

MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 9 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Jacksonville State University Faculty Senate met at three o'clock on January 9, 1978. Twenty members were present; absent were Dr. Ted Klimasewski, Ms. Roberta Watts, Mr. Robert Atchley, Dr. Stephen Bitgood, Dr. Norman Dasinger, Dr. Bill Dunaway, Mr. Quinn Head, Mr. Harold O'Bryant, Dr. James Reaves, Mr. Marvin Shaw, Dr. Mary Martha Thomas, and Ms. Wanda L. Wigley.

Senate President Gilbert called the meeting to order at 3:07. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the December minutes. Dr. Gilbert stated that there was no old business to be conducted.

NEW BUSINESS

Senate President Gilbert noted that, after the fire at Providence College and a power failure at Sparkman Hall, some faculty had expressed concern about fire prevention and control, especially in the library and Sparkman Hall. The Security Committee will be asked to look into this.

Another area of concern expressed by some faculty members is the proposed location of the Performing Arts Building. This building is to be located east of the Merrill Building. Possible problems with this location are its isolation from dorms and the library and an increase in traffic resulting from this isolation.

Dr. Dan Marsengill questioned the title of the new building. Dr. Van Cleave responded that the building was originally planned for the Drama Department. With the procurement of additional money, however, the project was expanded to include the English and History departments. This would allow the use of Pannell Hall as a dormitory, and that dormitory space will be needed as J. S. U. continues to grow. Dr. Gilbert then referred the question to the Policies Committee.

Dr. Gilbert stated that either he or a representative will meet in Birmingham with other Senate Presidents from across the state. The purpose of this AAUP sponsored meeting is to discuss the formation of a coalition of state college and university faculty senates.

The December and January issues of the Faculty Senate Newsletter will be combined.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Evaluation Committee reported that the proposed faculty evaluation form had been administered. The final report on the use of the evaluation instrument will be made in April.

Mr. Jamie Cabassa reported for the Admissions and Scholarship Committee. Mr. Cabassa's report addressed the problems encountered by foreign students on campus. The report follows:

As of December 1977, there were 58 foreign students attending J. S. U. This group of students is divided into three categories:

(1) International House Category--Twenty students residing in the International House. These students are on an Exchange Visa. The program is sanctioned by the State Department. They are properly screened prior to admission.

(2) First Time College Student category--This is an independent group. Students in this category reside in the economy. They have to score at least 500 in the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOFEL). This test is administered by J. S. U.

(3) Transfer students category--This is also an independent group. The students in this category reside in the economy. They are screened by the college or university granting admission for the first time.

In general, most foreign students experience language difficulties. This is particularly true for those students in the Transfer Student Category.

To alleviate the condition,

(1) J. S. U. offers FLOOO, English for Foreign Students, a non-credit course. This course is designed to enhance their fluency in the English language. It is required until satisfactorily completed of all foreign students failing to pass an English competence examination. Only two students took this course during the past semester.

(2) It has been recommended to the administration that the foreign students in the transfer Student Category be required to take the Test of English as a Foreign language prior to their acceptance at J. S. U. This recommendation has not been accepted.

Mr. Cabassa recommended that no action should be taken until the President's Committee on Academics reports. Possible actions might include a screening of students and utilization of the learning center to accommodate them.

Dr. Charles Johnson asked how the University identified foreign students. Mr. Cabassa replied that there was no positive way that they could be identified. He further stated that there are approximately sixty foreign students on campus.

Dr. Johnson then asked if there had been an attempt to analyze the abilities and achievements of foreign students as a group. Mr. Cabassa stated that there had not been any attempt at analysis.

Dr. Jerry Smith added that he felt that we need more information and analysis before making any final recommendations. Mr. Cabassa agreed and stated that his committee would continue to work on the problem.

Dean Tom Barker reported for the Policies Committee concerning library security. The Physical Security Team from Fort McClellan suggested the following:

1. Stairwells on each floor should have detectors which register the opening and closing of the doors. This would allow the monitoring of traffic flow in the stairwells at closing time.

2. Since there are two blind spots at the monitor's desk, convex mirrors should be installed. Also, the monitoring desk should be moved to a location between the restrooms on the main floor.

3. A two-card checking system should be instituted. There would be both library and I. D. cards. The student would surrender his I. D. card upon entering the library while keeping his library card. When the student left, he would pick up his I. D. card.

4. There should be a centralized check-in/check-out area on the bottom floor.

5. Rare books and records should be checked out only at the centralized checking area.
6. All furniture should be marked permanently in a standardized fashion.
7. A key control policy should be implemented.
8. There is an unnecessary delay between the time the building is secured for the evening and the time that the security alarm is turned on. This delay has varied from 30 minutes to 3 hours.

