Minutes for the 45th Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday February 07, 2022
5:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr Tilghman, Chair, at 5:05 p.m.

Attendees:

Attendees’ names are attached to the meeting minutes. If you attended this meeting, and you do not see your name on these minutes, kindly notify the executive secretary so that your name can be added to the roster. If you notice a discrepancy in the minutes, please do the same. If you are a committee chair, please email your updates to the executive secretary for inclusion to the minutes.

Dr. Tilghman welcomed everyone and asked whether anyone wanted him to share his screen for the minutes’ reading. That was not necessary: Dr. Bender offered a motion to approve; Dr. Parham seconded the motion: The minutes were approved.

Dr. Tilghman indicated the provost would join the meeting momentarily to address the Senate.

Updates

1. Dr. Tilghman attended a retreat with President Morris and the Board of Trustees 1/21 and 1/22/2022. Pay raise was mentioned: Starting July 2022, faculty and all employees will receive a pay raise of 3%. Funds will come mostly from grants. They indicated they were aware of issues with faculty pay and would further look into this in the future. Dr. Tilghman apologized because the issue of Department chairs did not come up at all.

Dr. Jones indicated last time when other faculty benefitted from a pay raise, Department Chairs did not qualify though holding dual positions as administrators and faculty.

Dr. Tilghman acknowledged the issue with Department Chairs’ cut in salary. He stated not being sure about what was going on with that issue and invited Dr. Jones to further elaborate. She indicated her deferring to Dr. Thiam as their group’s leader.

Dr. Thiam stated the group was still in deliberations with the President. No conclusions have been reached as of yet.

Dr. Tilghman reiterated all faculty and staff would receive the 3% increase. Dr. Jones made a request for Dr. Tilghman to ask that language be clarified concerning Department Chairs. Her contention was the last increase did not include language including or excluding Department Chairs.
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Chairs from the raise. However, they did not receive that increase. Dr. Tilghman indicated he would bring up the issue during the next meeting with the BOT in March.

Dr. Tilghman added the president expressed her understanding of the difficulty the inflation was causing to all. Dr. Tilghman also raised the situation of faculty whose pay was in the range of $40-45k. The president and the BOT acknowledged the information and stated they would look at further sources of funding potentially for future pay raises.

2. Dr. Tilghman reminded to all given we were in February and April was the last meeting for this year’s Faculty Senate meeting, the constitution provided for the creation of a nomination committee to manage April’s elections. There was a need for 3 faculty members serving their last year on the senate, to sit on the nomination committee for the 46th faculty senate both for the executive committee and the chairpersons.

He invited those interested in serving for either the executive committee positions or the chairs or committee positions to contact the nomination committee and make their intentions known.
Dr. Tilghman invited Senators serving their last year and interested in joining the nomination committee to contact Dr. Essounga.

3. Dr. Tilghman announced the impending new 2022/2023 academic calendar, adding it was particularly addressing the Covid-19 pandemic modes of course delivery. He indicated the T-Shirts were being in the works, though their delivery may be delayed due to the Covid-19.

The next faculty meeting will be held on March 14, 2022.

Committee Chairs’ updates

The different chairs offered their updates as follows:

a. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. Reid indicated the Academic Affairs Committee met on Thursday, January 20th, 2022 and voted on a proposal from the School of Nursing to make some modifications to an existing course, NURS 0403I Nursing Independent Study. The main modification is to change the credit hours from a set number of 3 to a variable credit hour course for 1-4 credits. The course will be used to build individual learning plans and enhance the students critical thinking skills and success in standardized tests. This will increase their ability to be successful in matriculating through the program. The proposal was unanimously approved to be recommended.
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They also met on Tuesday January 25th, 2022, and voted on a proposal from Dr. April Jones, Department of Social Work to create a Master’s degree in social work. Dr. Jones presented her proposal to the committee and answered several questions from the committee members. The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal to be recommended.

Currently the Academic Affairs Committee does not have representation from the School of Architecture and Construction Science. Dr. Reid indicated he reached out to the School but have not heard back.

b. Academic Personnel Services Committee

Dr. Nashar submitted the following report, for his committee:

The U-APSC committee is composed of 9 members (8 Faculty+1 representing the library) who received applications for Tenure and Promotion from TU colleges. The process for reviewing the applications has been discussed and implemented.

