Faculty Meeting

Friday, March 21, 2014

10-12

VCU vs. SFA at 6:30 TONIGHT!!!

1. Laura Osborne – New changes to D2L – Version 10.3
2. Ad Hoc HMS Tenure Policy Committee update (handout)
3. Speaker for HMS New Student Orientation Fall, 2014 (3:30 Sept 2)
4. IDEC Fellow!!! Congratulations Dr. Perritt
5. 239 – Possible Honors Program
6. FND Search
7. Coordinators – “Future Students – Future Revenues” (handout)
8. Articulations (updates….remember to use Legal Counsel’s template) (handout)

Assessment Committee – update and processes for each (Carl)

- Senior Survey (400)
- Freshman Survey (100)
- Employer Survey (?)
- Alumni Survey ?
- Graduate Survey ?

AD Hoc Internship committee (Can we do a diversity question/reflection at end of internship?)

1. job announcement to HBCU
2. Invite interview with Multicultural Affairs (handout)

10. Diversity in Higher Ed (Nedra)
11. Recruitment and Retention Committee – Get with program coordinators (Track Transfer students for HMS)

12. HMS 100, 300, 400 and ALL PLO courses.

13. Fundraising Ideas (Chay)
   - Parents Night Out $25/hr
   - Coliseum Clean Up/Trey Turner
   - Show for Dough/$100 per game
   - Research Funds
   - ARAMARK banquet set up
   - Lacy Claver – AXES on Student Affairs website

14. Committee Updates

15. FGOTO
The five must-watch games in the NCAA Tournament Round of 64

By Matt Norlander | College Basketball Writer
March 16, 2014 8:56 pm ET

We do this post every year. With 32 games going down on Thursday and Friday, you want to know which ones should play out to the closest endings. Which styles will give us really good games. What are upset possibilities? So here we are. The five Thursday/Friday games that you need to make sure you watch are below.

I do want to chime in real quick on the First Four games between at-large teams, though. Iowa-Tennessee is way intriguing. Both teams were expected to be single-digit seeds -- really, No. 6 or better -- entering this season. Both have a lot of talent. Iowa can score and run, but its defense is miserable. Tennessee has talent but is so inconsistent, I believe Vols fans are not even faithful they'll keep it close against Iowa.

I think Tennessee wins. Iowa has dropped six of its past seven.

In the other game, the field's surprise entrant, North Carolina State, plays Xavier. People don't know enough about the Musketeers, who have Semaj Christon. In a word, the guy is a baller. But Matt Stainbrook being healthy enough to play will be vital for Xavier. I'm actually thinking NC State wins a sloppy affair. T.J. Warren had an incredible season. He was the ACC Player of the Year and is one of the 10 best players entering this year's tournament. I'll take the Wolfpack in a close but ugly game.

Now, as for the games that we do have set in stone for later in the week; all times ET and p.m.

**South Region -- Ohio State (6) vs. Dayton (11), Thursday, 12:15 on CBS:** The intra-Ohio battle is interesting for a few reasons. First, Ohio State won't schedule Dayton during the regular season, so now the Buckeyes have to deal with the Flyers in the ultimate setting. What a thrill. Plus, you have a lot of kids on that Dayton team that probably would have loved to have been a Buckeye at some point. Passed over. That's motivation. Also, Jordan Sibert plays for Dayton. Used to be a Buckeye. Spicy.

It could be the final game of Aaron Craft's career. OSU has had huge issues on offense this season, illustrated by the play that eliminated the Buckeyes from the Big Ten tournament. **Midwest Region -- Louisville (4) vs. Manhattan (13), Thursday, approx. 9:50 on TNT:** What a plot line. Rick Pitino coaching against Steve Masiello. Masiello attended Kentucky when Pitino coached there. But the two go back even further. Masiello was a ball boy for Pitino's Knicks teams during the 1980s. Neither man is happy to be coaching in this game. The two must have felt nauseated upon seeing the bracket reveal.
But it will make for a hell of a watch! Louisville is a chic Final Four pick, understandably, but Manhattan is actually the sneakiest upset play of any 12 seed or lower that nobody's taking a chance on right now. Jaspers have vigor!

**East Region** -- **North Carolina** (6) vs. **Providence** (11), **Friday, 7:20 on TNT**: It's intriguing because North Carolina is an enigma. Yeah, UNC has shown for a while that it's reasonable to consider it a top-20 team. But those bad losses can't be forgotten. And UNC didn't look good in falling 80-75 to Pittsburgh (a Pitt team that's overseeded, by the way) in the ACC tournament.

