

FACULTY SENATE RETREAT AND MEETING
Monday April 29, 2008

Presiding: Maurice Holder, President

Officers (Present)

Dr. Maurice Holder, President
Dr. Dreamal Worthen, Vice President
Dr. Mildred Fennal, Secretary
Dr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian

Senators (Present)

Mrs. Ernestine Holmes	Prof. Thomas Pugh
Dr. Elizabeth Davenport	Dr. Robin Kennedy
Dr. Raymond Hix	Dr. Patricia Stampe
Dr. Delores Lawson	Dr. Mary Diallo
Dr. Almeta Washington	Dr. Eric Kalu
Dr. Velma Roberts	Ms. Linda Williams
Dr. Bidhan Saha	Dr. LaRae Donnellan
Dr. Angela Thornton	Lt. Col. Kelvin Scott
Dr. Charles Weatherford	Dr. Maurice Edington
Dr. David Jackson	Dr. Rufus Ellis
Dr. Charles Ervin	Dr. Renee Reams
Dr. Kinfe Redda	Professor Beth Lewis
Dr. Merlin Langley	Dr. Ngozi Ugochukwu
Dr. Kandy Woods	Dr. Lekan Latinwo
Dr. Gwendolyn Singleton	Dr. Primus Mtenga
Dr. Matthew Powers	Dr. Shawnta Friday-Stroud
Dr. Roscoe Hightower	Dr. Franklin Hamilton
Dr. Ebenezer Oriaku	

Ex-Officio (Voting) (Present)

Dr. Lauren Sapp
Dr. Uche Ohia
Dr. Donald Palm
Dr. Roland Gaines

Senators (Excused)

Professor Rhoda Cato

OPENING REMARKS

The theme of this years retreat was CONTINUED EXCELLENCE IN A TIME OF AUSTERITY: EXPLORING CREATIVE RESPONSES FOR CHALLENGING SITUATIONS. After a delightful breakfast, the Retreat was opened with remarks from the Retreat Chair, Dr. Reams and Dr. Holder, President of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Holder in the opening statement addressed the upcoming Commencement, discussed the occasion of and the history of the Retreat. The internationalization of the institution was presented, and the activities for the day were outlined.

Keynote Presentation # 1 SACS ISSUES

The first presenters Dr. Shawnta Friday-Stroud and Mrs. Janelle Jennings presented SACS Issues. Dr. Friday-Stroud thanked Dr. Reams and the Committee for the work done in preparation for the retreat. The presentation began with an overview of the feedback that has been received from SACS. A discussion on the importance; background; principles of assessment; progress report; faculty standards; and feedback occurred. The topic/title of the Quality Improvement Plan was presented loud and clear for one of the many times it would be heard during the event. For the record the topic is: **“ENHANCING PERFORMANCE IN CRITICAL THINKING”**. The Senators learned that the report (self-study) is due to SACS by September 2008. Voting will occur in 2009. There are eighty five core requirements for SACS. **EVERY CORE REQUIREMENT MUST BE MET**. The University must be in compliance with comprehensive standards and federal standards.

For discussion of the core requirements the audience was directed to:
Famu.edu/sacs/userfiles/file/sccspresentsfacsenApril. The power point slide used in the presentation can be located at the above site.

A review of core requirement 2.12 was discussed. This requirement states that the report must be written and sent to SACS for review. SACS will review the report. If the university does not pass the written portion of the evaluation, the QED plan can not be implemented, therefore the university fails the self study. There was a reminder that the information for SACS that address committee chairs and standards is being addressed in a work group.

There was an inquiry about the composition of the SACS Committee. The leaders are Dr. Harper, Dr. Mercer, Dr. Friday-Stroud and Dr. J. Jennings. Other members of the Committee are: Dr. V. Matthews (undergraduate education); Dr. Chanta Haywood (graduate education); Mrs. Gavin (federal requirements); Drs. Worthen and Houston (Quality Improvement Plan); Drs. Ohia and Pitter (instructional effectiveness); P. Gains (Student affairs); T. Hardy (Financial resources); J. Baker (Physical resources); Dr. Hughes Harris and Dr. Hall (Institutional mission and governance); M. Smith (Faculty communication). Dr. Holder requested that a meeting of the SACS committee be scheduled.

The presenters eluded to the expectation that faculty may have to submit another transcript because some of the previously submitted ones are not available

The next discussion during the presentation addressed Licensure achievement after graduation. Graduation rates need to be improved especially six year graduation rates. The following information came from the above discussion:
There was a question regarding review for general education courses. It would appear that a review of the process has not been done or ten years. The Curriculum Committee was assigned the task of designing a process for review of new course request for general education.

There is a major issue of graduate and undergraduate students in the same class. The question of how does one get credit for teaching two courses at the same time. Issues brought forth included; numbers regarding time allotted for each class (which does not solve the issue). Is the teacher in the class a member of graduate faculty (which it has to be)? Is this practice agreeable with SACS, will a different syllabus be sufficient for SACS? There seems to be a need to seek clarity for the practice of putting graduate and undergraduate students in the same class.

Keynote Presentation # 2 Constitution Governance Issues

Presenters: Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Holder, Dr. Muchovej. A discussion of the Constitution as prepared by the Faculty Senate and the concurrence with the Bargaining Unit requirements. There was also an update on the Quality Enhancement Plan. The history of the program was presented and a request for faculty to become familiar with the information was made. The information presented in this session was a reminder that the faculty is expected to know about the quality enhancement program, particularly prior to SACs visit. There was also discussion of the concurrence among the administration, the Faculty Senate and Faculty in understanding the constitution that has been constructed by the Faculty Senate.

