

**Stephen F. Austin State University
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Meeting No. 212
May 8, 1991**

1. Chairperson K. Mace called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in Regents Suite B of the University Center. Dr. Mace welcomed Sen. Roy Blake (Board of Regents), new senators, and Kent Hutchison (President of SGA) to the meeting.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

- * The minutes of Meeting No. 211 were approved as printed.

3. **Chairperson's Report**

- * Chairperson Mace reported on decisions made by the President on recommendations sent to him by the Faculty Senate. Dr. Bowen has given his rationale for either approving or disapproving each of the proposals and resolutions sent to him by the Senate. [See Attachment]
- * Dr. Mace reported that a letter has been received from State Representative Jerry Johnson in response to the Senate's letter. Mr. Johnson supports our stands and will continue to be a strong supporter of SFA.
- * Dr. Mace reported on the Board of Regents meeting, and distributed a copy of financial decisions approved by the Board. The Regents' Finance Committee, in a special meeting with the Fiscal Vice President and fiscal advisors, reviewed decisions made at the January meeting. The Regents voted to approve the package, based on the explanation from the Chairman of the committee [page 18 of Financial Affairs report].

Anyone who wants to can attend Regents committee meetings. All meetings are open to the public.

- * The Coordinating Board Executive Summary of Texas Higher Education Governance for the Twenty-first Century is on file in the Senate office.

4. **Treasurer's Report**

- * Treasurer D. Shows reported the following disbursements as of May 8, 1991.

Balance brought Forward	\$ 1,167.64
Expenditures	
Telephone	6.00
Payroll	123.25
Travel	0.00
Postage	5.90
Photocopies	1.05
Supplies	18.69
Steno Bureau	130.53
Balance	\$ 822.22

- * Dr. Shows reported that expenditures for the academic year are comparable to expenses from the previous year. The cost of print services is the leading expense for the Senate since we had to reproduce a number of reports for the general faculty.

5. Secretary's Report

- * Secretary M. Carns reported on procedures performed by the Senate Secretary. Several distribution lists are maintained for the various Senate reports and activities. Copies of the full Minutes are distributed to the Board of Regents, the University President, VPAA, Deans, and all requesting faculty. The Faculty Senate Report is a condensed version of the Minutes, and is distributed to everyone on the distribution list for the Minutes plus all SFA faculty. Other distribution lists are maintained for Agendas and special reports.
 - Faculty have shown an increased interest in Senate activities this year. Approximately 195 copies of the Minutes are being distributed on a regular basis.

All Senate Minutes, Reports, and resolutions are kept on the Faculty Senate computer. The Senate office is now using WordPerfect 5.1. All resolutions for 1988-1991 have been individually listed by unique filenames, keyed by identifying numbers to the meetings where they were approved. Sylvia Howard, student assistant for Spring 1991, has prepared a complete "job description" of the student assistant's duties and responsibilities. Senator Carns commended Ms. Howard for the excellent work done for the Senate this semester.

6. Committee Reports

- * Finance and Administration Committee (J. Howard, Chair)
 - Senator J. Howard reported on the charges to and responses by the Finance and Administration Committee for the current academic year:
 - In order to establish a statistical base, the committee was instructed to study funding for travel, materials and supplies in various schools and departments of the university for the past ten years coupled with a comparison of this academic funding with that of the intercollegiate sports program. A preliminary report was presented on February 13, 1991. Completion and submission of the final report is expected by September 1, 1991.
 - The committee was instructed to compare administration salaries with those of faculty for the past ten years, and to study the proliferation of administrative offices. The final reports will be completed by September 1, 1991.
 - The committee was instructed to develop a study of the procedures, funding, and academic awards by the University Foundation. The report of committee findings was submitted on April 3, 1991.
 - The committee was asked to investigate the possibility of changing the selection of members of the University Committees that report to the President to an election procedure instead of being appointed by the President. The committee recommendation was submitted to the President, noted in Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes (December 12, 1990). The Report on Survey of Faculty was submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Elections Committee (April 13, 1990).
 - The committee was asked to investigate which funds generated by various units of the university are returned to the units which generated them. If funds are returned to some units but not to others, the committee was to determine the basis for the return (Boards of Regents directive, President's office, V.P. for Fiscal Affairs). Submission of the final report is expected by September 1, 1991.

