

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Friday, Sept. 3, 2004**  
**3 p.m. SC 214**

Senators Present: Berry, Cartwright, Doughty, Doyle, Grau, Hicks, Knipp, Purtle, Schwarze, Underwood, Vachris (arrived 3:57), Wheeler, Whiting, Wymer (left 5:55)

Senators Absent: Kidd

Visitors Present: School of Business Dean Donna Mottilla, SGA Secretary for University Relations Kristen Agenburger, Prof. Ronnie Cohen

President Purtle called the meeting to order at 3:07.

The Order of Business was suspended to allow a presentation by Dean Mottilla (under Old Business) on plans for School of Business reorganization.

**Dean Mottilla addressed the Senate:** The School of Business has changed. The curriculum was ‘do as you please’ when she arrived, with no one enforcing prerequisites, for example. Of 1,200 School of Business students, there were 400 taking courses who hadn’t satisfied the prerequisites. She took over management of the curriculum. Decisions that had been dispersed among faculty and chairs were taken over by her. In her view, the best curriculum would result from single decision point, a single set of rules. This is especially true now that the School of Business has a single degree program, the BSBA. The last BS in Accounting degree will be conferred in December 2006. All new students will receive BSBA degrees, with majors in accounting, economics, finance, and marketing.

Currently two departments are now managing a single degree program. Last year she determined to do away with the departments and chairs and have a single faculty. This is not unusual in Schools of Business. However, she also had a plan for faculty to still participate in governance. Yet she wasn’t able to get past the complexity of the roles department chairs play in tenure and promotion decisions, etc., and so she concluded that she could have departments. The assumption in CLAS is that there is ownership of degree programs by faculty, but this is not the case in the School of Business. Our majors consist of 24 credit hours and a common core, while CLAS majors consist of up to 42 hours. Our accrediting body is interested in how we manage the core—our majors are really areas of specialization. Her purpose was for faculty to understand that they all owned the core. The current School of Business curriculum committee has been active in this. As dean, she does things that departments no longer do in terms of managing that curriculum. That’s why it seemed easy to eliminate departments, as she had planned to do last spring, but faculty personnel issues make that difficult.

Therefore, the current reorganization plan calls for:

- Maintaining two departments in the School of Business:
  - Marketing, Management, and Business Law and
  - Accounting, Finance, and Economics

- Removing curriculum responsibilities from department chairs and conferring them upon the School of Business Curriculum Committee (with elected membership and an elected chair), which already exists. These functions (and others) will be removed from the description of chairs' duties in the University Handbook: School of Business chairs will have different duties from CLAS chairs. She has highlighted duties to be removed from the current University Handbook list, but she is not yet ready to go through the list publicly with the Senate, as it is not final. Essentially, curriculum management and development will be the responsibility of the School of Business Curriculum Committee; personnel management responsibilities (promotion/tenure, etc.) will remain with the chairs.
- Establishing a Professional Development Committee that spans the entire school. It will be appointed by the dean to ensure AACSB standards are met with regard to professional development. School of Business chairs have never been proactive in terms of professional development. This committee will have a budget and will bring in programs to help with technology in classroom, etc. It will also determine what are 'high quality' meetings and journals and tell the dean.

These changes will create a broader decision-making body for the School of Business—right now, it's her. She wants broader consistencies besides just chairs represented. New Handbook language will be devised to describe the functions of chairs in the School of Business. She will work with the Provost on this.

**Senators then asked questions, and Dean Mottilla responded:**

Q: To what degree have you worked with your faculty in creating this reorganization plan?

A: It [the plan to abolish departments and department chairs] was presented to them in writing last spring; I had open meetings and an open-door discussion policy.

Q: Were there other suggestions floated at that time?

A: One was that we realign the department, but I didn't think this proposal would help change to occur—the realization that the curriculum belongs to everyone. Having across-the-board departments in the School of Business will accomplish my goal of having common interests.

Q: Do you trust departments to run their courses?

A: Our accreditation agency is not interested in that.

Q: But the lack of prerequisites problem—that's going to get fixed as features of the new registration system come on line.

A: We have five disciplines that have to cooperate with each other, and we have to document that we do what we say we do.

Q: If chairs have significant duties removed from their purview, to what extent do they remain authentically chairs?

A: I see chairs as middle managers. I have the bigger picture.

Q: I'm concerned about law of unintended consequences. Inertia can actually serve an important function in departments; departments tend to be very careful about what they do. These two committees (curriculum and professional development) could be in advisory roles to create initiatives, and chairs could then be retained as they are. Perhaps your chairs aren't doing their jobs—you may have to put pressure on them, or even fire them. It sounds as though you want to make them collections of employees, rather than academic professionals.

