

University of South Alabama

**JagWorks@USA**

---

Minutes 2015-2016

Faculty Senate Minutes

---

4-1-2015

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – April 2015

Faculty Senators

*University of South Alabama*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes\\_twentyfifteen](https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes_twentyfifteen)

---

### Recommended Citation

Senators, Faculty, "Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – April 2015" (2015). *Minutes 2015-2016*. 1. [https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes\\_twentyfifteen/1](https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes_twentyfifteen/1)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Minutes at JagWorks@USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes 2015-2016 by an authorized administrator of JagWorks@USA. For more information, please contact [jherrmann@southalabama.edu](mailto:jherrmann@southalabama.edu).



**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA**  
**Faculty Senate**

---

**April 15, 2015 – Faculty club - 3:00 pm**  
**Approved Minutes**

**Call to order by J Estis at 3:02 with quorum**

**Approval of minutes:** March 2015 meeting – **motion made; 2d; unanimous**

**Approval of agenda - moved to approve; 2d; unanimous**

**President's Report**

- **Welcome to new members** – asked new Senators to stand and introduce themselves.
- **Overview of progress on resolutions and initiatives**

If we think where we were this time last year, we had a new President. The search brought the faculty together and the FS together with administration and trustees. When I looked at our year, I looked at our initial areas of focus.

One was to engage our new President with the faculty and serve as a point of transition. We had hope for increased openness and increased faculty input. I'd say we have made much progress on that. We have seen a trend of increased openness and broad based faculty input. President Waldrop involves us in discussions from the very beginning.

As a part of that goal we set up town halls with each college back in the fall. Those were followed with small group walk and talks.

In September we had the presidential inauguration. At that event President Waldrop outlined 5 priorities. Since that time committees and working groups have been formed to move those priorities forward. J. Estis has been included in those discussions with the administrative leadership from the beginning. We had hoped to have open meetings on the priorities in the spring but the schedule was prohibitive; but we will have them on the calendar for early fall.

As a sign of engagement with administration, we have tried to count how many committees we have reps on – at least 40, not including search committees.

We have also seen increased engagement with the board of trustees, culminated in having trustees at the March Faculty Senate meeting in a way that wasn't managed or PR directed.

We also were promoting leadership evaluation and development. We talked extensively to each presidential candidate about leadership development and accountability. The administration heard that voice and has put into place leadership retreats for chairs and more are to come. The University recently implemented systematic evaluations of Deans. President Waldrop indicated he will be conducting evaluation of direct reports as well.

We had a goal to improve recruiting and retention of faculty – salary, workload, mentoring. To that end, the Senate was instrumental in the formation of a University-level task force to review tenure and promotion and Senate representatives have had on-going discussions regarding salary and benefits. We've talked a lot about hiring procedures. For those of you have been around a while, we had a hiring resolution that was never formally approved by administration, but they have put into practice most elements we have asked for – including greater faculty representation on search committees and Faculty Senate Executive Committee involvement in searches. We also focused on the Faculty Handbook grievance processes and policies and we have made inroads in making those policies clearer and more faculty-friendly. The University formed a Process-Improvement-Committee and that committee includes faculty representation (Doug Marshall, the Senate representative on the PIC noted that the PIC website is about to go public. Will have a portal to register process for review. A lot of things are coming to closure with hopefully useful simplification). Policy and handbook committee has worked diligently on a new grievance policy which will be discussed in a minute.

Given that the hiring resolution fell to the wayside, we are working to track resolutions. Also have process for updating handbook each year in October and website indicates when new policies have been added. A while back if you tried to find new policies it was difficult to find. Angela Coleman has been working on that.

We had one policy added to the Faculty Handbook this year – evaluation of instruction. We were, for first time, able to present the resolution directly to the Deans Council. In the past we had no role in presenting our resolutions to the deans. Direct presentation made a huge difference because we could explain background, answer questions, etc.