Dean Barker further added that he felt that all functions not related to the library should be kept to a minimum. The Physical Security Team from Fort McClellan will continue to study the library as a project for at least an additional year. Dean Barker added that the building was not designed for security and that a trade-off was necessary between absolute security and functional use.

Dr. Gilbert stated that he felt that a magnetic book detection system might be appropriate. Dr. Dan Marsengill noted that his name had been signed for records that he had not requested. He said that forged faculty signatures could be a problem. The Policies Committee will continue work on library security.

Since there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at three forty-five.

Respectfully,

Franklin L. King

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 6 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE 1978

The Jacksonville State University Faculty Senate met at three o'clock on February 6, 1978. Eighteen members were present; absent were Dr. Ted Klimasewski, Ms. Roberta Watts, Mr. Robert Atchley, Dr. Louise Clark, Dr. Norman Dasinger, Dr. Bill Dunaway, Dr. Thomas J. Freeman, Dr. Sue Granger, Dr. Fred Grumley, Mr. Quinn Head, Dr. Charles Johnson, Dr. Dan Marsengill, Dr. James Reaves, and Dr. Mickey Starling.

Senate President Gilbert called the meeting to order at 3:05. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the January minutes. Dr. Gilbert stated that there was no old business to be conducted.

Dr. Gilbert then welcomed Dr. Charles Merbitz, Director of the Center for Individualized Instruction. Dr. Merbitz gave the following presentation:

The Center for Individualized Instruction wishes to announce the availability to faculty of support for Individualized or Personalized courses at J.S.U. The Center is a component of the AIDP grant that exists to assist in the development and operation of personalized or individualized instructional systems by interested faculty members. The Center can provide support in the form of faculty release time for development of courses, advice and access to research on the effectiveness of various components of the proposed methods, facilities for student use, and so forth.

While details vary, courses taught through the Center generally share a set of characteristics. These include:

-division of the course into a number of smaller units or modules, each with distinct objectives.

-selection of materials --books, tapes, films and so forth -- to carry the objectives of each unit.

-written test questions for every objective so that each objective is represented and all must be studied, and so that repetitive tests for each unit can be taken.

-establishment of a mastery level (usually 85-90% correct) that the student must meet or exceed on each unit test before he can proceed to the next unit.

-use of continuous, direct measures of student activity on each unit to revise procedures and units as needed to support optimum student performance.

-student progression at paces appropriate to individual learning rates within limits.

-multiple testing attempts at each unit so that the feedback from each unit evaluation is a directly useful source of information to the students as well as to the instructor.

-use of advanced students to provide one-to-one attention, immediate feedback, tutoring directed at specific concepts, continuous, precise measurement of each student's progress, and a personal relationship built around course material.

Currently, the Center offers courses in study skills and academic survival (LS101, 1 hr.), communication skills (LS105, 3 hrs.), and quantitative skills (LS110, 3 hrs.). The LS105 and LS110 courses do not substitute for any required English or mathematics courses, but are designed to prepare the student for English 101 and Math 101.

In addition to the basic skills courses, the grant provides resources to allow some interested faculty to use individualized or personalized methods in the courses they regularly teach. In fact, the grant guidelines call for 12 courses to be developed and running by 1981.

ADDITIONAL USES

Since such a course is modularized, or in units, selected units can also

be made available to students in advanced courses who need refreshment or review in the specific units selected. Thus, a lower level course may serve both the students enrolled in it and advanced students that need to review a smaller part of it.

Some concerns may be raised immediately when a new or different method of instruction is proposed. A few are listed below, with some comments on each.

QUALITY CONTROL

Students taught through the Center must learn at least as much as those in sections taught by traditional methods. A rigorous measurement system is matched with the objectives of each course so that the extent to which the course objectives are reached can be seen for each student on each unit. Comprehensive final exams can also be used to check the effects of the class if desired.

Obviously, if the Center ever became an "easy way around" difficult courses, where a poor student could "slide through", its purpose would be defeated and it would rightly lose the trust and respect of both faculty and students. However, continuing attention to the rigor of Center courses by the instructors, department chairpersons, and the Center itself should prevent such a situation from development. In fact, to the extent that sections taught through the Center are more exhaustively measured than some parallel sections taught a traditional way, it may be that some students would actually learn more than they would in non-center sections.

