

Stephen F. Austin State University

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes 2004 Meeting #335 December 8, 2004

Subject to approval at the #336 meeting.

Senators present were: Julia Ballenger(1), Parker Ballinger(2), Chris Barker(3), Secretary, Linda Bobo(4), John Boyd(5), Mary Nelle Brunson(6), Debbie Bush(8), Deborah Dalton(9), Troy Davis(10), Greta Euginia Haidinyak(11), Kayce Halstead(12), Roy Joe Harris(13), Jere Jackson(14), Tommy Matthys (15), Gary Mayer(16), Lisa Mize(17), Chair-elect, Brian Oswald(18), Sue Ormsby(19), Jeana Paul-Ureña(20), Parliamentarian, Elton Scifres, (22), Treasurer, Sarah Stovall(23), Brian Utley(24), Michael Walker(25), Elizabeth Witherspoon(26), Chair, Gary Wurtz(27)

Excused absences: Leisha Bridwell(7), Kelly Salsbery(21)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by Dr. Gary Wurtz at the Tracy Pearman Alumni Center.

Senator Wurtz opened with discussion of the Workload Policy in assuring the Senate that it was not being sent forth on a fast-track to the Coordinating Board. The meeting opened with guests waiting for President Guerrero's arrival.

II. PRESENTATIONS

SPECIAL GUESTS: DR. STANDLEY, DR. MARLIN YOUNG, MS. KAREN HALL, & MS. GINA OGLESBEE

All parties were present to talk about the Workload Policy. Conversation began with Dr. Standley discussing the Policy Committee's purpose. Its existence is to represent all of the colleges and library with any policy change. It is set up in a manner that all policy reformulation goes to the Provost. Then Provost then sends the policy to the Policy Committee. As Chairman of the Policy Committee, the Provost has asked to find out what can be done to get the policy reviewed and try to complete it before the semester ended. This policy is not imperative; and it is not being "rushed" forward (as stated by Dr. Young).

Senator Wurtz commented that he heard the Provost wanted to see this go as quickly as possible.

Dr. Standley responded back that this is accurately said. He explained the working of the Policy committee is a reverse engineering of when the Board is going to meet. There are certain things that have to go to certain Board members, for example, changes in policies and requests for funds, curriculum committee information.

Dr. Standley continued in detailing the history of the Workload Policy. Policies have arisen for revision from various sources. There is a three year cycle in which all policies are revised or reviewed. Dr. Standley commented that he recalled being at 2004 Senate meeting where Dr. McDonald, the Chair-past, questioned credit for faculty that are teaching directive study, i.e., 495s. Dr. Standley stated this is part of the reason for the reexamination of this policy and is one

of the main drivers. This situation is an illustration and/or a footnote to the point that there are various ways that policies are put before the Policy committee.

Dr. Standley requested that everyone view the policy. He thanked Dr. Walker for creating the document that allowed all parties to view the old and new policy side-by-side and underscores some of the need for the revisions to this policy. The revisions put in paragraphs about summer, directive study and 495s were initiated by Dr. McDonald's questioning. The policy needs more specificity in various parts.

Karen Hall of Institutional Research was introduced to help explain why and what is being addressed. She passed out a summarized list of changes. She stressed that the general concept of the policy has not really changed. A point that had not been mentioned was the Coordinating Boards' requirement of cost. They have asked SFA to look at teaching loads and apply those guidelines to our faculty workload by indicating to them how each course counts on a faculty member's workload. In the previous policy this was not clearly enough stated for the Coordinating Board to understand. As a result of this, a separate interpretation document was created in order to apply the language to the specific values. The policy reformation attempts to bring that interpretation into the document instead of having to refer to a separate table.

Karen discussed the 24 teaching load credit change. In the past a fall/spring workload, or one academic year (AY) was done. The new policy presents more flexibility by saying 24, instead of 12:12, e.g. 9:15; 15:9. Coordinating Board is now requiring summer teaching to be reported. This is new and we must address the Coordinating Board's requests. A new addition is a teaching load standard for the summer. Before, the policy did not have the language that described how variable or cross-listed courses might count. Private lesson and practicum courses have been revised. "University credit," a new term defining an old process, has been added to cover a variety of exceptions. In this revision, we reviewed other university's descriptions and the committee felt this best defined the varying exceptions. (A hard copy is available on the web.)

