

**Faculty Senate Meeting
Southwest Tennessee Community College
Faculty Lounge, Union Avenue Campus
May Minutes (approved September 26th, 2001)**

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

The May Senate meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m. in the Union Avenue faculty lounge. The following Senators were present for roll call:

M. A. Bodayla, L. Smith, G. Cox, R. Land, W. Payne, K. Singleton, G. Worthy, B. Turner, R. Whaley, K. Rassy, M. N. Cook, J. Aldrich, E. Adams, T. McColgan, T. Waters, L. Cross, J. Williams, (and P. Nozinich)

The following Senators were absent for roll call:

B. Philips, M. Northern, R. Burkett, M. Vines, V. Armstrong,

The following Senator submitted a proxy:

S. Haley (to Bodayla)

B. Reading and Approval of Minutes

Senator Mary Vines' name was omitted from the April draft. With this omission noted, the April minutes were approved as amended.

C. Reports from Officers and Senate Committees

Nozinich asked if any of the following committees had any business for Senate consideration:

1. Senate Executive Committee

The SEC has received several action requests since the April meeting. Although some have been handled through emails, these are considered under new business.

Since all Senators have been elected to this new Senate as two-year representatives, it will be necessary to assign randomly one-year appointments to about half of the Senate membership. This is necessary to assure that some Senators remain on the Senate as new ones are elected. The SEC will divide the Senate into four pools, three divisional and one departmental, and make the selections.

2. Academic Matters Committee – no business before the Senate

3. Readmission Appeals Committee – no business

4. Grade Appeals Committee – no business

5. Faculty Handbook Committee – no business

6. Faculty Development and Evaluation – no business

7. Faculty Welfare – no business

D. Unfinished Business

1. Autian Funding (Motion from April meeting, Status of..)

Since the Farris family can no longer commit to this financial support because of Mr. Farris' ill health, a motion carried at the April meeting to ask Dr. Autian if he would be interested in funding future awards. J. Vernon contacted Dr. Autian about this and has reported that he is interested in continuing this support. Vernon and Nozinich will meet with Dr. Autian for further discussion.

2. Senate Web Site (Status of..)

The Senate Web Site has been set up at http://internal.stcc.cc.tn.us/faculty_senate/Default.htm.

3. Salary Equity Study (Status of..)

Refer to the Action Request under New Business

4. Evaluation Documents Submitted to Dr. Miller (Status of..)

The Senate did not discuss this matter.

E. New Business

1. Grade Appeals Committee: Grade Appeal Issue

A few days ago Dean Swinny met with members of this committee to consider a grade appeal. However, the committee objected to his request because it had not been charged by the Senate to consider this appeal. Nozinich will call a meeting with the committee members, ask them to elect a chair, and have them review the appeal. In addition, Nozinich will remind the other Senate committees to meet and elect chairs.

2. Faculty Handbook Committee: review of faculty handbook (**Action Request**)

Nozinich will meet with this committee in the next few days, have the members elect a chair, and charge the committee with reviewing the faculty handbook for any ambiguities and editing it in order to satisfy SACS recommendations.

(Secretary's note: Turner met with Nozinich and Williams after the Senate meeting and explained the history of the current handbook, how it was written for consolidation, and some of the existing problems. Dr. Miller has the handbook file on computer disk, and Turner will make sure the Senate gets the most recent version of the file for committee consideration.)

3. Dissemination by email names of Presidential Search Committee and the names of the 29 candidates (**Action Request**)

The requested information, committee and candidate names, was emailed to the faculty in April. Since then, the 29 candidates have been cut to 4, and one of those has withdrawn. The remaining candidates are Pettit, Danials, and Essex. Although exact itineraries have not been worked out, each one will visit the Union and Macon Cove campuses on May 30th and 31st. There probably will be an attempt to visit satellite centers as well. All meetings with the candidates are open, and each candidate will have as many as four interview sessions per campus. At this time, faculty, staff, administration, and student interview sessions are planned. Nozinich called for feedback from the Senators and faculty and requested that we send constructive comments either to her, G. Cox, Chancellor Manning, TBR members, and to members of the search committee. Names of the latter are posted on the web. Comments may be anonymous.

The Presidential Search Committee will meet on May 31st and make recommendations to Chancellor Manning. She reported that no candidate has an "inside track," and she said that TBR will likely act on committee recommendations at the July rather than June meeting.

4. Promotion and Tenure Deadlines (**Action Request**)

According to the guidelines, Dr. Essex should have made his promotion/tenure recommendations by April 30th, and Dr. Miller should have notified candidates by May 3rd. However, these deadlines had passed and no information was forthcoming from either Essex or Miller. The action requested was that the SEC ask the administration when the faculty/candidates could expect an administrative response. J. Gunter has reported that letters to the promotion/tenure candidates are in the campus mail.