Senator Howard moved that the Senate approve the report of the Finance and Administration Committee.

Seconded by Senator L. Clark

Motion passed

* Professional Welfare Committee (J. Seaton, Chair)

- Senator J. Seaton reported that the committee that the Professional Welfare Committee was involved in the formulation of thirteen proposals during academic year 1990-91.

Nine proposals were passed by the Senate. Complete versions of the proposals may be found in the Minutes cited below.

- Develop a comprehensive smoking policy for the University (Mtg. #208) [Presidential action: approved]
- Waiver of student service, student center, and general fees for faculty and staff members (Mtg. #208) [Presidential action: disapproved]
- Proposals on faculty evaluation forms (Mtg. #208)
- Proposal for on-line campus calendar (Mtg. #208) [Presidential action: approved]
- School and departments should formulate exact criteria for awarding merit (Mtg. #211)
- Names of recipients of merit raises should be made known, with descriptions of recipients' achievements (Mtg. #211)
- Those who make decisions regarding merit should be clearly identified. (Mtg. #211)
- Nominations for merit should normally be done by departmental chairpersons, although it should always be possible for a person to apply for merit (Mtg. #211)
- Committees might be used to assist the deans, department chairs and vice presidents [in merit selection], but they should not be anonymous panels (Mtg. #211)

Two proposals were rejected by the Senate.

- Notice of failure to attain merit should be given to the unsuccessful candidate with reasons for rejection (Mtg. #211)
- Merit raises should not awarded until cost of living increases have been made (Mtg. #211)
- Evaluations for merit should not be at a level above the dean's level except in the case where an appeal is made (Mtg. #211; failed with "chair" substituted for "dean")

The following proposal is expected to be voted on at the May Faculty Senate meeting (Mtg. #212):

- The policy for compensation of faculty teaching overloads should be clearly stated in the Faculty Handbook and/or the University Policy Manual.

Copies of the committee report will be distributed to all senators.

* Faculty Governance Committee (K. Price, Chair)

- Senator K. Price reported that the charge to the Faculty Governance Committee was to determine participation of faculty in the decision-making process at other universities. The committee spent all of its time looking at what other universities have done relative to faculty governance and decision-making. The committee looked at the Faculty Senate constitutions of Indiana University (Bloomington) and the University of Colorado at Boulder. The found that there is a great variance in how much activity the faculty plays in the decision-making process. At Bloomington, every decision is approved by some committee of the Faculty Senate, including tenure and curriculum. The committee does not think that all of the areas of activity are appropriate for SFASU. A more extensive study needs to be completed before a complete set of recommendations is made.

The Faculty Governance Committee recommends that the project continue next year. It is important for faculty to continue to be interested in faculty governance.

* Ethics Committee (C. Brown, Chair)

- Senator C. Brown reported that the Ethics Committee looked at Codes of Ethics for different

professional organizations to determine if a need exists for a "code of ethics" for professors. The committee concluded that little would be gained from a new code. It is the belief of the committee that the Faculty Handbook (VI-1) and the documents of the Coordinating Board (Policy Paper Number 1, Revised 1978) adequately address the questions of academic responsibility and ethics. The committee feels that the statement on academic responsibility in the Faculty Handbook provides a sufficient framework for professional integrity and ethics.

* Election Committee (S. Weems, Chair)

- Senator S. Weems reported that the Election Committee conducted all of the elections assigned to it. The committee handled elections to the Senate, assorted committees, amendments to the constitution and by-laws, and conducted surveys of faculty views on committee selection procedures.

The committee will turn in written record of elections, candidates, and results for the Senate files.

