

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Minutes 12-6-06

Senators Attending: Brett Serviss, Randy Duncan, Linda English, Larry Thye, Linda Wen, Duane Jackson, Alan Wright, Michael Taylor, James Engman, Maralea Gourley, Georgine Steinmiller, Kevin Durand, Steve Becraft (alt for Laura Storm), Carol Underwood, Rick McDaniel, Martin Halpern, Fred Worth, Paula Leming, Steven Carter (alt for Don Wells), Brian English

Senators Absent: Geoge Ann Stallings, Patti Miley, Shanta Sharma, Kenneth Taylor, Celya Taylor, Beverly Buys, Troy Hogue, Rafael Bejarano

Senate President James Engman announced the quorum and called the meeting to order at approximately 3:15PM.

Discussion with Vice President Houston:

- Students registering without advising: Currently, students with at least 15 hours do not have to be flagged by their advisor prior to the student registering, which is a new policy. Concerns were raised about the possible ramifications of this issue, as well as how this decision was made.
- Student course evaluations: The evaluations are currently used by Academic Affairs for promotion & tenure-related issues. The issue of where the packets go when released by Computer & Communication Services will be investigated before distribution in January.

The November 2006 minutes were approved as amended (typo: "referred" not "eferred").

President's Report: see attachment below Minutes.

Committee Reports:

- **Academics:** No report.
- **Building & Grounds:** No report.
- **Operations:** see attachment below Minutes.
 - Amendment III, B, 1, b: tabled
 - Amendment III, B, 2, c: tabled
 - Amendment III, B, 2, g: tabled
 - Excellence Award Changes: approved as amended
 - The following paragraph: "Note: to be nominated for an award in spring 2007, the nominator shall consider events occurring in 2004, 2005, and 2006. The selection committee will consider only events occurring in the previous three calendar years when making an award. *These awards are not lifetime achievement awards.*"
 - Was changed to read as follows (change in bold): "Note: to be nominated for an award in spring 2007, the nominator shall consider events occurring in 2004, 2005, and 2006. The selection committee will consider **primarily** events occurring in the previous three calendar years when making an award. (The last sentence, in italics above, was removed.)"
- **Procedures:** see attachment below minutes.
- **Ad-Hoc Faculty Hearing Committee:** in process of creating a draft.
- **Ad-Hoc Morale Committee:** held a brief meeting, but have not arrived to any conclusions.
- **Executive Committee:** Effectiveness of Faculty Senate Report, attached below minutes.

Old Business: none.

New Business:

- Smoking receptacles are not consistently located a minimum of 25 feet from the entrance of all campus buildings as per Governor's Policy Directive 15.
- A motion was approved to restore the previous advising system on campus.

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

- Ballots for At-Large elections will be distributed for the current election as has been done in the past.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:10PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian English

Faculty Senate Secretary

Faculty Senate President's Report, December 2006

Discussion with President Charles Dunn

We discussed Henderson's publicity campaign, and whether or not we have an idea if the benefits outweigh the costs of advertising. He explained that we do not, but he believes that we simply cannot afford not to advertise, and that the Board of Trustees agrees. This led to a discussion of poor retention between the freshman and sophomore year, and he reported that a survey of students who did not return in their sophomore year has been mailed out. The level of student response to the survey was very low, and a follow-up is being conducted to try to obtain more data.

We discussed the handling of student evaluations of courses. I explained that among some faculty there is concern that the evaluation program was initially solely to assist the personal improvement of the faculty member, with evaluations being delivered to faculty directly from the Office of Computer Services, in more recent years the evaluations "trickle down" through the administration until they eventually reach faculty members, and that they have become instruments for use in personnel decisions, which was not their original intent. We discussed the nature of the language in the handbook, which does not appear to clearly specify the process by which faculty members should receive the forms. Dr. Dunn expressed his feeling that the evaluations are vital for department heads and deans as part of the normal, ongoing faculty evaluation process.

I pointed out that in nine of the last ten years, and thirteen of the last eighteen years, Arkansas's Professor of the Year has been awarded to a member of the Lyon's College faculty. This is a national award, with recipients selected by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). While Lyon College may have very high quality faculty members, it seems reasonable that there may be other factors involved, including the possibility that many schools in Arkansas may not nominate candidates. Henderson has many outstanding professors who would clearly be competitive for this recognition, but as far as Dr. Dunn knows, the University has never nominated anyone. Henderson is a member of CASE, and he felt that it would be helpful if a representative from Academic Affairs were involved with CASE. He suggested that I discuss this further with Dr. Houston.

