

2011

Faculty Senate Minutes, March 16, 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, March 16, 2011 (Draft)" (2011). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 39.
http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/39

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 16, 2011

3:00-5:00PM, SC310

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 2/16/11 meeting (approved)
3. (3:10) Resolution on changes to grading policy [Marti Bombyk] (See below.)
 - a. M Bombyk gave summary of resolution
 - b. For #4, there is no committee, D Barton suggests that there just must be faculty input.
 - c. For #2 omit examples of “clerical error”
 - d. The “E to F” resolution was passed years ago, this is a reminder to them.
 - e. In #4, change “committee” to “faculty member to advise”
 - f. We need action on #1,2, and 3, maybe split off #4 and revisit it later.
 - g. Resolution adopted as amended.
4. (3:20) Resolution on a committee to advise the provost’s allocation of faculty positions. [Daryl Barton]
 - a. Nothing to report
5. (3:35) Appointments
 - a. Computer Refresh Committee (3) [Mehmet Yaya, ECON approved]
 - b. AA Strategic Planning Steering Comm. CAS (replacement for Elaine Martin) [Paul Leighton, SAC, approved]
 - c. E-Mail Evaluation Committee (1) [Krish Narayanan, COSC, approved]
 - d. Institutional Accreditation (AQIP) Committee, Helping Students Learn
 - e. Budget Council (COE) [Derek Fries SpEd, Pamela Smith, TeacherEd]
6. (3:45) Discussion of proposed changes to academic policies [Jack Kay, for Bette Warren, see below, and attached]
 - a. Intervention: Student may require intervention by an advisor, etc, to retake a course a number of times
 - b. Early Warning – what stick or carrot do we have for the student? They must see counselors/advisors before registering.
 - c. The Faculty senate endorses these policies (Vote: 24-0-0, unanimous)
 - d. Revisit the “full time load” in FSEB
7. (4:00) Provost’s Minutes
 - a. 9 students in Japan for study abroad, no increases of radiation, monitoring closely.
 - i. Provost asks for a Safety Committee for Study Abroad
 - b. Tenure files: Series of communication errors, where the Dean’s offices were asked to bring the Tenure Files to the Provost office. There was no request from the president’s office for these files.
 - c. “The List”: there is a list of programs that is being perceived as a list of programs that are “under investigation”. Not so. Provost office is looking at programs in terms of sustainability. List came from the

- deans. Looked at a variety of criteria. Provided the deans a list of programs that perhaps need help or whatever is appropriate.
- i. Provost agrees that we need a definition of “program” before we can start making any kind of recommendation.
 - ii. There would be no kind of decision making without faculty input.
- d. Discussion of ways to meet budget challenges
- i. 19.1% cut to budget, with a one-time rebate if we keep our tuition increase under 7.1%.
 - ii. They will get very specific about laying out the budget.
 - iii. We have a problem *this* year in terms of meeting the budget.
 1. Smaller CH growth than expenses
 2. Larger than expected expenses
 3. \$2M shortfall for this academic year.
 - iv. Should we have major cuts, the president has indicated that she is not going to do an across the board cut. Given the amount we (AA) get, we’re still going to face large cuts.
 1. Everything is on the table
 2. Provost has looked at the Provost’s office and found some savings in terms of eliminating or shifting positions.
 3. Needs a rapid input system.
 - a. Survey to faculty was suggested
 - b. We know the answer to most of the questions.
 4. J Eisenbach: We’re seeing parallels here (taxing one group and giving it to another). What input do we have about hiring sports coaches, etc?
 5. M Zinggeler: How about department chairs vs DH’s.
 6. T Moreno: Have other states gone through this, and are we looking at their models?
 - a. Reorg seems to be the #1 item.
 - b. OH used furlough days.
 7. D Crary: Oftentimes, changes in academics occur gradually. DH’s go back to faculty, overloading the department in terms of salary. Also, too many faculty release positions – just smoke and mirrors in the budget.
 8. P Koehn: What kind of input will the Provost office be looking for? (Soup to nuts.)
 9. L Lee: Game money and Pepsi money can help, are we looking at that? Yes. AA will not bear the full brunt, we’ll keep it under a number that we don’t know yet.
 10. M Rahman: If you resist the cuts on the Academic side, you will gain a lot of support from the faculty.
 - a. Nature is a great teacher. Must make sure that blood still flows to the heart – academic affairs.

