

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong Faculty Senate

2-8-2010

February 8, 2010 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes>

Recommended Citation

Armstrong State University, "February 8, 2010 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes" (2010). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 58.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/58>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Armstrong Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.



**Armstrong Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of February 8, 2010
University Hall, room 156, 3:00 p.m.**

I. Call to Order 3:06. For a roster of attendees please see Appendix A.

II. Approval of January 2010 minutes

Motion: approved – with the addition of a document recounting the list Senator Scott, Election Committee Chair, recited regarding departments who will need to participate in the coming senate election cycle.

III. University Curriculum Committee (linked at App B).

Motion to approve by college: approved.

College of Education:

Senator Carpenter queries the suitability of both the listed equivalencies (i.e. PEHM 3100's listed equivalency is a 2701 course), as well as the practice of keeping classes not offered in the Course Catalog.

Sen. Wimer responds that the courses are left in the catalog as they may want to be utilized / offered in the future.

Sen. Hollinger indicates that her experience and recollection show that this double-dip of content is problematic.

Additional discussion concerns the effect of remanding one section of the College of Education's curricular changes as it appears all will be affected in some way by modifying the first items.

Motion to remand entire College's curricular items back to the University Curriculum Committee: approved.

College of Health Professions

Motion to approve as a block: approved.

Curricular changes: approved.

College of Science and Technology

Motion to approve as a block: approved.

Curricular changes: approved with friendly amendment to section A.1 Biology, items e, f, and g. to strike “Open only to students in the last two semesters of their undergraduate program” from the description(s) and replace with language, in the form of a pre-requisite listing, indicating the seminars are open to only Biology majors.

IV. Graduate Affairs Committee Reports (linked at App C).

Motion to accept: accepted.

V. Old Business

a. Ad Hoc Committee: Resolution on Furloughs (App D).

Note:

After extensive discussion, the senate lost quorum and therefore had no final voting authority on whether or not to approve the resolution. Adjustments to the text, as it appears at the appendix, were passed as “friendly amendments” before quorum was discovered broken.

Discussion:

Sen. Mateer: what is the “committee” being referred to in the resolution?

Sen. Erney (chair of Ad Hoc Committee): dunno.

President Hampton: do you have any suggestions, Senator Mateer?

Sen. Mateer: depends on the intent.

First friendly amendment: first paragraph, last sentence: omit “for the university” and replace it with “for the college.”

Approved.

Sen. Farley: then the individual college will have capacity to set their own standards? The College of Liberal Arts can decide to do less than The College of Education?

Sen. Price: the problem is that every college’s expectations are not the same. Some have graduate programs, some do not.

Sen. Simmons: the intent seems to suggest people in decision making positions take furloughs into consideration.

Second friendly amendment: second paragraph, last sentence: remove.

Approved

Discussion:

Sen. LeFavi: I’d take out the sentence before too. Commencement shouldn’t be an issue.

Sen. Simmons: what don’t you like about not going to commencement?

(laughter)

Sen. LeFavi: I don’t think that’s a strong argument that “well just take our marbles and go home.”

Sen. Price: commencement is a weak example of the point.

Sen. Mahan: to clarify the intention, it was for faculty to go to commencement but not have it be required.

Sen. Simmons: I agree with Mike [Price] and Bob [LeFavi], but am reticent to take the only material example out.

Sen. Hollinger: I like no example better than a wishy one.

Third friendly amendment: second paragraph, new last sentence: remove, but keep commencement note in the bullet.

Sen. Fertig: is commencement a furlough issue?

(silence)

Sen. Nivens: I go because it's my job, not because I want to.

Sen. Fertig: it's a job issue that has always been a job issue.

Sen. Craven: I would like to not have cross discussion. I see it [commencement] as a teaching-service day.

Sen. Hollinger: Kathryn's right.

Sen. Price: so the jist of the argument is that furlough's damage instruction, does commencement effect instruction?

Sen. Hollinger: I don't think that's the argument. There's no reduction of work load commensurate with the lowering of faculty salaries.

Third friendly amendment: passed. One abstention, one nay vote.

Sen. Nivens: another friendly amendment [fourth], at resolution two, paragraph one, omit next to last sentence that begins "Likewise..." because it's indicative of there being NO travel money.

Sen. Farley: our department doesn't have any travel money.

Sen. Garrity: due to lack of travel funds in our department a poster presentation accepted for a national conference had to be withdrawn.

Senators from the Psychology and Language Literature and Philosophy departments concur. Additional commentary indicates some departments have elected to reserve travel funds for junior faculty as they are more needing of scholarship opportunities re: tenure and promotion.

Dr. Whitford: there has been a 6% reduction across the board.

Sen. Simmons: I agree with Delana [Nivens].

Sen. Nivens: this is a statement about furloughs not budget.

Sen. Price: there is no universal travel model – it's a key issue. This is not the venue for this discussion, but we do need to strengthen the sentence.

