Opening & Welcome
Dr. Bill Ndi, president of Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm. He welcomed the membership with “good morning” as this was the first meeting of the 43rd Faculty Senate for the year, representing a “new dawn.” Dr. Ndi explained that he had changed the time of the meeting from 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm because he thought it would be more convenient. Most classes are over, so more faculty may be able to attend the meetings if held from 4:00-5:00 pm (rather than 3:00-4:00 pm). He reminded the body to encourage other faculty to attend the Faculty Senate meetings. He also noted that problems/issues/concerns that will “never see the light of day” unless they are brought before the Senate so that the problems or challenges may be discussed/addressed/presented to the administration/Board of Trustees to be resolved.

Attendance (Roster Attached) Eighteen (18) present

Committee Chair Updates & Selections
Faculty in attendance were asked to select the committees on which they would like to serve. The Faculty Senate has six (6) standing committees:
- Academic Affairs Committee (Dr. Zanice Bond, Chair)
- Academic Personnel Services Committee (Dr. Fan Wu, Chair)
- Research and Graduate Studies Committee (Dr. Jay Bhuyan, Chair)
- Continuing Education and Outreach Committee (Dr. Yvette Essounga, Chair)
- Grievance Committee (Ms. Eunice Samuel, Chair—absent due to illness/recovering from a surgical procedure)

Dr. Ndi noted that he used to chair this committee and reassured the faculty that the best interest of the faculty is at the core of this committee—the goal is to defend the interest of the faculty.

Instruction Committee (Dr. Emma Haley, Chair—was not on campus today, so she did not attend the meeting.)

Of the committees, only the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) had any updates since the new year is just beginning. Packets have been submitted: Dean Carla J. Bell in the School of Architecture submitted a packet over the summer; however, the committee does not meet over the summer. This semester Dean Jeelani submitted packets for the Master of Veterinary Science College of Veterinary Medicine; Master of Integrative Public Policy and Development in collaboration with CAS, CBIS CAENS). Deans have also been asked to elect members among their facul-
ty to the AAC. (AAC and the Academic Personnel Services Committee members are determined by deans and senators are not simply able to sign up.

**Committee Selection**

Dr. Ndi asked if there was a quorum—if we needed one to conduct business. Faculty members are able to self-nominate or nominate other senators for committees. It’s important to have representation from each school/college.

Senators can serve on more than one committee (e.g. chair one committee and be a member of another)

Dr. Yvette Essounga wants to join Research and Graduate Studies Committee.

Faculty Senate is to include forty (40) senators. The chair noted that the deans appoint at least two members to the FS. The chair sent notice of the meeting to the deans. Faculty suggested that notices be sent to the deans, to individual senators, and to eblast.

Prior to the meeting two deans confirmed new members of the Academic Affairs Committee: Engineering and Business.

Continuing Education and Outreach (add) Ms. Mary Arrington Allied Health
Grievance Committee (add) Dr. Fan Wu, Dr. Joel Wao, Dr. Li Wang
Instruction Committee (add) Dr. Kerry Evans, Ms. Mary Arrington, Dr. Shahryar Jafarinejad (Chemical), Dr. Barbara Aker-Mills
Research & Graduate Studies Committee (add) Dr. Yvette Essounga
Dr. Olga Glotova wants to be on Dr. Yvette Essounga (Outreach).

Note that one need not be a senator to serve on a committee. (1/3 need to be senators; 2/3 may include non-senators—however, they may not vote)

**Open Discussion**

Because some faculty wished to remain anonymous, no names are included in this discussion. A faculty member did note that while they respected their colleagues’ wishes for anonymity, this reflects a culture of fear that permeates the campus ethos and should be acknowledged. A faculty member stated that this atmosphere of fear reflects very poorly on the administration. The chair reminded the body: “It’s not as if your concerns are not my concerns.” Thus, this conversation mentions no names. Faculty who disagreed were encouraged to express their disagreement should they wish it to be stated on the record.

**Adjuncts**

Faculty are concerned because adjuncts’ contracts are not being processed in a timely manner. The contracts are being delayed/held up. Some adjuncts are working even before contracts have been processed so as not to disrupt the semester for the students who have paid for the classes.
Contracts for adjuncts should be processed in the summer well before the semester begins, early enough so that when classes begin, they will be cleared to begin teaching classes when the semester begins.