I asked about the message we send by staging a "Miss Henderson" contest every year in which female students are judged based in part on how they look in a bathing suit, and whether or not this is really appropriate. Dr. Dunn provided some historic perspective and explained the relationship between the Miss Henderson contest and the Miss America Pageant, which makes a swimsuit competition mandatory.

I asked Dr. Dunn who in the administration he would suggest the Senate might use as a resource in our process of defining the specifics of the "chain of command" in the Faculty Handbook. He suggested Vice President Bobby Jones, Vice President Doris Wright, or Vice President Gail Stevens.

Following our meeting, Dr. Dunn sent me an email containing some comments on the Operations Committee's proposed amendment to the Faculty Handbook. He has given me his permission to include the following comments in this report.

The attached amendments to the Faculty Handbook concern me. Restricting the employment of a MA level person to a five-year period does not seem to be in the university's best interest. We have employed several MA level faculty members to teach introductory courses in English, Mathematics, and Biology in recent years. It appears to me that the quality of instruction has been good and that we have

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

been well served by those employed that way. In most cases, the individuals employed have not been in a position to work on a doctorate. Under the proposed rules, unless they had pursued a doctorate, their employment would have been terminated after five years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best wishes.

Charles D. Dunn, Ph.D.

President

Discussion with Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Houston

We discussed the Senate's ongoing analysis of the Faculty Hearing Committee and its procedures. I explained the perception that a clearer definition of "chain of command" appears to be needed in the Faculty Handbook, and that the Senate will be working to achieve this. He discussed his views on the hearing process as it took place last spring. In particular, he stressed that the involvement of legal counsel in hearings – as occurred last year - can result in a very different type of hearing than would take place if attorneys were not involved in the process.

We discussed the nature of Henderson's television advertising campaign. In particular, I asked about some faculty perceptions that Henderson may be hesitant to stress its academic strengths sufficiently, out of concerns that this might not appeal to some of the types of students we currently attract. Some faculty have also expressed concern that this attitude may explain Henderson's minimal publicity regarding its recognition as a College of Distinction. He felt that the way in which Henderson is trying to portray itself to potential students in commercials is worthy of more consideration, and suggested that I raise the same questions with Dr. Dunn.

We discussed Dr. Houston's use of and views on the student evaluations. His recollection is that he receives only summaries of the computer-scored section of the evaluations, and that he may even receive those after the faculty have received their copies. He was going to verify the specifics of the process and report back to the Senate. We also discussed the purpose of the evaluations, and whether they should be used only for faculty self-improvement or also as a component of administrative evaluation of faculty. Rather than have me try to summarize his views here, he agreed to share his thoughts with the Senate at the next meeting.

We discussed the possibility of Henderson nominating faculty members for the Carnegie/CASE Professor of the Year awards, and I provided a web page that outlines the nomination process.

We discussed the benefits of maintaining open lines of communication between faculty and university administration through the Faculty Senate. We agreed that much progress has been made in recent years, and are both optimistic this trend will continue.

Social Security Number Use

I contacted Mr. Epperhart to express our ongoing concern that faculty social security numbers are still required on a number of forms or in the university computer system in instances where the number seems simply to be a convenient form of identification, rather than a legitimate need for social security-related information. He agrees that we should try to reduce this as much as possible, but that software issues have traditionally been a problem in doing so. He stated that a significant amount of work has been done in this area recently, and he will contact the software vendors to see what can be done.

It was also brought to my attention that student social security numbers are also overused. The example I was given is the requirement for a social security number on a form for return of items purchased at the bookstore. The bookstore reported that they only need "ID number," not social security number, but that most students do not know their ID number, or do not have an ID number other than their SSN. I checked with the Office of Student Services, and they reported that students – other than international students – do not have unique ID numbers, and social security numbers are used. I contacted Dr. Gail Stevens, Vice President for Student Service, and asked if she had concerns about the use of student social security numbers for identification purposes. I also asked her if any

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

change in the use of those numbers was planned, and if her office would be interested in making changes in the event that the use of faculty social security numbers changes to include unique ID numbers. She has given me her permission to include her response, which follows.

