

Faculty Senate Minutes

February 26, 2009

4:00 pm in ELC 405

Attendance: Denise Woodbury (president), Bart Reynolds (Kathy Croxall proxy), Gerry Calvasina, Kathy Croxall, Dezhi Wu, Kevin Stein (Suzanne Larson proxy), Suzanne Larson, Mark Colberg, Andreas Weingartner, Kay Anderson, Deb Hill, Virginia Stitt, Fred Govedich, Carl Franklin (John Howell proxy), John Howell, Andrew Marvick, Matt Schmidt, Scott Lanning, Manghui Tu, Grant Corser (visitor from psychology), Mark Miller, Emily Dean

Welcome and Conducting: President Woodbury

1. Call to Order by President Woodbury
2. Approval of the Minutes: since they were not sent out, they will be approved next month
3. President's Report:
 - a. flowers sent from senate for Bill Douglas's funeral
 - b. Accreditation re-affirmed, a couple of issues still to discuss
 - c. Program fees vs course fees—with the exception of some very expensive courses, all will now become course fees, from about 800 fees to a one-page list; Andrew Marvick—course fee committee had no input on this decision, that seems to be a bit strange; attempt is 'truth in advertising' for students, simplification for them; suggestion came from Board of Trustees to do this; this appears inequitable for students that are in programs that generally have had no fees; any student input on this?; another person was on the course fees committee and he and the deans approved this (a month ago); can faculty have any input on this, several are unhappy with this decision; isn't this an academic issue; may go into a long-term account at the end of the year; will faculty still have control over items that will be necessary for their specific classes; what is the position of the faculty senate on this issue?
 - i. Motion: **"Faculty senate goes on record as objecting to the course fee changes"** Motion made by Suzanne Larson, Seconded by Mark Colberg;
 - ii. Discussion: this is an academic as well as a financial issue; if this diminishes who and what we are, then it affects on an academic issue and faculty should be involved; if students know, will that make a difference
 - iii. Question called: by Denise Woodbury, all in favor with the exception of two nays and four abstentions
 - d. Enrollment is up, faculty efforts identified as part of the difference and congratulated on that
 - e. Budget—waiting to see, maybe not as bad as originally expecting but we'll really know on March 11; looks better than a month ago

4. Policies and Procedures Manual—tabled until next month, wrong pages printed

5. Elections of New Senators and of the New President-elect
 - a. Senior senator that is coming off Senate from college should conduct the election; no guidelines for the elections, suggestion is to make it equitable among all areas of the college; try to have some with experience on the Senate; verify how many Senators each college has before running elections; generally this is a three-year term; suggestion to have some tenured and non-tenured faculty from each college; new senators should be elected and then attend the April meeting with current senators
 - b. Election of president elect—Gerry Calvasina, we are not following the current policy and we need to try something new at this point, Bart will send out a general call for nominations to all faculty, will use the Faculty Senate webpage as the ‘call for nominations’ and for later voting; if no candidate by the March meeting, we will select someone from this group; we will also need to fill other office positions: secretary, treasurer, parliamentarian, etc.; asked current senators to submit nominations and then ‘gentle persuasion’ will be employed to get someone as a president

6. Criteria for Program Discontinuance (Deb Hill and Task Force)—hopefully this work will not be needed; new copies (visual had one line in the wrong place) were passed out
 - a. Topic of concern to all of us, this was criteria that hopefully won’t be needed, but is ready in case it is
 - b. Policy identified four criteria; committee decided *essentiality* was the primary of the four criteria and it was addressed first (worth 40 points)
 - c. *Quality* was addressed next (worth 20 points)
 - d. *Productivity* was next; (worth 20 points)
 - e. *Cost effectiveness* (worth 20 points)
 - f. Every program will be asked to make their case for continuation if this situation occurs and need to write the submission highlighting their specific strengths, etc.
 - g. Discussion—there are some conflicts, especially over small class sizes and cost effectiveness; how does this address trends and fluctuations in programs, job markets; why did the committee put “supports an institutional major/degree”—it may be only gen ed or gen ed prerequisite for another degree; “provides service/outreach to community” why is this given such high rating—this puts some more ‘academic’ programs at a disadvantage; (bolding should not have been done, it doesn’t indicate higher weight); how was weighting of the four criteria done—essentiality was clearly the most important and then decided to make the rest equal—much discussion was carried on; suggestion that there be an indication of no order of importance in the bullets
 - h. This is just a recommendation, the first step; it will go to the dean’s council and then back down, etc. before final decisions are made; hopefully this will not be necessary, it is a preliminary step; it was built without numbers or data to influence the outcome

- i. Motion: **“Accept this work with suggested changes, commend group of faculty that put it together”** Motion made by Suzanne Larson, Seconded by Virginia Stitt
- ii. Discussion: each program will have its own set of criteria, should encourage that, allow some flexibility, don't have to address all bullets; may this, once revised, be shared with our colleagues
- iii. Vote: all in favor, everyone, no nays, no abstentions

7. Motion for Executive Session—Gerry Calvasina

8. Motion to Adjourn— Gerry Calvasina

Next Meeting: March 26th @ 4:00 pm in ELC Room 405