This included the following:

The Chair designated each two committee members (one from inside and another from outside their college application) to review 4-5 applications (depending on the total number of applications). Two committee members reviewed the applications independently and presented their argument for or against by displaying the application on screen and going through the criteria their decision was based on. The applications were then discussed by all members, and voted on. If voting resulted in a tie, the Chair took the final decision.

The Committee received applications from 14 Faculty; much less than what they usually receive each year. The review was based on the requirements stated in the Faculty Handbook of 2013 and 2020. A brief note was provided to the Provost, Dr. Hargrove, for those who were not successful.

The committee submitted all applications to Dr. Hargrove on February 10. The U-APSC requested from Dr. Hargrove that he informs the committee of his final decision regarding the submitted applications, to improve their review process, if required, and to guide their colleagues at the colleges they represent.

This process has not been followed in the previous years, resulting in the inability of the U-APSC to know whether their decision has been taken into consideration.

Dr. Jeelani asked Dr. Nashar the number of applications received from each College. Dr Nashar answered, indicating the following number of applications received by College, in this order:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number of applications Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAENS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBIS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONAH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSACS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Research and Graduate Studies Committee

Dr. Chitra Nayak (Interim)

Dr. Nayak submitted the following report on behalf of the Research and Graduate Studies Subcommittee of Faculty Senate:

The committee created a list of survey questions to assess faculty’s awareness regarding existing funding opportunities, steps involved while applying for a grant, and how to navigate the funding agency websites. The survey also measures IRB and IUAUC awareness. The survey has been sent to Dr. Kellie Samuels for implementation. The next step involves analysis of the data obtained from the survey.
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d. Continuing Education and Outreach Committee

Dr. Jennifer Bender

Dr. Bender shared the following notes:

- The CEOC met in early February. They are continuing to partner with TU’s local radio station to do work in broadcasting and television that supports our local community. They discussed considering various locations for filming their local television shows in order to support businesses in Tuskegee again.

In order to generate local interest in visiting restaurants for filming, the committee considered creating pamphlets/flyers and working out deals for discounts if an audience would come during the filming, especially for "Kids Can Cook, Too!" The committee thought it would be interesting to ask for help in generating some connections with a boxed luncheon at the Kellogg Center (the committee is hoping the Deans would be on board to sponsor this and attend). The committee considered this because it is seeking to pair up with others that are doing existing projects in order to be resourceful. There was one comment about what the faculty needed. The committee considered how Senate members could contribute collectively to a local project (the committee acknowledged the faculty’ busy schedule, adding this was a brainstorming idea).

Lastly, the committee discussed how the committee’s title included two groups: 1) Continuing Education & 2) Community Outreach. Thus, the committee decided to reconvene to discuss how it could best pair these two ideas. The committee’s next meeting date is set for Friday, March 18th at 2:00 PM; the chair invited all to please mark your calendars: the committee is always open to having faculty join their team.

Dr. S. Keith Hargrove, Provost, entered the room and was recognized. Dr. Tilghman thanked the provost on behalf of the faculty senate for attending the meeting and yielded the floor to him.

Dr. Hargrove thanked Dr. Tilghman, greeted the senate and apologized for his tardiness, which resulted from a previous meeting with President Morris. He expressed his wish to meet with the Senate to greet the faculty senate. He indicated having previously shared a welcome letter to both faculty and staff. He acknowledged the key role faculty played in the university’s mission of educating students. He added students came first but faculty was the university’s priority. He explained this statement was not meant to express students and faculty were equal, adding because without the faculty’s role, dedication, commitment, and instruction, and the responsibility of learning, the students being here could not receive the benefits of the learning that takes place; be it in the classroom or labs, field work, clinical, or other avenues.
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there may be, or in the different disciplines we have at the university. He added his wish to extend greetings to all in the senate: He thanked Dr. Tilghman for giving him the opportunity to be with the senate.

He wanted to leave all with one thought: The university completed an aggressive strategic plan with 8 priorities; he encouraged all to read the strategic plan that was posted on the TU website and stated the 8 priorities he has just alluded to:

1. Academic excellence
2. Operational efficiency
3. Making sure TU students had a good student experience
4. Being aggressive in finding research opportunities
5. Improving TU’s infrastructures
6. Development of faculty and staff in terms of employees and workforce
7. Athletics and
8. Partnerships: Local and external communities, industry, government, and other institutions.