For the most part, this has not been an issue from my perspective, although I do understand that we live in an age where identity theft is a major concern. Students have not brought it up though on occasion a parent will. Because of an incident in the summer, I've asked staff in Student Affairs to be sure that they do not print any lists that contain S.S.#'s. I try to never write one down (if a student comes into my office and I have to look something up for them, I type it as they tell me) and I cannot imagine why the bookstore would require such a thing. It seems to me that having your receipt or showing identification (student ID or driver's license) would be sufficient for returns.

To answer your specific question, we have no plans to make any changes, but would support any effort that protects this information.

Respectfully submitted,

James Engman

Operations Committee Report, December 6, 2006

The Operations Committee met Thursday, Nov. 16, to discuss the following two issues:

1. Reexamine our proposed Faculty Excellence Award amendment and decide whether to advance it to a vote at the next Senate meeting.
2. Draft a statement for introduction at the next Senate meeting regarding university policy for promotion of non-tenure track instructors, as suggested by last year's ad hoc committee on the issue (report attached).

Regarding Faculty Excellence Awards, the committee considered several suggestions received from faculty after our previous amendment, and elected to make one small revision (see revised amendment), in order to insure that all three areas of recognition (teaching, creative and academic research, and service) would be mentioned at the awards ceremony, even if only one area was recognized each year in rotation. With this addition, the committee wishes to call the faculty excellence awards amendment for an up or down vote by the senate.

Regarding the university policy for non-tenure track instructors, the committee first considered the report of last spring's ad hoc committee as well as the existing faculty handbook language on the issue (both attached). We recognized that we were being asked to essentially right two separate wrongs. The first, immediate problem is that there are several instructors on campus, including three who initiated discussion last year, who have served as full-time faculty for as long as two decades, with no chance of promotion under the existing handbook. The second wrong is that while the current handbook, university tradition and AAUP are all very clear that use of full-time, non-tenure track instructors should never be a long-term solution in any department, there are several departments on campus that do in fact rely heavily on full-time, non-tenure track faculty, creating an underclass of non-tenurable, non-promotable faculty who may serve decades at much lower wages than tenure track faculty; a policy needs to be articulated that will end this practice, whether by creating new tenure-track positions; bringing long-term instructors into tenure track status; or by simply limiting the number of years an instructor can teach.

Our solution to the first, immediate problem of allowing promotion for faculty with well over a decade of service is the first of three non-tenure track amendments proposed. (This amendment was actually adopted via email after the committee met, because we were under the mistaken belief that the current handbook already allowed the VP for Academic Affairs to promote instructors in special cases, whereas it only actually allows for award of tenure.) We urge the immediate adoption of this first, least

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

controversial amendment, as it will allow the English faculty who prompted this discussion to apply for promotion this year.

The second two non-tenure track amendments are the committee's suggested approach to solving the long-term problem, i.e., the mandate from the ad hoc committee to "fix this problem NOW!" To summarize these amendments, they basically enforce what is already policy: long-term, non-tenure track instructors must at some point be placed on tenure track if they are to remain at the university. The amendments will doubtless cause a great deal of discussion, and should be considered and commented on by the entire faculty prior to adoption, but it is worth stating here that our intent is not to restrict or handicap departments, but rather to provide a gradual, long-term solution to a policy that currently creates gross unfairness. We are not saying that all long-term instructors should be eliminated, but rather that, if they are going to be long-term, they must be brought into the existing tenure and promotion system.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Taylor

For the operations committee:

Rafael Bejarano, George Ann Stallings, Ken Taylor, Wen Wahong, Alan Wright

Operations Committee Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Handbook

Submitted by the Senate Operations Committee Dec. 6, 2006

(Proposed new language is in **bold type**.)

Amend III, B, 1, b of the Faculty Handbook to read as follows:

b. Tenurial academic ranks are those of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The rank of Instructor is a non-tenured rank; however, in certain cases of institutional, programmatic, or departmental need and exceptional individual merit, the Vice President for Academic Affairs may, at his/her discretion, approve special consideration of an Instructor, **whether 9 or 12 month faculty**, for tenured status **and/or the rank of Assistant Professor**. All faculty holding tenured or tenure-track appointments shall be so notified in their letters of appointment.