COMPETITION:

Since it may be feared that some students may prefer Center methods while others do not, it may be argued that teaching one section using Center methods and another section by more traditional methods and allowing students their choice of sections in which to register is in fact setting up "competition"

between the two. By that criterion, any course using two or more instructors teaching different sections is in fact a 'competition' situation. Given that at least the same level of student achievement is reached, it would seem that offering students a choice of Center versus non-center sections could only be to the advantage of students, faculty, the department, and all concerned. The advantage lies in using the method preferred by each group for each of the students. Given that the educational quality can be maintained, choice of methods preferred by students may ultimately be reflected in larger numbers of students. If that is desired, it would seem that the department could easily ascertain student preference by offering Center and non-center sections at the same time, and encouraging students to choose. Probably some students will always register without awareness, but after several terms, any preference that exists should be visible.

CRITERIA FOR COURSE SELECTION:

The faculty Task Force (Dr. Franklin King, Dr. William Medley, and Dr. Thomas Smith) for the Center has established a set of guidelines to evaluate courses proposed for Center support. The guidelines include:

- instructor willingness and enthusiasm
- permanence of course/instructor combination
- demand for course
- multiple sections
- suitability of course materials as back-up modules for more advanced courses
- number of advanced courses using proposed course as a prerequisite
- frequency of book or material change

TEACHING CREDIT FOR CENTER COURSES:

As stated before, the Center offers instructors an alternative method of

instruction. Once release time has been used to develop curriculum materials, the course is taught as part of the instructor's load in his department.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Any faculty member who wants more information about the use of individualized or personalized methods is invited to come to the Center, Room 3, Stephenson Gym, or call Ext. 397. The Director, Dr. Charles Merbitz, will be happy to discuss particular course and Departmental needs in detail. A collection of articles, books, reprints and research reports is also available for faculty perusal.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Dr. Merbitz called for questions. Dean Barker asked for a clarification of release time for the development of a course. Dr. Merbitz replied that release time depended upon the type of course being developed and that more time would be granted if no materials were currently available, and less time if easily adapted materials could be purchased. He further stated that teaching the developed course would count toward the course load of the instructor as would any other course.

Dr. Van Cleave asked about the duration of the program. He further wanted to know what effect a lack of faculty involvement would have on the program. Dr. Merbitz answered that the AIDP grant would provide initial monies. The University would then assume responsibility for continuing the program. Dr. Merbitz noted that faculty involvement is crucial to the Center. Dr. Bitgood added that AIDP grants are often renewable.

Both Dr. Van Cleave and Mr. Robert MacRae wished to know if programs for the fast learner might be developed. Dr. Merbitz stated that the methodology developed might be applied to all learners.

Mr. Harold O'Bryant asked if any course could be taught at the Center for Individualized Instruction. Dr. Merbitz replied that the courses must fit the

criteria established by the faculty Task Force.

Dr. Earl Poore asked if academic credit is granted for courses taught at the Center. Dr. Merbitz replied that both one-hour and three-hour courses were now being offered. He further stated that courses taught through the Center would have no special notations placed on the transcripts other than the standard prefix for the course, and he reported that the quality of a course taught through the Center must be at least as high as the quality of a course taught by traditional means.

Dr. Poore asked if the courses had to be taught at the Center and if they had to meet at scheduled hours. Dr. Merbitz replied that the majority of the courses would be conducted at the Center but not necessarily at a scheduled hour. He added that the time can be flexible since the student advisors who have demonstrated competencies in the area of instruction, and who provide private discussion of misunderstood concepts, immediate feedback, precise measurement, and personal contact, can often meet with students in the course at various times.

Mrs. Louise Clark asked if students were limited by a semester time frame. Dr. Merbitz replied that a student who doesn't complete a course during a regular semester would receive whatever mark the instructor deemed appropriate. It was also noted that individualized courses often use programmed texts.

Dr. Bitgood stated that he believed the faculty would want to use more than just programmed texts. There are many different approaches to conveying information and concepts.

Mr. O'Bryant wondered about the increased demands on a student's time. Dr. Merbitz said that some students might require more time to complete work but that they should find the approach at the Center less stressful, since the testing is repetitive and feedback is immediate.

Dr. Sue Griffith asked how long the Center would be open. Dr. Merbitz stated that currently the Center is open from 8:00-4:30 but that other times might be arranged.

Dr. Griffith then asked if only courses offered for credit would be conducted at the Center. She asked if materials might also be available to students who are not signed up for courses conducted at the Center. Dr. Merbitz stated that presently only course work was available to students, but other materials might be developed at a later date.