Senator Wurtz asked the Senate if they were ready for questions. He asked if this is a work in progress. With the questioning opened, Dr. Standley asked that all questions presented today be e-mailed to him so they can be taken to the whole committee.

Senator Ormsby asked if teaching graduate courses with 9hour as full load...is 10.5 now not viewed as a full teaching load with the new 24 TLC. The college dean will request "university credit" to cover situations like that where someone can not go have an overload. The Provost will grant the university credit based on the dean's request. This was created because of various accreditations.

Senator Ballinger asked why does the dean have to request the university credit. We with graduate status have not had to do this in the past. Can the levels be separated? It is confusing. The three levels need to be mutually exclusive. The calculation of teaching load credit of undergraduate and graduate did not change. The doctorate is 1.5. Dissertations did change based on number of students.

Senator Ballinger asked why language can not be included that each college will come up with it own policy given the approval of the Provost, if they are approved then the Provost will provide as many credits as necessary to implement that policy. Dean Standley answered that a lot of emphasis has been made to create a uniform policy.

Senator Haidinyak asked what will the 24 hour load credit do to overload. For instance if overload occurs in the fall with an intended lighter load in the spring, but end up overloading both terms...will faculty be paid for the fall. It would be up to the department chair to look at scheduling. The spring would be calculated to match the 24 load. Sec 3.14 tried to recognize there are times that do qualify as overload. **But can you get paid if you have to**

really do an overload? The overload would be in the spring because it is viewed as 24, not broken into fall / spring. So the overload actually occurred in the spring.

Senator Ballinger stated that by the way this is loaded, one could never have an overload in the fall.

Karen Hall felt the language has been the hardest to make fair and flexible, and also understandable. That is why the first part of that section was added (based on the department's available funding).

Senator Ballinger asked by why hold off paying the overload. Dr. Standley replied that the scale has been changed to the fall and the spring.

Dr. Standley went back to Senator Ballinger's original question about the variances with different colleges. Right now seven different policies exist. Part of the impetus was to create one uniform policy with the opportunity for variances.

Senator Ballinger asked why, what is wrong with the system now. Dr. Young referred to the animosity toward some policies. **Other colleges' perceptions and anger should not have any bearing on policy changes.**

President Guerrero added to the discussion by reflecting on a past experience of deans taking items out of tenure files. After the university explored that, it was realized there was a great degree of variability because academic units had created situations in which it appeared that one college could get away with something, where another could not. Not sure if that is factor here, but one of the outcomes of that experience was recognition that more uniformed practice needed to be created.

Senator Ballinger commented that yes that can be understood with tenure, but this is not a tenure policy, so each college can come up with their own with respect to our own without it affecting another college.

Senator Jackson added that the complaint is that all colleges are not equal, that some have different mechanism. It seems that this policy increases the chances for political favoritism.

Karen Hall added that there is diversity; however, all data has to be reported the same to the Coordinating Board. What is happening at SFA is happening at all universities, not just SFA.

Senator Ormsby asked what that had to do with teaching loads. Salaries are funded through the legislature based on different formulas and allocations where we have to report teaching load credits. They determine our funding.

Senator Ballinger used an example of two colleges reporting teaching loads varying, but all are reported the same. How is that hard and how does that affect funding. But they are not actually teaching those hours. **But the credit is still given, just reported differently.**

Senator Jackson added that exemptions are still being made and the hours are still awarded the same. **Senator Jackson asked how are reduction awarded now. All that we are doing now is talking semantics. The policy did not change, "permission slips" will now be given.**

Senator Oswald addressed the matter of the "impetus" of the change based on Independent study, but it is nowhere to be found in the policy. A lot of confusion has existed with Independent Study and it not counting in the workload in the old policy; it does not count in the new policy.

