

University of South Alabama

JagWorks@USA

Minutes 2018-2019

Faculty Senate Minutes

8-1-2018

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – August 2018

Faculty Senators

University of South Alabama

Follow this and additional works at: https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes_twentyeighteen

Recommended Citation

Senators, Faculty, "Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – August 2018" (2018). *Minutes 2018-2019*. 2.
https://jagworks.southalabama.edu/minutes_twentyeighteen/2

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 2018-2019 by an authorized administrator of JagWorks@USA. For more information, please contact jherrmann@southalabama.edu.



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH ALABAMA

Faculty Senate

August 22, 2018 – Faculty Club - 3:00 pm

Minutes

Present:

Cooper, O'Connor, Pelekanos, Thompson, Beebe, Gossett, Harrington, Hossain, Kozelsky, Lewis, Lindeman, Mark, Mata, McCready, Pavelescu, Robertson, St. Clair, Williams, Young, Zlomke, Campbell, McDonald, Gecewicz, Koestner, Donaldson, Keshock, Reeves, Woltring, Cleary, Poole, Spencer, Lemley, Shepard, Ponnambalam, Rich, Sayner, Weber, Madden, Pennywell, Turnipseed, Davis, Moore, Platt, Riley, Scott, Swanzy, Vandewaa, Varner, Younce, Aishwarya, Rocconi

Excused: Swiger, Lindeman, Reichert

Call to order: 3:10 pm

Approval of minutes: May 2018 meeting: motion to approve with amendments. 2nded. Approved.

Approval of agenda: Motion to approve. 2nded. Approved.

Search Updates

- Chief Diversity Officer
 - The search continues. Interviews are scheduled within the next week.
- Assistant Vice President for Research
 - More interviews are scheduled by Webex and then on-campus.

Old Business

- P&T External Reviewer Policy (Mara Kozelsky)

The initial proposed policy was designed to increase the quality of external reviewers and to make sure that certain language that had been taken for granted was made explicit: namely, that external reviewers must be external to USA and should be at or above the rank of faculty applying for promotion or tenure. Neither of these had been clear before, so new language was proposed to address these concerns. The CAD made changes that we went

back and forth on, but in the process, we lost transparency. Currently, at the end of the P&T application process, the policy allows for the full disclosure of names of reviewers which we think is a progressive policy. On the other hand, what the CAD proposed was a totally anonymous process, where the faculty member up for P&T could not find out the identity of the external reviewers. This is what we are as a committee and as a Senate need to consider.

In response to a question from a Senator, Mara stated that it had been a longstanding policy that a candidate would be notified of names of referees, but the CAD struck this clause, even though the Handbook Committee had tried to find middle ground. A suggestion was made from the floor to mark out only the name/identifying information of the reviewer. This way, the candidate would be able to read and respond to comments made in the reviewer's letter. A candidate should be able to see every point made about them, because egregious errors can be made, intentionally or unintentionally.

Mara asked for Senators to let her know if they had any strong objections, either in favor or not of the proposed policy. In response to a question, Mara stated that the FS can vote on this same policy with the change and reject their (CAD) retraction of transparency. Or, we could also revert to original policy which is how we currently operate. A vote was then taken for three options:

1. Eliminate transparency;
 2. Leave the policy as it has historically been: reveal the names of reviewers;
 3. Allow the candidate to see a list of potential reviewers and identify conflicts of interest.
- Chair Evaluation Policy (Mara Kozelsky)

To be voted on in September. The basic idea of this policy is a 5-year review for chairs which would be a step toward a rotating chair model; however, the Provost is not in favor of such a model. Some chairs have said that they do not want to be chairs for life, so the proposed policy would allow them to negotiate or step down. Ellen fought both for the inclusion of faculty feedback (1) and a discussion between the chair and the dean at the conclusion of the review process (2), but both of these proposed changes were struck by the CAD. One reason the CAD is not in favor of the policy is the worry that if enacted, the policy would create more work for them (i.e., Deans), especially in colleges with numerous departments. Question: There is great variation in colleges with regard to size. How

would such a policy be implemented university wide? Another commenter stated that if a chair got a good review, it would be leverage. If they got a bad review, they would have several years to undergo training to make corrections and improvements in job performance.

New Business

- ACUE - USA is partnering with the Association of College and University Educators to offer an initiative to faculty in the use of evidence-based teaching practices and active learning techniques. When faculty members complete the course, they earn a Certificate endorsed by ACUE. For more information, contact Raj Chaudhuri. Due to insufficient interest, the deadline was extended for one week. ACUE is a national program with strong support from the university.
- Email Policy – retirees will no longer be able to keep their official USA email account when retiring from the university, unless they are an emeritus or are working on a project under the auspices of USA. Question: what problem does this solve? The University Attorney was worried that student/patient information might be compromised. There was a lot of pushback at the CAD meeting: some deans observed that if students are allowed to keep their university email, why can't faculty? Some faculty still stay involved with colleagues after they retire.
- Call for Mentors – Tracy O'Connor needs mentors from different units.
- Community awards – be thinking of people who might be good candidates.
- Stadium Discussion – it was suggested that the Faculty Senate develop a list of questions about the stadium for presentation to the Administration. How is the university planning to pay for the stadium? How will the university make up the \$10 million shortfall that the City of Mobile was going to provide? We've been told that USA will not build the stadium unless we get a gift from a big donor and that no money will be used from academic resources, but instead from auxiliary entrepreneurial activities; i.e., dining, housing, bookstore. So who are the big donors? Is there a business case for building the stadium? Could it generate revenue? What are the maintenance costs? What are the advantages of the stadium? How will it impact the community and the campus on home game weekends? There is the hope a new stadium will more students. Will fees be increased for students? Were students ever asked their opinion on whether or not USA needed a new stadium? Or

faculty? The president of the SGA was very enthusiastic about the stadium when she spoke at the May Board of Trustees meeting, but we don't know if she represents student opinions about the stadium or not.

- Gwen Pennywell has joined MCOB administration and will be retiring from the Faculty Senate. MCOB needs a replacement Senator.

Adjournment: Move to adjourn: 4:15 pm.

Caucus and Committee Reports Submitted in Writing