Dr. Gilbert asked if the Center would have courses designed to help foreign students. Dr. Merbitz stated that there were currently no plans to provide special courses to meet the needs of foreign students. He added, however, that the Center was open to suggestions on the development of such courses.

Dr. Van Cleave asked how the Center recruited student assistants and how many student assistants were needed. Dr. Merbitz stated that assistants might receive pay or course credit. He added that an assistant to student ratio between $1/10$ and $1/5$ would be desired.

Dr. Mary Martha Thomas asked who would supervise the advisors. Dr. Merbitz stated that both the Center and the instructor who prepares the materials and receives credit for conducting the course would supervise the advisors.

Mrs. Louise Clark asked if students must still take required courses after having completed courses at the Center. Dr. Merbitz replied that the three LS courses currently offered at the Center do not take the place of any required courses. However, a required course taught through the Center would be no different from any other required course.

Dr. Mary Martha Thomas asked if there were plans to make modules for more advanced courses. Dr. Merbitz replied that modules for more advanced courses could be constructed. Dr. Thomas then asked how many students were currently

enrolled in the program. Dr. Merbitz stated that approximately sixty students were involved. Dr. Thomas asked when a student could join the program. Dr. Merbitz stated that while the program is relatively freely structured, the Center must still work within the administrative framework of the university.

Dr. Merbitz stated that the present grant calls for the establishment of twelve courses. Dr. Poore asked if all twelve courses were to be remedial in nature. Dr. Merbitz replied that courses which meet the requirements of the faculty Task Force would be considered, whether remedial, required, or elective.

Dr. Gilbert then asked for an additional clarification on release time for the conducting and preparation of courses. Dr. Merbitz stated that release time would be decided on a case-by-case basis. Currently the faculty Task Force is using a flexible policy. Dr. Gilbert then thanked Dr. Merbitz for addressing the Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Gilbert stated that he had received a list of scholarships which were available on campus. Dr. Gilbert added that most of the scholarships are of a non-academic nature or only partially academic so far as criteria for selection is concerned.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dr. Van Cleave reported for the Admissions and Scholarship Committee. Dr. Poore, Dr. Johnson, and Dr. Van Cleave met with Vice-President Montgomery. Dr. Montgomery is concerned about the status and availability of academic scholarships and financial assistance to students. He is also concerned that the faculty is not visible enough to potential students. There is a need to impress senior high school students with the quality of our faculty. It should be possible to attract prominent alumni to jointly sponsor scholarships. An additional

report on academic scholarships will be forthcoming.

Dr. Jerry L. Smith reported for the Policies Committee. Dr. Smith reported that plans for the Performing Arts Building have proceeded too far for relocation to be considered. He indicated that all the occupants of the Performing Arts Building had not yet been decided upon. The English and drama departments will be located there; the history and political science departments may be added, as well.

Dr. Smith then submitted the following resolution from the Policies Committee to be considered by the Faculty Senate:

Resolved, that a search committee procedure be utilized as a significant portion of the comprehensive process by which university administrative officials are selected, and that the procedure be designed with specific input from the general faculty, both in the selection of the committee and in its composition.

As a result of the rules of the Faculty Senate, the above resolution will be considered and voted on at the next Senate meeting. Dr. Smith noted that precedents for use of the search committee procedure have already been established.

Dr. Mary Martha Thomas, of the Welfare Committee, indicated plans for that committee to examine the procedures and criteria used by department chairmen and others evaluating faculty members for promotion and tenure purposes.

Dr. Van Cleave inquired about the Traffic Committee Report. A resolution was passed instructing Dr. Gilbert to ask Dr. Stone about the lack of faculty representation in reaching the publicized policy. Dr. Gilbert is planning to invite Dr. Stone to address the next Senate meeting. At that time the President may be asked about the traffic situation and other topics.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Franklin L. King

Memo

To: Faculty Senate Members
From: Jerry D. Gilbert
Faculty Senate President
Date: March 28, 1978
Re: Meeting

The Senate will meet, Monday, April 3, at 3:00 p.m. on the 11th floor of the library.

Please review the attached minutes of our last meeting for possible additions or corrections so that we may dispense with the actual reading of the minutes.

jll

Ground Floor
Read - pass on - eventually back to me. TJJ.

TJJ
DAB
KRR
JR
MPW

not
up m

MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6 MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE

78

The Jacksonville State University Faculty Senate met at three o'clock on March 6, 1978. Nineteen members were present; absent were Dr. Ted Klimasewski, Ms. Roberta Watts, Mr. Robert Atchley, Dr. Tom Barker, Dr. Stephen Bitgood, Mr. Jamie Cabassa, Dr. Louise Clark, Ms. Carol Deuster, Dr. Fred Grumley, Mr. Quinn Head, Dr. Charles Johnson, Mr. Harold O'Bryant, Dr. Mickey Starling, Dr. Mary Martha Thomas, and Mr. John Turner.