Karen Hall responded that in the past Independent Studies had been reported incorrectly, but being instructed as an organized class. There is discrepancy as to what is an Independent study class. Based on higher student numbers present in the course, it appears that it is a lecture course, rather than a small numbers independent studies course. We are making attempts to redefine that and give proper credit to the instructor. Hopefully the misunderstandings will be clarified. The exception may be where 1-3 students are being taught. Sec 1.0 addresses these. This should be reported to your chair for possible release time for university credit. If all were categorized correctly, we would not have had problems with it in the past. Care needs to be provided in how the courses are mis-categorized. If teaching the minimum student load it should be listed differently.

Senator Oswald followed that there is no apparent category for true independent studies. Just placing them in the general policy is not enough. It is not clearly written. Perhaps a recommendation from the Senate to the Policy Committee can be to address and clarify this matter.

Senator Jackson asked about teaching load based on outside accreditations setting minimized loads. Where do the buildup of credit hours go.

Senator Ballenger added that the COE did not get NCATE accreditation because of overload of faculty and inability to perform scholarly activities.

Senator Jackson asked about "monster sections," how will that be addressed. What is the incentive to teach these courses without a reduction of load. Sec 2.11. new policy minimized the value. Exceptions were reported to the board.

Senator Scifres stated that Section 2.17 is very vaguely written about summer teaching. This is done because departments have variances for summer teaching. **Senator Wurtz recommended that an organized course is 3 credit hours.** It was not defined because of variances of courses, diversity of courses that are offered. There is not a definition of an organization course based on student numbers. An organized class is defined by student enrollment: 10 undergraduate, 5 graduate.

Senator Wurtz stated that the Senate will compile a list of questions and point for the committee. Dr. Standley concluded the conversation that the Policy agenda will be held until the Senate submits its comments. The Senate thanked the special guests for attending.

PRESIDENT DR. TITO GUERRERO

Dr. Guerrero began his discussions with the Senate by apologizing for being late and then opened the floor for questions from the group

No questions were presented, so President Guerrero began with discussing the talk of SFA moving into a "system," and expressing the shock he felt when he heard the rumor. The President at Sam Houston State University had also heard the rumor. President Guerrero explained that SFA had been a part of the system at one point in history, but left it around 1969. Reflecting on the past membership, there seems to be no advantages to rejoin. If SFA were to rejoin, it would not be considered a "flagship" university of the Texas state system and could possibly lose its identity. In addition, it is likely that if SFA were to go before the governor with the request to join a system, it would be vetoed. It is only a rumor with no credibility.

Last week the President met with individual budget managers to form an advisory committee to help instruct him on to building a budget system that is more transparent, more participatory. The desire was to keep the group small where their function will be only to provide advice. It will be a challenge this year. During a legislative year, there is always a possibility that spring could end with out us knowing our budget situation. The possibility is prominent. Legislature can not deal

with an item when they come into session, unless it is classified as an "emergency item." People are hoping the school finance will be an "emergency item," so we are not ignored during the legislative process. The small committee formed is comprised of: Faculty-Brian Oswald; student member (SGA president) -Amanda Williams; Academic administration- Dr. Marlin Young; Staff person (housing)-Jamie Fain; non-academic administrator(new hire)-Lee Britton. We will meet one time before the holiday and after the holiday.

Senator Jackson asked if the cooperation agreement with Sam Houston State and Angelina College be addressed. The President responded that they have been in correspondence with Angelina for quite some time. They wanted to place some things on the table about which we had certain misgivings. In retrospect, we should have not had them. There were many good ideas. For example, students who attend Angelina should be able to use our facilities, our athletic events. The question was about students being admitted to Angelina College, being automatically admitted to SFA. **Did Sam Houston wave the other considerations?** We are supposed to meet with Angelina College on 12.16.04. We disagree with the automatic admittance to SFA if admitted to Angelina College. We worked too hard to up our standards and quality of students. We are not suggesting that we should have done everything that Sam Houston did. It just took us too long to get it done.

Senator Wurtz asked if this will also occur with smaller schools. The President responded that SFA has articulation agreements throughout the state: Trinity Valley, Kilgore, Angelina, Panola, TJC. We will be meeting with TJC next week to set up program. Yes, we are pursuing other programs. We just wish we were in paper before Sam Houston and Angelina College were in the paper.

