

# TSU FACULTY SENATE MEETING

2 Dec. 2010

## Minutes

Howard Beeth, Secretary

**Members Present:** Edieth Wu (Chair); Howard Beeth (Secretary); Rasoul Saneifard (Treasurer); Alexis Brooks de Vita ( Editor, *The Faculty Speaks*); Macaulay Akpaffiong (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Thorpe Butler (COLABS); Kiran Chilakamarri (COST); Robert Ford (COST); Doris Jackson (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Anna James (TMSL); Wei Li (COST); Byron Price (Graduate School); Andrea Shelton (Pharmacy & Health Sciences); Sara White (COLABS); Mammo Woldie (Business); Zivar Yousefipour (Pharmacy & Health Sciences). **Total: 16.**

**Members Absent:** Lalita Sen (Vice Chair); C.J. Tymczak (Parliamentarian); Demetrius Kazakos (Asst. Secretary); Daniel Georges-Abeyie (SOPA); Emlyn Norman (COLABS); **Total: 5.**

## Agenda Items

### Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10p when a sufficient number of Senators finally arrived to create a quorum. She noted that discussion of the minutes of the Senate's November 2010 meeting accidentally had been left off this month's agenda and so she immediately turned to a consideration of it. In the discussion which followed, several issues were raised. One concerned members who were occasionally absent for cause vs. those who were chronically absent from the Senate's monthly meetings. The Chair pointed out that there were provisions for replacing members who were chronically absent from meetings. On this matter, Secretary Beeth said he would try to prepare a members' attendance record for presentation to the Senate early next year. Another issue concerned the substance of minutes. The Chair took the position that the minutes should only reflect what is "done" by the Senate. Secretary Beeth took the position that

one of the most important things the Senate “did” was to discuss and deliberate, and that the minutes should also reflect this. After a sharp but unresolved back-and-forth about this, the Senate voted to table further discussion of the minutes of the November meeting until the next meeting of the Senate in February 2011.

### **Ombuds Nominations**

The Chair reported that Provost Ohia had asked the Senate to identify and nominate three persons for possible service in this important, new administrative position, which might include some release time. Accordingly, senators nominated several candidates and ranked them by voting. The top three candidates were, first, Andrea Shelton; second, Carlton Perkins; and third, Henry North.

### **March 2011 Senate Elections**

The Chair passed out information relating to the 2011 faculty elections. She recalled that the last election was complicated by the fact that some of those who volunteered to monitor voting did not show up on election day to do so. As a result, the outcome of the election was challenged. To help avoid such problems in the future, she called for the organization of an ad hoc election committee to oversee the 2011 March election and a chair to coordinate its activities. Senator Jackson nominated herself to chair this committee and was approved by acclamation. Senators Ford and Saneifard volunteered to serve on the committee, and other faculty will be approached to serve with them. The committee will share its preliminary plans for running the election in the Senate’s February 2011 meeting.

### **Faculty Manual Discussion re: Workload**

Editor Brooks de Vita proposed and Senator Butler seconded a motion that all Graduate Faculty have a 3/2 load, regardless of what combination of courses they teach. The only real objection to this resolution a few senators voiced was that it was not likely to become policy at a time of financial austerity. However, after a short discussion, the Senate passed the motion by a voice vote. This motion will subsequently be referred to the Faculty Assembly for further consideration.

### **Faculty Manual Discussion re: 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Tenure Review**

The administration has proposed a change in the currently established 6 year tenure process—namely the addition of a new candidate review at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year. If a candidate passed this review, the candidate would continue serving and submit material for a final tenure vote in their 6<sup>th</sup> year. Any candidate who failed the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review would be given a terminal, one-year contract for the 4<sup>th</sup> year.

This proposal elicited considerable discussion in which many senators participated. In general, those who spoke in favor of the proposal argued that it was in the best interest both of the employer and employee to terminate a bad match after 3 years rather than allow it to drag on for additional years. In general , those who opposed the proposal argued that that the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review basically converted and shortened a 6 year tenure review process into a 3 year process, putting additional pressure on candidates.

After discussion, Senator Price made a motion to vote on the proposal, which Senator Shelton seconded. In a show of hands, the Senate voted 6 in favor of passing, 6 in favor of rejecting, and 1 abstention. The motion thus failed to pass and will be referred to the Faculty Assembly for further consideration.

### **Faculty Manual Discussion re: “Rule of Rank”**

Senator Woldie introduced this topic and explained it, but the hour being late and a quorum being lost due to senators who had to depart, the senators remaining agreed to delay further discussion of this topic until the Senate’s next meeting in 2100 and adjourned at 5:20p.