

Faculty Senate Minutes
Tuesday, November 15, 2011
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Lee Hall Auditorium
Presiding, Dr. Narayan Persaud, Faculty Senate President

Officers (Present)

Dr. Narayan Persaud, President
Dr. Dreamal Worthen, Vice President
Mr. James Muchovej, Parliamentarian

Senators (Present)

Dr. Nazarius Lamango
Dr. Bettye Grable
Dr. Ebenezer Oriaku
Dr. Gloria Aguilar
Dr. Lekan Latinwo
Dr. Desmond Stephens
Dr. Adrian McCollum
Dr. Marian Smith
Dr. Narayan Persaud
Dr. Rufus Ellis
Prof. Thomas Pugh
Dr. Angela Thornton
Dr. LaRae Donnellan
Dr. Gwendolyn Singleton
Prof. Kandy Woods
Dr. DeEdgra Williams
Ms. Ernestine Holmes

Dr. David Jackson
Dr. Charles Magee
Dr. Tshaka Randall
Mrs. Almeta Washington
Dr. Frances Stallworth
Dr. Elizabeth Davenport
Dr. Mary Diallo
Dr. Carl Moore
Dr. Kyle Eidahl
Dr. Dreamal Worthen
Dr. Lewis Johnson
Prof. Beth Lewis
Dr. Elijah Johnson
Dr. Adrienne Cooper
Prof. Aurelia Alexander
Ms. Jeneice Smith
Dr. Endya Steward

Senators (Absent)

Dr. Adrian McCollum
Dr. Marian Smith
Lt. Diana Hess
Dr. Renee Reams
Dr. Hudson Nwakanma
Dr. Ngozi Ugochukwu
Dr. Pat Broussard
Dr. Brenda Bryant
Dr. Primus Mtenga
Dr. Marcia Owens
Prof. Chao Li

Dr. Gary Paul
Dr. Peter Kalu
Dr. Gervin Robertson
Dr. Angela Murphy
Dr. Edward Jones
Dr. Cynthia Davis
Dr. Uloma Onubogu
Dr. Lambert Kanga
Dr. Elijah Johnson
Dr. Christopher Ikediobi

Senators (Excused)

Dr. Roscoe Hightower

Ex-Officio (Voting) (Present)

Dr. Uche Ohia
Dr. Donald Palm
Dr. Lauren Sapp

Call to Order

The November 15, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 3:30 by the Faculty Senate President, Dr. Narayan Persaud.

Opening Remarks

Dr. Narayan Persaud

After greeting the senate body, Dr. Persaud encouraged everyone to let other senators know that we would like to have them here and to be here on time. He further stated that we are quickly approaching the end of the semester and the end of the year. As you know at the end of the year we make resolutions for old problems, only to forget them within a short while, but here at the institution there are old problems that we will have to address and one is the increasing scrutiny which we will undergo for as long as we are here.

The second is the budgetary woes. To deal with these problems, we need to be vigilant in institutional affairs, so I will again ask that those who would like to serve on the councils let it be known. We have the co-chairs in place and they will be willing to entertain whatever input you can provide them.

Please be aware, that complacency leads very much to despondency which could result in victimization. So to survive we need to mobilize our efforts and we need to do so conscientiously. This attendance is not representation of that conscientious effort. So again please assist me in encouraging your colleagues to be here and to be here on time.

As a start in the mobilization process, Dr. Worthen and I propose to have a Christmas party just after our last meeting on December 12, 4:30-8:30 at the Teleconference Center. I'm sure you will all be there and come with the presence of mind that you are going to have a good time.

Approval of the November 15th meeting agenda

Next, Dr. Persaud asked if someone would please move to approve the agenda for this meeting. It was so moved and seconded that the Faculty Senate Meeting agenda for November 15, 2011 be approved. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Approval of the October Minutes

You've all looked at the minutes from the October Faculty Senate Meeting. Would someone please move that the minutes be adopted? It was so move and seconded that the minutes from the October 2011 Faculty Senate meeting be adopted. Questions were raised. Dr. Donnellan from the School of Journalism and Graphic Communications asked that the name of the school (SJGC) be corrected. Also change the name of the College of Environmental Sciences to the School of the Environment. On page 5 the immediate past chair of the faculty senate is not a member of the advisory council. The statement is incorrect. Other corrections to the October minutes were noted as follows: Names of senators are to be corrected, Professor Kandy Woods, Professor Aurelia Alexander; Committee Representatives changes, Steering Committee - Prof Kandy Woods, Committee-on-Committees School of Architecture representative - Chao Li. Dr. Diallo was concerned about the statement on bottom of page 5. Dr. Worthen stated that the sentence

on page 5 will be rewritten to reflect what is corrected. After the vote, the minutes were adopted with the necessary corrections.

