

Minutes of Auburn Montgomery Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, January 16, 2009
204 Goodwyn Hall
Convened at 8:30 a.m.

Present: Gehling, Newman, Powell, Knigge, Foxx, C. Ligeon, Johnson, Buskist, Gilchrist, Morton, Krawczynski, Borton, Kaufman, Hamilton, Jones, Parillo (for Ioimo), Gantt, Veres, Warren

Absent: Finley, Rhodes, Tidwell

Guests: Susan Salter, Brad Moody, Blake Gerard, David Ang, Serajul Bhuiyan

I. Senate Business

- A. Minutes from the November meeting were distributed. Approval was postponed until the February meeting.
- B. The next Senate meeting is February 13, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. in 204 Goodwyn Hall.

II. Administrative Reports: Administrative reports were skipped in view of the town hall meeting later in the morning at 10:00.

- A. Dr. John Veres, Chancellor
None
- B. Dr. D'Linell Finley, Advisor to the Auburn Board of Trustees
None
- C. Dr. Bob Gehling
None

III. Committee Reports and Presentations

- A. Dr. Ang, Chair, Academic Standards Committee
 - 1. Dr. Rhonda Morton presented 2 proposals about Professional Improvement Leave (PIL) and the Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA). The changes to the Distinguished Teaching Award proposal would need to be presented to the Faculty Handbook Committee before final approval. The PIL proposal is about how faculty will apply for the leave, deadlines, and when the faculty will be informed of a decision.
 - 2. Dr. Morton gave the background for these proposals. The Academic Affairs Council was given these two issues to review and make recommendations to the vice chancellor. The vice chancellor asked them to come up with policies and procedures.
 - 3. The committee took the current handbook policy, kept some points and recommended changes to others. The description for the DTA is the same

as previously. A change was made so that you could receive it every 10 years instead of the previous 3 years. This would put this award in line with the Distinguished Research Award. Changes are also recommended to clarify the timeline and to make sure everyone knows the guidelines and timeline.

4. The handbook currently has the information about PIL split up, the description in one place, the timeline in another. Looking at examples from other universities, the committee is recommending putting all PIL in one place instead of several places in the handbook. The committee also included answers to common questions in the proposed document.
5. The proposals will be sent out by the Faculty Senate president for full consideration at the next meeting.
6. Dr. Brad Moody asked to clarify whether the DTA can be awarded to instructors. In the past they have been told it can't be instructors. Answer: It says only that the faculty member must have served two (2) continuous years as Full Time faculty. So, as it reads now, someone that is an instructor CAN apply. Second question: Is letter from the Dean a change? Response: It is not a change.
7. Vice Chancellor Warren responded that an exclusion of instructors has never been in the handbook.
8. A suggested revision is to clarify the following: All FT faculty on tenure track or non-tenure track appointments may apply for the DTA.
9. Dr. Ang asked whether he needed to bring the change to the Academic Standards Committee? No; it is a clarification, not a change.
10. Dr. Moody asked: If a person asked for a second or third PIL, do they have to report what they did in the first PIL? That is not required to be available to the committee and may not still be available within Academic Affairs. The document does not currently say that the person should submit the previous PIL report. Dr. Moody asserted that the person should be required to submit the report themselves. Response: The reports should be kept in the department or dean's office and in academic affairs. Would they be available? Maybe not. Question: Is there anything wrong with that person being required to submit that report?
11. Dr. Veres responded with his opinion that it can be asked for, but not required. The vita should have evidence of publications which he believes is sufficient.
12. Dr. Moody responded that if they said they were doing "X" with university resources and DIDN'T DO "X", then he believes they should not be awarded PIL again, regardless of other publications.
13. Dr. Buskist asked if there is a requirement stated about duties of the DTA recipient, such as teaching seminars and speaking at graduation. The answer is yes it does include some of those duties in the description.
14. Dr. Kaufman asked if there should there be a requirement about the minimum or maximum for length of the application. Response: The requirements state that they can use as much space as needed. Dr.

Kaufman stated that he believed that for a competitive award there should be some uniformity.

15. Question: What is intended with the requirement for a CD? Response: It could include a power point of the lesson or other materials. The DVD would be a lesson or partial lesson taught by the applicant.
16. The old timeline for PIL applications was March 1. The new one is November 1. There were concerns that a person might not be eligible this year if they had not met the Nov. 1 deadline; however, the new deadline will start next academic year if approved. The university needs to address storing archival copies of old PIL reports at a later date.
17. Dr. Morton clarified the two changes to the document and said she would distribute the new draft.
18. Dr. Veres reminded the committee and senate that if this is a revision to the handbook, it requires Board approval.

IV. Old Business

None

V. New Business

- A. Dr. Gehling addressed the need to fill the position of president-elect. He stated that we can elect one from the current faculty membership to serve until the March Faculty Council meeting, and then elect someone at the March meeting. Dr. Knigge clarified that this would require a special election and it doesn't seem prudent since we are so close to a March meeting.
 1. Dr. Gehling stated that there are critical issues that need to be addressed by the Rules committee which is chaired by the president-elect. He suggested that one of the current officers step in as chair so that the committee begin addressing these issues.
 2. Dr. Veres remarked that recently the administration was censured for not complying with the handbook. The Senate needs to make a conscious decision before it acts contrary to the handbook.
 3. We believe that the requirement for a special election can be interpreted to be an election held by the Senate, not necessarily the Faculty Council.
 4. Dr. Gehling said he will call a meeting of the handbook committee.
- B. It is necessary for the senate to vote on members of the Rules Committee. The nominations were presented in the last meeting. Dr. Gehling asked for a motion to accept the committee nominations. With a move and 2nd the Senate proceeded to vote by secret ballot as required. The motion passed with 15 for and 1 abstention.
- C. Dr. Veres informed the Senate that two items will be brought forward at the upcoming board meeting:
 - i. Housing increase for the coming year.
 - ii. The Wellness Center proposal. Financial projections indicated that we would need an extra \$160 per student per term in activity fees. AUM students currently pay \$10 per term while ASU students pay

\$210 students per term. He does not anticipate an increase of this amount; but, he is asking to move forward with planning and a decision about availability of funding to do so. If we move forward, there will be a student referendum to see how they would be willing to support the process.

A discussion of a tuition increase and funding issues followed.

VI. Announcements

It was noted that the Town Hall meeting would be video-taped and the Power Point would be available on the web.

Dr. Knigge asked the Rules Committee members to stay a few minutes to put together a nominating committee.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.