

2013

Faculty Senate Minutes, November 20, 2013

Faculty Senate
Eastern Michigan University

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "Faculty Senate Minutes, November 20, 2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 128.
http://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/128

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.

APPROVED Faculty Senate – 20 11 2013

Attendance:

S. Moeller (AAUP), M. Yaya (AAUP), M. Rahman (A&F), J. Demarte (Art), B. Winning (Bio), D. Chou (CIS), S. Hayworth (Econ), A. Eydgahi (Eng Tech), Z. Moore (G&G), R. Flowers (Grad), M. Bluhm (HS), J. Koolage (H&P), T. Moreno (HPPH), R. Baier (Lib), K. Banerji (Mgmt), D. Barton (Mkt), G. Dumitrascu (Math), K. Miller (M&D), P. Koehn (P&A), J. Kullberg (P.Sci), K. Rusiniak (Psych), R. Orrange (SAC), N. Monera (Std.Gov.), M. McVey (T.Ed.), R. Fulkert (Tech.S.), M. Zinggeler (WL), S. Norton (Eng)

From before Koolage arrived:

Notes for faculty senate, November 20, 2013

Note to John: please capture ALL input as best you can on the Degree Completion issue. No. 7

Approval of agenda approved at 3:10pm

Approval of minutes for 11-6-2013

From CHHS – Minnie Bluhm

Aldo BANERJI for Kamal Banerji

Change to second read ... ADD “global engagement center”

Motion carries 3:12pm

Chiara Helmsley new ombudsman cannot be in attendance

Budget Cmte. Report – met for the 5th time

Wants to meet with AAUP Howard Bunsis and go over institutional priorities discussion

Just finished studying the budget process with the full group

Budget Council members will meet with SBC to go over these processes so that all questions are answered concerning shared understandings of the process

Budget – sensitive thing – can lead to some dissatisfaction

SBC will look at “what are the processes that drive the budget” at EMU, finally at peers – who are they and what are their practices?

State funding, competition, etc.

Chair Rahman will bring budget motions when necessary

Academic Issues report (Judy Kullberg)

GLOBAL ISSUES: need a call for nominations for members so that the council will be full of representatives -- for Senate to send out

Judy and Michael will draft some sample language for Sandy

Institutional Issues: Randal

Title IX was discussed at the AAUP chapter meeting, this may become more important re: safety issues on campus and recent discussion.

eFellows Grants – Michael McVey

MMcV reminds the FS about the upcoming deadline for the eFellows: November 25.

Also reminds about the \$500 for dissemination

Incentive for new profs especially

6. COE and EAA affiliation

- Discussion of the COE CAC letter to the Board of Regents versus resolution
- A resolution was circulated for discussion, and given a first reading (see attached); some changes will be made and circulated
- MOTION: A resolution shall be distributed to the Faculty, given a second reading at the December 4th meeting, and be voted on at that time. [Approved 21 – 1 – 1]
- The AAUP has also supported the COE CAC letter

7. Input preparation on Degree Completion & Retention Plan (R. Longworth)

- Two documents were circulated (see attached)
 - Degree Completion and Retention Plan (DCR)
 - FITIAC Retention Rates
- R. Longworth talked through the “Progress to Date” section of the DCR document
- The most recent update to the overall document included (a) some terminological changes, and (b) some condensing of a number of strategies into a category called “high impact strategies.” But, no new proposals were added.
- A number of concerns were raised concerning the timing of the presentation of the plan to the Board of Regents.
- A number of concerns were raised concerning Faculty participation in the plan’s development.
- R. Longworth stressed the idea that most of these plans, ideas, and strategies are not new; they have been attempted, for the most, in some form or other on campus. The overall novelty of the DCR is to coordinate the efforts and be sure they are coherent and support one another.
- It was suggested that exit interviews/surveys would be a useful tool.
 - These ideas are intended to be addressed by point 3, in the DCR document that was circulated
- It was suggested that the DCR has done little to draw on Faculty who have expertise in these areas.

- The provost's office suggested that there was no intention to leave this out, and that this expertise is welcomed and to be celebrated
- WGST and African American Studies (correct name?) were highlighted as programs that desire to play a role the ongoing discussion
- Some concerns were raised regarding the "meaningfulness" of the retention rate for students who take 12 cr/semester versus 15 cr/semester in the FITIAC document
 - The provost's office reported that these numbers were for informational purposes, not predictive ones
- Concerns were raised about DCR page 5, and the relation of this page's suggested strategies to course cancellation policies – programs are unable to graduate students in a timely manner because core courses with low enrollments are at risk of cancellation, and this forces programs to offer core courses less frequently.
- Scheduling and planning for four year programs requires give and take on both ends (faculty and administration) – especially with respect to courses that can only be offered on an intermittent basis, the cancellation of courses, and so on.
 - The Provost's office recognizes the two above points and is interested in looking at how courses with low enrollments fit into the overall plan
- Concerns were raised regarding "students who are not prepared for college" fit into the plans.
 - Remedial course work is a challenge, since very few programs offer much to support remediation. Of course, this is a discussion that needs to be ongoing.
 - Seems we need to support these students, or we need to raise the bar for admission.
- The Provost's Office stressed, again, that this plan has to be ongoing: "We don't just make a plan, and then be done with it." As we move toward the initial implementation timeframe, more input will be sought and required.
- A regular reporting schedule regarding the DCR is certainly an important idea – this should provide for evaluation, input, and participation
- Written input from Faculty Senate will be provided to the Provost's Office by Friday, November 22.

8. New Business

- The Library Advisory Committee is looking at ways to help defray textbook costs, including reserve materials, and or alternate lending methods at the Holman Learning Center. Book donations are welcome.

9. President's Remarks

- Role of senators in relation to service to the senate: taking information back to your represented faculty is critical. The agenda has items marked with an * to highlight the need for faculty input. You are encouraged to ask for time at faculty meetings to talk about issues before the Senate.

10. Adjournment