Provost Remarks

Dr. Cynthia Hughes Harris

Good afternoon. I apologize; my remarks are going to be brief for the purpose of saving my voice. I have asked a few other people to provide reports, but before they come I will provide you with a few pieces of information.

Since we last met, we have had 3 accreditation site visits. It is always good to get a positive report at the end of a site visit. We know that those reports at the end of the site visits are not final, but it is always good to get a glimpse of what the site visitors are saying. I am pleased to say that we have had three site visits, each of which left us with glowing reports of activities. ABET came and visited our base program in the College of Agriculture, NCATE came and visited our Teacher Education program in the Colleges of Education and Arts & Sciences, and the Association for the Assessment of Animal Laboratory Care came and addressed our Animal Care facility. In each of those visits the accreditors came and left without one deficiency, for any of those three programs, and that is outstanding. Congratulations to all of you who directly contributed to those visits and recognize that each and every one of us contributes whether we are directly involved in a given department or not.

Dr. Persaud asked if I would provide an update on where we are with the restructuring activities. We officially named the School of the Environment at the last board meeting.

The requested name for the former CESTA – the temporary College of Agriculture will be presented at the next board meeting.

The next major activity is the restructuring of the Teacher Education programs which are currently housed in both the College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Education.

We are looking at the reorganization of those programs and how they will be officially structured, organized and operationally intact beginning in January as Teacher Education programs emanating from the College of Education. Keeping in mind that they will certainly be influenced by what happens in the College of Arts & Sciences. That influence will actually manifest itself as we move on toward the reorganization of the College of Arts & Sciences. By next June the goal is to have two distinct colleges and the first phase of that truly is this movement of Teacher Education from Arts & Sciences to Education. A work group has been formed to look at Teacher Education. Over the next several weeks they will be looking at college A in the newly formed College of Arts & Science as well as college B in the newly formed College of Arts & Science.

We have a coordinating committee which will be looking at all of the restructuring activities. It is important to have input from all the people who will be involved, who will be affected by the restructuring. That group will be put together and take us through this next stage of restructuring over the course of next semester

I mentioned at the last meeting that we had received a letter from the Governor, actually written to the President and a task group was formed that worked on a response to that letter. The response was actually delivered just today. The response is probably well over a

thousand pages. Every Dean did a magnificent job, probably involving many of you, providing documentation that the Governor was asking for in terms of things like “How do we know our graduates are contributing to the workforce” or “How do we access that what they are doing is leading to critical thinking; or “How do we know that our graduates leave the University and know how to write at a certain level of competency” and on and on and on. You provided a tremendous amount of documentation. We literally held ourselves up in a cubby hole for days at a time, hours at a time responding to the letter. Thank you for your input. We have not a clue as to where that letter is going, where our responses are going or how they will be used.

I think it is safe to say as, Dr. Persaud stated, that we are in an era of scrutiny. Everything we do is being observed, looked at and indeed analyzed by lots and lots of people, so everything we do, we want to be above board, transparent and we also want to reinforce that no matter what, we are FAMU, and therefore what we do, we are doing, based on how FAMU does things. We can't reinforce that enough. But the response to that letter has been submitted. There will be a link to that response on website in the next few days.

With that being said, there are two other pieces of information to be presented today. Dr. Pitter was asked to talk about teach out and the progress that is occurring in The Teach Out plans that are a part of the restructuring activities that were approved last April.

Dr. Davenport was asked to talk about the work group that is looking at FAMU's response to the Texas Plan. It is this Texas plan that is dominating so much of the discussion about the Future of Higher Education very specifically in Florida.