Senate President Gilbert called the meeting to order at 3:10. Corrections to the February minutes were asked for by Dr. John Van Cleave. Dr. Van Cleave stated that Dr. Charles Johnson had not met with Vice-President Montgomery concerning the status and availability of academic scholarships and financial assistance, as indicated in the February minutes. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the February minutes as amended.

Dr. Gilbert then welcomed President Stone. He said that Dr. Stone had been asked to discuss the plans and problems faced by Jacksonville State University and that he be open to questions from the senate floor at the conclusion of his presentation.

Dr. Stone stated that he believes in the Judeo-Christian tradition. He also believes in the freedom to worship or not to worship as one sees fit so long as those beliefs do not interfere with the rights of others. The faculty or administration must never impose their religious convictions upon students. A bill was recently introduced in the legislature which would allow public school students sixty seconds a day to meditate. One professor, however, objected to the use of school holidays to celebrate religious events and felt strongly that church related literature should not be distributed in the schools. Dr. Stone said that we were not going to violate or interfere with any law.

Dr. Stone stated that a recent University of Alabama research department survey indicated that 80-90% of all Alabamians approve of the academic work on college campuses and universities. The colleges and universities of Alabama rate higher than colleges or universities outside of Alabama with the people of our state. This information runs counter to the feelings of many state legislators who feel that institutions of higher learning grow fat and non-productive while taking away from the public schools.

There are some who support across the board mandated raises in higher education. There is, however, a belief among some academicians that not all personnel deserve a raise. Dr. Stone said that no law protects an incompetent individual and that an incompetent could be removed. Every year that Dr. Stone has been president of Jacksonville State University, with the possible exception of 1971, there has been a salary increase. All faculty members have received the same raise even though some special cases have received adjustments. The University publishes a salary schedule which allows everyone to know what they should be receiving. Merit raises are not possible unless additional monies become available beyond what would be necessary for an across the board raise. Dr. Stone hopes for a 10% raise in the fall.

Jacksonville State University has a great many federally funded programs. A mandated raise would make a raise mandatory for the federal employees as well as the faculty and would require much more money.

While it is true that additional monies will be available to the University, costs have also risen. Since January 1, 1971, many terminal degrees have been added which has resulted in an increase in expenditures.

Dr. Stone noted that some people have questioned the expenditure of funds for athletic programs. He informed the Senate that not one penny has been spent on athletic programs that could have been spent on anything else. The

money to pay for the new athletic facilities was obtained at 3% interest, and is amortized for 30 years.

An additional expense that must be met in complying with the federal laws to take care of the severely handicapped. Many buildings will need to have elevators installed and ramps constructed.

The Board of Trustees has instructed Dr. Stone and Dr. Montgomery to review the records of all appropriate faculty members with earned terminal degrees when considering the selection of the two new academic deans. The University will give first consideration to our own people.

If a search committee is formed, it will be necessary to go outside of Jacksonville State University to interview for prospective deans. Dr. Stone indicated that by promoting internally it would not be necessary to announce a position. The fact that the College of Arts and Sciences is too wide spread has resulted in the need for an additional dean. Dr. Stone stated that we already have excellent department heads in Arts and Sciences to select from.

Dr. Stone then entertained questions from the floor of the Senate.

Dr. Gilbert asked Dr. Stone about the recently adopted traffic policy. He asked specifically why the Campus Security Committee was not involved in the adoption of the policy. Dr. Gilbert also asked why an early proposal to make faculty parking decals semi-permanent was not accepted in the final policy decision.

Dr. Stone replied that the question of a permanent decal for faculty members had not been brought before him but that he would seek a clarification on the issue. He further noted that he was under the impression that the Faculty Senate has played a role in making recommendations for dealing with the traffic problem.

Dr. Norman Dasinger asked about the possibility of waiving tuition for faculty members' children as a further inducement for them to attend Jacksonville

State University. Dr. Stone questioned the legality of such aid and wondered whether this type of benefit would promote good public relations. Dr. Stone stated that, to his knowledge, the idea of waivering tuition for faculty members' children had never been brought up to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Earl Poore asked Dr. Stone if he knew of any additional sources of revenue for one year renewable scholarships. Dr. Stone responded that AIDP had a developmental segment which provided for a specialist to work on projects involving the solicitation of funds from alumni. Dr. Stone informed the Senate that there are many scholarships available on campus. The public sales of materials no longer needed by the University also provide scholarship endowment funds.