Another area of focus for this year was to establish representation of MCI and a voice for adjuncts and part-time faculty. Accomplished both of those.

So it has been a busy year and I do not anticipate it slowing down any time soon.

- **Salary Survey – Internal issues**

We have been talking about this for a while. Members of the Senate and representatives of administration have been exploring method for doing an external survey. Have a general agreement on that methodology. With that said there is only so much the University can do with the current funding model. Prediction is a .5% increase in state funding for the next fiscal year – double what other colleges are likely to see. There is a commitment at looking at salaries but recognition of limited resources. We have made progress on internal issues. Leadership is going to study internal compression and inversion issues. Methodology will take prior merit into account – if salary differences are a result of merit, that is not what will be evaluated. We are excited to see that move forward. The external survey will follow. Sense is that the internal issues will be evaluated fairly quickly.

- **Title IV (federal financial aid requirements) and record-keeping**

JE asked K. West to address – have been dialogue for most of the academic year about way financial aid is disbursed and ramifications of F/F\*.

K. West: University acts as a bank. We write a check to student for amount of aid above tuition. The problem arises when a student fails to participate or fails to participate up to the 60% mark. University has to return all aid given to the student. The F\* policy was implemented to catch those students who fell into the non-participating category, University would return \$, and then go after the students for difference. Return about \$800,000 each academic year. Administration has been talking about better ways to handle the non-participating designation. In the middle of those discussions came a DOE audit. There were some findings but we are NOT on the list for heightened monitoring. There are issues with our F/F\* system. DOE says our policy is not compliant. University is about to propose new system to DOE that is modeled after U of Ala. It includes mid-term grades. If an F is entered at mid-term, faculty will have additional screens to determine participation. Another change will be academic record keeping, which currently seems to be different in each unit. Likely policy will be 2 years – grade book and if you keep exams instead of returning.

**JE** – the Faculty Senate can help with this. We want to make sure that we are working to help combat the financial aid fraud that some students may be engaged in while minimizing, to the extent possible, impact on faculty workload/methods. We have been discussing keeping this linked to retention. Q: Will Jag Success go away? A: Has been raised with administration. Administration is open to some type of integration and technological ways to make this easier.

- **Adjunct Committee**

Took two proposals – (1) tuition reduction for long-term adjunct faculty and (2) number of courses that can be taught by full-time University employee teaching as adjunct. Took both to administration last week. They will get back to us.

**Announcements**

- Dinner at Moe's Downtown – 6:30 p.m. – Bill Gillis – Open bar. Back room. Are ready for some of us to arrive early.
- 2015-2016 Meeting Dates

April 15, 2015

May 13, 2015

August 19, 2015

September 16, 2015

October 21, 2015

November 18, 2015

January 20, 2016

February 17, 2016

March 23, 2016 (this is the 4th Wednesday; the 3d Wednesday is USA Spring break)

\*\*\*

April 20, 2016

- Search Committee Updates

Allied Health – J Estis -- No update for Dean of Allied Health – 3 candidates came for interviews. Search committee has provided feedback, but no other info.

QEP Director - Susan Gordon-Hickey – the QEP director search is moving forward.

Presentations Wednesday at 3:45-:500 (vision of the QEP) and the following Monday. Email will have location – see Daily Digest.

MCI Director – M. Gillespie – MCI director search has been completed with appointment of Dr. Mike Finan.

Education - Phil Norrell is on Dean of Education search – will have candidates coming in soon.

- **Common World Common Read**

Book selected each year that students and faculty read. Will have related programming on campus. Have info. for incorporating it into courses. Time to start thinking about this.

Cradle of Freedom written by USA's writer in residence is the chosen book.