7. Old Business

- * Chairperson K. Mace moved that the Senate adopt the following recommendation to the President and Board of Regents of Stephen F. Austin State University: Since inflation has seriously decreased the spending power of SFASU faculty over the past several years, the Faculty Senate of Stephen F. Austin State University recommends to the President and to the Board of Regents that an across-the-board salary increase, of an equal dollar-amount for all academic ranks, be given for the academic years 1991-92 and 1992-93.

Motion seconded by Senator B. Johnson

Discussion: Chairperson Mace explained that he had voted "no" to break the tie on an earlier proposal to grant across-the-board salary increases because he believes increases should be as a definite figure (dollar amount) rather than as a percentage increase so that all academic ranks would receive the same amount of funds. If increases are granted on a percentage basis, faculty with lower salaries will drop still farther behind. Those at the lower end of the salary scale need increases more than those at the upper levels.

Motion passed

- * Chairperson Mace reported that the Executive Committee met twice to discuss the development of a questionnaire to survey faculty views on participation in intercollegiate athletics.
 - The President of SGA has been contacted. He is interested in including students in the survey, and SGA wants to cooperate in developing the instrument for the survey.
 - The Executive Committee also expressed doubts about the questionnaire that was given to it by the committee. Senator D. Shows is developing some additional questions.
 - The Executive Committee voted to table the proposed questionnaire so that it could be reconsidered by the 1991-92 Senate.

Chairperson Mace recommended that such a questionnaire be formulated, in cooperation with the Student Government Association.

8. New Business

- * On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Senator E. Ledger introduced three motions concerning the grievance procedure. The committee feels that the grievance procedure is basically sound, but that it could be improved in a few ways.

- The committee received varied input from the faculty. Some felt the procedure should be left as it is, and others wanted substantive changes.

Senator Ledger moved that: During the Advisory Committee hearing, a time limit of eight hours should be imposed on each side for the presentation of evidence and questioning of witnesses.

Motion seconded by Senator J. Howard

Discussion:

- Senator Ledger reported that the committee felt that eight hours would be a sufficient length of time, and precludes drawing out the process to the detriment of either side.
- In response to a question from Senator M. Turnage, Senator Ledger noted that the length of time proposed was extracted from recommendations of faculty who had served on an advisory hearing. Senator J. Howard reported that this was the time recommended by the Advisory Committee after they had conducted a hearing.
- Senator B. Carr questioned whether the time limit is enforceable. Could one side appeal, on the grounds that time had not been adequate for the presentation of evidence? Senator Ledger responded that the proposal refers to the Advisory Hearing only, and the Advisory Committee would have the power to enforce the limitation or to extend the time allotted.

Motion passed

Senator Ledger moved that: During the entire proceedings, two audio tape recorders that share none of the same electronic components should be employed to provide a record. A neutral third party should have custody of the tapes until they are deposited in the University Archives.

Seconded by Senator J. Howard

Motion passed

Senator E. Ledger moved that: A court reporter may be employed by either party for the entire proceedings.

Seconded by Senator J. Howard

Discussion:

- Senator Ledger reported that this proposal was made to provide clarification.
- Senator W. Holliday asked who would have access to the recordings and transcriptions. He pointed out that this would be a very expensive process, with eight hours just for the Advisory Hearing. The decision of who has access to information will be partly determined by the expense involved and the need by various parties for information. If we are going to have free access, the University would have to provide copies to the complainant.
- In response to a question from Chairperson Mace, Vice President Reese indicated that the University is required to provide copies to the complainant.

Motion passed

- * Senator J. Seaton moved that: The policy for compensation of faculty teaching overloads be clearly stated in the Faculty Handbook and/or the University Policy Manual.

[The proposal was accompanied by this explanation, provided by the Professional Welfare Committee: The present unwritten policy with regard to faculty overloads is \$1000 per course per semester or up to \$2000 per course per

semester for a course which requires a new preparation. The committee feels that this compensation is much too low. However, whatever the compensation, it is strongly felt that the amount should be published in the Faculty Handbook and/or the University Policy Manual.]