A: I would have no chairs or departments at all if it were my choice. This plan actually expands faculty representation in the School of Business by expanding the number of people at the final point at which decisions are made. We have a single curriculum and I can't have two departments at loggerheads about a single curriculum.

Q: Was any consideration given to moving Economics to CLAS?

A: I never considered that. They have an important role to play in our programs, and I want them to play a routine part in our curriculum discussions.

Q: Looking at this new organizational chart and considering the mitigated duties of the chairs, it looks as though you will essentially have four committees in the School of Business, rather than two departments and two committees. Could you please clarify the appointment of the Professional Development Committee? Will it be elected or appointed?

A. Probably elected.

Q. Can you provide us with a document that spells out exactly WHICH duties of the chairs are being eliminated? It is difficult to get a complete picture with just a set of 'for instances.'

A: The Senate has forced my hand in asking for this presentation: those details are not yet ready. It would be chaotic to provide them now, before they are final.

Q: What is the role of your new assistant dean?

A: He is taking over student issues, ensuring students are meeting requirements, handling advising, etc.

Q: No one reports to him?

A: No. Right now it is an acting Assistant Dean position. If the person in the role holds a Ph.D., then the title would appropriately become Associate Dean.

Q: So chairs in the School of Business will not be chairs the way they are in the rest of the university, under this plan. Will their release time be affected?

A: Yes. Currently our chairs receive a two-course reduction/semester, but that is too much under this plan. The reduction will probably go down to a one-course reduction.

Q: What is the reaction of the School of Business faculty to this plan--happy? unhappy?

A: I showed it to them yesterday. They wanted to vote, but I told them it wasn't appropriate because it's too early—it's not a final plan yet. They were supportive, except for a handful of people, of the original plan [to abolish departments and chairs]. It's probably same split as last spring. We talked through a lot of concerns last spring.

Q: Will people want to be department chairs under this plan?

A: Absolutely. There may be even more interest now.

Q: Under this plan, the responsibility for vision is now gone from those departments and has gone to those committees.

A: We need one consistent vision [*provided by a committee, rather than departments with competing interests*].

Q: You need multiple visions.

A: Individual faculty members can have vision.

Q: This plan takes involvement away from people in departments.

A: No it doesn't.

Q: The issue is not the split, but the separation of responsibilities out of departments.

Q: What is the role of the Professional Development Committee?

A: It will set up forms for faculty evaluation, create developmental programs, etc.

Q: If there is a weakness in a faculty member, the chair usually works with that individual, often providing professional development funds. Here, the punishment will be with chair, and the funds with committee.

A: No. I have a policy for funding travel to meetings based on whether they are national, regional, etc., and all that comes out of my office at present anyway.

Q: But who will work with that faculty member to encourage, discourage, etc.?

A: These duties will still be the chair's responsibility. It is the quality of meetings attended that will be assessed by the Professional Development Committee.

Q: What about the department chair's desire to create a team? The English department has recently undergone tremendous change, coming together as a team to redesign the writing curriculum—as we do this work we as faculty members are creating our identity and who we are as academics, scholars, teachers. We have pride of ownership over that curriculum.

A: You're talking about department of English. I am talking about same thing.

Q: I am struck by your rhetorical constructions: “I can't have” versus “we can't have.”

A: I suppose I do that because I was the agent of change in the School.

Q: Professors like to own their own lives. Is this just a problem of defective chairs?

A: I don't have defective chairs now.

Q: Another option would be to get chairs to perform as you want them to. There's another way to do this.

A: Business schools perform differently from other academic units. We have a school comprising five different disciplines, and managing single degree program. We are trying to model the mentality and cultures of the business organizations for which we are preparing our students.

Q: Is it fair to say that this reflects current reality in the School of Business?

A: The Professional Development Committee is only real thing that is different.

Q: Why can't this structure exist, with department chair duties still intact? Also can we get a list of the actual chairs' duties being removed?

A: There would be too much overlap in the chairs' duties and the committees' duties, and it would be inefficient.

Q: The document exists that the Senator is asking for. It was given out yesterday at School of Business meeting.

Q: Is there any reason we can't see what was handed out yesterday?

A: It's incomplete and confusing.

Q: Is the "unit" of business a college or a department?

A: It's a school. If I'm being forced to choose between these terms, it's a college.