**Summer Faculty’s Decreased Salary without Negotiation**

Some faculty hired to teach summer school were not compensated their full salary because of smaller-than-expected class sizes. Faculty received half of their expected salary. Some noted that this is disrespectful and reprehensible. Some faculty would have decided not to teach or would have sought other employment had they known the differences in expected and received pay. The faculty taught in good faith at an expected salary and did not receive it. Some individuals with the same or fewer enrolled students did not miss compensation.

**Administration @ Faculty Senate Meetings**

Please invite the president, members of the president’s cabinet, and/or other key administrators to FS meetings. A specific suggestion—Invite our new chief of staff to the FS meeting as she supervises several areas that are critical for many of the faculty. Interaction with her, updates from her, and open dialogue will be very important. Dr. Smith came to the FS meetings and provided a lot of very useful information in the past. Are there any issues we would like to explore/discuss with them? The chair reminded the faculty not to forget the Grievance Committee as a source of support when issues/concerns arise.

**Leaked/Hacked/Accidental Email distributed across campus/among CAS faculty with Faculty Salary & Salary Compression, Gender Inequities**

An email circulated across campus that divulged personal information from faculty members’ contracts. This breach has caused the campus to look more closely at salary compression and inequities grounded in gender. Some faculty knew that these discrepancies existed. Faculty knew these discrepancies were not a surprise to the administration. Faculty questions included: “How will we be able to remedy salary compression?” “Inequity?” “We do not have merit pay here at Tuskegee University, so why do some departments have assistant professors with a $10,000-12,000 difference in pay?” “Was there an investigation about the email?” The body agreed that faculty and administrators need to approach these issues seriously. Invite the administration (president/provost) to attend occasionally so that they may hear our concerns or the issues that confront us.

Other faculty members mentioned that the Board of Trustees (BOT) met in June and posted on their website that 11 individuals had received tenure and 15 had received promotions. However, why did some faculty receive word on July 3 when others did not receive notice for three months—then others who received notice as late as August 16? One faculty member inquired about their T & P status and only after having asked about it, did they get some details/response to their tenure/promotion packet. One faculty noted that they didn’t know about their promotion/tenure results until the infamous email was leaked. Faculty stated that the Faculty Senate needs to say something about this breach and the information leaked. Dr. Wu, chair of the P&T committee, was asked to respond. He stated that his committee adhered to the timeline/deadlines—“worked
very hard” to meet the deadlines. Packets were submitted to the Provost in February or March—before spring break as he recalled. He could not speak to what happened after the packets left the committee. Some wondered if BOT held up the process. (grapevine had suggested such.) The committee, thus, had no control over the P&T packets once they left the P&T committee.

The email in question included the salary and rank of thirty-eight (38) faculty members. The chair noted that faculty who were successful and received the news in July had time to celebrate, but those who received the word three months later, for example, and those who received the news in August, did not have equal time to mourn/celebrate. Shouldn’t both groups have that same amount of time to react/respond to the results of their promotion/tenure applications? Some faculty might have begun job hunted had they known earlier that they did not receive tenure, for example, and would be informed of their impending termination.

**General reactions from Faculty to infamous email:** “This is wrong!” “I make less than a public school teacher in Alabama, and I have four degrees and experience.” “There was no apology.” “The apology didn’t even have to come from the person who accidentally leaked the email—but there was nothing—no apology.” “This was insulting. I was wronged.” “I knew I wasn’t making much—it was never acknowledged, addressed.” Faculty all applied at the same time, why wouldn’t we know/get results at the same time, too?” “One faculty member was put in the awkward position of having to go and ask about their status.” “Enormous inequities” “I am in my seventh year, and I have never been so uninformed.” “Our private information was shared.”

Some faculty mentioned the issue of power and how controlling information is a way for the administration to exert power. Note in CAS there are huge discrepancies within a given department $15,000-$20,000 difference for faculty with the same rank, discipline. There’s no clear structure how salary is tied to performance. Who decides on starting salaries? Again—there can be a $10,000-$2,000 difference in starting salaries—within the same discipline. Auburn University salaries are available to the public. One faculty member was able to find a neighbor’s salary just by googling it. There’s nearly a $30,000 difference in salaries compared to AU with same rank. Faculty reminded the body that AU is a public university with lots more resources. Another faculty noted that if we investigated thoroughly enough, we might find TU salaries as well.