After greeting everyone, Dr. Pitter said that she is going to talk about the Teach Out but first wanted to make one plug on behalf of Dr. Ohia for assessment. She said that the Governor's request needed documentation and your assessment reports saved us on several of the questions that the Governor asked. He asked for documentation for 5-10 years, on how we know that students are competent in critical thinking, how do we assess this, how do we know that they are competent in writing, so please keep taking those assessment reports seriously because you never know when someone like the Governor is going to ask for them. Dr. Pitter thanked everyone for what they have done on assessment thus far, and emphasized that we should know that it is important work.

The Teach Out – The BOT for FAMU terminated 23 academic programs in April and suspended 1. As soon as that action occurred, the Provost, the office of academic affairs and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness undertook several activities to ensure that the students in these programs were taken care of in a very systematic way. Almost immediately, the Provost sent out letters to the Deans with guidance in the form of form letters that should go out to inform each and every student that was affected. FAQs on how to handle various situations, templates on academic maps that should be provided to each and every individual student, templates of reports that the Deans should have to monitor progress of each student, and templates that they need to report periodically, every semester to the Provost what progress each student has made. All of these communiqués to the Deans were combined into a Teach-Out manual which is available on the Institutional Effectiveness website.

Some of you may be involved in these programs and if you are, thank you for all of your efforts to make sure our students are taken care of. We have had the first set of responses from the various Deans and departments, undergoing teach out. What we do know from those reports is that every student who is actually in one of these majors has been notified, given academic maps so that they know what they need to take every semester until they complete the program within the specified teach out period. Students who were not actually in the major, but thought they want to be in one of those majors are being advised out of the majors into other appropriate programs so that they can pursue a program that is going to be around. Dr. Pitter welcomed any questions or comments from the senate body. No questions were raised.

Next, Dr. Elizabeth Davenport greeted the senate body and stated that she was asked to report on the committee which has been created to present a FAMU response to the Texas Plan. As previously stated, the committee is charged with creating FAMU's response to the Texas Plan. They have met once with the Provost and will meet again tomorrow at 11:00. The first charge was to go over the plan individually, and write our response. Dr. Davenport encouraged the senators to contact the members of the committee with opinions, thoughts or suggestion for the response.

The committee members are: Dr Hughes-Harris, Ray O'Neal, Jessie Edwards, Charles Magee, Gwendolyn Singleton, Barbara Thompson, Dr. Persaud (ex-officio) and Dr. Davenport. Dr. Davenport asked for questions and asked if everyone received the PowerPoint she sent out. She also thanked Dr. Sapp for sending out FSU's President's response to the Plan. Each University is writing a response particular to that university, so your input will be important.

Dr. Davenport concluded her presentation by restating the Provost's comment for the senate body, which was, the Provost said that we will establish a website once the Plan has been constructed so that you can critique it and add information.

Dr. Persaud thanked the Provost and all the other presenters for their presentations. To follow up on something Dr. Pitter mentioned, I remember when Dr. Ohia first came here, she was very persistent in getting information from us and the kind of resistance that she faced. It is her tenacity which helped to get us where we are and I also want to commend her for that persistence and the efforts she puts forth in getting us to be a better prepared institution.

Continuing Business

Curriculum Committee

Dr. Maurice Edington

Dr. Verian Thomas stated that Dr. Edington had a conflict and asked that she present the information to us. In the last column it should have read approved on 11/14/11. As you see, this is a course titled Overseas Studies. Dr. Thomas read a description of the requested course. Questions were addressed before the vote was taken. Dr. Dr. Cooper from Agriculture asked if this is overseas studies. He said it sounds like a sustainability course. Another senator said that it is not clear from the description what the course is. Dr. Worthen stated for clarification that the course is a multiplicity of Disciplines. Specifics from the course will be with others in the

group. Dr. Persaud asked for a motion to accept the recommendation coming from the Curriculum Committee. It was so moved and seconded. After the vote, there was one Nay and no abstentions. The Motion was approved.