Seconded by Senator K. Price

Discussion:

- Senator W. Holliday pointed out that different faculty teach differing classes. Different ranks and training is involved.
- Chairperson Mace noted that the proposal does not establish an amount of compensation; it just asks that the compensation be clearly stated.
- Senator Holliday suggested that faculty should be paid one-quarter time to teach one course.

Motion passed

- * A proposal was made in an earlier meeting of the Faculty Senate that the Senate draw up an honor code for students. The proposal was tabled and referred to the Ethics Committee for further study.

Senator C. Brown reported that the Ethics Committee looked into the question of developing an honor code for students. It is the belief of the committee that the policy on cheating and plagiarism found in the Faculty Handbook (III-5 to III-7) is an adequate framework for dealing with the problems of dishonesty and cheating.

- Since situations differ from discipline to discipline and from professor to professor, the committee does not believe that specific policies should be imposed across campus (beyond that which is already in existence). The committee believes that each professor should develop and make clear his/her own approach to student conduct in the classroom.
- While the committee sees no need for a student "honor code," it believes that student input would be important if such a code were created. The committee suggests that the Student Government Association would be the appropriate body to initiate the development of a student honor code.

Senator C. Brown moved that no action be taken concerning development of a student honor code.

Seconded by Senator R. Darville

Discussion:

- Senator B. Carr: A recent article on cheating pointed out that schools with honor codes reported cheating by more than 50% of the students, but schools without an honor code had an even higher percentage (almost 90%).
- Senator L. Clark: A strong plagiarism statement is already in place in the Student Handbook.
- Senator J. Howard: The appeals process means that an "appearance of cheating" is not enough. He is aware of an instance where a student gave the appearance of cheating, and the student appealed. The University Council agreed that the student gave the appearance of cheating but ordered a "withdrawn" grade. The Dean and VPAA backed up the student, and the grade was changed from "F" to "W."
- Chairperson K. Mace: Would an honor code change that? We would still have to adhere to rules that are in place.
- Senator B. Johnson: We need to recognize that there is a problem with student cheating, and perhaps the Senate is the proper body to consider the problem. We may need to remind students of what cheating is; some do not realize what actions constitute cheating.
- Senator B. Carr: Many freshmen, in particular, do not understand plagiarism. They think that rearranging a few words is all that is necessary.
- Senator L. Clark: It would be difficult to have the same honor code for all classes. Not all faculty

define cheating the same way.

- Senator W. Holliday: It is possible for two faculty to interpret the same action differently, both with "pure" intentions.

No vote was taken: The motion was still tabled. (The committee recommended that no action be taken on the tabled motion.)

- Senator L. Clark suggested that the University conduct a workshop to give faculty tips on how to hold down cheating. This is a real problem, but there are ways through which we can minimize the problem. Some faculty are not aware of procedures we can use.
- Senator D. Shows noted that he had worked with the University Council concerning a stolen exam. He had strong proof, and the existing policy worked well.

- * Senator J. Howard moved that the Senate remove from the table the motion that: The decision concerning the awarding of a grade to a student for a course whether completed or not (e.g. "dropped"), is the proper and exclusive responsibility of the instructor of that course. (Meeting #209, March 13, 1991)

Seconded by Senator K. Price

Motion passed

Senator J. Howard moved that the motion (above) be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Seconded by Senator W. Holliday

Motion passed

- * Senator D. Shows was asked by one of his constituents to check on the status of a proposal passed by the Faculty Senate (under the previous administration) to establish a Wellness Program.
 - Senator J. Howard noted that the Senate had passed a proposal that a Wellness Program be instituted, and the response from the President was that there was not enough money in the budget for the program.

9. New Business

- * Senator J. Howard moved that the University establish a program for recycling paper and paper products on the campus.

Seconded by Senator M. Turnage

Motion passed

- * Senator J. Howard moved that the Bookstore in the University Center reestablish a policy of allowing faculty a discount on the purchase of books.

