

DRAFT



Minutes of the Faculty Senate

Presiding: Reginald L. Green (Leadership)

Date: 2-24-15

Secretary: R. Jeffery Thieme (Mrktng & Suply Chain Mang)

Senators Present: Charles D. Bailey (Accountancy), Jeffrey S. Berman (Psychology), Randel T. Cox (Earth Sci), Charles W. Crawford (History), Jill A. Dapremont (Nursing), Dipankar Dasgupta (Computer Science), Michael R. Duke (Anthropology), Richard D. Evans (Fin, Ins, & Real Estate), Donald R. Franceschetti (Physics), Edwin G. Frank (Univ Libraries), Michail Gkolias (Civil Engr), Reginald L. Green (Leadership), Wade M. Jackson (Mang Info Systems), Donna R. Jones (Law), Benwari Kedia (Management), Erno Lindner (Biomed Engr), Lisa Lucks Mendel (Comm Sci & Disorders), Jeffrey G. Marchetta (Mech Engr), Lorraine Meiners-Lovel (Univ College), Lisa Lucks Mendel (Comm Sci & Disorders), James C. McCutcheon (Crim & Criminal Justice), Ladrica C. Menson-Furr (English), George E. Relyea (Public Health), Sandra J. Sarkela (Communication), Michael Schmidt (Art), Steven D. Schwartzbach (Biology), David W. Spencer (Music), Ronald E. Spielberger (Journalism), R. Jeffery Thieme (Mrktng & Suply Chain Mang), Nicole L. Thompson (Instr & Curr Ldrship), Vania Barraza Toledo (Foreign Lang & Lit), William P. Travis (Health & Sport Sci), Mate' Wierdl (Math Sci), Joseph C. Ventimiglia (Sociology), James F. Williamson (Architecture), Stephen A. Zanskas (Couns, Ed, Psy & Res)

Senators Absent: Thomas E. Banning (Engr Tech), Lawrence B. Blackwell (Theatre & Dance), M. Elena Delavega (Social Work), J. Harvey Lomax (Political Science), Somogy Varga (Philosophy), Yongmei Wang (Chemistry), Mohammed Yeasin (Elec & Computer Engr), Economics (Vacant), Military Sciences (vacant), Sch Urb Aff & Pub (vacant)

TBR Representative: Wade M. Jackson (Manag Info Systems)

Faculty Senate Information Officer: Absent

Guest: Notable members of the University Faculty and Administration: Provost Karen Weddle-West, Jan Brownlee, Thomas Nenon (Dean College of Arts & Sciences), and Sutton Flint, Director of the Teacher Education Program (TEP) from the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences

The four-hundred-and twenty-fourth meeting of the University of Memphis Faculty Senate was held Tuesday, February 24, 2015, in the University Center, room 145 (UC Theatre). This was a special meeting of the Faculty Senate, inclusive of University faculty.

2.24.15.01 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m. with a quorum present.

2.24.15.02 Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as written. President Green brought to the floor for discussion three issues: the Reply program, the Strategic Resource Investment (SRI) budget process, and Shared Governance. He provided a brief background on the special meeting and the three issues to be discussed, including a summary of the motions that the senate has passed related to these issues. He stressed that the purpose of the meeting was to get a sense of the faculty to guide the senate in further action on these three issues. President Green also established the ground rules for open discussion during this special meeting. When recognized, faculty senators and faculty will be given three minutes to speak for each of the three issues on the agenda. Once everyone who has requested a turn to speak on an issue has been recognized, faculty senators and faculty who have already spoken on an issue would be given a second opportunity to be recognized.

2.24.15.03 The Relay program

President Green brought to the floor for discussion the issue of the proposed Relay program and provided a brief background on the issue. President Green met with the University Provost, University President, and the College of Education (twice). Also, an open forum was held to discuss the proposed program. The Faculty Senate passed a motion at its January 27, 2015 meeting: *The Faculty Senate is supportive of the recent steps taken by the President (and Provost) to communicate with the CEHHS faculty regarding the Relay Graduate Teacher Education Program. The Faculty Senate encourages the President (and Provost) to continue the dialogue with CEHHS faculty, specifically those impacted by the Relay Graduate Teacher Education Program and expand the dialogue to include faculty from other colleges/departments that may also be impacted. The Faculty Senate requests that all further discussions be open to all interested faculty. Moreover, nothing in this motion shall be construed as acquiescence to the Relay Teacher Education Program on this campus as enough information about this program was not provided in a timely manner.* President Green reported that President Rudd has put any partnership plans concerning the Relay program and the Shelby County Schools (SCS)/Achievement School District (ASD) on an indefinite hold. Consequently, unless the Faculty Senate has new positions to take on this issue, this issue is no longer a point of discussion. He then then opened the floor for discussion.