Academic Policy Updates **Atty. Linda Barge Miles**
Dr. Valerie White
Dr. Verian Thomas
Dr. Sundra Kinsey

Attorney Linda Barge Miles stated that Dr. Valerie White is going to give a presentation on the Academic Honest Policy. Currently, the university does not have a University-wide policy. The Fang, which is the Student Handbook, provides that each academic unit will have their own policy, so we are trying to get consistency across the University. What we are going to ask of the senate today is to refer this to your committee that would then look at it and make whatever revisions you deem appropriate, so that the next step, after it has gone through the senate, will be the Board of Trustees.

Dr. White stated that she is going to go over the PowerPoint presentation that is in our packet today on Academic Honest Policy. She is going to go over some of the violations, the process and the two processes which are being offered today for recommendation. There are about 6 or 7 violations: the first one is giving or taking material wrongfully, the second one is plagiarism, the 3rd one is copying another students work, the next one is talking with another student during quizzes or test, removing test materials or attempting to remove them from an exam room, having someone edit or re-write your assignment without prior approval; using work from other classes without prior approval, using copyrighted stories, pictures from the internet, even if it is modified by the student, using electronic devices, knowing or falsifying documents and assisting in any academic honesty violations, which includes not report the infractions. The procedures are everyone's responsibility and then the faculty must document any alleged violation. We have an informal process and a formal process. The informal process is resolved by the professor and the student and in the document it counts how many days for the professor to consult with the student. Also, for the informal process no legal counsel is needed. Some informal resolution options would be grade reduction for the assignment, denial of credit for assignment, failure of the course or other resolution as determined by the professor. The formal resolution is the student would be in a hearing. At that point, the student can have an advisor present. The committee composition should be faculty, students, and administrators within that particular unit which would be the college, school or institute. Some formal resolution options are reprimand, grade reduction, denial of academic credit, and failure of the course, invalidation of the university credit or of the degree, probation, suspension, dismissal or expulsion. If the student does not want to agree to what the committee has suggested, the next step is to appeal to Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs.

This body is an advisory body to the Provost and the representation is from the Faculty Senate, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Vice-President for student Affairs, the Ombudsman and the SGA President, and if these people choose

to send a representative, the SGA President must select a student. The outcome of the hearing, after this advisory committee has reviewed the documents, the student at that time can have an advisor present. The recommendation must be by majority vote. The Provost renders the decision and the decision is final and binding and may not be appealed.

Other information is that records under academic honesty are protected by FERPA. The course withdrawal or grade forgiveness is not allowed in the formal process determines students enrollment or status is unchanged unless the President deems that the student may endanger the University Committee. We also have an academic honesty referral form. It is one form that the faculty will have to complete. Any question?

Question: What is the difference between dismissal and expulsion? Answer: Dismissal could be from a program and expulsion could be from the University. Any other question? Concern was raised about students being in danger if they reported wrong doing. It was stated that students reporting wrong doing was removed from the policy because students did not want to be responsible.

Tshaka Randall – Law school argued for students reporting transgressions. Dr. Diallo was concerned about the safety of students reporting wrong doing. Another question concerned where the formal committee would be formed. Would that be done in the school or college where violation occurred or his or her school, college or institute?

Answer – Where the student violated the honor code. Senator stated that this should be made clearer in the policy. Dr. Persaud stated that the policy will be discussed within the Policy Council. They will get together and they will try to iron out some of these issues that you have raised. Also, I think we can have that the Law school be excluded from this, make an exception for Law School. Dr. Worthen asked that the minutes reflect that professional schools across the board will have exceptions noted in policy. The question is whether or not the Policy council has been created. The Policy council has been created and will be discussed further. We will provide you with an update.

Dr. Verian Thomas presented a procedure that goes with the policy Time limitation for completion of degrees. Currently, the maximum for the Masters degree is 5 years and that for the Doctoral degree is 7 years. Normally, the time limit is approximately two years for the Master and approximately 4 years for the Doctorate. Of course, by discipline you might get a longer period. But the spirit behind this is that we have had some folks who have been in PhD programs for 10-11-12 years and it's a hassle. The handout that you have says "notice is being given that currently enrolled students who have already exceeded their time to degree limits, or who will exceed their time limits during the 2012-13 academic year will be required to complete all requirements for graduation no later than the last day of the 2013 Spring Semester. We are saying that we acknowledge the fact that we have students who are well beyond their time to degree. So, we want to give them notice that the last day for completing their requirements will be 2013 spring semester. That gives them enough

