

2018 SACSCOC Faculty Committee Meeting Minutes
Sep 28, 2016 (3:00-4:00pm) AD 3.104

Attendees: Murray Leaf (chair), Nicole Piquero (vice-chair), John Barden, , Lev Gelb, Karen Huxtable, Tim Redman, Marilyn Waligore, R. Chandrasekaran, Serenity King.

Absent: Candice Mills, John Sibert, Jillian Duquaine-Watson, Todd Fechter, Christine Dollaghan, Meghna Sabharwal.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Murray Leaf at 3:00 pm.

II. Work Update on Principles

Dr. Leaf circulated notes for the meeting based on his reading of the narratives so far. Notes are italics. Responses are regular font:

Important general question: How do we get this smoothed out and final for November 1? The committee agreed to have final versions completed in their work spaces by October 17. We will then go over them remotely, and can comment. Leaf will set up a Doodle poll for a meeting time for the 20th or 21st, if possible, or soon thereafter.

2.8 Faculty. Marilyn has updated the narrative. Judgment is compliance. Faculty ratio to student ratio is 32 to 1. Faculty ratio with all the voting faculty is about 24 to 1. We described this as adequate. Very good schools look for a much smaller ratio. I think in the California System the allowance was 24 to 1 for lower level UG and 12 to 1 for upper level. Good little liberal arts colleges have 10 to 1. Our ratios reflect State formula funding, which is constraining. Should we discuss this?

Serenity said the SACS standard is based on full time faculty. The committee agreed to stay with that, but we may note the way current state formula funding constrains our ability to have our teaching done by tenure-track faculty.

3.2.8. Qualified administrative officers. We make a distinction between administrative officers and academic officers. Their language is one/the other. Our discussion is only our academic officers. Is this clear enough in the text? John B has updated the narrative. Some information is still missing. Tim is reading it. The new version has not yet been posted.

Missing information is being provided. Serenity and John are in communication. Nothing for the committee to decide.

3.2.9. Personnel appointments. Jillian and Meghna have updated it with comments but not with changes. Many of the comments are questions about whether policies have been updated. Who will check this?

Serenity's group will update, but the committee will still have access to the files after Nov 1, so the members can check the policies to be sure they are the right ones after Serenity's is has done what they can.

3.4.10. Responsibility for curriculum. Lev has updated the descriptions of school level processes this morning. This seems to be almost complete except that there are still some questions in the comments and we should put in answers. Everybody should now read over the whole thing and make sure is coherent.

Information from 2 schools is missing: NS&M and IS. Lev will finalize. Others in his group will go over it before Nov 17.

3.4.11. Academic program coordination. Lev has updated it. His notes ask whether we really need to include information in the schools. He says serenity says no. That is good enough for me. MJL.

We need terminal degrees of program heads. Serenity's group will provide them degrees. We may need to explain the connections.

3.5.4. Terminal degrees of faculty. This has been updated little bit dealing with the arts. Are we waiting for more data, or is the rest already correct? John S?

John S was not present; this may have gone unanswered.

3.7.1. Faculty competence. Nicole updated this I went over it on 23 September and suggested some changes that seems to be the last look at it. It needs some further adjustments. But generally is fine.

The numbers of faculty will change; information awaited.

3.7.2. Faculty evaluation. I see two things called workfile.TMP. One is the narrative. I think I have gone over this in a different form and made some comments. One was that I think we should mention that for full professor we expect continuing scholarly development and not merely more time in grade as associate. Otherwise, there is no way to account for a fairly large number of long-duration associate professors. We are also quite serious, usually, about expecting those promoted to full professors to have done their share of service.

Discussion turned up some issues regarding titles for NTS faculty that may need university-level resolution. In some schools, senior lecturer ranks are considered parallel to clinical professor, and in some schools clinical is considered higher. We should discuss more fully, probably in the Senate,

whether this should be consistent for the university or left to the schools. For SACS, for the university as whole, we should add language from the bylaws guidelines for schools on the hiring and promotion of tenure system and non-tenure system faculty. In accordance with them, school bylaws should make clear how specific titles are treated. We can check to see if they do so.

3.7.3. Faculty development. This seems to be pretty well work over by Nicole and Karen. On September 23 I suggested modification in the description of faculty development assignments (not leaves). These really don't come from a regents' rule. They are our own invention. The text needs a little adjusting then I think it's ready to go.

Nicole agreed.

3.7.4. Academic freedom. The work is titled NarrativeAcFreedom. So far, there are no further adjustments to the text. I went through it a few days ago to shorten it. Please somebody else look at it. The SACS comments ask for our definition of academic freedom. We have actually avoided making one very explicit. Implicitly, it is whatever freedoms honest scholarship and teaching require. See if what I say makes sense.

There were nods of agreement.

3.7.5. Faculty role in governance. The working copy is NarrativAcGovMJL2016. Again, I don't see anything in addition to my own words so I have no way of knowing if this makes sense to others. Please look at it.

Same response.

There was a discussion earlier in the meeting relevant here. There is inconsistency in referring to the Senate and officers. Faculty Senate or Academic Senate? Speaker of the Faculty or Speaker of the Senate? Secretary of the Faculty or Secretary of the Senate? The bylaws of the Senate consistently say Academic Senate. The bylaws also consistently say that the Speaker is Speaker of the Faculty and the Secretary is Secretary of the Faculty. So, we should use these titles for SACS, although we may note that Academic Senate is sometimes used to have the same meaning as Faculty Senate. Leaf will go over the 3.7.4 and 3.7.5 narratives to be sure they agree.

III. Meeting Schedule

- Narratives due in finished form in work files by Oct 17.
- A doodle poll will be sent out by Murray Leaf to determine the next meeting after everyone has the drafts. Target is Oct 20 or 21.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting dissolved at 4:00 pm.