

Minutes of Faculty Senate
Tuesday, October 21, 2015
3:00 p.m.—5:00 p.m., Lee Hall Auditorium
Dr. Bettye A. Grable, Presiding

Officer's (Present)

Dr. Bettye Grable, President
Dr. Joe Ann Houston, Vice President
Prof. Ann Marie Cavazos, Secretary
Dr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian

Senator's (Present)

Dr. Lillie Brown
Dr. William Guzman
Dr. Kyle Eidahl
Dr. Jenny Jones
Dr. Huberta Jackson-Lowman
Dr. Allezo Owens
Dr. Darryl Scriven
Dr. Merlin Langley
Dr. Paulette Reneau
Dr. James Strohaber
Dr. Lekan Latinwo
Dr. Musiliyu Musa
Dr. Hassiem Kambui
Dr. Rebecca Blankenship
Dr. David White
Dr. Raymond Hix
Dr. Daniel Solis
Dr. Glen Wright
Prof. Phyllis Taite
Prof. Joseph Grant
Dr. Tiffany Ardley
Dr. Maurice Holder
Dr. Ebenezer Oriaku
Dr. Perry Brown
Dr. John Cooperwood

Ms. Sheila Labissiere
Ms. Thomasina Brock
Dr. Yassir Abdelrazig
Dr. Dawn Brown-Cross
Dr. Lauralyn Burke
Dr. Clyde Ashley
Dr. Roscoe Hightower
Dr. Aretha Hill
Mr. Doug Blackburn
Dr. David Guthrie
Dr. Sevilla Bronson
Dr. Richard Gragg
Dr. Marcia Owens
Mrs. Pamela Monroe
Mrs. Gloria Woody

Senator's (Absent)

Dr. Desmond Stephens
Dr. Keawin Sarjeant
Dr. Mark Weatherspoon
Prof. Craig Huffman
Prof. Antonio Soares
Mr. Longineu Parsons
Dr. Lavetta Henderson

EX-OFFICIO (Voting) (Present)

Dr. Donald Palm
Mrs. Faye Watkins

SGA (Voting) (Absent)

Mr. Justin Bruno

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. by Senate President, Senator Bettye Grable and at 3:10 p.m. Dr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian announced a quorum.

Opening Remarks by President/Senator Grable:

President Grable initiated conversation about the 2015 Work Plan and framing the issues relating to the work plan. She stated that Governor Alan Levine and several members from the Board of Governors (BOG) would be attending our next Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for November 17, 2015 to discuss issues that concern the faculty and the institution as well as answer questions. She reminded us to schedule it on our calendars and she encouraged the faculty to attend the meeting. She emphasized that the Faculty Senate is “one of the most important constituency here on campus.”

- **Dr. Richard Gragg** asked whether the Senators will be receiving reports or comments in writing in advance from the BOG guest. He stated that *“President Grable should make a request for comments or a report from the BOG in advance. This will apprise the senators of the BOG’s concerns and better prepare the Senators for a robust discussion.”* President Grable said she would make the request.

President Grable reminded the senators that at the Steering Committee it was determined that senators should submit questions in advanced in anticipation of the BOG’s meeting. She asked Dr. Gragg whether or not that falls in line with his request. He said “no”, he clarified that his request is to get in writing comments in advance from the BOG as to what concerns will be addressed at the upcoming Faculty Senator’s meeting. **President Grable** said *“she would make that request of the BOG and will e-mail all senators if she receives such comments.”*

- **Dr. Gragg:** stated that he appreciates Pres. Grable’s giving us a heads up of the up-coming visit, he applauds her willingness to make such requests and inform the senators of the results. He further stated that *“Governor Levine, (BOG) needs to put his concerns in writing and he should back up his*

concerns with evidence supporting how he arrived at his conclusion. He remarked that “he was not aware that our mission or what we do as an institution should label us as a remedial institution.” How did Mr. Levin arrive at that misconception?

- **Dr. Ashley:** commended the President for inviting members of the BOG to attend the Faculty Senate meeting, but he stated, “in order for the meeting to be effective it is important to plan ahead and be prepared.” Like Dr. Gragg, he stated that Senators are to be proactive in knowing how to respond to the BOG’s concerns. He stated that knowing the Board of Trustees, the BOG and the President’s agenda is important and “would help senators respond accordingly.” He stated that *Dr. Gragg mentioned the misconception that the BOG has about the institution, and as such, we need to know what is on their agenda. “Let’s make this a productive and proactive meeting by being prepared.”*
- **Dr. Ashley** further suggested that the Steering Committee submit questions to the Governor and based on the BOG’s response to call a pre-Faculty Senators’ meeting prior to the Nov. 17, to discuss our responses for the upcoming meeting. He stated it would be embarrassing if we are not on the same page *“we need to be prepared, effective and productive for the meeting.”*