The Provost was present and thanked the SACs and the QED Committees for the diligent work being done in moving the university forward with SACs preparation. Dr. Holder thanked the presenters. It was decided that Dr. Kennedy, Muchovej, and Dr. Holder will put together information on legislature, the Bargaining Unit and the Advisory Council of the Faculty Senate and have it sent out to the members.

CURRICULUM

Dr. Edington presented seven items (see document approved by the Curriculum Committee). It was moved and properly seconded that the items presented by the Curriculum Committee approved. A Check List for Baccalaureate programs was presented to the Senators. It was moved and properly seconded that the list be accepted.

The following are some concerns about the above approvals: Dr. Washington mentioned Workforce Plus initiative in the country and if that would be a conflict with what was written in the document. Dr. Friday-Stroud stated the name change is concurrent with national standards. Dr. Palm asked if the MBA program met required standards. He also inquired if implementation would affect accreditation? It will be requested that implementation take place in the fall. Dr. Ashley stated that the new policy which has been adopted can not be implemented until the President approves the action. Dr. Holder commented that there is existing documentation that allows for changes in programs that have been approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate. However, policy changes can not be implemented for a year. Dr. Palm stated that the new courses would need numbers. Dr. Eddington stated that the new courses were assigned numbers. Dr. Washington asked if the new graduate courses had gone through the graduate

counsel. Dr. Edington said he was not clear on that procedure. Dr. Holder stated that it was correct procedure for new graduate courses to go through the graduate counsel. Dr. Edington assured Dr. Washington that it would be done. Dr. Muchovej mentioned that the Dean of Graduate Studies should sign off on graduate courses. There was some concern that students do not suffer penalties for something that should exist.

Clarity on the relationship of the Senate, the Curriculum Committee and the Provost office in expediting curriculum matters was asked for.

It was moved and properly seconded that the Check List for Master's Degree programs be approved. It was moved and properly seconded that Checklist for Doctoral Degree Programs be approved. A SUGGESTION WAS MADE THAT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS BE REQUIRED TO HAVE A CONSULTANT in the planning process.

It was moved and properly seconded that items 1-9 on page 9 of the document presented by the Curriculum Committee be approved. Motions were carried.

DISCUSSION

Dr. Washington commented that the approval list was a wonderful idea but what was also needed was one in keeping with SACS requirements. Dr. Palm asked; how do we change checklist to procedure? It is believed that a procedure would be more amenable to SACs. The conclusion was that the Check List could be changed at a later date. Dr. Donnellan questioned the statement under number one in the document. Clarity produced the meaning of the statement which was "the proposed program must be included in the Strategic Plan". Dr. Hughes-Harris commented that new programs must be on a list because that was designed as part of the Strategic plan.

Two additional items that need to be considered for SACs are the catalog (Dr. Matthews) and the Handbook (Dr. Singleton). It was moved and properly seconded that the two items be examined, updated and prepared for SACs.

Dr. Ohia and Attorney Linda Barge Miles present the Policy on Assessment. This document is being assessed because it was not completed at the last scheduled meeting. It was moved and properly seconded that the policy be accepted. Several questions arose in relationship to the document. Dr. Diallo wanted to know if the policy had anything to do with Faculty evaluation. It was established that the current document is different and has nothing to do with faculty evaluation.

Reference was made to minor corrections that were needed in the document. Dr. Redda asked what if this policy gives the student incentive to take the test. Dr. Kennedy asked what the assessment is. Dr. Ohia stated that we are using the NSSE and FAMUS model.

Lunch was provided for the participating members.

The afternoon workshops consisted of breakout sessions. Each session was manned by senior senators. The group reconvened at 4:00 p.m. to report on the information discussed in the breakout sessions. Listed are a few of the items discussed. Each group was instructed to send a typed copy of their discussion to Dr. Holder and one to the secretary. Copies that were forwarded to the secretary are attached.

Group I. Dr. Palm, Dr. Roberts, Dr. Redda

1. AORs
2. Class size
3. Quality of teaching
4. Assignment of responsibility
5. Development of graduate programs
6. Hire strictly teaching faculty
7. Faculty Moral
8. Holding leaders accountable
9. Systems support
10. Teaching overload/reducing teacher overload
11. Fair practice within departments
12. Course overload
13. Training of Administrators

Group II Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Worthen

1. Tenants of the Faculty Senate
2. Meetings for new senators
3. Attendance to all senate meetings
4. AOR overload coming out of vacation hours
5. Dress code and decorum on campus
6. Cell phone use
7. Generation of new money with medical school
8. PECO million dollars for Pharmacy Building

Group III Dr. Ohia and Dr. Jackson

1. SACs needs
2. Securing faculty in time for SACs visit
3. See list attached to minutes

The major themes coming from the limited data are assignment of responsibility, teaching overload, the need for faculty, and practices within departments. When all of the reports are in Dr. Holder will compile a list and share it with the Administration and the senators.

FAREWELL:

To: Dr. Holder, and Senate Colleagues.

Thank you for electing and trusting in my ability to manage the minutes of the Florida A&M University Faculty Senate. It has been my pleasure to serve you for two and a half terms. Working with the Faculty Senate and all of the various committees has been a learning experience, and one that was enjoyable I might add.

It is with a heavy heart that I leave you, but none of us were promised a rose garden in this thing called life, and "stuff" happens. I petition you to continue to support faculty, especially the ones that do make a positive difference in the lives of the students. The best is what I wish for all of you. Take care and God bless.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mildred D. Fennal
Faculty Senate Secretary

Rebecca Bruce
Office Manager