

2012

Faculty Senate Minutes, March 7, 2012 (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, March 7, 2012 (Draft)" (2012). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 31.
http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/31

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

March 7, 2012

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: M Peters (AAS), M Reedy (ART), B Winning (BIOL), T Brewer (CHEM), K Stacey (CMTA), M Evett (COSC), D Crary (ECON), S Norton (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Koolage (H&P), W Zirk (M&D), P Koehn (P&A), E Martin (PS), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), M Zinggeler (WL), T Moreno (HHPH), J Carbone (HS), M Bombyk (SW), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS), K Banerji (MGMT), P Francis (L&C), L Lee (SPED), J Texter (ET), P Majeske (TS), T Brewer (Grad Council), R Baier (LIB), K Schatzel (Provost)

Not attending: G Dumitrascu (MATH), S Nelson (NURS), D Barton (MKT&LAW), P Smith (TED)

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 2/15 meeting (attached)(approved as amended)
3. (3:10) Resolution inviting regular AAUP participation at Senate meetings
 - a. If the Senate goes into a closed session, only members (voting or non-voting) may attend. AAUP representative would not be considered a member, and would not attend a closed session.
 - b. 24 aye, 1 nay, 2 abstain
4. (3:20) Resolution inviting regular Graduate Council participation at Senate meetings
 - a. Passes unanimously
5. (3:25) Resolution (1st reading) supporting new eFellows charter [Randy Baier]
 - a. eFellows has undergone a change in funding source
 - i. Funding was through IT
 - ii. Funding is now through the Technology fee.
 - b. Draft charter attached.
 - c. Comment: How is this group different from the FDC? Is this a duplication of effort/funding? Would it make more sense to centralize?
 - i. eFellows and the FDC do share the same goals.
 - ii. FDC is the place to come to for workshops of all kinds, the eFellows committee is technologically oriented.
 - iii. The dissemination aspects of these grants are important – the full amount will be awarded after dissemination.
 - d. Comment: Was there a discussion about members of the committee being disallowed from applying for a grant?

- i. There was quite a bit of discussion, including rumor-squashing. There have been a few awards to people that were serving on the committee, in the beginning of the program.
 - ii. Committee members are not allowed to receive awards.
 - e. Comment: Perhaps make sure that the charter does not have bullet lists one line long. Also, the discussion of the chair's term is odd, as members have three-year terms. This should be re-examined.
 - f. Comment: This group should not be separated from the Faculty Senate. This setup (charter) is ideal in that the committee is made up of faculty, and FS has a chance for input into the system.
 - g. Comment: On page 4, under the discussion of the duties of the Chair, there is a strong tie ("coordinate the budget") to the FDC.
 - i. Coordination is in the form of accounting – the FDC handles the receipts.
- 6. (3:35) Discussion of modifications to the advising system
 - a. At our last meeting, the Provost mentioned that they were working on changes to the advising system.
 - b. The body should understand how advising is handled on a departmental basis.
 - c. [Provost Schatzl]
 - i. Wants to separate 'advising' from 'mentoring.'
 - ii. At the end of conversations with faculty (mentoring), the student should meet with their advisor to make sure that the plan of study is on track (advising).
 - iii. We don't have a "professional advising" system.
 - iv. Most students were unhappy with advising, with many examples of how poor advising has impacted them negatively.
 - v. 30% of our students deemed our advising system unfavorable.
 - vi. Advising and mentoring should be collaborative.
 - vii. Comment: The variety of advice is what makes the advising unacceptable. Faculty will need training so that the correct advice is given, and there needs to be more advisors in the advising office. There must be consistency in advice.
 - viii. Comment: The audit process is very slow, according to students. Many students don't talk to an advisor until they need an audit.
 - ix. Comment: The course catalog and advisor beliefs about its content are different.
 - 1. The "Advising Center" would make sure that the catalog is up to date and accurate.
 - x. Comment: Long ago, mandatory major selection by the end of the second year was discussed, but not put into practice. Useful forms may help the students that wish to self-advise.
 - xi. Comment: Advisors are frequently ignorant of changes in the catalog. Students are told to take classes that no longer exist. Some advisors seem to be steering students.