I just saw Providence win the Big East tournament and basically revive a dormant fan base in the process. It was a thrilling scene at MSG on Saturday night. The Friars are better than a No. 11 seed. Probably a 9, just in terms of what the team is and what it can do. I think they can catch UNC on an off night. Of any Round of 64 game, I feel like this is the one -- outside of the 8/9s -- that has the best chance of being in doubt with 30 seconds to go.

**South Region** -- **VCU** (5) vs. **Stephen F. Austin** (12), **Friday, 7:27 on truTV**: My single favorite game Thursday or Friday has to offer. VCU has Havoc and Shaka Smart and Briante Weber's awesome stealing ability. The Rams work you, and they're an incredible watch.

And they're going up against a team that has won 29 in a row and 58 of its past 65 games. Stephen F. Austin is an intriguing story. I haven't had time to research this, but at the very least SFA is one of only a handful of teams, if that, to enter the **NCAA Tournament** with a winning streak of 29 or more games. Small-major team, but they've killed a lot of their opponents. And they play a much different style than VCU. I'm thrilled the NCAAs rewarded SFA with a solid seed. Winning that many games is tough, and they can't control their league schedule. Give 'em a No. 12, and they did.

I think it's a total toss-up. I'll take SFA merely because winning 29 straight blows my mind, no matter what name is on the jersey.

**Midwest Region** -- **Kentucky** (8) vs. **Kansas State** (9), **Friday, approx. 9:40 on CBS**: Way, way too many people are assuming Kentucky's going to beat K-State. It's an all-Wildcats battle, with the purple-tinged ones owning wins over Gonzaga, Kansas, Iowa State and Oklahoma State. Kentucky has beaten Louisville, Providence and Tennessee. This is no gimme game, folks. Bruce Weber's team stands a very good chance of not only winning, but winning comfortably.

If you're going to take one factor into account here, it's that Kentucky was reportedly way ticked off at receiving a No. 8 seed. I want to see Calipari's guys play with anger. Why not? Then it will get interesting. But I'll believe it when I see it.
1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure

In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

Academic Freedom

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.[2] Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.[3]
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.[4]

Academic Tenure

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

1. The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.
2. Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's
total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.  

3. During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.  

4. Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges and should have the opportunity to be heard in his or her own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon the case. The teacher should be permitted to be accompanied by an advisor of his or her own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from the teacher's own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.  

5. Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

1940 Interpretations

At the conference of representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges on November 7-8, 1940, the following interpretations of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure were agreed upon:

1. That its operation should not be retroactive.
2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph 3 of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph 4 of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges, the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

1970 Interpretive Comments

Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.

The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 Statement of Principle on Academic Freedom and Tenure have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 Statement, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 Statement is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 Statement; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 Statement on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership
in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the Statement on Professional Ethics adopted in 1966 as Association policy. (A revision, adopted in 1987, may be found in AAUP, Policy Documents and Reports, 10th ed. [Washington, D.C., 2006], 171–72.)

2. The intent of this statement is not to discourage what is "controversial." Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teachers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.

3. Most church-related institutions no longer need or desire the departure from the principle of academic freedom implied in the 1940 Statement, and we do not now endorse such a departure.

4. This paragraph is the subject of an interpretation adopted by the sponsors of the 1940 Statement immediately following its endorsement which reads as follows:

If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph 3 of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph 4 of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges, the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

Paragraph 3 of the section on Academic Freedom in the 1940 Statement should also be interpreted in keeping with the 1964 Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances, which states inter alia: "The controlling principle is that a faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for his or her position. Extramural utterances rarely bear upon the faculty member's fitness for the position. Moreover, a final decision should take into account the faculty member's entire record as a teacher and scholar."

Paragraph 5 of the Statement on Professional Ethics also deals with the nature of the "special obligations" of the teacher. The paragraph reads as follows:

As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary and the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time faculty and teaching assistants, who exercise teaching responsibilities.

5. The concept of "rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank" is intended to include any person who teaches a full-time load regardless of the teacher's specific title.  

6. In calling for an agreement "in writing" on the amount of credit given for a faculty member's prior service at other institutions, the Statement further the general policy of full understanding by the professor of the terms and conditions of the appointment. It does not necessarily follow that a professor's tenure rights have been violated because of the absence of a written agreement on this matter. Nonetheless, especially because of the variation in permissible institutional practices, a written understanding concerning these matters at the time of appointment is particularly appropriate and advantageous to both the individual and the institution.

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the 1940 Statement with respect to the termination of service of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.

The general principle of notice contained in this paragraph is developed with greater specificity in the Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment, endorsed by the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors (1984). These standards are:

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:
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1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.