PROVOST MARY CULLINAN

The Provost was absent.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senator Oswald asked the membership to consider running for the position of an officer within the Faculty Senate. It has been the policy of outgoing Senators to nominate the new officers.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Senator Bobo requested the name of the Piper award nomination. Motion for #334 minutes to be accepted made by Senator Wurtz, seconding by Senator Davis. Accepted.

V. OFFICER'S REPORT

The topic of faculty dependent tuition reduction was discussed in friendly conversation. It was hard to get a response this quickly. Currently faculty are able to take up to six hours of coursework if relevant to teaching concentration. Discussion has been made to expand the offered hours and to also extend to faculty dependents. It was felt that more foresight was needed to discover "what-ifs" and special circumstances. The request was that was to be available to all employees. A question was asked what if both spouses are employed, can he/she bank those credit hours. Overall, the topic was positively viewed.

Senator Paul-Ureña asked if the credit hours can accumulate if not used in succession. No, the hours expire per semester.

Senator Wurtz added that the website is running and looks good. He asked that the members view the site and provide feedback.

A policy was created regarding a cap on extra compensation. With the old policy one could only earn maximum of 20% extra per year. The new interpretation is that one can earn up to 20% during a nine month period. Summer will not have a cap, but can not earn more than the nine month salary. (Refer to handout.) the desire is to remove the cap.

A faculty lounge was not included in the new Student Center. Ways are being looked at to address this.

a. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Report for December 1, 2004 Faculty Senate Meeting

1: Faculty dependent cost reduction. There was a lot of good idea trading about the future of this "benefit", and it seems like it is a real possibility. There are several ways of helping us out that are being considered, but the one gaining the most momentum expands on the existing policy that allows a faculty member to take 6 hours free (or tuition free, I don't know.) They are investigating the possibility of offering a number of hours that may be used by the employee or dependents over the course of the year.

2: New senate web site. Roni Lias is doing a great job in my opinion. We are to the point where we are just trying to gather archival data and documents. Please look and feed back.

3: Policy regarding cap on extra compensation. A committee consisting of Glenda Herrington, Danny Galant, Gina Oglesbee, Yvette Clark, Dora Fuselier and Marlin Young has been looking at the policy. They have decided that the problem with it has been in the way it has been interpreted, which is: we could earn a total of no more than an additional 20% of our salary annually. They decided that it may be interpreted so that we can earn 20% of our 9-month salary during the regular academic year, but that the only cap on the summer is that we cannot earn more than our 9-month salary total. They are looking at raising the 9-month cap to 25%. When asked "why have one at all?" Glenda replied that it has something to do with Federal Grant issues, budgetary concerns and hours worked issues. Ultimately, it would seem that there is a possible openness to abandoning a cap were the senate to drive the point, possibly via a resolution?

4: The faculty lounge in the UC has been closed down, and there is no provision for one in the new student center. According to Roland Smith, it was an oversight, and ways are being looked to rectify it (but that doesn't mean one will be added ex post facto.)

5: Beginning this fall, the senate chair has been invited to join the platform party at commencement.

b. CHAIR-ELECT'S REPORT

1. Graduate Council reviewed a mission statement / goals.

2. Graduate Council approved Graduate Faculty appointments.

3. Anyone interested in being nominate for one of the Senate Offices please contact us.

c. TREASURER

Only monies used was approximately \$50 to purchase a USB memory drive for the secretary to dictate notes and a gavel for the Senate Chair, Senator Wurtz.

d. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs - Senator Jackson

1) Talk was continued about the Graduate Dean position. The Senate's request has gone to the Dean's Council and still being discussed with Dr. Jeffrey and Provost Cullinan. Discussion has been made in creating a campus wide committee task force.

2) Feel the workload policy points that were addressed should support the need for Dean of Graduate Studies.

Professional Welfare - Senator Davis

1) Discussion was held with Dr. Johnston regarding suggestions for maternity leave, who referred further discussion to be held with GeorgeAnne Wimberley. Was unable to meet with Ms. Wimberley because she is on leave.