- xii. Comment: Course scheduling is critical here – cancelling classes presents difficulties.
 - xiii. Comment: There was a time when a student was *required* to see an advisor for registration. Perhaps faculty members should receive time release for this.
 - xiv. Comment: Sometimes curricula changes so much that there is no way that a professional advisor can keep up. Notification of changes must be very fast.
7. (3:50) Discussion of CAC's request to appoint representative URSLC.
- a. Six members are currently appointed by the Senate.
 - b. URSLC handles new faculty award applications, spring-summer award applications, as well as sabbaticals.
 - c. The applications are refereed at the college level; these recommendations are sent to the URSLC through the Deans' offices
 - d. Comment: With few exceptions (in other organizations), panel rankings are certain to be different. The URSLC's rankings may be different from the CCRSL's list (though the URSLC's rankings are never released), but in any case these rankings are input, and input only.
 - e. Comment: It is a red herring that this is about the URSLC. The college councils want to appoint individuals that will represent them. The proposal is about representation in general, not just this committee.
 - f. Comment: Adopting this kind of system would weaken the voice of the Faculty Senate. If the responsibility for appointments to committees moves to the college councils, there would be many voices advocating for things, rather than just one.
 - g. Comment: This will be on the agenda for the Bargaining Council. It was brought up by the same faculty members during the last negotiations. This proposal wants to have input twice – once on the CCRSL, and again on the URSLC. This would be a major contract change. The Faculty Senate sees things with a different perspective than the individual colleges. The college councils are viewed as more of a curriculum-centered committee, the Senate is not.
 - h. Comment: Faculty appointed to committees by the Senate may not understand their role. They are representing the faculty as a whole, rather than one college or another.
 - i. Comment: Why are we arguing about this? We have plenty of trouble finding representatives.
 - j. Comment: Administrative appointees could have a more scholarly record. Perhaps these (administrative) appointees could be removed. If not, appointees should have a strong scholarly background.
 - k. Comment: There is some leeway in the URSLC scoring. Perhaps CAC could give the URSLC a rationale for their rankings.
 - l. Comment: The idea of the URSLC is to have a fresh set of eyes looking at the application, and viewed from a university (global) level. There

must be a check-and-balance system to keep things fair for the use of university resources.

- m. Comment: Separate issues here:
 - i. What is the role of the Senate vs the CAC
 - ii. This is about representation – if we say we want someone from each college on a committee to represent the college, then yes, the college should appoint them.
- 8. (4:05) Provost Office’s “Minutes”
 - a. Enrollment management has moved into academic affairs. This is a national trend.
 - b. Technology has been flagged as a critical issue. We have been supported with funding to fix dead spots in Wi-Fi coverage. College of Business is on the list as well. As an isolated building, they have no other way to connect.
 - c. We have many categories in our structure, but no category for academic infrastructure. This has been created to track updates and upgrades to classrooms.
 - d. Shanty Creek issue: Spring Break program, three students involved in student misconduct.
 - e. Comment: With regard to academic infrastructure, every building should maintain the supply of white board markers, erasers, chalk, etc.
- 9. (4:15) Committee Reports
 - a. EEFC [David Crary]
 - i. Provided a list of classroom and technology areas to look at.
 - ii. Over the break, Physical Plant performed a “Glitz Blitz”, performing many small repairs in a short amount of time (SWAT Team approach)
 - iii. New windows and AC in Rackham will happen likely over the summer.
 - iv. Strong is still at the top of the wish list. We may be able to count our past investment in the science complex for our new matching contribution for state money.
 - v. Q: Any other plans for Rackham? A: Not at this time.
 - b. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
 - i. Budget council meets on March 20th as a whole body (rather than subcommittees)
 - ii. Looking at initiatives for growth, seed funding for said initiatives
 - iii. On the budgeting process, passed a resolution that a more conservative approach on the budget is called for, rather than planning on increases in resolution.
 - iv. Three motions:
 - 1. See attached.
 - c. Student Success Council [Marti Bombyk]
 - i. No report
 - d. IT Business Operations committee

- i. Time to reappoint a representative.
 - e. eFellows/FDC [Randy Baier]
- 10. (4:30) Report on Strategic Planning [Matt Evett]
 - a. Three subcommittees of the SP committee
 - b. Distributed: the results of the strategic planning committee meetings with faculty, regarding vision, mission and values statements
 - c. Matt Evett is participating in the wordsmithing subcommittee
 - d. Next big step – defining the Strategic Directions in which we want to go.
 - e. Draft for Strategic Directions will come out in April
 - f. Over the summer the overall Strategic Plan will be put together for the faculty to look at in the Fall.
- 11. (4:55) President's Remarks
 - a. Report on the February Board of Regents meeting
 - b. Search for Chief of Police
 - i. Search going on, phone interviews this and next week.
 - ii. 70 applicants, 10 phone interviews
 - iii. There are internal and external applicants.
 - c. Moving the Senate office, March 12
 - i. Moving on Monday
 - d. April Meeting: Officers (Secretary, Membership Secretary, and VP) will be nominated.
 - e. Next FS meeting: March 21, 2012, in SC310. Next FSEB meeting is March 14, 2012, SC304.

