AGENDA

I. Election of Officers
   A. Vice President/President-elect
   B. Secretary
   C. Parliamentarian

II. Approval of Minutes from April 22, 2010

III. Summer meeting(s) TBA

IV. Announcements and Concerns
   A. First meeting of the Fall semester: Thursday, August 26, 2010 at 12:45pm, Wingo 315
   B. University Scholarship Committee update
   C. Faculty Announcements and Concerns

V. Adjournment

Members Present (/a: absent; /aa: absent advised)

- Business Administration: Bartczak, Bradley, Moore/a.
- Education: Albritton/a, Copeland, Hebert/a.
- Fine Arts And Communication: Browne, Burley, Castner Post.
- Health And Behavioral Sciences: Fletcher, Poole, Ray.
- Liberal Arts: Arnold, Parrack, Spivey.
- Senator For Part-Time Faculty: (to be elected in Fall 2010)
- Office Of The Provost: Provost Grahn.

I. Election of Officers
   A. Vice President/President-elect: Janet Wilson.
   B. Secretary: Art Lichtenstein.
   C. Parliamentarian: George Bratton.

II. Approval of Minutes from April 22, 2010
MOTION to suspend rules to allow approval of minutes: Bradley, BrattonG.-approved.
MOTION to approve minutes: Bradley, Parrack.-approved.

III. Summer meeting(s) TBA
President Burley: Will host Faculty Senate gathering on Sunday 8/15/10.
IV. Announcements and Concerns

A. First meeting of the Fall semester: Thursday, August 26, 2010 at 12:45pm, Wingo 315.

President Burley: Regular meeting schedule is 2nd Tuesday and 4th Thursday, monthly.

B. University Scholarship Committee update

President Burley: Distributes memo from Scholarship Committee. Notes changes in titles of the various scholarships and in the amounts awarded.

C. Faculty Announcements and Concerns

Bradley: How will changes in scholarship offerings affect our recruitment? How do we compare to other schools? Have we considered these changes in light of our competitive position?

Grahn: Penny Hatfield, Director of Admissions, has been charged with looking into this. We are looking at reducing the amount of E&G funds that go toward scholarships, and this relates to the recent "Academic Challenge" (lottery) scholarships.

[additional comments: Rowley, BrattonG]

Parrack: Constituent concern [as follows]
"Dear Faculty Senators:
We are writing to urge the Faculty Senate to take immediate steps to fix the online teaching evaluation crisis by insisting that the university return to the paper evaluations until such time as the online method can be shown to elicit comparable participation from students. If, for some reason, there is continuing administrative resistance to this sane and reasonable fix to the problem, we call upon the Faculty Senate to insist that departments and colleges be allowed to use the old system so that the faculty can have meaningful information on which to base mid-tenure review, tenure, and promotion decisions.

If the spring semester’s response rate does not improve dramatically (e.g., reflect 70% or higher participation), we will have lost a full academic year of statistically significant information. That may not seem like a lot, but when you consider that mid-tenure review occurs in candidates’ third year and tenure review in their sixth year, both the candidates and the faculty who are responsible for evaluating them already will have lost more than one third of the information on teaching they need. Inaction threatens to extend this dire situation into yet another semester, maybe more. One of the main instruments for measuring teaching effectiveness, the primary consideration for tenure and promotion according to the Faculty Handbook, is being rendered ineffective simply because of administrative insistence. What makes this state of affairs even more frustrating is that the remedy already exists and is ready to be used right now, this very minute: the old system. There is simply no reason for this major problem to continue. The Faculty Senate should not stand for it. If a reliable way of evaluating teaching effectiveness and the use of the information in making crucial tenure decisions is not an overriding faculty concern, then what is?

In addition to this very immediate and practical crisis, there is also the question of basic fairness. How can we claim that candidates are being fairly evaluated when the information being used to evaluate them has become inconsistent due to an ill-considered change in the way the information is gathered? What if a candidate’s teaching performance was steadily improving as he or she
moved towards a tenure decision and then the last year of information was rendered meaningless by low student participation? What recourse would the candidate have? What should the tenure committee do? Again, this unfair and quite possibly litigation-causing state of affairs does not need to exist at all. There is no need to plan a fix, discuss a fix, and implement a fix. The fix is there. All that is needed is the will to use it.

As these things go, the stakes could not be higher. Faculty governance, legal and moral fairness, adherence to the Faculty Handbook, the serious consideration of student input, all of these serious matters are compromised by the way the online evaluation process is being handled. And, we repeat, there is no time. No time for waiting to see if the new system gains traction. No time for patching alternatives like extra peer review. The remedy is at hand. If the Faculty Senate is to safeguard the integrity of the promotion and tenure process, it must insist that the faculty have the information they need to make the most important decisions in their professional lives. You must not take no for an answer."

[additional comments: Bradley, Browne]

President Burley: Introduction of new members.

President Burley: Presentation of appreciative plaque to outgoing president, John Parrack. [hearty applause]

V. Adjournment
MOTION to adjourn: Ray, Isom.-approved.
Meeting Adjourned at 11:35 A.M.