Ethics Committee - Senator Mayer

1) The committee was charged with researching the Faculty Discipline policy. It was discovered that SFA did not have one. With recommendations from Provost Cullinan, one was created after having viewed Texas Tech's policy. The final copy is due December 13, 2005.

2) The first reading will need to be created and approved with an electronic vote. A request for discussion was made.

3) Provost Cullinan, in making this policy, expressed the need to remain ambiguous to any discipline. In addition, the Provost does not want this to be mandated. The SACS review wrote up SFA for not having one in place.

Administration and Finance - Senator Scifres

No report

Faculty Government and Involvement - Senator Salsbery

Absent

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Web reconstruction progress
- b. Cost break for faculty dependents

The Senate agreed that these topics had been discussed already and did not require further discussion. No feedback was given. The discussion progressed to the new business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. More New Workload Policy discussion?

Forward all questions to Senator Wurtz, who will in turn forward them to Dr. Standley.

Discussion created on the Workload Policy was very randomly expressed. Following is the copy of the submitted topics rather than the broken conversation that was elicited which was requested and forwarded to Provost Cullinan and President Guerrero,.

Because Workload calculation is an issue that impacts every faculty member every semester (which arguably makes it an even more important issue than promotion or tenure,) it is the will of the Faculty Senate that the faculty be given more and adequate time for thorough and open discussion regarding the re-writing of the Workload Policy, beginning in late January (due to the fact that we have arrived at the Christmas break.)

Furthermore we feel strongly that this policy should not appear before the Board of Regents earlier than April.

The following statements and questions are a highlight of what we, the Faculty Senate, want to have addressed, clarified, and/or adjusted before any considerations are given to allowing this document to leave the campus for presentation to the Board of Regents and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

We, the Faculty Senate, request answers or responses to the following:

- **What was the impetus for making these changes to Workload Policy A-8?**
- **Did the decision to make this rewrite (as compared to revisions) come from the Austin Building, Board of Regents, or the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board?**
- **Why was the revision process not "transparent" to the faculty body and the time period or feedback restricted to only one week?**

This document is entirely too important to the faculty to be "pushed" through and evaluated in a single week. With the conclusion of the semester and the introduction of the interim, the ability to receive feedback, process the comments, and then report to the Policy committee is impossible. As stated, this request is to prolong the presentation of the policy revisions to the Board of Regents until the latter part of the spring semester.

Reference to Section 3.14, *Teaching Overloads*: An overload is generally not considered until the standard load of 24 teaching load credits is met.

- **Why is overload pay suspended until the end of the spring semester?**

The request is that overload pay be paid during the actual term that the overload is performed. An explanation is requested as to why this policy was even considered for adoption.

Reference to Section 3.13, *University Credits and Section 1.0, General Policy*: The Provost has the authority to approve departures from established standards where considered necessary for the academic advancement of the university.

- **Why is the power to "grant exceptions," "award university credits and...extraordinary assignments in teaching, research, administration, select committee appointments, programmatic or accreditation requirements or other instructional activities" being taken away from the departmental heads?**

The request is that the power to make these decisions should remain on the departmental level as they have been done in the past. Rationale to revise a policy should not be administered because of individual perceptions and disgruntled feelings. Faculty will be lost based on the restructuring of the teaching loads.

Reference to Section 3.13, *University Credits*:

- **"Exceptions" will not satisfy all parties, how will each individual situation be addressed in fairness to each person?**
- **What is the origin of "Teaching Load Credits"?**

This terminology was unable to be defined, nor recognized among the represented colleges' accrediting agencies within the Faculty Senate. The perceived adaptability of these values is incorrect. Interpretations will have to be submitted with every self-study report.

- **If the decision is to convert to the jargon of "Teaching Load Credits," will they be documented on the new Faculty Activity Reports instead of FTE's / SCH?**

Reference to Section 1.0, General Policy: Professional responsibilities may also include supervision of independent studies, committee service, continuing education and other service to the university.