- **Course Fee Review Committee – Leigh Minchew (in writing) -** At the last meeting questions were raised by a Senator regarding denial of course fees. L. Minchew is a member of the Course Fee Review Committee. She looked into course fee denials and learned that all course fees denied at that committee to date were denied because of incomplete paperwork--no justification of fees requested or other missing pieces. Sometimes it is as simple as incomplete form; the request is denied and the incomplete form is returned to the Department Chair or Dean for completion and resubmission. Sometimes, it is because the committee is confused when a request is made either without justification or with justification that does not make sense as submitted. L Minchew encourages any member of the faculty who receives notification of a denied request to consider revision of their request with a full, clearly defined explanation of the fee and the justification of its need.

- **Faculty Survey – M Gillespie –** will be open in a few days. Please encourage faculty in your caucus to complete.

### **Old Business**

Revised Grievance Policy – update – Mara

In short our current policy is poor – discouraged faculty from presenting grievances and structured to tire the faculty by stringing out process. Handbook committee has spent time to research and craft faculty friendly policy. Moves timeline to 4 months. Created a new form. The most positive change is all grievances will be aired. Under old policy that did not happen. We have been trying to move proposal through administration. Have had several meetings and questions/changes have come back to the Executive Committee. The emailed policy has a few changes from the version we discussed last month. Today we would like to vote on moving the revised policy forward.

Last presentation went over the basics of the policy. Had to add back language that tenure decisions are not grievable under this policy. Interesting discussion on who should receive the grievance. We had recommend the President's office. We were told that it should start in Provost office – not President or one of the VPs.

Bill Gillis – the changes are important to understand. President Waldrop believed that if the grievance was filed in his office, then there couldn't be an appeal to the president. Also wanted T&P language put back in until T&P committee finishes its job and that that process will lead to a separate grievance procedure for T&P issues. This policy would then get updated to reflect the new T&P policy and process.

Motion to approve made and seconded; unanimous.

**Dean Emeritus - attached**

This policy is a way for administration to honor deserving Deans that can allow retired deans to be involved in professional organizations. Presented last month. Motion to approve; move; 2d; unanimous.

**New Business**

None

**Election of Officers and Committee Chairs**

Proposed Slate:

Officers

President:	Kevin West
Vice President:	Sam Fisher
Secretary:	Kelly Woodford

Call for additional nomination.  
Motion to approve slate; 2d; approved

K West – wanted to say what a pleasure it has been working with the officers and committee chairs has been great. The relationship the outgoing officers have built over the last 4 or so years has been incredible.

Committee Chairs

Academic Development & Mentoring:	Ellen Buckner
Environmental Quality:	Doug Marshall
Evaluation:	Phil Carr
Research & Creative Activities:	Tom Rich
Salary & Benefits:	Susan Gordon-Hickey
Technology Utilization:	Matt Campbell
University Planning & Development:	Bill Gillis
University Policies & Handbook:	Mara Kozelsky

Call for Additional Self-Nominations from the floor

Motion to adopt slate made; 2d; unanimous.

## **Special Business**

Creation of Ad Hoc Committee on Health Affairs –motion attached.

One of the conversations officers and ex comm have had is looking at the committees – names and charges – to align with the presidential priorities. For example, looking at adding graduate education to the research committee charge. One thing we found completely missing was health services/health care. Only place it is mentioned is the technology committee.

So have a motion that was sent with agenda to form Ad Hoc Health Affairs Committee with charges listed in attached motion.

Under the Faculty Senate Bylaws, we have to create an Ad Hoc Committee and have that committee for one year, then can move to establish it as new standing committee. Did that recently with the research committee.

Open floor for discussion. No discussion.

Motion; 2d; unanimous approval.

Have asked Mark Gillespie to serve as the first chair of this committee.

## **Guest: Sue Mattson – ILC – ALISA**

Many of you may have noted announcement from Dr Johnson on new teaching initiative on best practices. To help us get a better idea of what is going on, Sue Mattson, who came to us in January, will tell us a little about the program.