Seconded by Senator B. Johnson

Discussion:

- Senator F. Smith indicated that this policy was abolished because it was abused by the faculty, who used the policy to purchase textbooks for their children.
- Kent Hutchison (President of SGA) noted that it is his understanding that the faculty can order books through their departments.
- Senator J. Seaton believes that the reason the discount was discontinued was that other bookstores objected.

Motion passed

- * Senator J. Howard moved that resignation (withdrawal) from the University before the end of an academic term should be meaningful. One full calendar year should pass before readmission is allowed, with exceptions allowed for particular circumstances by the office of the appropriate Dean.

Seconded by Senator B. Johnson

Discussion:

- Senator Howard pointed out that this proposal is similar to one that was not approved by the President. President Bowen stated that "I find that I cannot approve this resolution as I believe that there are a variety of reasons why students would withdraw from the University that have nothing to do with their academic performance." [See page 3 of Attachment] The new proposal makes clear that an appeals procedure is possible. It was never the intention of the proposal to penalize a student who has to withdraw due to extenuating circumstances. Students now [under existing policy] effectively assign themselves grades of "W" after mid-semester by dropping out of school. Withdrawal is a major action and should not be routinely done.
- Senator K. Price noted that a failing grade will be reflected on the transcript with "WF" if the student withdraws; therefore, the student is not assigning his/her own grade.
- Senator B. Carr noted that some students are forced to withdraw because they do not have funds for the final tuition payment. Would such students be penalized?
- Senator L. Clark suggested that six months sounds more realistic than a full calendar year.
- Senator E. Ledger noted that the policy should be uniform from dean to dean, yet there is no reason to assume it would be uniform.

Amendment proposed by Senator L. Clark: Change the time from one full calendar year to six months.

Seconded by Senator R. Darville

Amendment failed

Vote on original motion was by show of hands:

9 - Favor

9 - Oppose

Tie broken by the chair: Chairperson Mace voted in favor of the proposal because the Senate had previously voted for the general policy, and this proposal adds an "escape clause" for students.

Motion passed

- * Senator J. Howard moved that the office of OMBUDSMAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY be established, with the following specifications:
 - a. The Ombudsman is to be confirmed by the Faculty Senate following nomination by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
 - b. The Ombudsman is to be chosen from the current faculty, the retired faculty, and the emeritus faculty.
 - c. The Ombudsman is to receive recompense equal to the teaching of one three-hour course, for alternating regular terms.
 - d. The Ombudsman is to assist in arbitration of disagreements, to provide an avenue for communication of ideas and suggestions for improvement of teaching, and to generally allow a means for improvement of the University through confidential counseling and information sharing.

c. All specifications, together with recommendations for changing the scope and duties of the office are to be reviewed periodically by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Motion seconded by Senator W. Holliday

* Discussion:

- Senator Howard pointed out that the President, in turning down another recommendation, noted that a proposal for an ombudsman is a significant matter that needs more discussion. To Senator Howard's knowledge, this is the first time a proposal speaks directly to the question of who would appoint an ombudsman, and the duties of the office.
- Senator B. Johnson believes this office would add to an air of communication.
- In response to a question from Chair-Elect F. Smith, Senator Howard indicated that the term of office would be up to the Ethics Committee of the Faculty Senate. Senator Smith pointed out that the "Ethics Committee" not listed as a standing committee under the Senate by-laws.

Senator J. Howard moved to amend the motion to say: the Ethics Committee or the appropriate body of the Faculty Senate.

Seconded by Senator W. Holliday

- Senator Holliday pointed out that an avenue of arbitration or mediation is not available anywhere else.
- Senator J. Frye noted that two parties can be very emotional, and an objective third party could serve a useful function.
- Senator E. Ledger stated that we have been talking about not having so much secrecy at the University, but this is "institutionalized secrecy."