time to get the job done. After this time the student will be dismissed from his or her academic program. In extenuating circumstances or cases which could be properly documented, departments may petition the Graduate School for a one semester extension. Completion of all requirements includes receipt of all final copies of bound theses and dissertations by the deadlines established by the School of Graduate Studies in the division of research. After the end of the 2013 spring semester, no other extensions will be granted to these students and they will be formally dismissed from their respective programs if no further extension is granted by the results of a departmental appeal. Any questions for Dr. Thomas? David Jackson, College of Arts & Science questioned the language in the proposed policy dealing with extensions. He stated that the language or some kind of consideration should be made for other exceptions outside of what is presently in the policy proposal. For example, if a dissertation advisor is gone on sabbatical leave for a year, what position does that put the student in if they don't have that major professor to work with? The response from Dr. Thomas was that the language of the policy says that a departmental appeal could be made. Dr. Thomas also stated that this is a procedure not a policy. The policy is already there. There was more discussion from Dr. Jackson on the language of the procedure dealing with extensions. Linda Barge Miles stated that this procedure was actually recommended by the graduate council and it would be appropriate to take this back to the graduate council so that they can address those issues and bring something back to you that would cover the extenuating circumstances. Dr. Persaud said that all of this will be discussed in the Policy Council. Dr. Davenport asked if these policy changes were discussed in the schools & colleges. She wants to see the buy-in from the departments. She had a student, who had followed all the rules, but the department made changes and abrupt changes should not take place.

Dr. Persaud – the council will go through the necessary refinements. All feedback will be taken into consideration.

Dr. Diallo requested that information be sent to the faculty senators before the meetings. Attorney Barge Miles requested the faculty senate listserv so that she can send information out to the senators so it can be reviewed in advance. She concluded that at this time the policy will stay with the Faculty Senate and not go back to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Sundra Kincey is going to come forward now. What she is providing to you today is really technical changes. This is slated for the Board of Trustees meeting so we will need a vote on this one of approval or disapproval. Dr. Sundra Kincey – Today I want to talk about two already existing FAMU academic policies and these are Termination of Academic Programs and Authorization of Academic Programs. The reason that we are revising these two particular policies is to align them with the revised policies for the Board of Governors. The BOG actually has two separate policies on approving academic programs and terminating academic programs. The BOG policy for termination is BOG regulation 8.0.12 and the one for authorization is BOG regulation 8.016.

Here at FAMU, those policies respectively are 4.005 for termination and 4.010 for approval or authorization of academic programs. These are in your handouts. The changes in the termination of programs policy are straightforward. We did not make a lot of edits to it. What we did, that policy was originally for Authorization and Termination of Academic Programs here at Florida A&M, again to align that policy with the BOG, we are now making that policy solely for the Termination of Academic Programs. So, the way that you can terminate a program here, and again we did not make any changes, is that enrollment in the program is not enough for the program to continue, the program is no longer aligned with the University's Mission or Strategic Plan, or the program is no longer aligned with the workforce needs for the State of Florida. At the University and BOT's level, we can terminate programs at the bachelors, masters, or specialist levels. Any programs that are recommended to be terminated at the doctoral level have to be submitted and approved by the BOT and then reviewed and approved by the BOG. Any termination program that currently has students enrolled in it, the department must first determine what the negative impact will be on any enrolled students, particular for students who are female or those that are in the minority. If students are enrolled in the program before it is terminated a Teach Out plan must be developed for that particular program. That is the gist of the termination regulations.

Under 4.010, what we have done for this one was make it solely Authorization of academic programs. Initially this regulation was to define the criteria for developing a degree, a major, a track, a minor or concentration. We have left that information in there, but we have taken the language that was in the FAMU policy 4.005 for Termination that was related to authorization and consolidated that language into the authorization. You will see it on the front page, the underlined language, some of which already existed in the programs majors and minors, other language is new or In sections IA – IE this gives you the criteria for authorizing and implementing a program here at FAMU. The primary difference in this regulation is new language that has been placed in the BOG's regulation and that is in section 1B where it talks about, if you are trying to implement a program here, that is duplicated at another state university, and then you must have conversations with that institution where the program is being offered. The only other difference is on the second page where it talks about continuing education. That area is very short because the BOG again has a separate regulation on continuing education and the hope is that FAMU will as well. Are there any questions regarding termination and authorization of programs?

Tom Pugh, School of Architecture: I realize that some of this in not new, but item 3 on the termination, paragraph A says “the program no longer meets the needs of the citizens of Florida in providing a viable educational or occupational objective”. I think we have already seen the attack on many of the humanities courses by the Governor and it just seems to me that that is an unnecessary open door. The University, in item two, determines what an appropriate course for us to be teaching is. Our goal is educating people, not creating tradesmen if you will or whatever for the pleasure of the Governor. I think that when a program no longer meets the mission or the strategic goals of the University, that covers that issue. Specifically, explicitly incorporated, it seems to me we are doing lip service to the Texas plan.

Dr. Davenport suggested that we should take time to read this and vote on it electronically. Dr. Diallo agreed that the senate should have time to read this and be prepared to vote on it. It was stated that the BOT will meet on December 7 & 8 in Orlando. It was suggested that we have a vote completed by December 5th. Dr. Diallo asked the urgency of this is. Dr. Pitter said that we want to align with the BOG as soon as possible. We need 30 days to post it as a public notice. There is no urgency. The senate has time to go through this and vote on December 12th. This was acceptable to the attorneys.

Dr. Nazarius Lamango asked why we need an external consultant. The response was that this is only under the doctoral program and it is to be in line with the BOG policy. The senators were instructed to look at the policy and make comments and send comments to Dr. Persaud.

Senate Council Update

Council Co-Chairs

Dr. Worthen stated that there are 6 councils. They will meet Tuesday after @ 3:00 pm. One correction, Chao Li is the representative on the Committee-on Committees for the School of Architecture. The council will have co-chairs. This does not replace the committee structure of Standing and AD-Hoc committees. Duties – an electronic copy to be re-sent to all. Councils are asked to meet prior to the December 12th faculty senate meeting.

Councils and Co-chairs:

1. Shared Governance: Dr., Ngozi Ugochukwu, Dr. Nazarius Lamango
2. Institutional Policies: Prof. Tom Pugh, Elijah Johnson
3. Budgetary Policy Committee: Dr. Roscoe Hightower, Dr. Deidra Williams
4. Institutional Technology: Dr. Lewis Johnson, Dr. Kyle Eidahl
5. Faculty Welfare and Relations: Bettye Grable, Elizabeth Davenport
6. Student Welfare & Relations: Dr. Lambert Kanga, Dr. Endya Stewart

Dr. Worthen: What we would like you to do is have 5-7 committee members. They do not have to be elected senators.

The committee on Committees will meet next Tuesday at 3:00 in the Faculty Senate office. Dr. Donnellan asked where does the Green Committee come in this. It is not a Faculty Senate committee. It was stated that the President appointed a Sustainable Committee. End of comments.

Benevolent Update

Dr. Deidre Powell

The Benevolent Committee is alive and well. Co-chair, Brian Lucas and I are working hard. Sharon Saunders office has \$8,000.00. We will work within the system to let the University know when a fallen rattler dies. The Memorial Service has been set back to spring 2013. We are unclear about the date. We are still looking at Friday or Saturday before graduation. Two weeks before spring graduation was also presented and this is still under debate. We plan to honor fallen for last 10 years and each year after, all Past Presidents, & founders. We will

send out Save the Date announcements. On the Memorial wall, there are only two in the country. The proposed location is the area behind BL Perry Building. This is not too expensive as the University will use its resources to plan & build it. We ask for your patience, we are moving.

New Business

Update on Reorganization & Teach out
(Presented in the Provost's remarks)

Dr. Cynthia Hughes Harris

Announcements

International Program Flyers

Adjournment

Dr. Persaud said that he was encouraged by the senator's vibrancy and endurance. He then asked for a motion to adjourn. It was so moved and seconded. The motion was approved and the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Mrs. Jeneice Smith
Acting Secretary

Mrs. Rebecca Bruce
Office Manager