by Mr. Futterer, seconded by Dr. Helms, to move Item F from the description section of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Appeals section and make the wording changes. Motion carried.

(see attached)

President Bean recognized Dr. Lovely for a report. Dr. Lovely indicated the subcommittee had not been able to meet but would have a report for the fall. Dr. Lovely asked that the motion tabled from the April meeting now be acted upon and read the tabled motion:

Faculty teaching courses which have multiple sections are encouraged to adopt a common text. However, no faculty member should be compelled to adopt a text not of his/her choice.

As the motion had been previously seconded by Dr. Lasey, President Bean called for a vote. Motion carried.

Dr. Lovely explained that his motion does not mean that any faculty can pick any textbook they choose; it means that the department head cannot compel the faculty member to use a book they do not want to use. The faculty member would instead be able to use supplementary materials. Dr. Helms observed that now she had heard his explanation of his motion she better understood the motion’s intent, but expressed her concern that the motion may be misunderstood. Dr. Lovely stated the motion is a “stopgap” measure and indicated his hope that the subcommittee will be able to formulate a more reasonable policy.

Dr. Smith noted that if there are some departmental issues relating to selection of textbooks, perhaps due to a department head’s interpretation of the policy, then the Senate may not be able to resolve those issues.

Dr. Garner asked that the subcommittee consider suggesting that the policy be amended to allow faculty in certain circumstances to be able to pick their own texts, particularly in senior-level and graduate courses. Dr. Bullock reminded the Senators that the policy does not apply to graduate courses.

NEW BUSINESS:

EMERGENCY PROCEDURES VIDEO

President Bean reported that Dr. Biller had not been able to attend today’s meeting.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION WITH SGA IN FALL

President Bean asked for any topics for discussion with the Student Government Association in the fall. Dr. Mirkovic noted that the SGA elections are not yet complete and several positions on the SGA have not been filled. He asked that this item be postponed until fall.

BLACKBOARD UPGRADE

President Bean asked Dr. Garner for comments. He noted that 1,000 additional new students are expected for fall due to the eTech initiative. At a luncheon held earlier today, Dr. Garner stated there was discussion of an assessment and statistical tool upgrade to
Blackboard which could assist faculty teaching the eTech courses. Faculty attending the luncheon had asked that the Senate endorse purchase of the upgrade.

Motion by Dr. Garner, seconded by Dr. Mirkovic, to endorse purchase of the described upgrade.

Several indicated concern with endorsing purchase of a product about which they had no knowledge of cost or function.

Motion failed.

President Bean referenced a colleague questioning the inability to borrow monies from his retirement funds to use to make a down payment on his home. She stated that the faculty member had been told this was university policy. Mr. Futterer noted that he knew those funds could not be accessed until retirement but did not know if it was a law or university policy. President Bean stated she believed it was university policy but was not certain. Mr. Futterer stated the Senate should look at this issue since it was brought to the Senate’s attention. Dr. Smith (chair-elect) indicated Mr. Moseley might be the appropriate person to address questions to relating to the policy and stated she would invite him to speak at the September meeting.

President Bean asked Mr. Mudrinich for comments. Mr. Mudrinich noted several questions by faculty in his department relating to special problem courses. He stated he had first questioned whether faculty not teaching in the summer could supervise a special problem course during the summer and had been told by Academic Affairs that this was not an issue and was common practice.

Mr. Mudrinich asked if any department compensated faculty by workload assignment for supervising special problem courses. None were indicated. He stated that in his department the faculty supervised several special problem courses each term. A question arose concerning whether the AAUP had conducted a survey a few years ago relating to this topic. Dr. Lovely stated he would check on that and asked that this topic be included on the August agenda.

President Bean asked for items for discussion. Dr. Eshelman asked that discussion of the textbook policy be put on the September agenda.

Dr. Lovely asked that the August agenda include discussion on faculty committees and chairs.

Dr. Mirkovic thanked President Bean for her service.

President Bean expressed her appreciation to the Senators for their “professionalism, collaboration, and cooperation” during this academic year.

President Bean announced that the August meeting would most likely be held on August 22, 2011, at noon and that the regular monthly meetings would be the second Tuesday of the month at 3 p.m.

A discussion with Dr. Watson on the issue raised in April concerning promotion/tenure and years of credit will be held in the fall.
ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda C. Bean, Ed.D., President

Alexander Mirkovic, Ph.D., Secretary
Promotion and Tenure Committee Move and Alignment

(NOTE: Paragraphs A and C were changed, F was relocated to the Appeals section. No changes to B, D and E.)

University Promotion and Tenure Committee

Replace paragraph A with:

A. Membership: The University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) shall consist of seven members. One faculty member appointed from each college including the supernumerary voting block and one additional member selected on an at-large basis from the eligible faculty of each college including the supernumerary voting block and the library.

Replace paragraph C with:

C. Four members of the UPTC shall be appointed by the chair of the Faculty Senate with its advice and consent, and three members shall be appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Appointments shall be for three years. The Faculty Senate Chair shall have first choice in the appointment process, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be responsible for appointing the at-large position.

(NOTE: Appeals is changed by adding paragraph F from the P&T committee description, and of rearranging the original paragraph plus the phrase "or committee".)

Appeals

Appeals of promotion and tenure decisions may be made utilizing either of the two following processes.

A. Appeals to the individual or committee responsible at the next level.

1. If at any step in the promotion procedure the applicant does not receive a favorable recommendation, he/she may submit an appeal statement rebutting reported deficiencies to the individual or committee responsible for making a recommendation at the next level. The faculty shall submit the statement within ten working days of notification of an unfavorable recommendation. The faculty member may withdraw his/her application at any time.

B. Appeals made to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Appeals of promotion and tenure decisions may be made to the Faculty Welfare Committee only under the following two conditions and prior to recommendations being acted upon by the President:

1. The faculty member's appeal is a claim that a promotion and tenure policies process was not followed at a specified level of review.

2. The faculty member's appeal is a claim that evidence which had been presented in a timely manner was not considered at a specified level of review.

If the Faculty Welfare Committee finds an error has been made, the application will be returned to the process at the point where the error occurred. In no instance should the Faculty Welfare Committee substitute its judgment for the judgments made by the parties in the process.