- b. Need to ask the hard questions (play ball vs programs)
 - c. Students serve no one, admins serve students. Teachers serve students, and admins should help them. Teachers should not serve admins.
- 11. S Norton: A few years back, there was a lot of talk about restructuring the university. There was a committee to study this, but at some point it stopped. If we're going to think in terms of reorganization, find that committee's results!
- 8. (4:15) Proposed change to my.emich Faculty interface [Kathy Robertson, IT]
 - a. Vote to support changes and effort: approved
- 9. (4:25) Academic calendars for 2012-3, 2013-14, 2014-15
- 10. (4:40) Committee reports:
 - a. Graduate Council news [Tim Brewer]
 - b. Report from the EEFC [David Crary]
 - i. 350 responses to tech survey
 - ii. Part of the budget solution may be to suspend computer refresh for one year and then go to a 4-year cycle.
 - iii. Requests for computers in classrooms: there's just not enough money. We might want to request laptops.
 - c. Digital Literacy Subcommittee [Matt Evett]
- 11. (4:50) President's Remarks
 - a. The Financial Forum
 - b. Participate in budget feedback!
 - c. Please check out the Graduate dean forums

Attending: P Koehn (P&A), L Lee (SpEd), J Eisenbach (BIO), M Peters (AAS), M Bombyk (SSW), M Zigger (WL), J Texter (SET), M Rahman (ACCT), M Higbee (H&P), J Carbone (SHS), T Moreno (HPHP), L Kolopajlo (Chem), K Kustron (STS), D Barton (MKT/LAW), S Norton (ENG), D Crary (ECON), S McCracken (CMTA), K Banerji (MGMT), D Chou, (CIS), S Gray (WGST), J Nims (LIB), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), M Evett (CS), J Kay (Provost)

Proposed Academic Policies

1) The proposed Academic Probation Policy seeks to advance student academic success by:

- Provides an early warning to students whose performance is trending down.
- Adding a requirement for minimum course completion rate (CH satisfactorily completed/CH attempted) to the minimum cumulative grade point average to the standard for Good Academic Standing to encourage progress toward degree.
- Providing an academic plan for students who are not able to return to Good Academic Standing after one term on Academic Probation, and dismissing students who are not making adequate progress before they amass too great a deficit to overcome if they leave EMU and want to return later.
- Aligning the Financial Aid and Academic Probation Policies so that students who are ultimately not successful do not leave with such a crushing debt.

2) The proposed Course Repeat Policy would limit the number of times a course can be repeated and reduce the total number of courses that can be repeated to improve a grade without intervention. The current policy allows/encourages course repeats whether or not there is academic value to the student, and in may severely impact a student's course completion rate, making it incompatible with the proposed Academic Probation Policy.

Proposed Resolution Regarding Grading Policy:
From Marti Bombyk on behalf of the Executive Board
January 18 2011

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas there are repeated concerns expressed by faculty regarding certain grading policies, be it resolved that

1. EMU change its policy of requiring hard copy submission of a complete Incomplete grade within one year of its occurrence. The faculty want to be able to handle this electronically.
2. Grade changes caused by a clerical error or the student's advocacy for why the grade should be different should not require the signature of the department head/ director and college dean if the change occurs within the first month of the subsequent semester.
3. The letter grade that represents failing a course should be changed from E to F.
4. A faculty member shall be appointed to the committee of the Records and Registration office that sets grading policy.

Respectfully submitted,
Marti Bombyk