Mr. Robert MacRae stated that he didn't realize that the faculty had much input in the Liason Committee's traffic report. Dr. Stone replied that he was under the impression that the faculty had provided input. He stated that he would ask Dr. Montgomery to get in touch with Dr. Gilbert to resolve this issue.

Dr. Stone stated that Dr. Millican has noted that the parking curb between the Library and Martin Hall was a danger and that it should be removed. Dr. Stone said that he agreed with Dr. Millican's recommendation.

Ms. Wanda Wigley asked if it was possible to leave on the campus lights to provide outside security. Dr. Stone stated that all lights needed for campus security would be left on but that it may be necessary to reduce the wattage.

Dr. Reid stated that improved security was needed in the library to prevent the loss of books. Dr. Stone replied that additional security in the library and in the women's dormitories would be very expensive and could result in an increase in student costs.

Dr. Van Cleave asked if a search committee should be formulated to help pick a successor to Dr. Stone. Dr. Stone stated that it was up to the Board of Trustees to choose a successor. He will retire on June 30, 1981. Dr. Stone

stated that if a successor had not been selected by then, he will remain on the job for three to six months in a non-pay status. The Board of Trustees will probably form a screening committee which will be made up of faculty members, students, and board members. There will be clear specifications written to serve as a guideline.

Dr. Sue Griffith asked if Jacksonville State University ever had a list of available openings posted for academic faculty. Dr. Stone replied that no general list has ever been posted. Dr. Gilbert then thanked Dr. Stone for addressing the Senate.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Jerry Smith presented the following resolution on behalf of the Policies Committee:

Resolved, that a search committee procedure be utilized as a significant portion of the comprehensive process by which university administrative officials are selected, and that the procedure be designed with specific input from the general faculty, both in the selection of the committee and in its composition.

After discussion by the Senate, the resolution was put to a secret ballot and was adopted.

Dr. Gilbert stated that it was time to consider potential new members of the Faculty Senate. Elections are to take place during the month of April.

Dr. Gilbert recently attended a meeting at which a prepaid legal plan was presented. The plan is not expensive and may be something many of the faculty would be interested in. The topic was referred to the Welfare Committee for study and recommendations.

The Security Committee is investigating the problem of fire safety in the high rise buildings on campus.

Dr. Gilbert asked the Senate whether he should survey the deans again this year concerning the level of utilization of the mini-nester off. The

membership indicated that such a survey was desired. The senate would like to know how many faculty members are actually off during the mini-semester. The senate would further like a clarification of what "off" really means in the different schools and departments.

Dr. Gilbert stated that a Constitutional Revision Committee was being constituted to consider items which need changing in the present constitution. This Constitutional Revision Committee will consist of the Committee on Committees which will report its recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. John Van Cleave reported for the Admissions and Scholarship Committee. He stated that his committee was considering ways to encourage Faculty Senate members to attend meetings. The following resolution was submitted for consideration:

Whereas, The JSU faculty member is expected to serve the University in capacities other than classroom teacher; and

Whereas, the faculty member is evaluated partly on his/her effectiveness in the performance on administrative and other committee assignments; and

Whereas, those faculty members who are elected to the JSU Faculty Senate by their colleagues are expected by their constituents to make a contribution to the University's growth and development by their involvement in the Senate and its committees;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that we, the JSU Faculty Senate, request that the Senate Committee on Committees establish guidelines to discipline those Senators who, without a valid excuse, miss more than a specified number of meetings, and to make their discipline a matter of official record.

The resolution will be discussed and voted upon at the April Senate meeting.

There being no additional reports the meeting was adjourned at 4:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Franklin L. King

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 3 MEETING ¹⁷⁸

OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Jacksonville State University Faculty Senate met at three o'clock on April 3, 1978. Seventeen members were present; absent were Dr. Ted Klimasewski, Ms. Roberta Watts, Mr. Jamie Cabassa, Dr. Louise Clark, Dr. Norman Dasinger, Ms. Carol Deuster, Dr. Thomas Freeman, Ms. Sue Griffith, Dr. Fred Grumley, Dr. Charles Johnson, Dr. Dan Marsengill, Mr. Harold O'Bryant, Mr. Marvin Shaw, Dr. Mary Martha Thomas, and Mr. John Turner.

Senate President Gilbert called the meeting to order at 3:12. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the March minutes.