SM \_ Came from California. Have degrees from Berkley and Florida State. Background really is in education multi-media project development. The ILC has a strong contingent of instruction designers, faculty development, on line tool development, etc. ALISA is one solution to a multi faceted problem. Poor content mastery, decreased academic success, retention in predictor courses. Idea is on whole course development and imbedding active learning strategies into high impact classes. Course redesign is not a new thing. The ALISA model comes from national center for academic transformation that has a large initiative to change academic metrics. Have completed over 160 course redesign projects with 70% showing marked student outcome improvement.

The 2014-2017 strategic plan includes improved student outcomes. See in other plans as well. The evidence of need is seen in our list of top 25 “killer courses.” Active Learning Initiative of South Alabama. In 2013 eduventures did a pre-accreditation assessment and recommended centralized course redesign model that is coordinated so we can see change in metrics and track improvement. So ALISA uses centralized course redesign model. Is based on Purdue’s Impact program in course redesign. System wide collaborative. Partnership is health science, institutional research, institutional development, etc. Being monitored by steering committee. Key thing is the model is based on a whole course transformation model. Start with whole course, not a section of a course. May start implementation in a section to get data. But at end of

cycle a whole course (all sections) will adopt redesign. Starting in August there will be a cohort who will go through a faculty development program with deliverable at end of fall – a plan for the course. Systematic process.

Year 1 – 2015 – pilot. Small group prototyping. Number of courses will be fewer.

In following years, up to 15 courses.

By end of year 3, 30-35 courses.

How? All colleges are invited to participate. Are sending out request for application.

Application process is fairly minimal to determine if the course is a good candidate. Looking for large enrollment that are gateway courses. Will launch development phase in fall. In spring will develop those more fully. And redesigned course will go forward in Fall 2016. Comprehensive assessment on both student outcomes and faculty outcomes. Will have model for continuous course improvement as well as full scale course redesign.

Q: How are you going to work adjuncts into this? Many of our large enrollment courses are taught by adjuncts? A: That is the crux of the issue. There was deliberation on when to bring in adjuncts. Decision made to go with strong faculty leader, then in spring have some development with other instructors in the course. Two things needed – faculty development for buy in as well as proof of the concept. ILC can help encourage others. Need departmental support. Department chair has to be on board, even if in stages; as well as the deans. Senator noted that incorporation of active learning is very time consuming. Sue said much of the heavy lifting is likely to be done by ILC staff.

Comment: Lot going on around university. One of the president's priorities is to become more scholarly research intensive institution but there is an inherent conflict between the amount of time spent teaching and time left for scholarly work. Need to be mindful of efficiency – task force looking at optimizing relationship between teaching and research. Need help enhancing time available for scholarly activities.

Comment: One challenge is student with writing skills. Enhancing student-faculty interaction needs to be encouraged.

SM – big research opportunity at this point. Could be a study of redesign's contribution to enhanced research.

**Motion to adjourn; 2d; 4:05**



### 3.3.4.2 Emeritus Dean

#### Introduction

The institution may confer, at its discretion, the title of “emeritus” on any Dean who, at the time of retirement, had 10 or more years of honorable and distinguished service to the University of South Alabama.

#### Eligibility

All academic Deans holding rank of Dean at the University are eligible for consideration for emeritus status. The Dean must have retired officially from the University of South Alabama and have ten or more years of service at the university. Deans entering into retirement as the result of a disability may be exempt from the ten year requirement. Deans may also be considered by exception posthumously.

#### Criteria

Eligible Deans are recognized for emeritus status for honorable and distinguished service to the university. It is expected that this would be evident in significant contributions in one or more of the following areas: teaching, research, service, scholarship, or administration.