Amendment passed

Original motion passed

10. Comments from Ex Officio Members

* Vice President J. Reese commented on several Senate proposals:

- Dr. Reese told the Senate that he appreciates the suggestions for the grievance procedure. The proposals include some very positive ideas, and Dr. Reese plans to bring additional responses to the Senate in September. Dr. Reese has already been talking to the University Attorney, and after the current Grievance Procedure is over he intends to bring some recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
- Committee appointments will be made earlier in the fall this year.
- The idea for a workshop on cheating is good.
- The proposal for recycling is a good idea. At one time, recycling was too costly this is no longer the case. Dr. Reese thanks the Senate for bringing to this to his attention

11. Comments from Visitors

- * Kent Hutchison, President of the Student Government Association, told the Senate that he supports the idea for a survey of both faculty and student views on participation in intercollegiate athletics. He wants a survey that would be easy to tabulate, and he questioned who will do the tabulation.

Mr. Hutchison believes that each School should develop its own honor code. He wants student input in the development.

SGA is in the process of conducting a survey for a student credit union, in conjunction with the East Texas Professional Credit Union.

Last year the Student Government Association invited legislators to campus for Legislators' Day. SGA would like to work closely with the Faculty Senate to pursue faculty interests as well as student interests. We cannot legally use state money for lobbying, but we can use locally-generated money (student service fees) for information purposes.

SGA opposes the student withdrawal proposal.

Students have been working on a recycling project, and SGA commends the Senate for also working on it.

12. Chairperson's Concluding Remarks

- * Chairperson Mace noted that this is the final meeting for the 1990-91 Senate. The newly-elected Senate will meet immediately following adjournment of this meeting to elect officers for the next academic year.
- * Dr. Mace commended the Senate committees, the committee Chairs, and the Senate Secretary for work done this year. Dr. Mace asked senators to encourage our constituents to serve on University committees. We have had several occasions this year when we have had difficulties in getting candidates to serve on the Faculty Senate and on various committees. Without participation, SFA will not have effective faculty governance.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

ABSENCES:

W. Arscott
J. Goodall
T. McGrath (excused)

VISITORS:

J. Reese, Ex Officio (VPAA)
K. Hutchison, Ex Officio (SGA)
F. Codispodi (Political Science/Geography)
H. Downing (Physics/Astronomy)
C. Jones (Art)
J. Robertson (Kinesiology/Health Sciences)
S. Rulfs (Secondary Education)
J. Standley (Applied Arts & Sciences)


Mary L. Carns, Secretary 1990-91

ATTACHMENT

Stephen F. Austin State University

P.O. Box 6078, SFA Station • (409) 568-2201
Nacogdoches, Texas 75962-6078

MEMORANDUM

Office of the President

TO: Dr. Kenneth Mace, Chairperson
Faculty Senate

FROM: Donald E. Bowen
President



DATE: April 22, 1991

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolutions

I am returning to you the following Senate resolutions with the following decisions.

1. Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 208

The Faculty Senate resolves that provision be made to waive student service fees, student center fees and general fees for faculty and staff members enrolled in courses at SFASU.

Response:

I find that I cannot approve this resolution for several reasons. First, we are unable to waive fees except for those fees which have been established by our Board of Regents. This is a very small number of fees and would not result in much saving for faculty and staff members. It would create significant problems for the University in deciding for whom to waive fees and for whom not to waive fees, considering the university employment status of many of our students. In addition, I note that a bill is making its way through legislature which would waive tuition and fees for certain university employees. Consequently, I would like to wait until a decision is made on that bill before taking action here at SFA.

2. Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 209

The Faculty Senate recommends to the President of Stephen F. Austin State University and its Board of Regents that, because of continued serious financial deficiencies in the support of academic programs at SFASU, at least \$500,000 per year for the next five academic years, be transferred from the funds allotted to the intercollegiate athletic program to the funds dedicated to academic programs.

