Faculty Senate Meeting

March 15, 2012

Location: LSA 121

Time: 2:00 pm

Linda Wilson-Jones, Faculty Senate Chair, Presiding

Members present: Agrawal, Vikas; Allen, Marlene; Booth, Shane; Brooks, Jeff; Charles, Kelly; Coyle, Laura; Daniel, Samantha; Dent, Skye; Deroze, Phyllisa; Hall, Phoebe; Hall, Richard; Hammack, Brenda Mann; Hennessey, Thomas; Jin, Mingxian; Hemstock, Hsiaofen; Jing, Wu; Larkin, Patrick; Lee, Baeyong; Lenning, Emily; Khalid, Lodhi; Lucas, Nicole; Nagdas, Subir; Nyman, Micki; Osei, Joseph; Pearson, Darren; Senter, Phil; Tang, Xin; Wilson-Jones, Linda; Wu, Jianshi; Yorgov, Vassil; Zhu, Leiceng

Faculty Assembly Delegate: Charles, Kelly; Dilday, Chet

Members absent: Barnes, Hilary; Blount, Stacey; Cain, Beverlyn; Carter-Woods, Tamara; Grier, Robert; Guevara, Lori; Heastie, Samuel; Johnson, Reeshemah; Johnson, Stanley; Kennedy, Dorrance; Kim, Ji Young; Sarami, Chekad; Thomas, William; Wilson, Dawn; Wolter, Faren

Guests: Abokor, Abdirahman; Bir, Beth; Breitzer, Jonathan; Brooks, John; White-Olyler, Dianne; Okeaque, Jonas

I. Declaration of Quorum/CALL TO ORDER

A quorum was declared and Linda Wilson-Jones called the faculty senate meeting to order.

II. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF THE LAST MINUTES

The February 15th faculty senate meeting minutes were motioned for approval by Tom Hennessey and seconded by Phoebe Hall without any corrections. The minutes were approved by voice acclamation.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda for the meeting was motioned for approval by Tom Hennessey and seconded by Darren Pearson. The agenda was approved by voice acclamation.

IV. WELCOME/Opening Remarks
In order to cover the work that is needed, the floor was yielded by the faculty senate chair for the update reports.

V. UPDATES

A. Chancellor Anderson- State of the University address

The chancellor first thanked Phoebe Hall and the faculty in the Performing Arts for the work done on the play Othello. The chancellor mentioned that talks are in the works concerning bringing a true performing arts theatre to Fayetteville, NC. Chancellor Anderson stated that the university is currently running under the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. Priorities consistent with the Strategic Plan are where funding will go. Planning for the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan will begin soon with input from the faculty and the colleges. Ideas for research and projects that one wants to get funded must align with the strategic plan. The 2015 -2020 Strategic Plan will have some carry over from the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan along with new priorities. The Business funding model is stressed along with retention. The state legislature and the UNC-board of governors is moving to a Performance Funding Model and the state will look at 4 and 6-year graduation rates along with data such as how many Baccalaureate degrees are produced for each 100 students. State funding will be clearly tied to performance based measures. The chancellor emphasized that departments must retain their majors and departments that do not retain their majors will be hard pressed to receive additional funding. In the big scheme of things these departments will be hurting the university’s overall funding. The chancellor then talked about Title III funding. Many Title III activities are tied to measurable outcomes and some activity directors are not keeping very good data on these outcomes. Outcome data must be collected and properly demonstrated. If the activity directors do not demonstrate the measurable outcome that was written in the proposal, they will be at a serious risk of losing funding completely.

A power point of the Strategies Deployed by the University to Address Financial Issues was presented by the chancellor. The power point topics are listed below.

Strategies Deployed to Address Financial Issues

1. Budget cuts targeting administrative operations and services.
2. Increased tuition by 6.5 %.
3. Budget cuts targeting low-producing academic programs and activities.
4. Selective hiring freeze for new administrative positions.
5. Launching/expanding new online programs and summer school.
6. Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions.
7. Raised student fees for campus programs and services.
8. Across the board budget cuts.
9. Reduction in part-time faculty.
10. Increase grant writing and entrepreneurial initiatives.
11. More strategic utilization of the Title III funds.

The university is in the process of opening up a 5-year capital campaign. A lot of the money expected for the capital campaign will be from external sources. The capital campaign is currently in the silent phase.

The administration is in talks with developers about the Washington School site. The first building expected to be built will be a research building for the particle accelerator. Once the instrument is set up, the instrument is expected to begin paying for itself.