#### Procedures

- At the time of retirement the eligible Deans will be considered for emeritus status by the Provost / Vice President for Health Sciences.
- With a favorable vote from Faculty Senate, the Provost / Vice President for Health Sciences will send a letter to the President. The nomination letter must address one or more of the stated criteria. Additionally, current curriculum vitae must accompany the nomination letter. Deans not considered at the time of retirement due to differences in historic policies, may also be recommended.
- The Provost / Vice President for Health Sciences will review all materials / recommendations and forward a recommendation along with the nomination materials / recommendations to the President.
- The President will review all materials / recommendations and forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. All recommendations will be considered by the Board of Trustees only once each year, during the September meeting.
- Upon approval of the Board of Trustees, the President will send a letter to the candidate notifying her/him of the emeritus appointment. The duration of the emeritus appointment is for life unless terminated earlier by the Board of Trustees.

#### Benefits / Privileges

- Emeritus Status is an honor that includes the following privileges to the extent available:
- Name included in listing of Emeritus Deans
- Certificate with name and emeritus status
- Library privileges including opportunity to use electronic databases within library
- Invitations to various university events
- May serve by invitation on various university related committees
- May be invited to serve as guest lecturer or in other volunteer service
- University email account available

- May be a member of recreation center
- May use Faculty Club
- May attend university cultural events

## Motion for the Formation of an *Ad Hoc* Health Affairs Committee

Whereas, The Faculty Senate represents the whole of the Faculty including the caucuses of the College of Allied Health Professions, the College of Medicine and the College of Nursing; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has recently added a new caucus comprised of faculty from the Mitchell Cancer Institute; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate currently has no standing or *ad hoc* committees representing the Faculty with respect to the Medical and Health Sciences, Health Care delivery or the University of South Alabama Health System; therefore

*Resolved*, The Faculty Senate authorizes the formation of an *Ad Hoc* Health Affairs Committee with the charge and description as given below:

*Ad Hoc* Health Affairs Committee: This Committee represents the faculty in matters related to the Health and Medical Sciences, Health Care delivery and the University of South Alabama Health System.

This committee will be charged to serve for one year, after which the Faculty Senate will vote on its status as a Standing Committee. The committee will be comprised of any Faculty Senator who wishes to serve on this *ad hoc* committee.

Proposed chair:                      Mark Gillespie, College of Medicine

## **Caucus Reports – submitted in writing**

### **College of Allied Health Professionals**

Elisa Kennedy from Physical Therapy, Susan Gordon-Hickey from Speech Pathology-Audiology, and Mona Hagmaier from Physician Assistant Studies were elected to serve as COAHP senators for the next 3 year term. Julie Estis will continue to serve as a senator as post president in the upcoming year. The senators have been actively involved in the search process for the new Dean during the spring semester.

### **Mitchell College of Business**

#### **1. 2nd Story Business Program**

The Mitchell College of Business and Career Services continue their 2nd story business program that links employers with students. Recent employers include IBM, Alabama Department of Revenue and Old Navy. Announcement of each week's visiting employer can be found in the Daily Digest. Please encourage your students to stop by.

#### **2. Meet the Editors**

On Friday April 17th, the Mitchell College of Business will host editors of leading academic journals to discuss publishing in top-tier journals. Both panel discussions and breakout sessions are scheduled.

Dr. Steve Kachelmeier  
R. B. McDonald Chair of Accounting  
Univ of Tex  
Past Editor of the Accounting Review

Dr. David Ortinau  
Professor of Marketing  
Univ of South Florida  
Co-Editor of Journal of Business Research

Dr. Robert VanNess  
Bruce Moore Scholar in Finance  
Univ of Mississippi  
Co-Editor - The Financial Review

Dr. Jonathon Halbesleben  
Healthsouth Chair of Healthcare Management  
Univ of Alabama  
Editor - Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology

University Committee Reports

**Course Fee Review Committee – L. Minchew** - see announcements re need for fully completed paperwork and understandable explanation of fee and its justification.