3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

Other obligations, both of institutions and of individuals, are described in the Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members, as endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors in 1961.

8. The freedom of probationary teachers is enhanced by the establishment of a regular procedure for the periodic evaluation and assessment of the teacher's academic performance during probationary status. Provision should be made for regularized procedures for the consideration of complaints by probationary teachers that their academic freedom has been violated. One suggested procedure to serve these purposes is contained in the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, prepared by the American Association of University Professors.

9. A further specification of the academic due process to which the teacher is entitled under this paragraph is contained in the Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1958. This interpretive document deals with the issue of suspension, about which the 1940 Statement is silent.

The 1958 Statement provides: “Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay.” A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

The concept of “moral turpitude” identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year’s teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year’s teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally.

Endnotes:
1 The word “teacher” as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties. Back to text

2 Boldface numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments that follow. Back to text


4 For a more detailed statement on this question, see “On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period,” Policy Documents and Reports, 10th ed. (Washington, D.C., 2006), 55-56. Back to text

Endorsers
The 1940 Statement of Principles has been endorsed by more than 200 scholarly and education groups.

Report Category: Standing Committee and Subcommittee Reports Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Due Process

Tags: Academic Freedom Tenure Association of American Colleges and Universities
Choosing Where to Compete

Five Emerging Student Segments

- Adult Degree Completers: 3M → 20M
- Professional Master's: 1.3M → ?
- Community College Transfers: 3M → 5M
- English Language Learners: 35K → 500K
- Low-Income, High-Ability: 2.8K → 35K

Net Revenue Potential

Market Size
Current → Potential

Source: Education Advisory Board interviews and analysis
Articulations:
Angelina - CDFL
Austin - HADM
Blinn - CDFL
Central Texas – (Notice of Intent) CDFL
Del Mar - CDFL
El Centro – HADM; FM
Houston - ID
Kilgore - CDFL
Kingwood - ID
Le Cordon Bleu - HADM
Lon Morris - HADM
Odessa - CDFL
St. Phillips - CDFL
Tarrant - CDFL
Tyler Junior - CDFL
Western Texas - CDFL
Hiring, Recruitment and Retention Practices
To increase Diversity within Faculty Populations

For the purpose of early recruitment, program faculty members are encouraged to identify university program contacts for the purpose of sending letters to chairs and program directors at historically minority-majority institutions AND predominantly White institutions to develop contacts with current students at the dissertation level within disciplines. These relationships are typically established in advance of openings.

Offices of Multicultural Affairs/Affirmative Action/Diversity and/or Human Resources and/or Search Committee Chair are required to review all announcement posting locations to insure that publications and communications specific to racial/ethnic group diversity have been contacted. This review process would also include the submission of a form to applicants requesting voluntary submission of information related to diversity. This allows a means to assess the composition of the application pool.

Search Committee Chairs in collaboration with committee members are required to write a report that includes the announcement publication, diversity-specific recruitment activity, description of the application pool, search committee ranking of candidates, interview processes attending to points of diversity noted within the ranking, and selection process of applicants invited for telephone and on-campus interviews. Reasons for the final decision at each point must be clearly noted in the written reports. No search would be approved by Human Resources until there is documentation of effort to broaden search to minority-related publications/contacts and/or documentation of diversity within the application pool.

Search Committees and/or interview processes must be composed of program faculty, faculty selected from the department, member/members from representatives from on-campus minority faculty and student organizations, and related professional groups within the surrounding committee. If not for direct service on the search committee, minimal participation would include diverse professional populations for attendance at candidates’ on-campus presentations.

All candidates invited for on-campus interviews must have interviews scheduled with a college or university-wide Committees of Multicultural/Diversity Affairs and/or minority/special population student groups.

Dossiers of ALL applicants, majority and/or minority group members, with professional experiences in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service related to specific points of diversity, will be weighted differently, more positively in decision-making, than those that do not reflect some experience or background with attention to some point of diversity. This practice will increase the probability of hiring culturally sensitive/aware faculty regardless of racial/ethnicity status.

Final reports with the rank ordered candidates must include a summary of the evaluations distributed after the on-campus presentation. Forms would include an indication of the status of the attendee. As indicated above, community members composed of diverse populations, office of multicultural affairs staff and students, program students, members of the college of multicultural affairs, faculty, etc. would be invited to attend and participate in the evaluation of each candidate.

The Office of Multicultural Affairs might work with College and Departmental representatives to develop a graduate program-level mentoring program for future academicians with a specialty in diversity in research, teaching, and service delivery. The overall objective would be to encourage students’ successful application for doctoral education and possible future placement as faculty at SPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enriches the education experiences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the American Council on Education