5. Clarification on Summer Teaching (**Action Request**)

This matter is far from resolved. Dr. Miller's position has been that department chairs should consult with 9-month faculty about the summer schedule. Some departmental chairs have done this but not all. Dr. Miller has not indicated how she will deal with this inconsistency. There is no guarantee that 9-month faculty will have two classes this summer, and there is no guarantee that 9-month faculty will be able to teach summer classes after this year. The school budget does not include funding for 9-month faculty past 9 months of work.

However, as soon as Nozinich receives information from the administration, she will email the faculty. She notes that next summer the 9-month faculty most likely will not have an opportunity to teach, and in all probability, 12-month faculty and adjuncts will cover these summer classes.

Senator comments were numerous and included the following:

We are the lowest paid. There always seems to be money for expensive administrative positions but not for 9-month faculty. We should fight this and not accept what they tell us. We have always had the understanding that we will be able to supplement our income with summer teaching. Summer sessions pay for themselves. Faculty members depend on that income and this would be a hardship. We don't have equitable salaries across the school. It is not fair to students to have only adjuncts as teachers during the summer. No other school in the state does this. There are not enough adjuncts in the area to cover all these summer classes. Equity studies may include summer salaries and overloads, and if we lose the summer pay, then these studies would reflect a salary level that is no longer valid. The question of whether the salary equity study includes summer pay to 9-

month faculty should be raised at the campus meeting when the equity study is presented to the faculty and staff for discussion. Will we eliminate summer school completely or just the 9-month faculty from teaching summer?

The Senate discussed the issue of the 9-month contract at length. In her concluding remarks about this issue, Nozinich repeated there is no documentation that assures 9-month faculty the opportunity to teach summer classes, and the existing budget necessitates that 12-month faculty and adjuncts teach the summer classes.

6. Salary (Equity) Study Status: **(Action Request)**

The state legislators via TBR mandated the equity study because there are so many different pay scales across the state. These studies are statewide for faculty, staff, and administration. TBR required that each campus completes a plan and submits it in time for the June meeting. In the future TBR is considering developing a common equity plan in place across the state, but for now TBR asked each school to develop its own.

The equity plan should be available to the faculty in May for comments before it is sent to TBR for approval and September implementation. This is not a study any longer, but rather, a plan establishing salaries and providing for a process of implementation. There is 1.5 million dollars set aside to implement the plan at STCC, and this includes the \$350,000 budgeted for salary increases at the former SSCC. Implementation will begin incrementally; however, approval and subsequent implementation are subject to the budget.

(Secretary's note: Dr. Essex's April 30th memo says the following:

We expect to receive a draft Compensation Plan within the next two weeks. It is estimated that roughly 3 million dollars will be needed to achieve the midpoint (market average) for faculty/staff salaries. Although the college is facing a 2.5 million dollar deficit, we are committed to addressing salary issues. Since we only have 1.5 million dollars set aside for salary improvement, it will be necessary to develop a phase-in plan as all other TBR institutions are doing to ensure that each person recommended for salary improvement will receive an increase. When the final report is completed, it will be placed in the library at each main campus. I have also requested that Dr. Rockmore meet with the college community to discuss his methodology/recommendations and respond to questions that you may wish to address.)

Fifteen million dollars has been set aside in the Governor's budget, but much of that money will go to universities who have "at risk" faculty; that is, those schools which might lose critical faculty to higher paying jobs.

The equity plan is for all employees and not just faculty. TBR made no mention of any increase in salary being retroactive, and if it is retroactive, it will not likely go back to July of last year as Essex had said earlier. There may be a tuition hike of as much as 15% this fall according to TBR, and some of this money will be used to fund the equity plan.

The budget provides for a 3% raise for higher education employees (2% state, 1% campus operating budget). It is important to note that at this time budget planning is in a flux and not much is certain.

L. Smith addressed these concerns:

We must not lose the opportunity for personal growth. We must examine the quality of adjuncts that are hired to replace 9-month faculty. We should look at the differences in pay scales for the former STIM-STCC employees. If summer classes pay for themselves, then we need to know what is causing the financial shortfall. The faculty position should be unified. According to a study conducted by her department, summer classes on many campuses were available for full-time faculty, often were assigned based on seniority, and most of these were 9-month faculty.

