

Catawba College Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 20, 2008

Senators Present: Barnes, Boulter, Chamberlain, Dougherty, Eastis, Fish, Osterhus, Stringfield, Sullivan, Zink

Guests: Dr. Craig Turner, Dr. Edith Bolick

The Senate convened at 11:00 a.m. in the Rendleman Conference Room. Senate Chair Chris Zink called the meeting to order and presided.

Item 1:

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the November 6 meeting. The Senate voted to approve (after fixing a couple of typographical errors).

Item 2:

President Turner and Dr. Bolick joined the Senate to discuss the status of endowed professorships. Dr. Turner noted that the current market downturn has affected every college's endowment at this point. Altogether, Catawba's endowed professorship and faculty development funds lost \$457,684 in value between June 1st and October 31st of this year. Specifically:

- Jefferson Pilot fund—down \$31,136
- Chaplainship—down \$1,188
- Peeler—down \$73,396
- Herman (English)—down \$33,485
- Jenkins (faculty development)—down \$114,365
- Bayshore—down \$64,683
- Saleeby (Business)—down \$65,000
- Weaver (Humanities)—down \$63,467

There is nothing to pay out. NC state law forbids going into corpus of an endowment to pay an award. In some cases that would be required to pay an award; in other cases, there are simply no earnings to disburse.

Prof. Zink noted that the entire faculty needs to be informed about this situation, for transparency's sake and for planning purposes. Dr. Turner agreed.

Dr. Stringfield asked what the current value of the College's endowment is. Dr. Turner replied that it would be better not to ask, and did not provide a number.

A discussion followed about the best way to get this information to the faculty. It was agreed that Dr. Turner would attend the next full faculty meeting to present information about the state of affairs and to answer questions.

Dr. Turner reported that the provost search committee has moved very quickly, and that the members of that group deserve our thanks.

Dr. Turner and Dr. Bolick left the meeting at this point.

A discussion followed about how, in the absence of funding, we might honor individuals who would receive endowed professorships. At the moment, none of the endowed OR honorary chairs are filled; 2007-08 was the 2nd academic year of the two-year cycle. Several procedural questions arose:

Can we award the endowed chair title without the monetary stipend? Could a person be named to an honorary chair now, and then to an endowed chair once funds return? How are the decisions to be made about who is named?

Prof. Zink reminded the Senate that we have already agreed that honorary chairs should be named and that Dr. Bolick has been working on that process. He will meet with her for an update. Dr. Fish suggested that the Senate continue to gather information with an eye to making a recommendation to the new Provost/Dean. Prof. Zink agreed, and will look for information and documentation about the legal procedures involved with naming chairs, with and without funds.

Item 3:

Senators reviewed the standing governance committee rotation process proposal that we plan to bring to a full faculty vote. To recap previous discussions/decisions—the full faculty overwhelmingly voted to keep a rotation schedule. At this point, the Senate is working on a proposal that would address some of the problems that the current 4-year rotation schedule has, while keeping the idea and practice of rotation itself. The first suggestion is to switch to a 5- or 6-year cycle. The next is to replace the random assignment with some system based on seniority with regard to service at the college.

During the discussion, the effects of a year without committee service on the tenure reviews of junior faculty was a topic of concern. Dr. Sullivan proposed the following amendment to the proposal

Amend section 2, “*The rotation cycle will.....*” to read:

Full-time, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty MUST accept their year off. Tenured faculty may decline.

The Senate approved this amendment.

Discussion followed about what aspects of this proposal need to go before the full faculty for a vote, and what is for information only. To clarify—the faculty needs to vote only on the motion which proposes a change to the faculty handbook. The rest of the

document we have before us is the rationale/explanation of the procedure the Faculty Senate expects to follow in enacting the handbook policy.

Prof. Zink will prepare the motion(s) and the explanatory supporting material to include on a future faculty meeting agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carla M. Eastis