The Center for Defense and Homeland Security is now a priority for the university. FSU is the only HBCU with a stand alone Center for Defense and Homeland Security. There is only a handful of institutions in the country have stand alone Centers for Defense and Homeland Security. No one is doing disaster simulation research in large complexes such as theatres or arenas with the exception of a professor here at FSU. The chancellor mentioned that FSU is an associate member at the Oakridge National Laboratory.

The chancellor also shared with the faculty the most common complaint that students had. Students do not feel that faculty care about what they do outside of the classroom. The one consistent notable exception is in the Performing Arts. Students have the expectation of seeing faculty at their events.

Before addressing questions Chancellor Anderson stated that he believed in governance and he supports the academic affairs office and tries not to get in the way of how the provost runs things.

Questions

Tom Hennessey asked the question of the chancellor about the comment about how the state will look at the number of baccalaureate degrees produced by each 100 students; does this number include transfer students? Provost Young mentioned that transfer students are ultimately included in the count.

Guest Jonas Okeagu posed a question concerning the microprobe. He asked “what is happening with the microprobe in the Lyons Science Building”? Darren Pearson mentioned that two microprobe search candidates will be on campus Monday (March 19) and Wednesday (March 21) of next week. The candidates will give
research presentations at 2 pm on Monday (March 19) and Wednesday (March 21) in LSA 121.

The chancellor mentioned that this information needs to be sent out to the faculty as a whole

B. Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The provost stated that he appreciated the chancellor for his support for faculty development. An invitation was sent out to faculty asking them to apply for summer research grants. Forty faculty members received these grants last summer and about the same number of faculty received these grants the previous summer. Faculty are invited to submit proposals for research fellowships for year long support. The first phase of the fellowship application involves a one page application. After the first phase of the process, the applicant may be invited to complete a second application phase. Tuesday March 20, 2012 at 2 pm in Room 140 in the SBE building, the faculty mentoring program will be officially launched.

The provost reiterated the chancellor’s comments that funding is based on the Performance Funding Model and that the departmental continuing improvement report is based on this policy.

The provost then talked about the Faculty Emeritus Policy. FSU does not have a current policy where a professor can be named Professor Emeritus. Most of our sister institutions have such a policy.

Tom Hennessey has a concern that as the policy is written it only recognizes full professors. This is a concern because of the history at FSU of giving tenure to professors at the rank of assistant professor. Tom would like to have the rank of full professor removed from the policy in order to open up the policy to associate and assistant professors.

A question was asked about “What factors would prevent a professor from rising to the rank of full professor”.

Tom mentioned that some professors did not get their Ph.D. degrees until late in their careers and they will not be eligible for tenure until they had a Ph.D. degree. Up until very recently tenure came at the assistant level.

A comment was mentioned that currently once can become a full professor in 10 years.

Tom stated that post tenure review is showing that there are a lot of productive professors at this university at the assistant and associate ranks.
A comment was asked about can these professors be grandfathered in. Tom stated that the easiest way was to remove the full professor requirement from the policy.

Provost Young stated that the Professor Emeritus Policy is a board of trustee policy.

A motion was made by Tom Hennessey and seconded by Phil Senter to remove “professor” from the professor emeritus policy. The motion was then opened up for debate.

Nicole Lucas made a comment that the policy is fine the way it is written.

Hennessey stated that if we leave the policy with full professor, we could be leaving out professors by saying to them that you are not valuable because you never reached the rank of full professor.

Phoebe Hall agreed with Hennessey’s comments. We have a large number of associate professors that have been here for many years without becoming full professors.

**Proposed Amendment to Emeritus Faculty proposal**

Remove the words “hold the rank of professor” from I. Introduction and II C Criteria For Candidacy.

**Rationale:** The post tenure review process is reminding us that Fayetteville State University has variety of extremely valued long time faculty members who do not hold the rank of full professor. Some may be considered for emeritus status. It would be unfortunate if their service was denied to the university because of their lack of full professor rank.

A hand vote was performed on the amendment to the Emeritus Faculty proposal. A majority of faculty senators opposed the amendment. The amendment failed.

A motion was made by Micki Nyman and seconded by Samantha Daniels to approve the Professor Emeritus proposal as it currently stands.

A hand vote was performed on the Professor Emeritus proposal. A majority of faculty senators supported the proposal. The proposal passed.