Dr. Gilbert then welcomed Ms. Miriam W. Haywood, Director of Personnel Services. Ms. Haywood told the Senate that she did not know all the information about TIAA and CREF but that she would be happy to research any topic suggested by a participant. Ms. Haywood then referred to a handout which stated:

"That during the years 1976-77, 1977-78, each participant would contribute not less than 3% of his regular monthly salary or weekly wage, and the University would match up to 4%. During the years 1978-79, 1979-80, each participant would contribute not less than 3% of his regular monthly salary or weekly wage, and the University would match up to 5%."

She informed us that a member can change his status of participation only in October of each year. Members may contact her as early as September about a change.

Dr. Gilbert asked her if she thought members should elect to increase their contributions to 5%. Ms. Haywood replied that it depends on whether one needs the money before retirement. If a participant leaves the teaching profession before completing five years, both contributions and interest are refunded, as well as previous service contributions.

Ms. Haywood stated that CREF accounts did not advance in 1977 over their status in 1976 and, therefore, sustained a net loss. CREF did better, however, than Standard & Poore's report on some 500 stocks in 1977. While the accrual unit value was lower, more units could be purchased. When the market recovers, the value will increase with the ownership of more units.

The interest being paid on TIAA annuities is currently 7 3/4%. The expense charge for TIAA is 3.5%. The expense charge for CREF is 1 3/4% plus 1 1/2% upon payment of benefits plus the investment expense charge for a total of approximately 4%.

The TIAA annuity is a fixed dollar annuity while the CREF annuity is a variable annuity. Throughout the nation, a 50/50 allocation level is the most popular. A participant can transfer from CREF to TIAA provided he is 55 or over and has not yet started annuity income payments. Ms. Haywood stated that a person of any age who is beginning his annuity income may purchase a TIAA fixed annuity. The transfer may be made in one sum or in installments of at least \$1,000 a year.

SRA provides for a partial cash withdrawal from the SRA contract. The cash withdrawn must be at least \$1,000, and no other partial withdrawal should have been made from the same SRA contract during the preceding six months. All amounts withdrawn from an SRA are subject to Federal income tax in the year received. SRA is always by tax-reduction.

Ms. Haywood then stated that a participant can always increase or reduce contributions to TIAA. A participant who leaves the teaching profession can continue to contribute to TIAA. A participant who is contributing to TIAA on one campus and then transfers to another university which is also a member of TIAA will not have to wait to begin their contributions. Ms. Haywood added that when statements of TIAA contributions are received, the statements actually are one month behind.

Mr. MacRae asked if a faculty member could put previous service contributions into an SRA. Ms. Haywood replied that a member could put new monies into an SRA but not previous contributions.

Mr. MacRae asked about the Legislative Health Plan. Ms. Haywood replied that the proposed plan was too vague.

Ms. Haywood said a dental plan was not feasible because of the cost involved and the necessity for all personnel to join. The University does provide dental coverage if the cost is incurred as the result of an accident.

Ms. Haywood then addressed the question of withdrawing from social security. She said that when the state of Alabama contracted with the federal government to go into social security in 1951, the unit of Alabama was set up in three groups: (1) Teachers' Retirement System, (2) Employees' Retirement System, and (3) all others (cities).

Alabama teachers voted to have coverage beginning January 1, 1955. According to the federal Social Security Administration, a part of a unit cannot withdraw; therefore, the entire state would have to request withdrawal for an individual to withdraw.

All positions covered by teacher retirement are automatically covered by social security as well, with the state paying the employer's portion of the tax. This means all such employees are mandatorily placed on social security/teacher retirement reports, even though the employee may not be a participating member of the Teacher Retirement System. The federal projects pay the employer's share of matching tax.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Gilbert told the Senate that one item of old business remained: a discussion and vote on the resolution dealing with Faculty Senate attendance.

Dr. Reaves called for a clarification of the terms "discipline" and "official record" in the resolution. Dr. Gilbert said the Committee on Committees will determine the proper disciplinary action to be followed. The "official record" will be the minutes of the faculty senate. Dr. Jerry Smith added that the precedent is established for a legislative body to discipline its own members.

Dr. Tom Barker called for an amendment to the resolution. He felt that the guidelines as drawn up by the Committee on Committees should be approved by the Senate. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the amendment. The following resolution, as amended, was passed by the Faculty Senate.

