

# TSU FACULTY SENATE MEETING

4 Nov. 2010

## Minutes

Howard Beeth, Secretary

**Members Present:** Edieth Wu (Chair); Lalita Sen (Vice Chair); Howard Beeth (Secretary); Rasoul Saneifard (Treasurer); Alexis Brooks de Vita (Editor, *The Faculty Speaks*); Thorpe Butler (COLABS); Robert Ford (COST); Daniel Georges-Abeyie (SOPA); Doris Jackson (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Anna James (TMSL); Wei Li (COST); Emlyn Norman (COLABS); Byron Price (Graduate School); Andrea Shelton (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Sara White (COLABS); Zivar Yousefipour (Pharmacy & Health Sciences). **Total: 16.**

**Members Absent:** C.J. Tymczak (Parliamentarian); Demetrius Kazakos (Asst. Secretary); Macaulay Akpaffiong (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Kiran Chilakamarri (COST); Mammo Woldie (Business). **Total: 5.**

**Guests:** Dr. James Opolot (School of Public Affairs), Ms. Demetria J. Weeks (Director of Title III, Office of Sponsored Research)

## Agenda Items

### Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10p when a sufficient number of Senators finally arrived to create a quorum. She immediately introduced Ms. Isoke Frank-Williams, the newly hired staff person for the Faculty Assembly/Senate, who was warmly welcomed, as well as an invited guest, Ms. Demetria Weeks, Director of Title III, Office of Sponsored Research, who proceeded to describe the review process for Title III proposals.

Ms. Weeks said the eight or nine forms that applicants must complete for Title III proposals are all available on the university website. Completed proposals must be aligned with the strategic plan and priorities of our university to be considered for approval. Proposals are routed up the

chain of command via department chairs and college deans to Provost Ohia, who sends them for review to Ms. Weeks, who in turn forwards compliant ones to President Rudley for final review. Ms. Weeks stressed that proposals can be stopped at any point during the review process.

Ms. Weeks' presentation was followed by discussion. Vice Chair Sen raised some issues concerning grant applications from the School of Public Affairs that were disallowed because of eligibility issues, and agreed with Ms. Weeks to prepare a justification statement in defense of her School's proposals. Other Senate members complained to Ms. Weeks about the failure to notify applicants about the progress or failure of their applications. Senator Brooks de Vita and Dr. James Opolot, a visitor, stressed the importance of creating a policy that provided applicants with feedback on their applications. Both made the case that if applicants spend time and effort on lengthy applications, they need feedback in order to learn from their endeavor. Ms. Weeks agreed that it would be a good idea for applicants to be notified at each level of the review process. The Chair suggested that it would be appropriate to bring up the possibility of establishing a notification system for Title III at a future Deans' Council meeting.

Following this discussion, the Senate thanked Ms. Weeks for her informative presentation.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Secretary Beeth distributed draft copies of the Senate's October 2010 meeting to Senators which they approved as submitted.

### **Senate Networking vs. Non-Networking**

Secretary Beeth suggested that historically the Senate did not network, communicate, or coordinate its activities with other, similar campus organizations such as the Student Government Association or the Staff Association. He said it might increase the effectiveness of all if they exchanged observers in each other's meetings. He proposed that Senators think about the possibility of networking in this way with these groups and discuss it at greater length at next month's meeting. Senator Georges-Abeyie agreed that the idea was an interesting and important one but cautioned that it involved problematic issues of academic freedom. Senator Ford agreed, noting that the issue of confidentiality was also involved. The Senate moved further discussion of possible networking to the next meeting.

### **A Long-Range Plan for Increasing the Senate's Functionality**

Secretary Beeth proposed that the Senate's ability to function has been hampered, especially in recent years, by not having a permanent or adequate space in which to conduct its business. He recalled that the Senate's former location in the old President's home at the corner of Cleburne and Tierwester was neglected by the university to the degree that it became infested with termites, was declared unsafe for further use, and subsequently torn down. He said that other important campus organizations also had space problems. His suggestion: that the Senate

recommend that our university commit to a dedicated building permanently to house the offices of the Faculty Assembly/Senate, the Staff Association, the Student Government, and the Office of Alumni Relations. This would provide a stable, adequate space for all four important organizations. However, Senator Price doubted the feasibility of such a request, and Senator Norman reminded the Senate that the site of the Senate's former headquarters in the old President's house at the corner of Cleburne and Tierwester is supposed to be the site of a new headquarters for the Assembly/Senate. The Chair added that there was university master plan for building and that a long process was required to become part of it and for actual construction to result. Beeth agreed, saying that he was just proposing a long range idea for resolving an important, basic problem to the Senate for further discussion at next month's meeting.

While he had the floor, Secretary Beeth went on to report the success that Senators Brooks de Vita, Butler, and he had had with convincing Provost Ohia to allow faculty to use either the 2002 *Faculty Manual* regulations or those in the proposed 2010 revision of the *Manual* in the preparation of their current tenure/promotion applications. Beeth reported that the provost was attentive and cooperative in resolving the issue. However, Senator James complained forcefully that the committee had exceeded its authority by not, as agreed, informing other Senators of the progress of the negotiations as it occurred so that they also could participate in deliberations. In defense of the subcommittee's behavior, Senator Brooks de Vita responded that the amount of back-and-forth correspondence with the Provost precluded wider participation by nearly twenty additional people, and Secretary Beeth added that the short deadline for tenure/promotion applications (Oct. 20<sup>th</sup>) further precluded such time consuming participation. While the Chair agreed with Senator James that the committee violated agreed-upon procedure, she said that since it was a done deal, and a deal done successfully, further discussion therefore should be ended.

### **Faculty Manual Discussion**

Re: workload, Vice Chair Sen distributed the latest version that her committee prepared. She said it incorporated critiques and comments made of the earlier version and tried to accommodate oddly configured courses. The Vice Chair urged immediate adoption, saying the longer the faculty delayed action on this matter, the more risk they ran that budget reductions might injure the faculty. However, the Chair reminded Senators that the Faculty Assembly also had to deliberate and act in this matter. Accordingly, the Senate agreed to postpone further discussion of workload policy as well as sabbatical policy until the next Senate meeting in December in order to focus on the language in the proposed 2010 *Manual* regarding rank, tenure, and promotion.

A conversation followed about several differences in the 2002 *Manual* and the current revision under discussion. One concerned the role and authority of the Rank, Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Committee. In the 2002 *Manual*, this committee is an appellate committee with the power to overrule the Provost; in the proposed 2010 *Manual* revision, however, the committee is limited to advising the Provost but cannot overrule him. After some discussion, the Senate

unanimously voted to incorporate into the proposed 2010 *Manual* revision the language of the 2002 *Manual* wherein the Rank, Tenure, Promotion and Salary Committee is described as an appellate committee with the power to overrule the Provost.

Another such issue senators discussed involves the time-in-rank requirement that faculty must serve prior to applying for promotion. After discussion, the Senate voted in favor of motions that Assistant Professors should be required to serve a full 3 years before applying for promotion to Associate Professor in the beginning of their 4<sup>th</sup> year, and that Associate Professors should be required to serve 5 complete years before applying for promotion to Full Professor in the beginning of their 6<sup>th</sup> year.

The hour being late, Senators agreed to postpone a discussion of further matters until their last 2010 meeting in December and adjourned at 5:10p.