

2011

Faculty Senate Minutes, December 7, 2011 (Draft)

Faculty Senate
Eastern Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes, December 7, 2011 (Draft)" (2011). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 35.
http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/35

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Materials by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Draft Minutes for Faculty Senate

December 7, 2011

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: R Woods (AAS), M Reedy (ART), B Winning (BIOL), S McCracken (CMTA), M Evett (COSC), D Crary (ECON), C Cunningham (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Koolage (H&P), J Cohen Jones (MATH), P Koehn (P&A), E Martin (PS), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), M Zinggeler (WL), T Moreno (HPHP), J Carbone (HS), G Rubinfeld (NURS), M Bombyk (SW), K Banerji (MGMT), D Barton (MKT&LAW), P Francis (L&C), L Lee (SPED), P Smith (TED), J Texter (ET), P Majeske (TS), T Brewer (Grad Council), R Baier (LIB), J Carroll (Assoc. Provost), J Lumm (EMU), S Martin (EMU)

Not attending: G Edwards (CHEM), W Zirk (M&D), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS)

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 11/16 meeting (attached) (approved as amended, 5 abstain)
3. (3:10) A resolution on domestic partnership benefits (Resolution 20111116.3, below) [Suzanne Gray]
 - a. Physics is wordsmithing! Minor changes, no change in meaning.
 - b. Resolution was approved as amended.
4. (3:25) Question whether to support the Student Success Council's request for a representative from the Senate.
 - a. Possible appointment to said position. [Marti Bombyk, SW]
 - b. A Findley, Chair of Student Success council, feels the committee would benefit from FS representation.
 - c. We appoint a member at present, but perhaps an additional representative would be appropriate.
 - d. Most meetings are smaller groups, and they meet regularly.
 - e. The additional member would be a FS member, and can report back.
 - f. Motion approved.
 - g. M Bombyk approved by acclamation.
5. (3:30) Discussion with University Chief Financial Officer, John Lumm.
 - a. Financial statements are available on the Business and Finance website
 - b. FY11
 - i. SCH growth was up ~1% in FY11.
 - ii. Small General Fund operating surplus (\$400K), as is always hoped for.
 - iii. Increasing capital assets.
 - iv. Reduction in reserves over the last two years.
 - c. FY12

- i. Reduction in state funding, \$11.4M.
 - ii. Attempting to contain costs, minimizing effect on students.
 - iii. Budget is \$283.1M
 - iv. Increased by 0.8% from the previous year.
 - v. Fraction of budget for AA is up, as is FA. (~2% “of the pie” has been shifted from support to student-related lines)
- d. Technology fee
- e. FY12 Status
 - i. Budgeted for 1.75% growth, saw a 1.5% decrease
 - ii. \$3M shortfall has been offset, however.
 - iii. If Winter and Spring mirror the Fall (down 1.5%), there will be another \$3M shortfall to deal with.
- f. FY13
 - i. Budget council has been restructured, as reported by M Rahman.
 - 1. Four new subcommittees.
 - ii. New capital outlay request, Strong Hall renovation is still a priority.
- g. This year, Lansing asked for input concerning metrics for a new funding “formula”
 - i. Response: If they are going to consider metrics, look at tuition restraint, % of in-state students, students graduating, student demographics
- h. Important to remember that each budget is not an isolated entity – there must be continuous improvement from year-to-year.
 - i. Are there different ways to get the work done as effectively as possible.
 - 1. Re-bidding, renegotiating contracts, etc. are consistent with this.
- i. Comments:
 - i. Long term planning for faculty replacement due to retirement: We don’t seem to do much long-term planning.
 - 1. J Lumm: “not the expert” on long term planning for faculty. New provost will decide on the appropriate mix of faculty (lecturer vs tenure track). Continues: Savings will be at the non-personnel level.
 - 2. J Carroll: In the last 5 years, we’ve had a large number of Provosts, so long term planning is difficult
 - ii. Indirect funds being taken back.
 - 1. J Carroll: “This will not happen.”
 - iii. What happened to the “Comprehensive Campaign?” Alums seem to be an untapped revenue stream.
 - 1. J Lumm: The Campaign counts gifts, bequests, donations, and the Foundation will be supported. Alums do indeed need to be approached. Gift officers have been added, and it will take time.