Motion:

Dr. Ashley made the following motion: *“That the Steering Committee submit questions to the BOG in advance of the 11/17/15 meeting, and plan to have a pre-faculty senators meeting to discuss the responses to the questions in order to have a productive and effective meeting.”*

Motion second by _____ (the person was not identified)

Discussion on the motion

- **Dr. Gragg:** stated that he agreed with the thrust of having a pre-faculty senate meeting prior to our 11/17 meeting because the object is to be prepared. However, it's his understanding that the BOG requested to come and speak with the Faculty Senators. "The notion of us having questions before the 11/17 meeting is based on what! We don't have any idea what the BOG is going to talk about except that there are some misconceptions about FAMU being a remedial institution". Dr. Gragg believes that submitting questions in advance will limit the flow of discussion.

Reminder: at the Steering Committee meeting Dr. Houston and President Grable suggested that the BOG attend the 11/17 meeting so they can have an opportunity to interact with the faculty.

- **Dr. Holder:** speaking on the motion stated that *"Dr. Ashley prescribed an interesting scenario". "We should not meet in advance to talk about the big bad wolf attending our meeting". We are not "afraid" of what the BOG has to say. When they present their case we will ask questions. "I'm not in favor of that staged strategy. Dr. Holder further stated "he is in favor of responding to their questions and allow for an even flow of exchange and dialogue. This format will be more inviting and meaningful."*
- **Dr. Ashley:** agreed and stated that he *"fears no one nor is he suggesting that the faculty is afraid."* His point is to be prepared and know their agenda. He indicated that in order for faculty to be prepared there is a need to know what BOG is planning to say. A pre-planning meeting with Senators is a strategic plan that will allow the faculty senators to be *"prepared, effective and productive"*.

Outcome of the motion:

- 9 in favor of the motion
- 27 oppose
- Motion fails

Comment by Dr. Houston, Vice President of the Senate:

- "She explained that when the initial idea came up at the Steering Committee, that the BOG was invited to attend the Faculty Senate meeting she was opposed to it and was suspect and leery about the meeting. We are in a critical time in the history of this institution and I would ask you as

critical thinkers to examine what is going on here. There is a distraction and we cannot pull away and following that distraction and not realize what the issue is. We need to be cautious as we go into this meeting. This is the first time that BOG is addressing the Senators. We need to be cautious, we need to do our research, and we need to listen. But the spontaneity that occurs in a situation like that is ok. "Remediation is against the mission" Let's be objective. This may be a teachable moment; an opportunity to teach about the history of our institution."

Continuing Opening Remarks by President, Dr. Grable

1. Pres. Grable discussed the Sept. 7, 2015 anonymous letter addressed to the BOG. This letter was addressed at BOG meeting held on Sunday, Sept 25 and she wanted to share it with the faculty. (See letter in folder);
 2. Letter addressed to President Mangum from the **Andrew Carnegie Fellows Program**. The purpose of this fellow is to provide fellowships to individuals whose research addresses threats to our democracy and their international order. President Mangum supports and encourages all faculty to apply for this fellowship. Dr. Grable sent information to all faculty. Application is due by Nov. 19, 2015. (See encl. in folder)
 3. **2015-2016 Institutional Research Awards**. Dr. Grable urge faculty to apply or nominate faculty for this award. Nominations opened 10/19/15. This award is designed to promote and encourage research among faculty. This is a golden opportunity to share your research. (See encl. in your folder) On another note, **Dr. Grable** encouraged Senators to invite other faculty to attend Faculty Senate meetings. She stated that *"we as faculty are the most important constituent considering we are the true residents of an academic organization."* So she urged faculty to invite other faculty members to attend and present their ideas.
- **Dr. Guthrie, School of Nursing:** *He stated that he would like an investigation or at least for the Faculty Senate to take a look at some of the colleges and schools that are not producing robust research outcomes. He further stated that an inquiry as to what the challenges are and why these schools and colleges are not producing should be examined. There is a great disparity between schools and colleges that are producing research as opposed to other schools that are not. Faculty Senate should take an interest as to why some colleges and schools are not getting research done*

to help them meet their outcomes. There needs to be an action plan to ascertain the problem and find solutions to address these challenges.