- **Independent Study has again failed to be recognized in the Workload Policy. How will this be addressed?**

The request is that this course should receive recognized values based on the credit hours awarded. If it is to not receive any teaching load credits, then that needs to be clearly stated in the Workload Policy.

The Faculty Activity Report refers to Independent Study as a teaching responsibility in Section I: Teaching under the following listing: Student Supervision: **Note: List internships, Honors students, theses, dissertations, graduate projects, and so on,...**as opposed to, "...institutional and professional obligation above and beyond organized teaching (Section 1.0, General Policy)."

Reference to Section 2.11, *Lecture, seminar and laboratory course types*: With available funding, a department chair may choose an alternative, such as a teaching assistant, in lieu of additional teaching load credit for a large class size.

Reference to Section 2.14, *Master's thesis and dissertation course types*: These credits may be granted with available funding and without adverse effect on the academic department teaching responsibilities.

Reference to Section 3.0, *Teaching Load Exceptions*: The dean may request either a change in the teaching load **OR** additional compensation for teaching load exceptions in accordance with section 3.1 below.

- **Funding is coming from where? Will it only be rewarded if individual departments have the additional funding? If a department does not have the resources, does the faculty member do it for free?**

Reference to Section 2.0, *TEACHING LOAD STANDARDS AND EQUIVALENCIES*: The standard full-time teaching load at SFASU is 24 Teaching Load Credits (TLC) of instruction for the combined fall and spring semesters. Normally, a faculty member should teach no more than 18 TLC in one semester.

- **What is the definitive number of TLC's that defines a teaching overload? What happens to those extra TLCs?**

The teaching load has now gone from a "normal" load of 12 credit hours to a "normal 18 TLC." That is quite a drastic difference considering TLC value is the same as a semester credit hour. [Section 2.1, *Teaching Load Credit (TLC) Equivalencies*: undergraduate courses generate 1 TLC per semester credit hour (SCH) value of the course; graduate courses generate 1.5 TLC per SCH.]

Each academic semester needs to remain mutually exclusive in regards to assigned TLC's.

This change has the potential to increase the number of students in a section as a way to avoid creating a higher workload. This will affect our often-mentioned quality teacher:student ratio.

Reference to Section 2.11, *Lecture, seminar and laboratory course types*: If the contact hour value of the course exceeds the credit hour value of the course, the contact hours are used for the calculation of teaching load credits. Undergraduate generate 0.667 TLC; graduate generate 1 TLC. The maximum value for this type of course is 6 TLC per course.

- **The new values for each TLC when calculated for contact hours vs. credit hours of activity courses has the ability to quickly create an overload per faculty member. Will the departments be given the funding ability to fill existing position vacancies or hire the new faculty ?**

Reference to Section 2.14, *Master's thesis and dissertation course types*:

- **Within this section the following are unclear: --what courses will receive thesis / dissertation credit, research or writing, or will both be given credit?
--"available funding" has yet to be defined nor specified by its source?
--ability to "roll-over" has been eliminated, thus reducing the chance for any credit to be extended if the projects last more than an academic year?**
- We are requesting this whole section be re-written with better clarity. This section, as written, does not create a friendly environment for professors to embrace the move towards increasing graduate programs. Roll-over must be included for those projects that do extend.

Reference to Section 3.13, *University credits*:

- **This section failed to mention doctoral programs.**

Is there another document within the state that we can reference during this revision period?

In conclusion, we would like to request a faculty forum to be held within the first month with of the 2005 spring semester with the Workload Policy being the main topic.

Motion was made to create a resolution to slow the progress of the Workload Policy changes. Motion made by Senator Jackson, seconded by Senator Walker. Accepted.

Senator Wurtz proposed the following to be submitted to Provost Cullinan:

It is the will of the Faculty Senate that the faculty be given more and adequate time for thorough and open discussion regarding the Workload Policy and should not go before the Board before April 2005.

Motion made by Senator Boyd, seconded by Senator Paul-Ureña. Accepted.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business to conduct, a motion for adjournment was made by Senator Oswald, seconded by Senator Boyd. The Senate stood adjourned at 4:53PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Linda Stark Bobo
Secretary