- iv. Do we anticipate layoffs in the Winter term?
 - 1. No. Unless something dramatic happens.
 - 2. As there is attrition, they look carefully before a position is filled.
 - v. Are we able to reduce energy costs to keep up with increases?
 - 1. J Donegan has identified high-leverage energy savings projects.
 - 2. These are put into the capital budget.
 - 3. We are a high user of natural gas. By purchasing forward, we've been able to save quite a bit.
 - 4. Energy savings days are added to weekends, and shifting academic calendar is a good suggestion.
 - vi. There has been a lot of shifting information about accounts (IDC, etc) and how those funds are to be used. Can you (Lumm) take the lead in putting together a list of policies?
 - 1. Yes. Someone monitoring this, however, may find IDC funds that sit there for years, untouched. I (Lumm) will not tell you if you have one, however.
 - vii. Technology Fee has been very visible recently. On the EB we were trying to be truthful about what a fee is, what tuition is, etc. Money from these fees goes into the general fund, which sounds like tuition.
 - 1. The BC has talked about this frequently. Fee boundaries are muddy. To roll fees into a base means that what you report to Lansing would be misleading.
 - 2. Would feel badly if the IT budget had not been growing faster than the fee can handle.
 - 3. Original resolution was vague.
 - a. Comment: intent was to aid with the transition to Banner, and then to keep up-to-date with technology.
 - viii. Member Comment: June 19, 2001 memo mentions \$10 fee, another memo is specific about what that money is to be used for. The intent is not vague.
6. (4:00) Discussion with President Martin
- a. Chief O'Dell has returned.
 - b. Lansing: The good news is that the Domestic Benefits bills have been amended to exclude universities.
 - c. CC and 4-year degrees: Senate canceled the meeting to discuss this. It will likely be handled in January.
 - d. Questions:
 - i. What do you think your priorities for the new Provost?
 - 1. Strategic priorities, budget issues, but mostly leadership in the provost's office. The Strategic Planning survey will give her a lot of good information.
 - ii. Is our motto "Education First" or "TrueEMU"?

1. TrueEMU is this year's advertising program, Education First is still the motto.
 - iii. Comprehensive Campaign?
 1. We are at \$50M! On track to reach our goal.
 - iv. What do you hear from Lansing about capital outlay?
 1. The bill will run in W2012. We have been reassured that we will be in the next bill.
 - v. With regard to Community Colleges: How do we get through to Lansing what we do? Our counting includes FTIAC only. Success is a different number.
 1. We should be telling them about the degrees we produce. The goal is to get more degrees awarded.
 2. Each university should choose their own metrics, as each University is different.
 3. President's Council is in agreement on this.
 - vi. Is there any effort to educate the legislature about the overuse of funding to support prisons over education?
 1. S Martin is lobbying for it!
 - vii. Last year, you started having all honoraria, etc pass through your office. How large of a burden is this, and will this continue?
 1. It has led to significant savings. Many things that are paid through honoraria should be paid through other channels.
 - viii. Where does Payroll report to?
 1. John Lumm. We need to look at a lot of our processes.
 - ix. What are your ideas concerning internationalization of the university?
 1. We need to create the right links between offices to push this forward effectively. The new Provost will work with this.
7. (4:30) Provost Office's Minutes
- a. Interim Director for the FDC position has been opened.
 - b. Provost office is still looking for speakers at the BoR meeting, to speak about how conference travel enhances their teaching and student learning.
 - c. IDC:
 - i. Not touching funds related to events (MLK day, for example) and others (individual faculty, centers, institutes)
 - ii. What are we using the IDC money for? There is a lot of money socked away.
 - iii. This amounts to around 30% of department budgets!
 - iv. Not proper to look at each fund as a rainy-day fund for each account. If there are plans for this money, that is important to note.