Nearly thirty years ago, the issue of whether to unionize the Faculty Senate emerged. It was voted down. Alabama is a Right to Works state, so it is unlikely that unionizing is an option, though some liked the idea of a union. Some will investigate.

Faculty Senate has an advice and consent role. Some think Faculty Senate doesn’t have power; however, the Faculty Senate has much more power than we think. Tuskegee works on a grapevine. If the Faculty Senate shows that we have strong feelings about certain issues, we will be heard. Imagine if all forty senators were present. Faculty should be able to come to the meetings and voice opinions/concerns—then expect action.
TU should be transparent. For example, show/reveal that an assistant professor makes between X and Y, and the associate professor makes between A and B, for example. On faculty member said they saw in The Chronicle of Higher Educator that a TU Assistant Professor made approximately $17,500. Faculty said that figure was really wrong and perhaps it reflected an adjunct’s salary. A first-time attendee asked how concerns are shared with the administration. The president noted that he serves on two committees and assured the body that the discussion does not simply begin and end here/at the Faculty Senate meetings.

Ad Hoc Committee
Some of the problems at Tuskegee University are systemic. The problems are beyond the scope set for the Grievance Committee. The problems are bigger and require a more comprehensive look. Thus, an ad hoc committee (consisting of senators and non-senators) will examine discrepancies discussed in the meeting. It is charged with drafting a letter that will discuss issues around faculty salaries (including but not limited to) salary compression, gender equity, and the timely completion of contracts. Dr. Ndi will be asked to give to administrators or Board of Trustee (BOT) members this document from the FS (as he is on two committees that includes BOT and/or administrators). Dr. Wu, chair of what some believe is one of the most important FS committees, will be asked to give the letter to the Provost, as his committee works directly with her. Members will include Dr. Caroline Gebhard, Dr. Li Wang, Dr. Richard Evans, Dr. Kerry Evans, Dr. Yvette Essounga. No chair has volunteered/been selected. We believe the chair needs to be a senator. This document will reflect the shared concerns/interest of TU faculty, so faculty members’ input will be expected. The president reminded that the document should not simply complain, but it should offer suggestions.

It will offer strategies and suggestions that will remedy disparities. The Faculty Senate agreed that the well-being of the faculty is paramount. It translates into the well-being of the University. A faculty member asked what the Personnel Committee (i.e. P&T Committee) is shared to do? See the committee duties/expectations sheet Dr. Ndi emailed. The sheet is on the FS website. Faculty salary is within the purview of the committee.

Students
Some faculty mentioned concerns about student engagement. One was concerned about a dress code on campus. They (faculty) have tried to enforce a dress code while other faculty members do not/have not. There is no consistency or decided-upon dress code. Dr. Ndi asked the body who is in charge of setting a dress code? President? Board of Trustees? Faculty? The School of Business has a dress code. Should students wait until after they have graduated from college to know how to dress in a professional/business setting? Some faculty agreed that students should learn how to dress in college.

Faculty Handbook
Has the 2018 Faculty Handbook been approved? When will it be posted? The updated version has not yet been posted. Faculty going up for P&T must adhere to guidelines from which ver-
sion of the Faculty Handbook? Dr. Ndi noted that the 2018 version is a work in progress. It affects only faculty who began their employment in fall 2018. FS will work on updating the website. Dr. Wu (in the past) has typically updated the website for us.

One faculty member noted that they have a hardcopy of the 2013 version if someone wanted to see it. Date of employment determines which version of the handbook applies to the individual faculty.

**General**
The president noted that faculty coming up for P&T should be here asking questions. Others said that the agenda should be disseminated in advance. Minutes should be distributed widely and should be announced when minutes have been posted. Meetings will always include time for faculty to ask questions, raise issues that are important to them. Attendance for this meeting was low. Faculty received a contract that contained several blank spots. They refused to sign it. They wondered if that would impact tenure. Dr. Ndi stated that the P&T packet does not request copies of contracts. Faculty agreed most would not sign a document that was not properly completed. “The lion is not the king of the jungle because he is the strongest, but he is the most patient.”[proverb from Dr. Ndi]

**Adjournment**
After a robust discussion, Dr. Ndi observed the time and closed the meeting, reminding attendees to invite colleagues (even those outside our departments) to upcoming meetings. He also noted the importance of the emerging ad hoc committee. He thanked the body, commented positively on the energy of the group, and promised to have snacks next time. He reminded all of a common British saying, “A problem once discussed is a problem half solved.”

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.

---
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