Response:

I find that I cannot approve this resolution. I certainly recognize and have publicly stated that academic programs at SFA are in need of more financial support and I shall strive to find additional resources for them. I do not, however, believe that a proper source for such funds are those currently being used in our intercollegiate athletic programs. For us to reduce our expenditures in these programs by \$500,000 per year would be tantamount to eliminating a significant portion of our intercollegiate athletic programs. I do not think that this would be a fair thing to do to these programs, to the students that participate in them and to the staff that work in them.

3. **Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 209**

The Faculty Senate believes that there is a need for an Honors Program at SFASU. The Honors Program should be given a high level of priority.

Response:

I have approved this resolution and will see that establishment of an Honors Program is given the highest possible level of priority. Whether or not we will be able to implement one within the next couple of years will depend upon the level of state funding that we receive.

4. **Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 210**

The Faculty Senate recommends that a student's grade point average should be computed as grade points earned at SFASU divided by hours attempted at SFASU. (That is, grades should not be replaced upon course repetition, as is the current practice in the SFASU Registrar's office.)

Response:

After discussion with and based upon recommendations from Vice President Reese, I find that I cannot approve this resolution. Other state universities in Texas of similar nature to SFA use the same policy that we do. I am, quite frankly, attracted to this resolution and believe that in the future, if we have been able to improve the quality of our students, we should reconsider this resolution.

5. **Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 210**

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University schedule for summer classes be adjusted so that classes begin at 8:00 a.m. instead of 7:30 a.m., or that academic support staff be available when classes begin.

Response:

I have approved this resolution with the understanding that academic support staff will be made available when classes begin. I am instructing the deans and department chairs to make such arrangements as soon as possible.

6. **Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 210**

The Faculty Senate believes that resignation (withdrawal) from the University before the end of a semester should be meaningful. One full calendar year should pass before readmission is considered.

Response:

I find that I cannot approve this resolution as I believe that there are a variety of reasons why students would withdraw from the University that have nothing to do with their academic performance. Consequently, we should not impose a restriction on them that would not allow them to return to the University even though they are considered to be in good academic standing. If the students are not in good academic standing and have been suspended for poor performance, other rules prevent them from re-enrolling at SFA.

7. **Faculty Senate Resolution, Meeting No. 209**

The Faculty Senate recommends that a committee for teaching excellence be established on the Stephen F. Austin State University campus.

The purpose of the committee would be to maintain and enhance the high standards of teaching excellence that has been traditional on this campus. The paramount function of a teaching excellence facility would be to offer appropriate aid to faculty members in the form of:

- 1) **The generation and implementation of more meaningful rewards for excellence and innovation in university teaching to a greater portion of the teaching faculty than is presently the practice.**
- 2) **Seminars in university classroom instructional techniques and in teacher-student interaction.**
- 3) **A newsletter devoted to the reporting of research in university teaching.**
- 4) **Assistance with construction and analysis of examinations.**
- 5) **Assistance with the interpretation of student evaluation of courses and faculty.**
- 6) **The counsel of faculty ombudsman.**

- 7) Other associated and appropriate professional aid that would further promote excellence in university classroom teaching.

Response:

I find that I am in agreement with most of the points of this resolution, but am declining to sign it because I find that I am not in agreement with all of the points. Specifically, I believe in having a committee for teaching excellence and will establish one effective with the fall semester of 1991. I believe that statements 1 - 5 and statement 7 would be an appropriate charge to this committee and I will so provide them. I am concerned about establishing a faculty ombudsman under this resolution in that I feel such an individual would be credited with having much more authority than working with faculty to improve their teaching. Perhaps the chair person of this committee could assume the responsibility of counseling with faculty who wish to improve their teaching. Having a faculty ombudsman is a more significant matter and in need of further discussion.

I would like to see such a committee have at its disposal financial resources in order to accomplish its task. At the moment, due to our budget problems, I am not certain that we will be able to have such resources at our disposal, but, I will work towards securing them.

8. Faculty Senate Constitutional Amendments

These amendments have been approved.

DEB:ko

cc: Dr. Reese