

**Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
March 1, 2018
UC 221**

Senators/Reps in attendance:

James Ayers, Kelly Bevill, Anne Bledsoe, Joshua Butler, Kristen Hague, Pamela Holder, Darin Kamstra, Meredith Lyons, Chad Middleton, Nathan Perry, Dan Schultz-Ela, Elizabeth Sharp, Sarah Swedberg, Thomas Walla, Jared Workman, Scott Vangemeren (proxy for Karen Urban)

Senators/Reps absent:

Karen Urban, Lisa Friel-Redifer, Ben Linzey

Guests in attendance:

Chris DeLeon, Suzanne Owens, Bette Schans, Lisa Driskell, Tim Pinnow, Tim Casey, John Seebach, Cynthia Pemberton

Minutes Recorder: Renae Phillips

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL BY SIGN-IN

The meeting was called to order by President Josh Butler at 3:31pm.
President Butler welcomed guests and reminded senators and guests to sign the circulating Roll Call sheet.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Motion: to accept A. Distance Learning and Technology Report on the Consent Agenda

(Ayers/seconded); motion carried unanimously

Discussion: none.

A. Distance Learning and Technology Report

III. APPROVE FACULTY SENATE MINUTES OF 2/15/18 MEETING

Motion: to approve the Faculty Senate minutes of February 15, 2018 (Swedberg/seconded); motion to approve amended minutes carried unanimously.

Discussion: VII E. change “we will be receiving the charge” to state “we will be receiving the report.”

IV. COMMITTEE MINUTES AND REPORTS TO APPROVE

Motion to move items IV.C. and IV.D. in front of item IV.A. (Middleton/second); motion carried unanimously

A. Assessment Committee Minutes 12/5/17

Motion: to approve the Assessment Committee Minutes 12/5/17 (Schultz-Ela/seconded); motion carried unanimously.

Discussion: The minutes are tied to the proposal, if one passes and the other does not, what does that mean? Historically the minutes are discussed, then future proposals are discussed.

Section 2C: There may be exceptions for certain programs to not have to assess this SLO—what does that mean; who makes the exception? It is important that each program assesses the SLOs across campus, but that may differ depending on departmental dynamics. Specific SLOs may not fit in certain programs. When the department submits the SLO plan, they would give a paragraph on specific reasons why certain SLOs were not able to be met.

Concerns were raised about increased workload to assess additional SLOs with the same supporting data.

**B. Assessment Committee Proposal: Personal and Social Responsibility SLO
Motion: to approve the Assessment Committee Proposal: Personal and Social
Responsibility SLO**

(Middleton/seconded); motion 7 yeas, 4 nays, 3 abstentions, motion passed.

Discussion: Continuation of discussion began in IV.A. President Butler expressed that he liked the intention of this: the spirit is spot on and there are many places on campus where this can be done effectively and is very important. The difficult question is who is going to be able to “not implement the SLO” and what is the process of “stepping out” of the SLO? Kamstra recommended following Tim Pinnow in the Theater Program by writing a paragraph of why or how the SLO does not fit specifically within the program.

Discussion ensued concerning how assessment of current ethics SLOs would be shifted to the new category. The HLC considers that we are doing an adequate job now. VPAA Pemberton noted that our accountability is linked to imperatives and the assessment is mandated by accreditation standards. Resistance relates to time spent gathering additional data and writing reports.

President Butler: Would it be a good idea to form an Ad Hoc Committee to look at how to make assessment more efficient? Or maybe the Assessment Committee themselves can come up with a way to more streamline this? A formal charge may be made to the committee at a later date after further discussion of the general issue.

**Motion: to Table the Assessment Committee Proposal: Personal and Social
Responsibility SLO until our next meeting, March 22, 2018**

(Ayers/second); motion to table, failed unanimously

Discussion: Is there going to be new information presented? If not, why should we table the vote?

**Motion: to move the Report from the Office of the Vice President up in the agenda
(Kamstra/second); motion approved unanimously** (report presented before item IV.E
owing to items IV.C. and IV.D. moved ahead of IV.A. and IV.B.)

Discussion: none.

C. Faculty Success Committee Minutes 12/6/17

Motion: to approve the Faculty Success Committee Minutes 12/6/17 (Swedberg/seconded); motion carried unanimously
Discussion: none.

D. Faculty Success Committee Collegiality Award Proposal

Motion: to approve the Faculty Success Collegiality Award Proposal (Middleton/seconded); motion as amended carried unanimously

Discussion: Tim Casey expressed that the Faculty Success Committee thought it important to reward success by creating a Collegiality Award. A colleague would tell a story of how someone has been collegial. Academic Affairs may provide funding for the award. Submissions should be sent to Aparna Palmer as the chair of the committee.