Editorial suggestion to the fourth friendly amendment:

Sen. Price: How about "this does not support scholarship" period.

Sen. Hollinger: we're being unnecessarily picky.

Sen. Simmons: the previous sentence had already mentioned travel reduction.

Sen. Mahan: agree.

Second editorial suggestion to fourth friendly amendment:

Sen Fertig: I want that “(real or otherwise)” omitted.

Third editorial suggestion to fourth friendly amendment:

Sen. Mateer: at the same two sentences question, adjust it to read “...constraints, likewise...” and the sentence ends at activities.

Sen. Simmons: I warned you about editorializing. Or if we send it back to committee... Let's go with Delana's [Nivens].

FOURTH FRIENDLY AMENDMENT NOT VOTED ON

Fifth friendly amendment:

Sen. Craven: strike, “Is the administration, considering...” sentence from the first paragraph.

Fifth friendly amendment: passed. Two absentions.

Sixth friendly amendment:

Sen. LeFavi: I think the bullets are a bit much, cross the line to unreason. Make the last bullet “Normal scholarship expectations are modified accordingly while furloughs are imposed.”

Sixth friendly amendment: passed.

Dr. Whitford: I hate to do this, but I've been listening. The audience for this was originally the chancellor and legislature. I have to take this to President Bleicken, and she's going to ask me who it's for. I'm going to say they want you to take this to the chancellor and legislature. There are items here for the president though, your audience is muddled.

Sen. Price: what we have is a doc addressed to the chancellor and legislature. Is the president not rightfully a part of this? What I'm hearing is that this is an issue that transcends each university. We can only speak to our president at our level. It seems to me that our president will take this and articulate with other presidents up the food chain.

Dr. Whitford: no this is supposed to go to the chancellor.

Pres. Hampton: Dr. Whitford is correct.

Sen. Price: the question isn't about audience, but whom we're empowered to speak to. Can we speak over our chancellor over our president? No.

Sen. LeFavi: is it best to go on with this or add a “we realize...” statement? I would say that as it does have to go through President Bleicken and some of this stuff is her discretion and purview, some of the ramifications of the furlough can be mitigated by her actions, so send it along and in effect tell her so.

Sen. Price: if we strike the “please forward” then it’s all up to her discretion.

Sen. Fertig: can we send it to President Bleicken and Chancellor Davis?

Dr. Whitford: you know where we were coming from, and the struggle is how do we convince the legislature that a furlough day does really effect instruction? That’s what I think we were trying to communicate. I agree with what’s in here. This is the impact of it, but do they care?

Sen. Price: so what you’re saying is the audience is the president?

Dr. Whitford: yes.

Sen. Price: if we take out the chancellor we’re empowering our president? Is that what I’m hearing?

Sen. Mateer: the university presidents were told to have so many furlough days and they should not affect instruction. So what we should be saying? Is there is no way to have a furlough day that does not affect instruction? Does this say that?

Sen. Hollinger: there’s stuff in here the president cannot do anything about. So simply addressing her, it’s a bigger issue than that. And, it has already taken so long to get this document together

Sen. Childress: when you write something your first issue is audience. Maybe we need to re-examine our audience. And yes, I know I’ve heard the grumblings. No organized unit has gone to the state, but stuff is going on, maybe we’re ahead of the game for a change. Maybe though we need to think through where we want this writing to go.

Sen. Nivens: don’t the bylaws dictate our communication line? Our first line is the president.

Sen. Price: that was my key point. If we strike the “forward” note...

Sen. Eaton: I move we call the question.
Quorum is discovered to be broken.

Adjourned 4:39
Respectfully submitted,
Jewell Anderson

Appendix A

Senators Present	Senators Absent
<u>College of Education</u> Linda Ann McCall Brenda Logan Greg Wimer Mike Mahan Beth Childress	<u>College of Education</u> Marsha Moore, Alternate Joan Schwartz
<u>College of Health Professions</u> April Garrity Bob LeFavi Joey Crosby Laurie Bryant Michelle Butina Helen Taggart Pam Mahan Carole Massey Andi Beth Mincer Gloria Strickland Rhonda Bevis	<u>College of Liberal Arts</u> Daniel Skidmore-Hess, Alt. Becky daCruz Ned Rinalducci, Alt. Becky daCruz
<u>College of Liberal Arts</u> Kevin Hampton John Jensen Rick McGrath Mike Price Barbara Fertig Karen Hollinger Jack Simmons Hans-Georg Erney Kalenda Easton	<u>College of Science and Technology</u> Frank Katz, Alt. Azita Baharami
<u>Library</u> Jewell Anderson Kate Wells	<p style="text-align: center;">Guest</p> Glenda Ogletree
<u>College of Science and Technology</u> Kathryn Craven Scott Mateer Delana Nivens Suzanne Carpenter Daniel Liang Priya Goeser Sean Eastman Greg Knofszynski Vann Scott	<p style="text-align: center;">Ex-Officio Present</p> Ellen Whitford, VPAA Russell Watjen, Assoc. VPAA Shelley Conroy, Dean COHP Patricia Wachholz, Dean COE Mark Finlay, on behalf of Dean COLA Steve Jodis, on behalf of Dean COST

Appendix B

Please see the curricular items from January 20, 2010, from the
University Curriculum Committee at [this link](#).
Thank you.