- v. J Carroll is asking for plans, not for cash. 41 out of 56 IDC accounts are untouched for more than a year.
 - vi. There are 3 departments that have a 3-year operating budgets-worth of IDC, sitting untouched.
 - vii. Every dean has each of the designated funds broken down to the department level. Tomorrow, department heads will have the information.
 - viii. Sees this money as seed money to support research.
 - ix. Question: Can you talk about lab fees?
 - 1. Lab fees are for refreshes of things that students touch. Consumables, etc are to be funded by fees. Departments must have a plan for using this money!
 - x. Question: So this money (IDC) can be put to use?
 - 1. We want this money to be put to use! If departments are saving it, that's one thing. If they are saving the money for a photocopier, the university will find some way to buy them a new copier.
 - xi. Are DH's trained for handling these budget items?
 - 1. No. Every time someone gets close to putting together a handbook or something, they move on.
8. (4:40) Status reports:
- a. Support of the CAS's CAC's call for changes to the naming of bachelor's degrees [Matt Evett, Executive Board]
 - i. Postponed until January for the new Provost.
 - b. Consideration of changes to the General Education outcomes for Quantitative Reasoning (QR). [Matt Evett, Executive Board]
 - i. Will meet with Chris Forman in January to discuss and then will come before the full body.
 - c. Cross-committee appointments to Student Affairs and Enrollment committees? Enrollment Target and Budget Forecasting [Mahmud Rahman]
9. (4:45) Committee Reports
- a. Search Committee for University Chief of Police [Matt Evett]
 - i. Never met.
 - b. Strategic Planning [Matt Evett].
 - i. Raw data from the survey is back. Much of it needs to be anonymized before release.
 - c. EEFC [David Crary]
 - i. Meeting tomorrow, talking about targets for upgrading equipment.
 - ii. Still discussing the need for more faculty offices.
 - d. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
10. (4:55) President's Remarks
- a. Search committee for interim FDC director
 - b. Next FS meeting: January 18, 2012, in SC310. Next FSEB meeting is January 11, 2012, SC304.

A Resolution to Advance Benefits Equity at Eastern Michigan University
Suzanne Gray and the Executive Board

Whereas Michigan House Bills 4770 and 4771, which seek to prohibit any state public employer, including universities, from offering medical or fringe benefits to unmarried individuals who reside in the same household, and to limit the right to collectively bargain for these benefits, are currently awaiting a vote by the full Senate < <http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2011-HB-4770>>, and

Whereas Eastern Michigan University has led nationally in creating a positive campus climate for all of its employees and students, which include those who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students, faculty and staff:

- EMU was “named one of the top gay friendly universities in the nation by the 2011 Campus Pride Climate Index.”
<http://www.emich.edu/univcomm/releases/press_release.php?id=1313158920>
- EMU was ranked 18th in the country, leading the state of Michigan, on Newsweek’s list of gay friendly colleges and universities in 2011.
<<http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/features/college-rankings/2011/gay-friendly.html>>
- EMU established the Center for the Study of Equality and Human Rights in 2010 through the generous gift of alumnus and former Regent Timothy Dyer. The Center’s mission is the advancement and promotion of research on equality and human rights, with a primary focus on eliminating homophobia in society.
<http://www.emich.edu/univcomm/releases/press_release.php?id=1287500302>

and

Whereas across the nation, universities and corporations deem offering equitable benefits to all employees as critical to recruiting and retaining talented faculty, professionals and staff, and

Whereas the current EMU Additional Eligible Adults (AEA) benefits policy is in purposeful compliance with current state law, in that it does not grant benefits based on domestic partnership, yet offers equitable benefits to all employees, regardless of marital status, and

Whereas Michigan universities are autonomously governed bodies that make decisions based on the best interests of their institutions’ constituents.

Therefore be it resolved that:

Eastern Michigan University continues to offer and support full and equal benefits for Additional Eligible Adults.

We urge President Martin, the Regents, and the Office of Government and Community Relations to publicly support the continuation of these benefits and to strongly advocate with both the Michigan Senate and Governor Snyder for the University’s ability to autonomously offer competitive AEA benefits to attract and

retain a diverse and vibrant faculty and staff that is treated with respect and equity.

Resolution 20111116.1: Regarding checking for student graduation from pre-requisites

Whereas it is common for students to register for a course in an upcoming semester while taking one of its prerequisites in the current semester and

Whereas it has sometimes happened that such students fail the prerequisite course yet because they are already registered for the upcoming course they go on to attempt that course, and many of these students subsequently fair poorly in that course and

Whereas this current policy does a disservice to our students, allowing them to participate in courses where they are at a distinct disadvantage to those students who have successfully completed the prerequisites. Therefore,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost's Office and the Office of Records and Registration implement a procedure to recheck course prerequisites after grades are posted at the end of each semester. If a student does not pass a course that is a pre-requisite for a course a student is registered for in the upcoming semester, the student's registration for that course should be cancelled prior to the start of classes. The student should be notified as quickly as possible to afford them sufficient time to register for a different course.