- Dr. C. Nordbye stated that in his opinion the matter should still be investigated, citing the Faculty Senate motion to create an ad hoc committee to investigate the Relay program. President Green informed the faculty that if the Relay program resurfaces, it will resurface through a broad based task force. R. Kozma suggested that if the Relay program does resurface again, the curriculum councils (undergraduate and graduate councils) should be involved, but members of these councils should not necessarily be members of the taskforce. Procedural issues were raised regarding the communication of the Relay program, specifically that Administration should involve affected faculty and the Faculty Senate first instead of engaging with the potential partners and then informing faculty.
- Senator Wierdl questioned the process for the selection of the Relay task force members. President Green stated that the senate would have an opportunity to play a role in the selection process when and if a task force is formed.
- Dr. C. Nordbye suggested that an ongoing dialog would be a priority and should engage a wide variety of stakeholders.

2.24.15.04 The Strategic Resource Investment (SRI) budget process

President Green brought to the floor for discussion the Strategic Resource Investment (SRI) budget process. He reported that the Senate has raised several concerns regarding the SRI model and asked for and received an open meeting held by the Administration to discuss the pros and cons of that model. The purpose for changing from the current model is to provide increased transparency and accountability in budgeting issues. Also, the Administration formed a steering committee to oversee the development process. The steering committee unanimously approved the budget model. Both President-Elect Jackson and President Green of the Senate are serving on the steering committee and are a conduit to communicate issues and positions of the Faculty Senate to the University President, Dr. M. David Rudd.

Concerns:

- The SRI budget model should safeguard against problematic procedural and pedagogical issues.
- There is concern that departments/administrators might game the system. Curriculum changes shouldn't be driven by financial issues. Instead, they should be driven by pedagogy issues.
- It should be stressed to President Rudd that we need to have an ongoing discussion on the budgeting process.
- By virtue of their positions on the University Budget steering committee, President Green and President-Elect Jackson meet and interact with an expert panel of representatives from other higher education institutions on campus to discuss SRI.

- Thomas Nenon, Dean of Arts and Sciences, spoke on his college's perspective regarding the SRI Budget Model. He stated that all budgeting models are subject to some degree of gaming. He stressed that the SRI model will provide enhanced transparency.
- President Green reported that only 12 senators responded to the senate's survey for feedback on the SRI budget process. The survey will be resent to senators to generate more responses.
- Discussion ensued concerning an apparent lack of transparency in developing the SRI model as well as questions concerning the selection of Senate representatives in the process. President Green responded by saying that an ad hoc budget committee is engaged in the process, the Faculty Senate has representation on the steering committee, and open meetings have been held on the model. However, the model is still under development and decisions on many details have not yet been made.

2.24.15.05 Shared Governance

President Green brought to the floor for discussion Shared Governance. He reported that the Administration is committed to shared governance and that a symposium on shared governance has been proposed for some time in the Spring semester. He asked for discussion on the position of faculty on shared governance.

- A concern was raised about what role the Faculty Senate should play at the University. The mechanism for achieving shared governance is the Faculty Senate. We need to take a look at how our Faculty Senate works. President Green informed the Senate that Provost Weddle-West supported the symposium on shared governance.
- Suggestions were made that Faculty Senate representatives need to do a better job communicating issues that are before the Senate to the members of their respective departments.
- Faculty Senator Michael Schmidt proposed a possible speaker for the Spring symposium, Carey Olston. He also suggested that an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, dated July 23, 2009 [<http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/>] would be a good starting point for discussion of the definition of shared governance.

2.24.15.06 Summary

President Green summarized the discussion on the three issues on the agenda by stating that we've had a fruitful discussion, the positions expressed in the meeting have been noted, and the Faculty Senate will act on those positions. He also stated that it is in the best interest of the University for faculty to engage in these issues through the Faculty Senate rather than through other outlets such as newspapers. Finally, on behalf of the faculty he will move forward in organizing the symposium.

2.24.15.07 Report of Committee on Committees

Committee on Committees

Senator Evans, Chair of the Committee on Committees had no motion but spoke to the need to have a faculty senate representative volunteer to serve on a committee to revise a University policy at the request of the Office of Legal Counsel on the Title IX, EEO Advisory Committee.

- Joseph C. Ventimiglia, Sociology and Nicole L. Thompson, Instruction Curriculum Leadership volunteered to serve on the committee. The Committee on Committees will meet and select a nominee after the meeting.

Postscript: The Committee on Committees will make a nominating motion to the full Senate to appoint Senator J. Ventimiglia to the committee in the March 24 meeting. Senator J. Ventimiglia will begin service as soon as Office of Legal Counsel (William Mueller) calls a meeting.

2.24.15.08 Additional Discussion of Shared Governance

- Dr. Gray Matthews suggested that there is a lot of frustration among faculty regarding shared governance. It is difficult to form a general consensus or position statement in a forum such as this special meeting. He suggests that a more productive forum would begin with expert speakers (not administrators) speaking for 10 - 15 minutes each with different opinions followed by a question and answer session with the audience.
- A brief discussion ensued regarding whether the term collaborative governance should replace the term shared governance. President Green noted the potential position that the term collaborative governance could replace the term shared governance.

2.24.15.09 Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.