Amend III, B, 2, c of the Faculty Handbook to read as follows:

c. Non-tenure-track faculty personnel are eligible to receive, but are not entitled to expect, renewal of their appointment or further assignments following expiration of their current appointments, **provided such renewal does not exceed the limits defined in paragraph g below**.

Amend III, B, 2, g of the Faculty Handbook to read as follows:

g. The University recognizes that continuous employment on a full-time non-tenure-track status is inappropriate as a long term commitment to faculty members, except to meet special needs in specific departments, with departmental approval. **In no case shall a single individual fill a full-time, non-tenure track position for a period longer than five years including the initial year of service. During the fifth year of service by a full-time, non-tenure track faculty member, the department may elect to place the faculty on tenure track status in accordance with the criteria described in paragraph f above, provided the faculty member has met qualifications for such appointment. Alternatively, the faculty member will be informed that the employment contract will not be renewed for a sixth year, and the non-tenure track position may be re-advertised, with the current faculty member ineligible to apply. This policy shall be explained in writing to all full-time non-tenure track faculty at the time of initial appointment, including both 9 month and 12 month faculty, and shall not be considered binding on full-time non-tenure track faculty already in service at the time this amendment is adopted.**

(Promotion and tenure for those faculty in service prior to the adoption of this amendment shall be decided on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Sec. III, B, 1, b above, with special consideration given to faculty who have provided exceptional service to the University.) Where practical,

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

departments and the administration should assist full-time non-tenure faculty in achieving criteria for tenure-track appointment.

Operations Committee:

Suggested changes to section N. Excellence Awards of Faculty Handbook

Paragraph 1: In recognition..., there shall be fifteen Excellence Awards (add:) *given over a three year period* as follows:

Paragraph 2: Change "three annual cash awards in these amounts: ...\$500" to "*one annual cash award of \$2500.*"

Delete the sentence **Only... categories.** Add: *Five awards shall be given each year in rotation starting with Excellence in Teaching, followed by Excellence in Scholarly or Creative Activity, then in the third year, Excellence in Service. There will be no ties or shared awards.*

Paragraph starting with "All nominations..." change fall to spring, March 1 to October 1, and spring to fall. Add sentence at end of paragraph: *Award winners will be presented at the annual Founder's Day Celebration.*

Delete paragraph "If a candidate..." Add: *Evidence to be considered in determining the candidate's qualifications for an award shall consist of accomplishments pertaining to the nominated award in question occurring in the previous three calendar years.*

Note: to be nominated for an award in spring 2007, the nominator shall consider events occurring in 2004, 2005, and 2006. The selection committee will consider only events occurring in the previous three calendar years when making an award. *These awards are not lifetime achievement awards.*

With all of the above changes inserted, the amended section N would read as follows (new language in **bold**):

N. Excellence Awards

1. College/Division Awards

In recognition of outstanding performance by Henderson State University faculty who have served the university community above and beyond the call of duty, there shall be fifteen Excellence Awards **given over a three-year period** as follows:

The three divisions of the Ellis College of Arts and Sciences (Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, and Science and Math), The School of Business, and Teachers College Henderson will each make **one** annual cash award of **\$2500.**

Five awards shall be given each year in rotation starting in 2007 with Excellence in Teaching, followed by Excellence in Scholarly or Creative Activity, then in the third year, Excellence in Service. There will be no ties or shared awards.

These awards shall be made within each college (or division) by an awards committee composed of faculty below the level of chair from that college (or division). The term of appointment to each awards committee shall be limited to one year, and shall be made by faculty vote. The election shall be conducted by the Faculty Senate Procedures Committee. Each of the five awards committees shall be composed of five members, with no more than one member from any single department or discipline. For the purposes of excellence awards, faculty serving in the library or student services shall be considered within the School of Business.

Names of committee members and chair-elects (persons that receive the most votes) will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs upon conclusion of committee elections. The Office of Academic Affairs will be responsible for monitoring the activity of the committees to ensure faculty have been properly notified of the award nominating process by committee chairs. Committees shall report names of award recipients to the Office of Academic Affairs. (The addition of this paragraph was approved by Faculty Senate on April 6, 2005, and by Dr. Dunn on October 6, 2005.)