## **End of Year Committee Reports – Submitted in Writing**

### **Salary & Benefits Committee**

During the 2014-2015 academic year the Faculty Senate Salary & Benefits Committee completed several objectives aimed at evaluating the status of current faculty compensation. The Faculty Senate has expressed concerns that USA is losing faculty due to compensation issues and is also losing potential new hires due to these same issues. The committee requested both an internal and external salary review. The purpose of the internal salary review is to evaluate compression/inversion as well as potential gender disparities. The purpose of the external salary survey is to learn if USA's salaries are competitive with our peer institutions. The faculty senate executive committee and salary & benefits committee members met with the leadership team to discuss these salary evaluations. President Waldrop has approved completion of an internal salary survey and has plans for completion of the external salary survey in the early part of 2016. Goals for 2015-2016 include continuing our efforts related to the 403b and tuition reimbursement benefits.

**Submitted by Susan Gordon-Hickey**

Faculty Senate Research and Creative Activities Committee  
Submitted by Ellen Buckner

The Research Committee members are Jonathon Audia, Ellen Buckner, Clista Clanton, Ellen Burton Harrington, Elisa Kennedy, Mihaela Marin, Bill Richards, and Saami “Yaz” Yazdani. *Ad hoc* members are Lynne Chronister, VP for Officer of Research and Economic Development (ORED), and Kim Littlefield (also of ORED).

The chair (or designee) has attended the College Research Council (Asst. Deans for Research) and ORED Office Chronister & Littlefield have met with Dr. Buckner periodically. Various announcements and reports have been circulated to the Committee.

#### Research Committee Goals for 2014-2015

1. Continue to engage faculty to create a culture of research, creative activities, and scholarship (Fandango, grant/incentive publicity, resolution of issues, collaboration with ORED).
2. Develop networking to facilitate interdisciplinary research teams in Arts & Sciences, and Health Sciences.
3. Explore educational opportunities for building research capacity among faculty from across the University.
4. Serve as review committee as needed for ORED activities.

The committee met approximately monthly and coordinated/discussed the following:

1. Coordinated Fall Fandango for networking and showcase of Institutes and Centers took place on November 19<sup>th</sup>. There was excellent participation (70+) with excellent evaluations.
2. Continued to publicize faculty opportunities. For example, the ORED grant to “buy out” one course so faculty can devote time to scholarship was under subscribed with fewer applications than available incentives. There was an increase however in Arts & Humanities Small Grants applications from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015 (semi-annual application cycle).
3. Reviewed and made recommendations for funding of Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 Arts & Humanities Small Grant Applications.
4. Reviewed and supported USA pursuing addition of REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) data management service developed by Vanderbilt University. This is currently being reviewed by Andy Lightbourne at Computing. <https://redcap.vanderbilt.edu/>
5. Discussed Graduate Student and Faculty Research Forum and ways to increase participation by faculty. An overall faculty scholarship day could be developed to showcase faculty work ongoing and recently presented. This needs to be

reviewed and discussed in more depth. Other scholarship events include college/school level (COM in August, A&H in spring) and undergraduate (UCUR in fall). These all need to be in calendar and publicized. Clarification continues to be needed for the different internal grants (USAFDG, ORED) and how these can be communicated to faculty. The committee discussed with ORED recognition event for past and current A&H grant awardees.

6. Tentatively identified date and topic for Fall 2015 for Fandango September 16<sup>th</sup> (following September Senate Meeting) with interdisciplinary research groups highlighted. Fandango would also showcase additional centers and core services available to faculty. We will publicize at New Faculty Orientation and invite last two years new faculty as we have done before.
7. The ORED has purchased the research administration software, EVisions. The implementation schedule and process is being planned-e.g. how it articulates with banner, proposal tracking and submission, post-award change management and etc.
8. Articulation with Presidential Priorities:
  - #1 Student retention: The new advising database will give opportunities for research.
  - #2 Research: A Chair's Retreat was held to focus on the Research Priority. The Committee gave input to the Agenda with numerous suggestions on ways to focus on capacity building, the role of the chair in developing a strategic plan and coaching faculty and scholarship teams.
  - #3 International priorities: Emphasis is on bringing in international students and in establishing international research collaborations.
  - #4 Community involvement: There will be a push to have us apply for the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification in 2010. This will mean our Health Disparity Research Group (HDRG) and Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) groups will be part of that. The HDRG, CBPR, and Cancer Control & Prevention (MCI-CCP) groups are working in this area. We plan to invite these groups to present in September at the Fandango.
  - #5 Health Services: Continued input is needed for the Health Sciences Division Strategic Plan.
9. Scorecard: ORED stated that there will be a scorecard for scholarship developed. This will include departments and schools' # UG research, # Grad Research, # Post-doc research, # Faculty research, etc. We need to have representation on this group.
10. Committee was encouraged to promote submission of REU supplement request to NSF grants to support our UG research programs. We need to learn more about new criteria and partnerships required and incorporate into our requests.