- **Dr. Holder:** He stated that Dr. Guthrie raises a very important issue on research outcomes. “Let me make a very strong and intentional comment that such an analysis should come from the Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs office. If the Faculty Senator Steering Committee is going to take up that question, which is important, that they take it up with the notion to formally inform the Provost office, to look into those factors that prevent and limit faculty access to research. Until we do that the Provost office will not be in a position to answer that questions. We have to tell the Provost what to do and raise her sensitivity to the issues that face us out there to do proper research. There are a number of issues that need to be addressed.”
- **Dr. Allezo Owens:** He stated that he does not know what robust research outcomes really means. But he explained what is going on in his college. Each professor has approximately 30-35 students, no teaching assistance, no research assistant and with all the work being placed upon the faculty it is difficult to conduct research when all time is spent teaching, grading, and having faculty hours for the students. But in the face of that, research is getting done— quality research is being done. Maybe not as much as other colleges or schools but quality research is being done. The Provost or President has to address those factors and those factors need to be taken into consideration.
- **Dr. Gragg:** stated that “research is connected to what the faculty is doing and has to come back to us in the performance measure and how we are being compared to other institutions.” As stated “we have a higher course load, we are conducting research, we are serving on shared governance committees, despite the high course load we are being challenged and are expected to achieve the same results when we have less resources. They wants us to perform on the same metric. How can we be treated equitably and then receive a fair comparison in terms of what our outcomes are.”

- **Dr. Perry Brown:** stated that this is an issue faced each year. “It is time for the Faculty Senate to say to the administration that four (4) courses is an overload.” Have the administration conduct its own investigation. Let the administration say that the teaching load is too high. We have been telling the administration all along. Now, is the administration going to handle this issue? The “overload” hinders research. What is the administration going to do? How will the administration address the issue concerning research?
- **Dr. Latinwo:** stated that we must examine the way we award research. Need to support faculty from the Social Science department. The administration has to support the faculty.

University Administration Remarks:

President, Dr. Grable: stated that both the President and the Provost are always invited to attend the Faculty Senate meetings but their presence was required at another event. Neither one is available to attend this meeting because they are being presented with public land from the Governor.

- **Dr. Holder:** stated that he has been a member of the faculty for 38 years and he is “close to tears today.” “The Faculty Senate is the highest legislative body on campus. This is where shared governance reaches its highest peak. We expect the administration to be present at these meetings. This is a standing committee meeting scheduled the third Tuesday of each month at 3pm. They have control in accepting the agenda to be elsewhere. Neither the President nor the Provost makes an effort to attend these meetings. The Faculty Senate includes all deans and none are present.” **Dr. Houston:** stated, “There were three (3) deans present at the meeting.” **Dr. Holder** expressed “his dissatisfaction of management style and the manner in which faculty is treated on campus. Never before has it been this way.”
- **Dr. Gragg:** stated that Dr. Holder’s comments were “over the top”. The President and Provost are not present because they are at another event. They are receiving public land from the governor. He stated “that he does not agree with Dr. Holder’s position. He further stated that Dr. Grable has

been identifying issues to the administration. There needs to be an appropriate spin with respect to their absence.”

Announcements

Dr. Powell expressed great appreciation for the support from the Faculty Senate, President Grable and Dr. Lucas. The event, “Fallen Rattlers”, was a great success.

Dr. Angela Coleman (Assoc. VP of Student Affairs) discussed how to handle and address incidents or concerns in the classroom. Reports can be completed online. All forms can be found online. She invited all senators to attend their standing meeting held every Wednesday at 3pm. She also discussed the incident report forms and stated that information is in the folder. (See encl. in folder)

Dr. Huberta Jackson- Lowman announced the up-coming 6th annual African Black Psychology Conference to be held on Nov 6th & 7, 2015. (See encl. in folder)

Approval to adopt the October 20, 2015 Meeting Agenda-motion passed

Approval of September 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Friendly amendment motion made by Dr. Gragg to correct the term “College of Engineer” to “College of Engineering” under the section labeled Ad Hoc Committee 2015 Work Plan. Second by _____. **Motion passed and minutes adopted.**

Election of Steering Committee Members

Dr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian, conducted the election. The newly elected members of the Steering Committee are as follows. Please note the meetings are held on the first Monday of each month from 12:00 pm to 2:00 pm. The Steering Committee sets the agenda for the Faculty Senate meetings.

- College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities - Joe A. Houston
- College of Science and Technology - Lekan Latinwo
- College of Education - Hassiem Kambui
- College Agriculture and Food Sciences - Raymond Hix
- College of Law - Joseph Grant
- College of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences - Ebenezer Oriaku
- FAMU DRS - Sheila Labissiere

- FAMU/FSU College of Engineering- Mark Weatherspoon
- School of Allied Health Science- Dawn Brown-Cross
- School of Architecture - Craig Huffman
- School of Business & Industry - Aretha Hill
- School of Journalism & Graphic Communications – Doug Blackburn
- School of Nursing - David Gutherie
- School of Environment - Marcia Owens
- Library - Pamela Monroe
- SGA - Justin Bruno

Motion to approve the new members of the Steering Committee passed.