Q: I'm still worried about chair issue. You would never take a job if your only responsibility was evaluation of employees and nothing else.

A: Departments will still have budgets.

Q: We in CLAS have colleagues in the School of Business and we see them as the same as we are. That appears to be the concern of the table. How we see ourselves as a whole.

A: We live in a different world over there.

Q: How will the nuts and bolts work? As the faculty expands, how will searches be conducted?

A: Department chairs will put search committees together.

**End 4:17. Dean Mottilla departs.**

**Motion to enter Closed Session: Unanimous. Closed session ends at 5:30 p.m.**

**Regular Order of Business resumes.**

- I. Approval of minutes. April 30, 2004 and August 18, 2004. Minutes unanimously approved as corrected.
- II. President's Report
  - A. Senators Cartwright, Doughty, and Purtle met with Provost Summerville, Sept. 3, to discuss what we believed to be misinterpretations of two items in the Curriculum Task Force proposal. These issues have been resolved and a report from Senators Cartwright and Doughty will be given in the "old business".
  - B. President Purtle has been working on the mentoring project. We are about ready to send out a letter of invitation to the faculty and staff to serve as volunteers. This will be strictly a volunteer program for faculty, staff and students.
  - C. The President and Secretary of the Faculty Senate will be able to send out "blanket" e-mails in about 4 weeks.
  - D. The Provost has forwarded 2003-2004 Resolution 16--Mandatory Attendance on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of Classes to the Registrar Lisa Raines and requested that she call a meeting with President Purtle and the Deans to see if the policy can be

implemented electronically.

- E. The Provost declared that Resolution 2003-2004 Faculty Awards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service required no action on his part. He interpreted this as internal to the Senate. The next step will be for us to form an *ad hoc* committee of the Senate to create the qualifications and procedures for these awards.
- F. The Indic Studies Concentration in Philosophy and Religious Studies is under consideration.

### III. Committee Reports

- A. Board of Visitors Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Wheeler reported that not much was discussed at the May 2004 meeting. She briefed the passing of the new curriculum to them, and queried Senators for topics of interest to raise with them. Support for a 3-3 teaching load and interest in the School of Business reorganization were proposed.
- B. Board of Visitors Student Affairs Committee: Senator Whiting indicated that this committee had discussed freshman enrollment numbers at its May meeting.
- C. Board of Visitors Finance Committee: Senator Hicks indicated that President Tribble was present at this meeting. Problems with softball field and band practice placement were discussed.
- D. Board of Visitors Development Committee: President Purtle indicated there is still no Vice President for development.

### IV. Old Business

- A. Presentation by Dean Mottilla on School of Business reorganization—see above.
- B. Senators Cartwright and Doughty reported on their meeting with the Provost to clarify discrepancies between his decisions and Senate recommendations on the new curriculum. These problems were ones of miscommunication rather than disagreement. The Provost agrees with the Senate that students may use a course taken in the minor to fulfill an Area of Inquiry requirement, but this language needs to be clarified in the final curriculum document. On the issue of AP/IB credit, the Provost also agreed with the Senate's recommendation that AP/IB credit may satisfy the foreign language requirement. Again, though, language needs to be clarified. Senators Cartwright and Doughty will write new sentences addressing these points and present them to the Senate.
- C. Senator Doughty also said the Provost wants the Senate to look at the consistency of AP scores across departments. Senator Vachris will chair this committee; Senators Underwood and Hicks will serve.

### V. New Business

- A. Resolution 2004-05: 01. To Schedule Spring Break to Coincide with Local Public Schools. The motion died for lack of a second.
- B. Resolution 2004-05: 02. Beach Express. Continued until next month.
- C. Other New Business.
  - 1. Senator Whiting expressed concern that there is actually very little time for faculty, especially new faculty to actually get started during Getting Started Week. Because of the inundation of meetings and materials, there is no time to prepare for classes. New faculty especially are swamped. Contracts do not start until Getting Started Week.
  - 2. Senator Whiting also expressed concern that new freshmen were required to fill out a Student Information Form, part of the National Survey of Freshmen, a special study conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute. Senator Grau read questions from that last 42-60 items: “Do you pray? How do you experience God?” Students were also asked if they gave permission for the ID numbers to be released. Senators expressed concern that students were being required to fill out this survey. SGA University Relations Secretary Kristen Agenburger told Senators she had helped administer the survey to freshmen, and that students were NOT required to fill it out. She said freshmen should have been told that the ‘university asks that you do this, but that it is not required.’

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Tracey Schwarze  
Faculty Senate Secretary