Minutes
Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate Meeting
April 2, 2003

Members present: Glenn Abney, Barb Carroll, Gayle Christian, Bonnie Fritz, Gerald Gay, Hugh Hudson, Charles Marvin, Mona Matthews, Linda McGehee, Marian Meyers, H. Richard Miller, Jean Miller, Jim Senn and Marta White

Members absent: Barbara Baumstark, Joan Carson, Pauline Clance, Nancy Floyd, Lynn Hart, Katherine Johnston, Linda Nelson, John Peterson, Ted Poister and Cherian Thachenkary

The first agenda item was the approval of the minutes of the previous meeting.

Bonnie announced that this was the last Faculty Affairs meeting before a Senate meeting, and the agenda was quite full with items that need to be approved and taken before the Senate.
Bonnie also announced that she was retiring from the University, and if anyone was interested in chairing the Committee to please contact her or Hugh Hudson.

Gayle Christian presented the Disruptive Student Policy to the group for discussion. The group felt that defining disruptive student behavior as student behavior in a classroom or other learning environment was limiting. The group agreed to change the word classroom to class or section. Whichever term is selected, it should be defined in a footnote in its first usage in the text. Glenn modified the wording that an instructor may initiate removal of a student to remove the words may initiate, changing it to an instructor may remove a student. The word preamble was problematic to Linda, in that she was not clear where the policy actually begins. The group decided to put the word PROCESS above the second paragraph and to possibly italicize the preamble. There was a typo noted in Step One: it should be instructor’s response. The group suggested that the policy should be consistent in the use of the words classes or courses, and not to interchange the two.
Glen added to Step Two by requiring that, if the student wishes to respond to the instructor’s complaint, that the student submit a written statement to the Chair. The group agreed. Hugh and Jim objected to the requirement that the student who objects to the Chair’s decision must meet with the Dean of the College. The group agreed that the Deans would prefer receiving a written appeal from the student. The Dean could then decide to meet with the student if necessary, but that it would not be required. Charles had a problem with the wording stating that the Dean’s decision would be based on the written record. His question was what constituted the written record, and was the written record to include information from meetings with the student. After discussion, based on the written record was struck from the draft. The group agreed that the final draft of this policy incorporating these changes would be distributed by email for a vote. Once the final draft is approved, it would be forwarded to the Senate.

Marian presented her committee’s report on the Childcare Center. Basically, the committee is requesting additional space in order to raise enrollment. There are just too few spaces to meet the demand for service. No cost estimate for expansion was presented, as the committee was merely putting in a request for space at this time. Glenn moved to approve the request for additional space, Linda seconded the motion, and the group approved the request to be referred to the Senate.

SGA passed a smoking prohibition within a 25-foot radius of all University building entrances, and Bonnie presented to this group for a vote. Linda moved to join SGA in passing the smoking prohibition, Marta seconded the motion, and the group approved the motion.

Bonnie formalized a wish that the group articulated in an earlier meeting that faculty be held blameless from on-line course evaluation during the trial period. She presented the on-line course evaluation faculty option for a vote. The option reads:
Faculty electing to participate in on-line course evaluation during the trial period of Fall 2002-Summer 2003 shall be given the option of choosing how the results of these evaluations should be used in professional matters that may include Promotion and Tenure and Contract Renewal. Such faculty may elect to use the results with or without commentary or to discard them entirely in professional matters. The group then reviewed the proposal to restrict student access to grades in courses with on-line evaluations. Glenn reiterated that faculty who already decided to use one method or the other will be aggravated to find that the period for completion of on-line evaluations has been lengthened. The group voted to approve the proposed option and send it on to the Senate along with the proposal that a student must complete an on-line evaluation in order to see his or her grade for a class using on-line evaluation.
Hugh Hudson presented the Policy on Promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers that his subcommittee had been working on. Hugh’s proposed policy required promotion to senior lecturer for those lecturers who are reappointed after five years of consecutive service and receive favorable evaluation for retention. Jim Senn expressed opposition to the policy on behalf of his college. RCB would prefer to state that such lecturers are eligible for promotion, without guaranteeing promotion. There was also concern regarding the wording about reviews for lecturers. The group voted to require two reviews for lecturers: a third-year review for reappointment and a fifth-year review for consideration for reappointment/promotion to senior lecturer. The group also added the following sentence; Each college of the University must establish a policy that articulates clearly stated promotional criteria and governs reviews of lecturers and procedures for promotion to senior lecturer. By adding this sentence, the group agreed to drop the rest of the second paragraph defining instruction, service and other activities.

Jim requested that the third paragraph be considered procedure issues and be dropped. The group agreed and added the following sentence as paragraph three; Reappointment of lecturers is determined on an annual basis. The group, with Charles Marvin opposed, agreed to adopt the policy as amended.

Cherian had requested that the Committee consider an editorial correction to the sick Leave Policy as approved by the Senate in March, 2002. The preamble to the approved sick leave policy erroneously states that faculty on ten-month contracts do not accrue annual leave, nor do they earn sick leave for summer employment at their institutions. The group voted to approve a corrected preamble striking the incorrect statement.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05.