Bodayla observed that at one time adjuncts could teach a full load (3 classes) at both STIM and STCC. Now they can only teach 3 classes at STCC, reducing the pool of adjuncts available. She raised the issue of funding for the proposed 3rd campus given these budgetary conditions. (Nozinich replied that according to Dr. Essex, enrollment must justify a 3rd campus.) If there are not enough adjuncts for summer classes, Bodayla said the school would have to cancel these classes causing a decline in enrollment.

Nozinich said that the school might possibly use money “drained” from summer school to fund the equity plan beyond the one-time 1.5 million dollar amount that has been set aside. She speculated that the administration might offer summer classes to faculty at adjunct rates, and she stressed that the Senate should be prepared to take a position if this happens.

Rassy observed that whenever an administration wants something there is always money; if not, the lack of money is always cited. There always seems to be money to hire another administrator.

Cook raised the issue of a top-heavy administration. . Nozinich responded that Essex is not likely to challenge TBR on issues such as the administrative structure, and that he is more of a caretaker rather than one who fights for the school. She suggested that the Senate appoint a subcommittee immediately in order to address the issues of summer school for 9-month faculty and funding for the equity plan. She said any Senate response must be grounded in solid arguments, and it must be a comprehensive, cogent response that is supported by statistics. She said that we must find and introduce previous quality studies into this response.

It was moved to establish a study subcommittee to address the budget issues, the quality issues, and summer teaching for 9-month faculty. The motion carried with no opposition. L. Smith agreed to chair this subcommittee, and the following people volunteered to serve: B. Turner, R. Whaley, G. Cox, T. Waters, K. Rassy, and P. Nozinich. Land will forward previous quality studies that he has obtained to this subcommittee. As a charge, Nozinich once again asked that the subcommittee begin work as soon as possible and develop a comprehensive response to the issue of 9-month faculty teaching in the summer, quality issues, past practices and assurances to faculty on the Union Campus about summer teaching, comparable practices on other TBR campuses, budget issues, and effects on enrollment. She said we should question the presidential candidates about alternate sources of funding such as workforce development because in the future, TBR will only supply a minimum budget, the bare essentials, and a President must be able to bring in additional funds.

The Senate continued discussion about the top-heavy administration. Aldrich observed that some of the mid-management administrators (such as Wells and Miller) have far too much to do, and she wondered how this could be the case if we are top heavy. Nozinich observed that job descriptions are vague, and the campus should address this now with a valid, workable plan.

7. Generation of Forms

In an effort at curbing or regulating the proliferation of forms at STCC, Dr. Miller suggested that the Senate examine all proposed school forms and any form revisions that affect the faculty. Nozinich suggested that each Senator could serve as a contact person for this task. She offered to have Senators removed or exempted from other committee assignments in order to give them time for this, and that generated considerable discussion. Smith stated that it is a problem for those without tenure to request removal or exemption from committee service, and there should be no negative impact on any Senator who chooses not to serve. Land agreed and suggested that Senators should be able to decline service. The consensus of the Senate was that it should be left up to the Senators to accept or decline committee appointments or to request removal from a committee.

After some discussion on the matter, the Senate agreed that each Senator will act as a contact person or liaison for a department, and any proposed or revised forms that affect faculty will be brought before the Senate prior to adoption. Nozinich asked Senators to examine a form according to functionality and for the number of signatures that are required on the form.

8. Dr. Essex as a Presidential Candidate (**Action Request**)

Black said that TBR promised that Dr. Essex would serve as an interim president, and that he would not be a candidate for the permanent position. Dr. Essex reaffirmed this as well. Black was concerned that TBR has reversed its position and has encouraged Dr. Essex to run for the position for a reason. Nozinich asked if the Senate wished to take a position on the candidacy of Dr. Essex. Payne said taking a position is the job of the Senate, but several Senators indicated a reluctance to take such a stand before seeking opinion from their departments. Discussion then focused on how the 29 candidates were reduced to a pool of 4. Nozinich related how the pool was selected and how candidates were eliminated. Cox and Nozinich said that Dr. Essex is not the strongest of the three remaining candidates. They said that if Dr. Essex were selected over the other two candidates, TBR would have a difficult time justifying its choice.

Nozinich asked Senators to go back to the departments and obtain comments and responses about these candidates, particularly about Essex’s candidacy based on those prior promises. In response to a question

from Land, Nozinich said the Presidential Search Committee has been asked to make a recommendation, but the committee has not been asked to rank the candidates. Nozinich said the committee will meet after the campus interviews, and the matter of Essex's candidacy will be brought up. The consensus was that Senators would first determine what faculty members in their departments think about Essex as a candidate, and if there is campus-wide concern from the faculty because of these earlier assurances from TBR and Essex, the Senate may take a position opposing his candidacy.