He added those 8 priorities provided a road map for the university over the next five years. Out of the provost's office, he was advocating how TU could become the #1 HBCU. He added that was a bold task, but one that set a vision, a purpose, a target for all. He stated all were aware TU was currently ranked #4 and asked why would TU not be #1. He added his belief was through the dedication all faculty put in everyday, week, month, semester, and over the years, there were some things that were currently in place and others that could be put in place, that would take the university to that level of recognition.

A lot of that, he added, was part of the strategic plan. It had to do with retention, quality of instruction, and student responsibility. He mentioned having met with the SGA president that very day (i.e., 2/7/2022). During the meeting, he emphasized that students also had a responsibility for their learning, environment, and that in many ways students should be accountable, just like faculty, and staff, for their instruction and the services TU was providing to them.

Dr. Hargrove stated his excitement to serve in his role as provost and senior vice president of academic affairs. He commended again all for the service done, being done, and that will continue to be done as all support Dr. Morris and her vision for the university. He added he hoped the letter he shared with all described not only his passion, and his appreciation to return back to TU in a different kind of role, but also his commitment to making the university
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Dr. Tilghman thanked the provost and asked if he was willing to answer some questions to which he acquiesced, promising he would try his best and answer the questions the faculty would ask him.

Dr. Tilghman added many in the senate were welcoming and welcoming the provost back at TU.

Dr. Jones asked the provost if there were any plan to hire more staff to support the registrar’s office. She added the staff working at the registrar’s received many requests, causing a backlog.

Dr. Hargrove indicated he discussed workload automation with Dr. Bloomfield in terms of the types of activities done by the registrar’s that could be automated, thereby improving the throughput of the tasks done everyday and every semester: This involves the entire registration process as well as advising. He added they also discussed IT processes to improve many of the tasks involving faculty such as grade change, change of major. He added there was about 10 processes being looked at, in terms of how they could be improved by means of automation between now and May.

Dr. Hargrove mentioned, going back to the strategic plan, that he was inviting faculty and staff to become engaged in the deployment of the strategic plan. He said they were looking for members such as faculty to be on the task force for implementing the strategic plan. He added he encouraged and begged all to become engaged with the strategic plan at a level that interested each person, in order to move the university forward, and transform it, in a matter of three to five years, with regards to a number of metrics and indicators that would make it the #1 HBCU.

Dr. Reid asked about the travel policy for faculty who wanted to attend professional conferences this year. The provost answered there was a no-travel policy for now due to the Covid-19 situation. He added the numbers were indicating more faculty than students were being affected by the Covid at TU. He stated only in special cases have the provost or the president approved of some proposals for travel, provided specific guidelines be respected, before, during, and after having attended the conference, among which, testing negative for
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Dr. Bender and Dr. Tilghman asked whether the no-travel policy affected travel for study abroad purposes, particularly for Dr. Bender’s summer program in Italy, and Dr. Tilghman summer program in Ghana. The provost responded in the affirmative, adding until he heard differently from the President or Attorney James, no travel would be permitted. He added he sympathized with those who planned special events and travels, as one who used to be involved in study abroad: He indicated having taken students to China three or four times; he’s been to South America, and Japan. He is one who’s always advocated for study abroad for the benefit of both students and faculty. He added the environment changed; for this reason, all were encouraged to change plans and behaviors, personally, and professionally as well.

Dr. Jelani indicated he sent a question to the provost by text. In response to that question, the provost answered he was reviewing a number of documents, among which the students’ regulations, the faculty handbook, and the responsibilities and workload of every faculty member; workload including instruction, advising, and research. He added he was reviewing the faculty role as a faculty member, but also how that played in tenure and promotion evaluation. He stated he was going on history when it came to that whole process, adding, as mentioned in his letter, the spring semester for him, would mostly be more a period of listening and learning. He understood historically, what the tenure and promotion process consisted of. He suspected after his review and re-examination of that process, and after having conversations with Dr. Jelani, HR, and President Morris, that there may be a possibility of the process being modified, while adhering to the faculty handbook. He indicated not being, at present, in a position, to suggest how to change the tenure and promotion process, even though he was paying close attention to the process.