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

Recipients may be nominated by chairs and or colleagues; no nominated recipient may serve on an awards committee during the semester of nomination. Only full-time faculty (as opposed to adjunct or part-time faculty) are eligible for awards, and no one faculty member may receive more than a single award in one year. The awards shall be presented in lump sum at an annual ceremony, and shall NOT be considered part of a recipient's base pay for the computation of raises, benefits, etc., nor shall they be directly tied to the annual faculty review process.

All nominations for Faculty Excellence Awards shall be submitted to the College Faculty Excellence Award Committees by the conclusion of the **spring** semester. Faculty Excellence Award selections shall be determined by **October 1** of the following **fall** semester. **Award winners will be presented at the annual Founder's Day Celebration. During the presentation, the master of ceremonies will introduce the awards while recognizing recipients in the previous two years, as follows:**

"Henderson recognizes faculty excellence with rotating awards for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Last year's awards, recognizing _____, went to (list recipients). The previous year's awards, recognizing _____, went to (list recipients). This year's awards are in the field of _____."

Award criteria shall be decided individually by college and, where appropriate, by department (for example, the Art Department might provide the Ellis College's Fine Arts Awards Committee with criteria defining unusually meritorious artistic expression). The specific criteria for eligibility and receiving of each award should be stated clearly and specifically in a memo sent to all faculty at the beginning of each school year.

Evidence to be considered in determining the candidate's qualifications for an award shall consist of accomplishments pertaining to the nominated award in question occurring in the previous three calendar years.

Three years after the institution of such a university-wide awards system, the Senate shall examine the system to determine whether it has indeed fostered excellence among the faculty in a fair and impartial manner, and the Senate may at that time modify the plan according to its findings. **Periodic additional review is at the discretion of the Senate.**

Report of the Procedures Committee

December 6, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Procedures Committee met on Friday, December 1 to discuss the issue of Faculty Hearing Committee Elections, and to tally results of the Departmental Representative elections. Members present were Brian English (Chair), Don Wells, Linda English, and Troy Hogue. There were no members absent.

The Committee recommends that no change in wording of any document is necessary, due to the current wording of the Committee Handbook (page 6):

"The Procedures Committee of the Faculty Senate is responsible for conducting the election and reporting the membership annually to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Committee on Committees by April 15."

The wording does not mention any specifics as to conducting the election, leaving it to the discretion of the Procedures Committee.

The Procedures Committee recommends that when Faculty Hearing Committee elections are conducted, that two representatives be voted for instead of one.

Also, the Procedures Committee recommends that when votes for the Faculty Hearing Committee are tallied, that all persons receiving any votes for each position be ranked accordingly to votes received to generate a longer, ordered list of alternates. Ties should be broken through lots. This will make the procedure of convening the Faculty Hearing Committee go much smoother, if it has to meet again.

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

The Committee would also like to announce the winners of the 2006 Departmental Representative Elections:

Department	Winner	Alternate
Biology	Mike Matthews	Anna Smith
Comm. & Theatre Arts	Paul Glover	Ron Addington
Counselor Education	Linda English	Michael Kelly
Curriculum & Instruction	Gary Smithey	Lonnie McDonald
Family & Consumer Science	Beverly Baker	Evelyn Good
Health, PE, & Recreation	Patrick Wempe	James Gould
Library	Lea Alexander	Linda Evans
Math & Computer Science	Catherine Leach	Deborah Hill
School of Business	Jack Meadows	Gary Linn
Sociology & Human Services	Doc Gibson	Joyce Shepherd

Respectfully submitted,
Brian English
Chair, Procedures Committee

Report Concerning the Effectiveness of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate appears to be relatively effective in maintaining lines of communication open between the Faculty and the University Administration. In particular, the regularly scheduled meetings between Senate President and University President Dunn and Vice President for Academic Affairs Houston, plus Dr. Houston's monthly visit with the Senate provide opportunities for issues, concerns and rumors to be discussed relatively early in their development. This sometimes avoids unnecessary conflict. This may have helped to contribute to the perception that in recent years, the relationship between faculty and the University administration has been less confrontational and more open and cooperative than at some times in the past. The Executive Committee suggests that these avenues for communication be maintained, and that the Senate consider additional means to increase meaningful and productive dialogue between the faculty and administration.