Election of Committee on Committee Members

Dr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian, conducted the election. The newly elected members of the Committee on Committee are as follows. Dr. Houston will manage this group.

- College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities – Kyle Eidahl
- Science and Technology – Paulette Reneau
- College of Education – Lavetta Henderson
- College of Agriculture & Food Science- Daniel Solis
- College of Law – Phyllis Tate
- College of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences – Tiffany Ardley
- FAMU DRS – Thomasina Brock
- FAMU/FSU College of Engineering- Yassir Abdelrazig
- School of Allied Health Science– Lauralyn Burke
- School of Architecture- Antonio Soares
- School of Business & Industry-Clyde Ashley
- School of Journalism – Bettye Grable
- School of Nursing – Sevilla Bronson
- School of the Environment – Richard Gragg
- Library – Gloria Woody
- At Large Committee on Committees-Allezo Owens and William Guzman

Motion to approve the new Committee on Committee members passed.

Continuing Business:

- a. Curriculum Committee Report- Dr. Neil James (See Curriculum report in your package for details on the changes in the curriculum)
 1. Request for eight (8) new courses
 - (2) in College of Agriculture;
 - (2) in Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities;
 - (4) in School of Nursing
 2. Request for two (2) new online courses-College of Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities –Literature and global writing
 3. Request for two (2) new tracks-College of Education-
 4. Request for three (3) course changes –School of Allied Health Sciences
 5. Request for one (1) CIP code change-College of Education
 6. Request for three (3) program modification request-
 - College of Education
 - College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities
 - School of Nursing-drop in licensure exams
 7. Request for seven (7) program terminations- College of Education. However, B.S. Primary Education and Pre-K, BS in Trade and Industrial Education Teacher Education, 0 students College of Education
- b. Faculty Senate Statement Supporting FAMU Work Plan-it was decided to circulate the statement via email and to vote via email.

Initial Motion to accept the Curriculum Committee report “as is” was motioned by Dr. _____ and second Dr. Langley.

Discussion

- **Dr. White-** opposed the termination of the B.S. in Trade and Industrial Education program. Dr. White indicated that there is one (1) student. Dr. White addressed the reasons why the program should not be terminated pursuant to 4.005, Termination of Academic Programs. (see regulation in folder) Dr. White also submitted another document with an e-mail attached that he wanted everyone to have. Dr. White stated that he serves on the Curriculum Committee; however, this was the first time as coordinator of the technology program that he had heard of the

termination which was addressed in an e-mail dated 9/27/15. All coordinators in low enrollment program know there is a possibility that the program may be terminated. However, “the regulations clearly states that there must be faculty involvement in the termination decision and this did not occur.” However, Dr. White admitted to “making a mistake in signing off on the Curriculum Committee document.” He stated that he “misunderstood his chair.” He stated as a faculty member he “never had an opportunity to defend the program before the decision was made.” He stated he “felt rushed but this forum is not the place to have those discussions.”

- **Dr. James** stated that “faculty owns the curriculum and faculty must act within your college.” The document submitted to the University Committee was duly signed off by the Chair, Dr. White as Curriculum Chair and by the Dean. The reason for termination of the program is because there are no students. However, the chair agreed to submit a proposal to have Technology included as a major in the new secondary proposal. That is where the Curriculum Committee stood. Dr. White stated that he “felt rushed.” Again, Dr. James emphasized that “*faculty should not give up your ownership even if the dean pressures you to do so.*” If you are the faculty in charge then you must be responsible for that course. We understand that for the last six years this course had low enrollment and it is hard to keep this course on the books.

Dr. Muchovej stated that “due to the lateness of the hour maybe we should excise Dr. White’s section from Dr. James original report, and accept the Curriculum report.” That suggestion was objected to because the original motion was already on the floor.

Dr. Guthrie motioned to accept the Curriculum Committee report “as is” and second by Dr. Langley.

Friendly amendment to the motion on the floor by **Dr. Hightower**. He motioned to add the language “***to excise Dr. White’s department from Dr. James original Curriculum Committee report.***” All in favor of accepting Dr. James’s Curriculum Committee report excluding Dr. White’s portion. **Motion passed.**

- **Dr. Houston** asked Dr. White how many students have graduated from his program within the last 5 years. How many students are in the pipeline? Dr. White's response is currently one and twenty next fall.
- **Dr. Grable** then directed us to take a look at the copy of the Work plan in the Senators' folder and confirmed that a copy will be submitted via email.

New Business

The two matters were adjourned and will be discussed at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

- a. Academic Progress Policy that Dr. Palm will be submitting via email
- b. Dr. Boston will come back at the next meeting to discuss the Tenure/Promotion Application Process and International Education Policy.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm