

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Sept 10, 2001**

**Senators Present:** H. Ostrom, J. McGruder, G. Tomlin, M. Jackson, D. Balaam, J. Hanson, C. Kline, K. Hummel-Berry, B. Breitenbach, R. Wilson.

**University Officials:** T. Cooney, K. Bartanen, B. Barry, D. Bahar (ASUPS President).

**Visitors:** K. Maxwell, N. Bristow, T. Mace, Bill Beardsley.

Chair: noted that Martin Jackson is conducting an election to replace Connie Hale and David Sousa.

He also noted that the minutes for the 5/14/01 meeting were not approved as they had been lost (and since have been located).

The chair will continue the practice of allowing each senator up to one minute to speak at the beginning of the meeting. No one spoke.

The senate discussed charges to the following committees.

Academic Standards: after some discussion of procedures to deal with number 2. "Response to Instances of Plagiarism..." Julie McG noted that separate policies might be useful for the OT, PT, and Education programs especially as they apply to graduates who work with vulnerable people. The senate voted without objection to approve the charges to the committee.

Curriculum Committee: No objections, committee charged.

Diversity Committee: on number 4. the words "develop additional" were changed to "explore." No objections, committee charged.

LMAC Committee: No objections, committee charged.

Professional Standards: Dean Cooney suggested the committee be given a priority list of 3 charges. No. 1 would be "reviewing departmental statements and guidelines...", no. 2 was "a request to review the current Instructor Evaluation Form," and no. 3 would be a complete review of department statements. The senate then voted without objection to charge the committee.

Student Life: ASUPS President Bahar suggested that the Student Life Committee consider a student Bill of Rights and report back to the senate with regard to the feasibility of such a Bill. Senate passed without objection committee charges.

University Enrichment: a number of senators discussed the issues of money for conferences—how much for international travel and for second papers. Dean Cooney suggested the committee "discuss" charges numbers 1 and 2 instead of "increasing" only funding for International Travel.

Chair: then asked for an update on the Physical and Occupational Therapy program. Julie McG noted that water damage had been occurring in the lecture halls of the OT-PT building. Kathie H-B said that enrollment this fall was exactly on target at 17. She did not recall the exact numbers for PT for fall 2002, but indicated that inquiries seem to be up from last year. Terry C noted that he believed the target number for fall 2002 was 22-23 (confirmed later at 21). Roberta Wilson inquired whether previously enrolled students and graduates with an MPT would be awarded a DPT. Kathie H-B noted that because of the rules of the physical therapy accrediting agency, UPS could not retroactively award the DPT, even to students currently enrolled in their second and third years of the program. These students may be able to upgrade

their program to a DPT with some extra coursework. The PT faculty are in the process of preparing a proposal for a transitional program, which is the process for upgrading the degrees. New brochures for both programs were close to being ready to be mailed out by early October. George T said the occupational therapy enrollment benchmarks for the next three years were 15/18/26 for OT graduate programs. There is currently a new, small undergraduate OT class just starting. These students will be the last baccalaureate level OT majors to graduate, in December, 2003.

George T went on to discuss the "bigger picture" of what was happening to the OT and PT programs. First, there were the financial accounting and infrastructure issues. As the School becomes all graduate it was being financially scrutinized as a separate entity. Previously, the occupational therapy program had one foot in the undergraduate curriculum and one foot in the graduate school. Physically, there has been no graduate school on the campus, just bureaucratic responsibilities. Now the department was in a year of transition to an all-graduate program. Total enrollment was likely to be lower than in the past. There has been quite an effort to establish program expenses. This effort, careful and sincere, was still at best an estimate of the true accounting of program contributions and costs. There was no consideration given, for example, for the value of the time faculty are involved outside the department (e.g., university governance), in the financial evaluation of faculty members. Any department chair in this position would have to have his or her colleagues pull back from governance commitments, when financial pressures were present, unfortunate as that might be.

George went on to discuss that in the past the programs had generated large, reliable surpluses for the university- about one million dollars per year. Now that they were currently just breaking even, they were placed under separate financial accounting. Administrative rearrangements were needed on many levels, from decision-making procedures to the large effort of marketing to prospective students, which the Office of Admission no longer wants the responsibility for. These issues had not been thought through in advance, but were thrown upon the department. Tomlin expressed his resentment at the way these changes occurred. It was becoming harder for faculty to make a big contribution to the university when the "bottom line" has become the bottom line. The second issue was the changes administratively that will accompany the department operating "financially independently." Will OT, PT and Education form together as a graduate school, with real administrative implications? Will undergraduate education be more deeply split from graduate education? Will there be further splitting of different academic units?

The Senate then moved to the issue of charges to different committees. It was decided to deal with the issue according to alpha.

Bill Beardsley proposed to look at areas of the code to revise. He gave an overview of the trustee request in 1998 to revise the code—to streamline it and make it more efficient. The trustees were on the cusp of rejecting the faculty's proposed amendments to the code and proposed themselves to meet with a faculty committee. The faculty voted to have 3 members of the PSC to meet with the Trustees—Sarah Moore, Bruce Mann, and Bill Beardsley. Their meeting resulting in some rethinking and revising. The trustees and the Committee then agreed to form a new committee to work on the sticking points and come up with a new package of proposals. Bill Haltom appointed Nancy Bristow, Keith Maxwell, and Terry Mace. The Chair Ostrom noted that the conference committee still existed but that the new committee was working on the new proposal.

Keith Maxwell said that there were 3 main issues to deal with: instructors, hiring and chapter 3 evaluations.

Terry Mace handed out proposals to deal with Appendix A. He noted that the trustees want to delete Appendix A altogether. Essentially, the new committee is proposing to put much of Appendix A into the code in other places. Mace made clear that instructors want the "performance standards and compensation area comparable to career faculty teaching similar

courses” part of the number 2. of the Appendix to be kept—somewhere in the code. He went on to discuss a variety of issues here including compensation. He feared that many people would be disturbed if the part of the code were left out or changed. Chris Klein suggested that another body should perhaps address the issue as it doesn’t cover all types of instructors or course, e.g., people in education.

The senate then proceeded to discuss the proposed changes to the code including an effort to “clarify who the faculty are.” Many of the proposed changes came from chapter 2 of the code or from Appendix A. Dean Cooney noted that the general authority of the dean to create new positions--such as clinical instructors—need not match the guidelines for instructors.

After a good deal of discussion the issue was tabled until the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned without a formal vote at 5:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David N. Balaam