Resolutions

AAUP Representation at Senate Meetings

Faculty Senate Executive Board

In order to improve communication between the Faculty Senate and the Bargaining unit, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate express a standing invitation to the AAUP executive committee to appoint a representative to attend and participate at Senate meetings. This representative will not have voting rights unless he or she is also an elected Senate representative.

Graduate Council Representation at Senate Meetings

Matt Evett

Whereas the president of the Graduate Council has long attended in an informal capacity in Senate meetings and

Whereas the Senate wishes to formalize this arrangement as a way to ensure continued good communication between the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council, therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate express a standing invitation to the Graduate Council to appoint a representative to attend and participate at Senate meetings. This representative will not have voting rights unless he or she is also an elected Senate representative.

Appointments

General Education Course Vetting, U.S. Diversity

Beth Currans

I'd be a good candidate for this committee due to my expertise in gender and sexuality studies and background in critical race theory, religious diversity, and global issues. My research explores gender, sexuality and race in contemporary public protests in the U.S. I've taught courses such as "Introduction to Gender and Sexuality Studies," "Feminist Thought," "Theories of Sexualities," "Queer Studies," "Race and Queer Theory," "Activist Performances, Performing Activism," "Transgender Studies," "Gender and Religion in the U.S." and "Feminisms, Transnational Solidarity, and Justice" at EMU and other institutions.

Best, Beth

CAC Representation to the URSLC

From: "Jill Dieterle" <jdieterle@emich.edu>
To: "elaine martin" <elaine.martin@emich.edu>, smoeller@emich.edu
Cc: jegge@emich.edu, wkoolage@emich.edu, mstrasma@emich.edu
Sent: Monday, March 5, 2012 7:48:34 AM
Subject: Fwd: College Council input to Bargaining Council

Elaine and Susan,

I am forwarding to you a proposal for the Bargaining Council from the CAS CAC. As you can see from the email below, I have also forwarded the proposal to the other college council chairs for consideration by the other colleges.

The current method of electing representatives is very strange. Just last month, the CAS rep to the Student Success Council came to CAC to solicit input. We did not elect this individual, which made the discussion very odd. If an individual is supposed to represent us, we should be the body who elects that representative.

The representation to URLSC is especially important. Historically, the rankings coming out of URLSC diverge greatly from the rankings coming out of CCRSL. CCRSL puts in a tremendous amount of time and effort discussing and ranking the proposals, and, given the way things are now, all of that gets lost when the proposals move forward to URLSC. The proposal aims to fix this problem. College councils will have the option of appointing a rep from the college level screening committee to the URLSC.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Jill

I've cc'd my departmental representatives to the Bargaining Council.

Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2012 07:32:33 -0500

To: ptartalo@emich.edu, mkinneys@emich.edu, dtanguay@emich.edu,
smoeller@emich.edu, pwalsh@emich.edu

From: Jill Dieterle <jdieterle@emich.edu>

Subject: College Council input to Bargaining Council

College Council Chairs:

Our last contract gave Faculty Senate the right to appoint all faculty representatives to university-wide committees. The intent was to make sure that representatives were elected by faculty, not appointed by the administration. However, giving such authority to the Faculty Senate has resulted in many oddities. College Councils used to appoint their own representatives to things like the Library Advisory Council, the Extended Programs Advisory Council, etc., but now those representatives are appointed by the Faculty Senate. As a result, people from all colleges are voting on representatives from specific colleges. This is undemocratic. When a faculty representative is supposed to represent a particular college, the representative really should be elected by the College Council in question, not the Faculty Senate.

The attached proposal is aimed at fixing this problem. The CAS CAC unanimously voted in favor of it and I am forwarding it to the Bargaining Council as input from CAS. It would be stronger, though, if it had the support of all of the colleges, and so I request that you put it on the agenda for your College Council to consider.

Note also that the proposal specifically addresses the election of representatives to the University Research and Sabbatical Leaves Committee. Giving the College Councils the right to appoint their own representative to URSLC is a much more democratic and transparent method for selecting representatives to this important committee. Furthermore, it will allow more continuity between college-level and university-level screening committees.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I am more than happy to attend your meetings to discuss the proposal if you think that would be helpful.

Thanks for your consideration,
Jill

Jill Dieterle, Ph.D.
Chair, College of Arts and Sciences Advisory Council
Professor, Department of History and Philosophy
Eastern Michigan University

BALLOT

1. Appointments:
 - a. GenEd Course Vetting (monthly, M 3:30-5:00) (3 yr. term)
 - i. U.S. Diversity
 - ii. Arts