E. UCC Minutes 1/25/18

Motion: to approve the UCC Minutes 1/25/18 (Ayers/seconded); motion, as amended, carried unanimously

Discussion: Proposal 58 on page 6 of the minutes: the program modification for Bachelor of Science was changed from requiring CSCI 100 to requiring CSCI 110 or above, as well as MATH 110 or above and STAT 200.

Motion: to amend the motion to approve the UCC Minutes 1/25/18 with the exception of program addition item 58.

(Ayers/seconded); motion to amend failed unanimously

Discussion: Sharp noted that within these minutes, the proposal is listed as a program addition and in the next minutes they will be listed as a program modification. The next minutes will be on the Consent Agenda for the next Senate meeting. So are we denying the addition of the new program by pulling them out of these minutes, which means the next minutes will contain a modification of a program that is technically non-existent? Butler stated that Emily would make sure that the modification would be on the next agenda.

Motion: to table the UCC Minutes 1/25/18

(Ayers/seconded); 1 yea, 12 nays, 2 abstentions, motion failed

Discussion: Will tabling affect the timeline of the getting all of the programs in the minutes approved? Ayers stated that we can talk with the Registrar about making sure they are in the catalog. We will vote on the UCC Minutes on April 5, 2018.

Motion: to amend the original motion to approve the UCC Minutes 1/25/18 to sever item 58

(Schultz-Ela/seconded); 13 yea, 1 nay, motion approved

Discussion: Clarification discussion ensued

Motion: to table item 58 from the UCC Minutes 1/25/18

(Ayers/seconded); motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: none

V. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- A. None

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Academic Policies: Policy for using Graduate Courses for Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Credit [handout of same title provided]

Motion: to approve the Academic Policies Committee’s “Policy for using Graduate Courses for Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Credit” and report back to Faculty Senate with their findings

(Middleton/seconded); motion carried unanimously

Discussion: The charge is to look at the *draft* policy, then recommend how to move forward. Also need to look at whether the student is paying undergraduate or graduate price for credits.

VII. REPORTS

- A. CFAC report, James Ayers

Report: none.

- B. Student Government Report, Ben Linzey (not present)

Report: none.

- C. Executive Committee Report, Dan Schultz-Ela

Report: Nothing that we have not discussed already.

- D. Faculty Trustee Report, Chad Middleton

Report: no report today.

- E. President’s Report, Joshua Butler

Report: Contact John Marshall about shooter training. Ask & Answer session on March 8th with Dr. Pemberton. Happy Spring Break! Next meeting March 22nd.

- F. Update from Academic Affairs, Cynthia Pemberton

Report: Update on the Handbook Committee: Met 2/28/18 to work on finalization of the proposals presented. Currently putting edits together and an email will be sent out to campus the week after Spring Break with a link to the portal to take a look and give feedback. The VPAA will remove names from suggestions before giving them back to the Handbook Committee. The Handbook Committee will decide whether to further edit, and then send proposals on to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees will review the proposals when they meet in May. The handout provided at the last meeting shows the status of the proposals after the Faculty Senate vote.

VPAA Pemberton was asked to summarize the proposals, as follows:

Syncing tenure and promotion clocks: Faculty Senate was in favor. A sunset clause allowing the option of using the current policy until 2020 has been added at the suggestion of the president.

Early Tenure: the current policy stays, and the proposal will go back to Faculty Senate to change the wording to something like “rare occurrence.”

Mentoring Process: the committee was not comfortable with a one size fits all, but worked on guiderails and created some options for department-wide policies.

Tenure & Promotion: Committee did not elect to move the policy forward, because there are a lot of changes to Department evaluations regarding the Teacher/Scholar model that need to be looked at. Maybe will need to take time (a year?) to see how that plays out before making further recommendations.

Pre-Tenure Review: Committee did not elect to move the policy forward. If synchronizing the tenure and promotion clocks, the Handbook Committee wants to see how that falls out a bit before revisiting.

Performance Ratings: Research is being done on a five-point scale for evaluation. Feedback will determine whether to reassess or move forward, but changes will not affect this year.

There are questions on how Robert’s Rules of Order treats abstentions during vote counting. The Executive Committee will review it and will respond to the Faculty Senate at the next meeting.

VIII. ADJOURN

**Motion: to adjourn the Faculty Senate meeting of March 1, 2018
(Sharp/seconded)**

Meeting adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Renaë Phillips, Minutes Recorder