A faculty member asked whether the course load for tenure-track faculty could be reduced to give them time to pursue grants and publishing opportunities. The provost responded he understood the course load’s weight from having spent 11 years in his former role as faculty, department chair, and dean. He stated, his observation has been not all faculty desired or even chose to do research. He added some in the senate may be outstanding teachers in the classroom. Others may be outstanding researchers. He further stated the question may be how to provide an academic career pathway that would satisfy every faculty member between both ends of the spectrum. He added there should be some flexibility in that. He hoped for faculty’s input and engagement that would allow any faculty member to pursue the appropriate tenure
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and promotion based on his or her expertise or based on the academic career they would like to consider.

A question on the chat asked the provost about the status of EAB navigate. The provost apologized for not being able to answer that question, promising to follow up with IT on that situation.

Dr. Ndi asked the provost whether he would consider having two tracks: a teaching faculty track, and a research faculty track; or whether the two [i.e., research, and teaching] could be combined, then, apportion the teaching load and the research load in a way to make it manageable. He added he was expressing this as an option to be considered, citing the example of Australia, where he worked, and where there were faculty hired on a teaching track; these were granted tenure and promotion just based on their teaching. On the other hand, faculty hired on a research and teaching track also gained their tenure and promotion based on research and teaching.

The provost acknowledged Dr Ndi's statement and asked all to consider the question of what kind of institution we wanted TU to be, or what kind of institution we wanted to be recognized as. Did we want to be recognized as a premier undergraduate institution? A premier graduate institution and go to an R2 designation? Or do we want to do both? He added he was challenging all to think about those two questions he just asked. He stated for his part, he wanted TU to be recognized as the best undergraduate institution in the country. He noted not having said "HBCU:" He wanted TU to be recognized as the best undergraduate institution in the US. Whether that involved, quality, innovative, and experiential learning, in the classroom, study abroad experiences, a whole number of things whereby TU’s students grow, not only in their intellect, but also professionally and also socially: These were the components he thought would make TU an outstanding or the best undergraduate program.

He mentioned at the graduate level, that was an external funding model to support graduate students as well as faculty. He added all faculty were typically expected to do some level of research: It could be educational research or any other kind. He stated one could demonstrate innovation in a number of ways. He continued, mentioning typically, the model was teaching, research and service. He stated he did not see it that way. He saw it as learning, innovation, and engagement. He explained, the reason was teaching implied a one-way exchange. Learning involved multiple ways of gathering knowledge and information. Sometimes Research was perceived to be more STEM-related or something in other disciplines. Innovation could come
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out of music, the social sciences, the STEM areas: Chemistry, Engineering, and other areas. To him, innovation was more of an appropriate term than research.

He continued saying, rather than service, the level of engagement many may have in the community, organizations on campus, or partnerships outside of the university represented a more important level of engagement, and one that was of value to the faculty and the university than would be expressed by using the term ‘service.’

“Learning, innovation, and engagement,” he thought, was more an appropriate mindset than “teaching, research, and service.” He challenged all to think about that mindset regarding the comments Dr. Ndi made.

Dr. Jelani stated he wished to share an observation the faculty senate already knew. The observation was that the faculty handbook was being disregarded, based on what happened last year, and may even be happening this year. He added this needed to be looked at carefully. The faculty was given the faculty handbook at the time of hire as the book containing the rules that would help them become tenured and promoted and be recognized as regular contributors to the university. Facts, though, were going in a different direction. His question was the following: If a faculty member applied for promotion, and his or her application has not been sent to the faculty senate with a positive or negative recommendation, nor has the application been returned back to the faculty, what would be their recourse? Would the faculty just have to leave TU?

The provost answered he did not know the answer to Dr. Jelani’s direct questions. However, the provost stated he agreed with Dr. Jelani’s first comment about following the process, regulations, and protocols in the faculty handbook. He stated he intended to follow the faculty handbook. He added he could not speak historically to the kind of the practice or non-practice of the handbook. On his part, he could publicly state he intended to follow the handbook to the letter with regard to the tenure and promotion process.

Dr. Jones indicated she would email the provost regarding a handbook issue she wanted to discuss privately with him about a faculty member.