11. ORED Website for Research Development & Learning: Kim Littlefield has developed the site: <http://www.usouthal.edu/departments/research/rdl/index.html>  
The overall ORED website is working to add internal grants, metrics, and policies. Kim welcomes faculty to send her resources, announcements and other information that can be added.
12. The committee approved a procedure for creating a subcommittee of the committee for review of Arts & Humanities Grant applications. Ellen Burton Harrington agreed to chair sub-committee in the Fall 2015.

*Subcommittee to Review Arts and Humanities Grants*

*Immediately before the deadline for submission of USA Arts and Humanities Grant proposals, the Faculty Senate Research Committee chair will appoint a member of the Research Committee to serve as the chair of the USA Arts and Humanities Grant Subcommittee. Whenever possible, the chair of this subcommittee should be a faculty member from one of the departments covered by the grant who is not submitting a grant for that cycle.*

*The chair of the USA Arts and Humanities Grant Subcommittee will request that three members of the Research Committee from any discipline serve on the subcommittee. In addition, the chair of the subcommittee will request additional representation from members of the Faculty Senate (not on the Research Committee) from the Arts and Humanities, making an effort to represent a range of areas of expertise from the Arts and Humanities. If members of the Faculty Senate from the Arts and Humanities from a range of disciplines are not able to serve on the grant subcommittee, the chair of the subcommittee will request faculty volunteers from underrepresented areas. No one serving on the subcommittee can submit a grant proposal during that consideration period.*

*In addition, during regular meetings in September and October 2015, the Research Committee will formulate a draft rubric for the grant consideration. The members of the subcommittee will refine this rubric before using it in the consideration. Future grant subcommittees will use (and, if desired, refine) this rubric in grant consideration.*

The Committee has had an active year. Thanks to the members and the ORED leadership for excellent discussions!

Respectfully submitted,  
Ellen Buckner, Chair

**Academic Development and Mentoring Committee Report 2014-2015**

Chair: Tom Rich

*In 2014-2015 the primary goal of the Academic Development and Mentoring Committee has been to find appropriate faculty mentors/advisors for faculty in need of mentorship.*

*In essence this is a 'matchmaker.com' model for helping faculty in need of support and advice. This year faculty from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Nursing, Allied Health, and Education sought mentorship via the Faculty Senate. Results of mentoring efforts are difficult to quantify. That said, the positive outcomes have been finding mentors to assist in development of competitive grant submissions and to help for several faculty in time management/prioritization and other associated faculty development issues. In other instances we have not been able to identify faculty mentors that match well with the needs of the mentees. The difficulties rise in part from the lack of a formalized mentoring process on campus and the lack of a database of faculty mentors with defined areas of experience/expertise.*

*These observations highlight need to develop a more efficient process for faculty mentoring on campus. Toward this end the committee has compiled several faculty mentoring resources, including summaries of practices at a variety of academic institutions. These data should provide a starting point from which to work with the administration to develop guidelines/best practices for faculty mentoring at the University of South Alabama.*

## **Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Evaluation**

**Members:** David Benko, Elizabeth Fuller, Gerald Liu, Nutan Mishra, Thomas Shaw, Angela Coleman (*ad hoc*), Phil Carr (*ad hoc*), and Sam Fisher (*ad hoc*)

**Report:** The Senate Committee on Evaluation met three times throughout the 2014-15 academic year. The first meeting established a tentative time-table and procedure for crafting the Annual Faculty Survey, while the latter two meetings prepared the document. The Committee expects to make the Survey available to faculty during the second or third weeks of April, 2015. The Survey will be open for completion for a period of 7-10 days.