Whereas, The JSU faculty member is expected to serve the University in capacities other than classroom teacher; and

Whereas, the faculty member is evaluated partly on his/her effectiveness in the performance of administrative and other committee assignments; and

Whereas, those faculty members who are elected to the JSU Faculty Senate by their colleagues are expected by their constituents to make a contribution to the University's growth and development by their involvement in the Senate and its committees;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that we, the JSU Faculty Senate, request that the Senate Committee on Committees establish guidelines as recommended by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Faculty Senate, to discipline those Senators who, without a valid excuse, miss more than a specified number of meetings, and to make their discipline a matter of official record.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Gilbert said that the Search Committee Resolution had been given to the Vice President for University Academic Affairs and that Dr. Montgomery would notify the appropriate officials.

Dr. Gilbert then told the Senate that all appropriate deans were notified of the need to hold Faculty Senate elections in April.

The following Senate terms expire:

- a. Arts and Sciences - Dr. Fred Grumley and Dr. Charles Johnson
- b. Science and Mathematics - Dr. John Van Cleave
- c. Social Sciences - Dr. Jerry Gilbert
- d. Business - Ms. Louise J. Clark
- e. Education - Dr. Louise Clark and Mr. Quinn Head
- f. Graduate School - Dr. James Reaves
- g. Law Enforcement - None
- h. Library Science and Instructional Media - Dr. Thomas Freeman and Mr. John Turner
- i. Nursing - Ms. Sue Griffith and Ms. Roberta Watts

Dr. Gilbert said there was no set policy concerning the minimester off for faculty members. Dr. Gilbert then called for committee reports. He said the Committee on Committees had worked on amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws. The amendment procedures as found in the FACULTY HANDBOOK are complex. Dr. Gilbert said the amendments could be voted on in the general faculty meeting in August. It will be necessary to let the amendments wait until then. The proposed amendments are as follows:

Article II, Section I
Membership

[to be inserted between third and fourth full paragraphs]

By no later than the February Senate meeting the Committee on Committees will appoint a Special Committee for Elections. This committee will publicize in the Faculty Newsletter the number of Senate seats to be filled from each school. The committee will, during the first week of April, supervise an approved, by the Committee, nominating process within each school. The persons nominated will be publicly named in letters to each department with notice that additional names may be added to the ballot through petition of one-fifth of the faculty of the school involved. The nomination period will close on April 15 and the committee will prepare and distribute ballots to all faculty within each school no later than April 20. Marked ballots will be received by the

the committee through the last Friday of April with results being declared by the following Wednesday. In the event no nominee in a given contest gains a majority of votes cast, the committee will conduct a run-off election within one week.

Article II, Section I
Membership

∟paragraph 3, beginning with line 9 to read as follows:∟

. . . shall be held in April of each year, terms of office to begin immediately following completion of the May meeting of the current academic year's senate. Incoming members should attend the May meeting of the current senate as non-voting participants.

Section 2
Officers

∟paragraph 1, beginning with line 3 to read as follows:∟

. . . ganization. Elections thereafter shall come at the initial meeting of the coming academic year's senate, which meeting shall occur immediately upon conclusion of the May meeting of the current academic year's senate. The retiring Senate President shall preside over the election of new officers.

∟Repeal paragraph 5.∟

Article II, Section I
Membership

∟Repeal paragraph 6.∟

Article II, Section 3
Meetings

∟In line 6, change "September" to "October".∟

Article II, Section 4
Quorum and Attendance

[existing provision not changed.]

Members who have two non-approved absences may be censored by vote of the Senate with public notice of this action being placed in the Faculty Newsletter. Upon occurrence of a third non-approved absence, the member will be removed from office by declaration of the Committee on Committees. Approval of absences will be determined by the Senate President subject to appeal to the Committee on Committees. Should a conflict occur between Senate meeting times and a Senators' scheduled class, the Senator may name an alternate to serve in his place for no longer than one semester. The named alternate must be from the School of the Senator concerned and must be approved by vote of the Faculty Senate.

Article IV
Amendment

The Faculty Senate may amend these By-Laws at any regular meeting by a simple majority vote of the members present. A proposal for amendment must be recommended by at least five members of the academic faculty, submitted to the Faculty Senate at a regular meeting of that body and voted on by the Faculty Senate at their next regular meeting.

An amendment shall become effective when approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Council of Deans.

Dr. Stephen Bitgood of the Evaluations Committee reported on the results of the proposed faculty evaluation instrument. He said there was a wide difference of opinion and suitability on the use of the evaluation instrument. Approximately twenty-nine volunteers participated in the study.

Dr. Van Cleave requested that the Evaluations Committee look into the possibility of using an instrument to evaluate mid-line administrators such as department heads. Dr. Bitgood said his committee would address itself to this problem in the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17.

Respectfully submitted,
Franklin L. King