Dr. Ross asked whether the travel policy applied to summer travel when faculty would return on campus. Dr. Essounga asked whether it was possible for faculty to have teaching assistants if faculty was going to have the same teaching load.
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In response, the provost indicated the difficulty in predicting what may happen in the future. The epidemic taught all the virus was dynamic, not making it possible to forecast what variant may emerge during the summer. He could not answer the question about what the environment would be like in summer or in fall. Regarding the workload and TAs, he shared his assumption TA were, in most cases, graduate students. How these students could be distributed and allocated would depend on working with Dr. Jelani, and HR. He stated his uncertainty about having a sufficient number of TAs to go around for those that may request them but promised nevertheless to look into the matter. He added not being certain assigning TAs was an allocation of the Provost’s Office. He reiterated he would look into the process.

There was no other question; Dr. Tilghman again thanked the provost for his time, for coming to address the faculty senate, and for answering the questions asked to the best of his abilities. He ended his remarks by welcoming the provost again.

The provost answered by thanking Dr Tilghman and reiterated for all to read the news interview coming out soon on the campus’ digest, in which he discussed his mindset regarding his role as the chief academic officer. In that interview, he also talked about the role the university, faculty, and students, should play in the university. He wished to all a great evening, expressed his wish to attend all faculty senate meetings, if invited. He offered to answer all questions to the best of his abilities.

Dr. Tilghman thanked the provost and indicated he was always welcome to participate in faculty senate meetings.

Dr. Tilghman continued with the Chairs’ update, asking Dr. Ross to share her report.

e. Instruction Committee  
Dr. Jennifer Ross

Dr. Ross thanked Dr. Tilghman for facilitating the conversation with Dr. Hargrove, adding it has proved helpful to have had the provost join the faculty senate meeting. The LMS committee met last month. Dr. Ross provided an update on the way the Instruction committee has assisted the LMS committee. The instruction committee assisted the LMS committee by identifying 52 faculty members that were interested in sandbox testing the LMS contenders: D2L, and Canvas. The LMS committee chair indicated, the survey results from the sandbox testing showed Canvas was the clear favorite. This was included in a report sent to the provost earlier this year. Some concerns were raised by the committee: Transition time from Blackboard to Canvas, and faculty’s access to last year’s grade book.
Dr. Nayak asked whether Dr. Ross had an update about the Navigate system. Dr. Ross answered she did not have an update, promising to look into the matter.

Dr. Ross continued her committee’s report, stating they discussed the committee’s activities for the current semester. They discussed having a best practice workshop, a few topics’ discussion, and leaving the session opened for Q&A. Some items that may be discussed were the following: Dealing with students’ complaints, attendance, and tardiness; in effect, having clear policies in the syllabus. She added her committee welcomed new ideas from all.

f. Grievance Committee

Dr. Ndoye reported the following:
The committee did not receive any grievance to address over the past month, and as such, did not have any update on grievances for February.

Dr. Tilghman asked whether there were other matters arising. There was none. Dr. Parham offered a motion to adjourn, seconded by Dr. Bender and Dr. Quarcoo. Dr. Tilghman thanked all attendees and adjourned the meeting. The next meeting will be held on March 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2022, at 5 PM.
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Attending:

1. Abdul Salau
2. April Jones
3. Asseged Dibaba
4. Barrett Vaughan
5. Barrett Vaughan
6. Benjamin Fishkin
7. Bill F. Ndi
8. Brandon Gines
9. Brandon Gines
10. Byunghoon Lee
11. Charles Parham
12. Chitra Nayak
13. Clarissa Harris
14. Dokes-Dumas
15. Dokes-Dumas
16. Esmaeil Esfandiyari
17. Febreu L. Holston
18. Firas Akasheh
19. Franklin Quarcoo
20. iPhone
21. James Reid
22. Jennifer Bender
23. Jennifer Ross
24. John Tilghman
25. Lecia Robinson
26. Lynn Benson
27. Mandoye Ndoye
28. Marisol Alcantara Ortigoza
29. Mary Arrington
30. Maya Martin
31. Moses Ntam
32. Olga Glotova
33. Rose Frazier
34. S Keith Hargrove
35. Shahryar Jafarinejad
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36. Shaik Jeelani
37. Sheritta Fagbodun
38. Thierno Thiam
39. Toufic Nashar
40. Woubit Abebe
41. Yvette N. Essounga
42. Zahid Baig
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