C. **Student Affairs** – No Report

D. **Student Government Association** – No Report
E. Faculty Senate Delegates
The faculty senate delegates report was present by Kelly Charles. The next faculty senate delegate meeting is scheduled for March 23rd. Kelly Charles asked that if anyone has concerns about what has been cut and what is proposed to be cut to please email these concerns to her or to Chet Dilday. Kelly Charles’ email address is kjackso7@uncfsu.edu and Chester Dilday’s email address is cdilday@uncfsu.edu. The provost mentioned that Academic Affairs could provide her with information concerning specific and proposed cuts. It was suggested by Linda Wilson-Jones that the Faculty Senate Delegates should meet with the provost in order to obtain this information.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs
The academic affairs committee report was presented by Jianshi Wu. Wu stated that on February 23, 2012 the faculty senate academic affairs committee approved the Core Curriculum proposal from the Core Curriculum steering committee. The Core Curriculum proposal asks for the approval of the Framework that would have scientific literacy at 7 total hours and the natural science requirement of 4 total hours.

A motion was made by Jianshu Wu to approve the Core Curriculum proposal. Since the motion came as a report from the academic affairs committee a second of the motion was not required.

The motion was then up for discussion.

A motion was made by Phil Senter and seconded by Zhu to amend the science requirement from 4 to 7 hours, but not in sequence.

Guest John Brooks made a comment. He stated that one feature of the proposal is that it does not specify specific courses. Currently in front of us is the framework. Later the actual courses to fit the framework will be discussed.

Guest, Abdirahman Abokor from the Department of Chemistry and Physics, presented a power point presentation titled “Making a Case for Maintaining the Natural Science Curriculum”. A copy of the power point can be obtained from Abdirahman Abokor. His email address is aabokor@uncfsu.edu.

Richard Hall made the comment that science comes from the Latin word for knowledge. The less science that one has the less knowledge one was of the world. He also mentioned that the university is using Evidence Based Learning and Discussion as a SACS focus.
Hennessey stated that what was on the floor is the motion to amend the science requirement from 4 to 7 hours but the science courses do not have to be in sequence.

There were comments that were not in favor of the motioned amendment to the science requirements.

A comment was made that there were a large number of science faculty in the audience without the other disciplines being represented appropriately as they may be used to skew the senate vote unfairly.

A comment was made that only faculty senators are allowed to vote on the amendment motion. The guests in the audience are not allowed to vote.

Tom Hennessey asked for a quorum call of the number of senators present by counting the number of raised senator hands. A quorum was met that did not overly represent a large number of science faculty senators.

Another comment was made that some senators had left the senate because they had to go to teach their classes. Tom Hennessey stated that even though some senators may have left, the meeting still has a quorum.

A question was asked if senators could vote on the behalf of absent faculty senators. Hennessey stated that proxy voting is not allowed.

A hand vote on the amend motion was taken. The motion was approved by a majority of faculty senate voters. The amendment change was approved.

After the passing of the amend motion. The motion made by Jianshi Wu asked for the approval of the Core Curriculum proposal was up for vote with the approved amend to change the number of science hours from 4 to 7 hours

The initial Core Curriculum motion established by Jianshi Wu was not up for senate approval with the amended science requirement change from 4 to 7 hours but the science courses do not have to be in sequence.

This motion will now change the number of science literacy hours from 7 to 10 hours and it would change the number of science requirement hours from 4 to 7 hours.

A hand vote on the motion was taken. The motion was passed by a majority of faculty senate voters. The Core Curriculum proposal passed.

**Student Affairs** – No report.
Faculty Welfare – No report.
Budget and Planning – No report.
Faculty Handbook – No report.
Governance – No report.
Faculty Evaluation – No report.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Fall Scholarship Celebration Update

The Next Fall Scholarship Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 29, 2012 @ 2 pm in the Continuing Education Building

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Department Senate Elections. Linda Wilson-Jones asked the faculty senators to please remind their departments at department senator elections must be held during the month of March to replace the senators whose terms will end during the April 19, 2012 faculty senate meeting.

Senate Elections. A reminder that Faculty Senate Executive Committee elections will be held of Faculty senate vice chair and Faculty senate parliamentarian at the end of the April 19, 2012 faculty senate meeting.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER

IX. ANNOUNCEMENT & ADJOURNMENT

Digital Measures
A reminder was given to Faculty senators to remind faculty members to update their information in Digital Measures.

The next Faculty Senate Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 19, 2012 in LSA 121 @ 2 PM.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Minutes were taken by Darren Pearson, Faculty Senate Secretary.