We request that this policy be implemented as soon as feasible, and that the Provost's Office report back to the Faculty Senate on this implementation before March, 2012.

Resolution 20111116.2 Support of the CAS's CAC's call for changes to the naming of bachelors degrees

Whereas the College Advisory Council (CAC) of the College of Arts and Sciences passed a resolution on October 30, 2011, calling for the Provost's Office to adopt a policy allowing each program/department to determine the naming of its bachelors degrees (for example, "Bachelor of Arts" or "Bachelor of Science") and

Whereas the Faculty Senate unanimously passed a resolution on February 17, 2010, supporting an earlier resolution by the CAC, stating that "*Each academic program should determine the degree type that is appropriate for its graduates (B.A., B.S., etc.).*"

Remove one year of college credit in a foreign language as the distinction between the B.A. and the B.S.” and

Whereas in a memo on May 5, 2011 Provost Jack Kay suggested three different frameworks for determining the naming of bachelor’s degrees and

Whereas at the Senate meeting of September 7, 2011 the Provost’s office requested that the Faculty Senate and the CAC consider formal written criteria to determine whether a BA or BS should be awarded and

Whereas the CAC has surveyed many of Eastern’s peer institution and determined that most of them do not require a written criteria but instead rely on their individual departments to determine the name of their bachelors’ degrees, and

Whereas the CAC’s resolution calls for the use of the usual, contractual, faculty input process to vet any changes to the names of program degrees, therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the CAC’s response of October 30, 2011 and asks that the Provost’s Office move to implement this policy change as soon as possible, and report back to the Senate on this implementation no later than March, 2012.

The central paragraphs in the CAC’s resolution are:

We suggest, rather, that the criterion for each degree should be the program of study. The unifying experience for our students should be at the level of *bachelors degree* (i.e., all students who earn a bachelors degree from EMU must...), not at the level of *Bachelor of Arts* and *Bachelor of Science*. We have requirements in place for the bachelors degree: university graduation requirements (including General Education). The “... of Arts” and “... of Sciences” should be appropriate to the program of study.

Proposals for each program’s degree type should be subject to the standard input process: proposed by programs/departments and reviewed by all of the college councils.

The full text of the CAC resolution is appended here:

To: Rhonda Longworth, Associate Provost
From: Jill Dieterle, College of Arts and Sciences Advisory Council
Cc: Tom Venner, CAS Dean; Matt Evett, Faculty Senate President
Provost Kay’s memo of 5/5/2011 suggests three different frameworks for awarding Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Below is the response from CAC.

Framework (1) suggests that the B.S remain the default; Framework (2) suggests that the B.A. become the default. But to make either degree a “default” is to denigrate the default degree,

suggesting that it is lesser than the other degree. This is not the case; the B.A. is the preferred degree for the arts and humanities, whereas the B.S. is the preferred degree for the sciences. We therefore do not endorse either of these frameworks.

Framework (3) suggests that EMU institute different criteria for the B.S. and the B.A., and then programs must meet the criteria for their graduates to qualify for the degree in question.

We suggest, rather, that the criterion for each degree should be the program of study.

The unifying experience for our students should be at the level of *bachelors degree* (i.e., all students who earn a bachelors degree from EMU must...), not at the level of *Bachelor of Arts* and *Bachelor of Science*. We have requirements in place for the bachelors degree: university graduation requirements (including General Education). The "... of Arts" and "... of Sciences" should be appropriate to the program of study.

Proposals for each program's degree type should be subject to the standard input process: proposed by programs/departments and reviewed by all of the college councils.

Provost Kay's memo suggests that it is the norm that there be some criteria distinguishing the B.A. from the B.S. However, our research does not support this conclusion. We surveyed all of the Michigan Publics, all of the MAC schools, and all of the EMU identified peer institutions (38 schools). While some of the schools do have specific criteria for the two degrees, they are not consistent about what those criteria are. Furthermore and most importantly, 23 of the 38 institutions make the degree type dependent on the program of study.