9. Senate Position on Calendar: 55min class time, time between semesters

Nozinich said we must take a position and raise issues about the calendar. She has forwarded a number of faculty comments about the calendar to the Vice-Provosts, but she has received no response. She said that the TBR policy mandates that a semester will be a minimum of 15 weeks, and that may include the week of finals or it may not. This semester length is in compliance with federal financial aid, but a school may start on any day of a week, even Friday, and meet the full-week requirement. A certain number of minutes are required (710 or 750?), but it is up to the school to divide up these minutes. The exceptions to the TBR policy will involve distance learning and accelerated learning.

Land said there was not enough time between summer and fall convocation for the 12-month faculty. Rassy recalled that the last Senate passed a resolution regarding this issue, but there has been no response. Bodayla said that the administration has suggested that faculty not schedule back to back classes, but that really is not an option at the Midtown campus because most students take morning classes. She also mentioned the loss of the Wednesday holiday prior to Thanksgiving (**action request**). Nozinich responded that this may be due to the fall break, and questioned the need for this break. She said that the days for the fall break may be taking up discretionary days, and this break is near the Thanksgiving holiday as well. Aldrich pointed out that some faculty members were giving exams early because there was so little time between the end of finals and the date grades are due. The comments then centered on the makeup of the calendar committee, which apparently has only two faculty members. Singleton volunteered to determine faculty participation on this committee after the Senate meeting.

(Secretary's note: Singleton determined that 10 of the 15 members of this committee are faculty. She noted the following committee make-up:

Barbara Boswell (Faculty), Verna Crockett, Ken Dunn (Faculty), Ann Everett, Kathy Germain (Faculty), Teresa Jones, Lydia Linebarger (Faculty), Roma Magtoto (Faculty), Dan Miller, Bill Newsom (Faculty), Kathy Singleton (Faculty), Herb Temple (Faculty), Pam Trim (Faculty), Janice Van Dyke (faculty), and Barbara Wells)

Nozinich said that we have several options to consider:

- a. Decide what to do about the earlier Senate motion that Rassy had mentioned.
- b. Request that more faculty members serve on the Calendar Committee.
- c. Request that we scrap the proposed calendar.

L. Smith moved that a new Calendar Committee made up with a majority of faculty revise the proposed Calendar, and that the administration submit the proposed calendar for Senate review before adoption. The motion carried without opposition.

10. Letter from Ed. Barnard, Chair of the Curriculum Committee

Payne read a letter from Barnard to Dr. Essex informing him of faculty appointments to the Curriculum Committee. In the letter Barnard states the following:

The below faculty have been recommended by their respective divisions to become voting members of the Curriculum Committee. These recommendations are in compliance with the current Curriculum Committee handbook and they should begin their terms with the beginning of the 2001 academic year.

The faculty appointments include McKinney, Little, Moses from Liberal Studies; Pope, Summons, Whaley from Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Health Sciences; and Rudolph, Blakenbeckler, Dytrt from Business,

Career Studies and Technology. **Payne moved to accept the committee as constituted**, and his motion carried without opposition.

11. Attendance at Graduation (**Action Request**)

Last fall the faculty members were told that if they attend graduation in December, they would not have to attend it in May. Now Dr. Miller has said this was a mistake due to faulty communication. However, Dr. Miller said in the previous Senate meeting that faculty members are not required to attend spring graduation, but they are expected to do it. Dr Miller said that since no roll will be taken at graduation, a decision not to participate is between the faculty member and the department head/dean. (Just don't announce that you are on vacation before May 15th.)

12. Senate Meeting Locations

Land introduced a concern from Macon Cove faculty about the previously announced meeting location of the Senate. At the last meeting, Nozinich said we would hold the meetings in the faculty lounge at Union. Several Macon Cove faculty members have requested that the Senate reconsider that decision and alternate the meetings between Union and Macon Cove. The Senate agreed to this request and will schedule future meetings accordingly.

13. Office Hours Requirement

A few days back, Dean Williams sent out an email requesting that department heads remind faculty to post a note when out of the office during scheduled office hours or inform the departmental secretary. In a previous Senate meeting, Dr. Miller said that such requirements are unnecessary. Payne pointed out that this email notice was not sent to all faculty members in Dean Williams' division, and there may be a specific reason for the notice. Payne suggested we find out why it was sent before declaring it a problem. Nozinich will talk to Dean Williams about this and report back to the Senate.

14. Union – Macon Cove Balance on the Presidential Search Committee (**Action Request**)

The Senate did not address this issue.

F. Adjournment

Nozinich asked the Senators to check their email during the summer. She will schedule a time and location for the September meeting at the Macon Cove campus.

The Senate adjourned at 4:15 p.m.