About 30% of the questions used in the 2013-14 version were deleted because they were outdated or were revised to improve clarity or to account for recent changes in University personnel or procedures. New topics also are included in the 2014-15 version of the Survey.

It is recommended that in forthcoming years the Evaluation Committee consider shortening or streamline the Survey in an effort to increase the response rate. This could be accomplished by identifying selected questions to be included in the Survey on an every-other-year basis and by judiciously determining which questions have outlived their usefulness to the Senate and its constituents.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark N. Gillespie, Ph.D.  
Evaluations Committee Chairperson

**2014-15 Final Report of the F.S. Environmental Committee Meeting  
Monday April 13, 2015**

2014-2015 Committee Members:

Chinkers, Michael	COM
Cioffi, Gene	COM
Freed, Chris	A&S
Gapud, Albert	A&S
Cecewicz, Chimene	SCESP
Phan, Anh-Vu	ENG
Taylor, April	A&S
Haywick, Doug (Chair)	A&S

Synopsis of 2014-15 activity.

The Faculty Senate Environmental Quality Committee dealt with three main issues this year. The first concerned the University's smoking policy. At the beginning of the Fall 2014 semester, the USA Wellness Committee asked the EQ Committee to develop questions for an online survey presenting options to change the current smoking policy (no smoking in buildings or university vehicles, no smoking 25 feet from building entrances). We worked in conjunction with others outside the senate and came up with questions for two possible surveys and presented both to the Wellness Committee. The selected survey was eventually distributed to faculty, staff and students and responses were used to gauge support for a smoke-free campus.

The second issue that the EQ Committee concentrated on this year was once again the gully area between the Humanities Building and the Marx Library/Student Center on the main campus of USA. For the past several years, the EQ Committee, as well as interested faculty and students outside the Senate, have been concerned about this area of campus. Despite cosmetic improvements along the edges of the gully (specifically landscaping near Humanities), the ravine itself is still unattractive and still prone to erosion. The bridge that crosses the southern tip of the gully is in urgent need of repair, and direct access for handicapped individuals between the Humanities Building and the Marx Library along the northern crossing is restricted because of stairs. The EQ Committee held a "walk about" and a presentation session with President Waldrop and representatives from Buildings and Grounds and Academic Affairs to outline our concerns and to provide suggestions by which to make the gully area a state-of-the-art teaching/research/recreational resource. Although positively received, University representatives noted that our suggestions for enhancement (based largely on a proposal by the 2013 USEPA Rainworks Challenge Team) would cost a considerable amount of money. Some work would have to be done "immediately" on the area (e.g., shoring up the bridge crossing) before plans for a more comprehensive project could be proposed. Although not the 100% enthusiastic response that we had hoped for, we feel that there is interest in Administration in making the gully area a much more attractive part of the main campus. We will just have to be patient and keep the gully area as an active area of concern for future EQ Committees.

The third area of focus for the 2014-15 EQ Committee was done more informally. There are several committees and student groups on campus that all have overlapping environmental interests. For example, there is a USA Sustainability Committee and a student Sustainability Council. There are student groups, some informal, that focus on composting (e.g., Homegrown), or recycling, or efficiency. It is desirable for all of these groups to have some interaction with one other. The Chair of the EQ Committee met separately with the chairs/leaders of many of these groups to discuss each of their mandates and to

suggest better collaboration between them. Nothing formal occurred this year, but a closer working relationship between all like-minded groups should be a goal for the 2015-16 EQ Committee.