Appendix C

Graduate Affairs Committee Curriculum Actions

August 26, 2008-May 5, 2009

Please see the approved documentation, available [here](#).

Thank you.

Appendix D

With approved “friendly amendments,” as passed at the meeting.

From the Ad Hoc Committee on Furloughs.

To President Linda M. Bleicken (please forward to Chancellor Errol B. Davis, Jr.)

The faculty of Armstrong Atlantic State University would like to voice the following concerns about the recent implementation of furloughs.

RESOLUTION I:

The faculty are dismayed by the disparate financial burden which the furloughs impose on 10 and 12-month employees. Adjusted for annual salaries, the pay cut for full-time faculty on a 10-month contract is significantly larger (3.06%) than that suffered by year-round administrators and staff (2.28%). In concrete terms, a 10-month faculty member earning \$50,000 annually will lose \$1,530 over six furlough days, while a 12-month employee earning the same nominal salary will lose \$1,140, a difference of \$390. The President should be aware that the impression created by this unequal treatment has been a significant factor in the sharp deterioration of morale among AASU faculty, many of whom remain unconvinced by the oft-repeated talking point that “six days are six days.” An often voiced counter is that faculty can work in the summer to make up the difference. While true that some faculty can work in the summer, this is not an option for everyone, nor is it included in the faculty contract. Also, faculty contracted for 10 months, are not eligible for unemployment in the summer and summer sessions are not an option for many. Thus, this is not an equal opportunity response.

Proposed Action I:

Base furlough salary adjustments on percentage of total salary, not on number of furlough days.

RESOLUTION II:

The faculty have been assured that, notwithstanding the economic and budgetary crisis, our teaching will not suffer, and that therefore there will be no furloughs on class days. Also, as more and more classes are taught by part-time faculty with no service expectations and with the increased enrollment, it is likely that the burden of committee work and advising for full-time faculty is going to increase. If neither teaching nor service will be affected, the faculty would like to know what method will be used to calculate an appropriate reduction in faculty workload relative to the percentage reduction in salaries. ~~Is the administration considering a reduction in scholarship expectations for tenure and promotion? This is an important issue in a time when the university is pushing for more scholarly activities.~~ As salaried employees, we are expected to complete tasks and are paid for completing these tasks; few of us work just nine to five to get our jobs done. As a result, furloughs currently force us to do more work at home or on the weekends, and are nothing more than pay-cuts with a new name. This culminates in the faculty being asked to do MORE for less money. Furthermore, it is patently unjust to increase tenure and promotion expectations during a furlough and travel expense reduction. Thus, it would seem contradictory to increase tenure and promotion expectations when furlough implementation is designed to reduce work load

in order to address budget constraints. The administration should officially charge the tenure and promotion committees ~~for the university~~ **for the colleges** to reduce the research and service expectations by a commensurate amount, given the furloughs and reduction in travel support for presentations.

The faculty are aware that furlough days can not be on teaching days (or risk university accreditation) and there must be some showing of a reduction of work (real or otherwise) in order to enact the furlough. Many faculty feel that the state government will consider the use of furloughs an acceptable operating practice if the students are not impacted. The senate encourages the administration at AASU to be creative in dealing with these situations. ~~For example, the furlough days considered for 2009-2010 did not include commencement exercises, which are days we are required to work but do not affect instruction and could be justified as following the intent of the furlough program. The faculty are not saying this should be done, just that there are ways to affect the students, their parents and the state government without affecting teaching.~~

Proposed Action II:

The following suggest creative reduction of faculty workload without impacting instruction

- Reduce expected office hours
- Reduce advising time period
- Add an extra reading day (for a furlough day) and compact the final exam schedule (i.e. students can take two exams per day)
- Make commencement exercises optional for faculty
- Normal scholarship expectations are ~~considered “outstanding”~~ **modified accordingly** while furloughs are imposed

Conclusion:

The statement that “teaching will not be affected” is inaccurate at best. Faculty use those non-class days to prepare for lectures, grade papers and tests, advise students, and perform other work directly related to instruction. With the loss of six days combined with increases in service work and class sizes, the time available for class preparation will be diminished, resulting in an unavoidable decrease in teaching quality.

Also, the faculty is interested to learn whether the language allowing for furloughs will be included in faculty contracts beyond the current academic year, and if so, when we can expect the cessation of a budget-reducing method so unsuitable to academic work. There is also some concern that the Governor is the one who decides that we need furloughs when our contracts state that the decision is to be made by the President. We urge the President to involve the faculty and prepare wisely for any future contingency and would like to impress upon her awareness the devastating effects that furloughs have on the faculty's morale.