The Senate seems to have had little success in furthering the process of shared governance on campus; significant policy and procedural changes are still sometimes made by administrative proclamation without any involvement of Faculty Senate or the faculty as a whole. The change in the advising and registration procedures made this semester is one example of the ongoing nature of this problem. The announcement that Spring graduation would be held in two ceremonies rather than one is another example. The Executive Committee suggests that the Senate remain watchful for opportunities to promote shared governance, and bring lapses to the attention of both the faculty and the administration.

There appears to be significant opportunity for the Senate to have a more meaningful involvement in the University budget process. During recent years' budget meetings, the Senate has not been provided with enough information to allow any significant or timely contributions to the budget process. Senators on the committee do not see a budget or draft proposal of a budget of any type until after the Board of Trustees had approved a final budget. The Executive Committee recommends that the Senate continue to request meaningful involvement in the budget process, and hold frank discussions with the administration if such participation is not permitted.

The Senate appears to have significant opportunities to involve student input in the process of Senate decision-making. In previous years, SGA representation at Senate meetings sometimes provided valuable student input. Although the Senate has attempted to encourage SGA attendance at meetings, SGA attendance at Senate meetings has lapsed. The Executive Committee encourages the SGA to

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

consider renewing its involvement with Faculty Senate, and recommends that the Senate continue to encourage SGA participation and attendance.

Accomplishments of the Faculty Senate in 2006

- Supported recommendations of Buildings and Grounds Committee to the University regarding safety issues on campus. Issues included intersection safety issues, crosswalk safety issues, and a need for improved lighting,
- Proposed an amendment to the *Faculty Handbook* to allow tenured faculty members within individual departments to write either a single group letter or individual letters for promotion and tenure. A format for group letters was recommended.
- Facilitated agreement between course evaluation proctor's instructions as distributed with the instructions as printed in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- Removed list of suggested teaching materials from the Excellence in Teaching Award guidelines.
- Determined not to place Faculty Morale survey on the web.
- Discussed the nature of the fall conference sexual harassment seminar, and obtained assurance of the University's house counsel that some changes would be made in the program, effective fall 2006.
- Made recommendations to the university administration supporting moving Founder's Day to fall semester, increasing the event's significance, and providing additional funding.
- Made recommendation regarding utilities management and energy conservation, and banning non-service dogs from campus.
- Established an *Ad-Hoc* committee to consider faculty hearing committee issues, and to clarify the specifics of "chain of command" on campus.
- Made recommendations regarding textbook rotation and controlling textbook costs.
- Recommended that additional hours or an online component be added to Monday night classes in order to meet state requirements on hours.
- Recommended that faculty members have access to the transcripts of students enrolled in their classes, for the purpose of checking prerequisites.
- Proposed an amendment to the *Faculty Handbook* clarifying the assessment of registration fees for dependents of faculty/staff members who die or retire after five consecutive years of employment.

Initiatives as yet unresolved by the 2006 Senate

- Revision of Faculty Handbook language related to the Faculty Hearing Committee is still needed.
- Issues related to the handling and use of course evaluations are unresolved.
- The question of appropriate accommodation for students with disabilities is ongoing.
- Some buildings and grounds safety issues sent to the administration have not been addressed.
- Computer-based course evaluations have not been implemented campus-wide.
- As of this writing, changes to the Faculty Excellence Awards Program have not been approved. Language to allow promotion of instructors with over ten years of service has not been approved.

Outgoing Senate President's Statement of Appreciation

It has been a pleasure and an honor to work with the faculty, the members of the Senate, and members of the administration in my capacity as Senate President over the past year. I continue to be impressed by the amount of hard work and careful consideration that goes into running an institution like Henderson State University. As a diverse community, we often have differences of opinion and disagreements about priorities and approaches, but I truly believe that the faculty, the staff, and the administration are dedicated to providing the best possible education for our students. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the many members of the Senate, their alternates, the committee chairs, and officers. I also sincerely appreciate the honest and candid way in which both Dr. Dunn and Dr.

December 2006 Faculty Senate Minutes

Houston approached our many discussions over the last year, and their clear willingness to listen to the concerns of the Senate. I thank the previous Senate President, Dr. Mike Matthews for helping to foster this climate of openness and respect, and wish the President-Elect, Dr. Kevin Durand, as rewarding an experience as President as I have been privileged to have.