

Faculty Senate Meeting
January 24, 2014
OCNR 363

Present: Senators-Anderson, Araiza, Bowden, Chambers, Concannon, Crane, Engelhart, Friday, Giraldo, Griffith, Kar, Keys, Klaus, Larkin, Miller, Moreno, Spencer, Wines (acting as substitute secretary), Zimmer

Absent: Baldwin, Brown, Tejeda-Delgado

Present: Ex Officio-Meyer

Guests: Cassin, Hearne, Chen (Dr. L. D.)

- 1) Meeting called to order by Spencer at 2:00 p.m.
- 2) Approval of agenda: Motion to approve by Miller, seconded by Crane, motion passed unanimously.
- 3) Introduce ex officio members and guests: Cassin, Chen, Hearne, Meyer
 - a) Lionel Cassin is now the IT representative, in place of Tatum
 - b) Dr. Chen will be speaking on behalf of Engineering
- 4) Minutes of December 6 emergency meeting – Larkin moved, Klaus seconded, to approve as distributed. The motion passed unanimously.
- 5) Old Business
 - a) Griffith discussed faculty forums.
 - i) Point of discussion was the definition of a minimester. There is a need to clarify this definition; there is a general sense of confusion.
 - ii) Spencer commented that the registrar is using the term minimester to describe the 7-week term. It was requested that the Provost clarify.
 - iii) Question: What constitutes a course – especially those mirrored with AP?
 - iv) Concern expressed about teaching online in a way that is pedagogically appropriate. This may be an issue to explore.
 - v) Comment: COB was told by central administration to start the MBA program online before the faculty considered themselves and the offerings ready and a year later was told it must be offered in conjunction with Academic Partnerships (AP).
 - vi) Request for clarity on the recruitment effort of the University versus recruitment by AP.
 - vii) Meyer stated he was not aware that AP was contacting University undergraduates as its recruits.
 - viii) Question: What constitutes a separate course and, if a course limit is not respected by administration, why is it there? Later, comment that it is interesting that faculty must ask what is a course.
 - ix) Question: Is the function of a course to generate money?

- x) Bowden believes faculty forums are great and appreciated by faculty. Senate should continue having these forums, with more notice, and have one for faculty only and one for faculty with administration.
 - xi) Discussion: Course evaluation and course design – the inability to control these variables and that we are undermining rigor and the quality of education.
 - xii) Question: At what level is it decided to expand enrollment?
 - xiii) Observation that faculty discussion is non-existent or dismissed, as are faculty proposals.
 - xiv) Question about workload policy related to this issue
 - xv) Spencer proposed an ad hoc committee for these issues.
 - xvi) Bowden recommended that the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee would investigate and make recommendations, rather than an ad hoc committee.
- b) Sick leave Q&A session on Dec. 3 – Larkin reported that this session addressed the sick leave policy and that the intent of the language about doctor’s note not intended to be overbearing.
- i) Statement: FMLA protects your position but not compensation when you are away from work.
- c) Faculty Awards – Engelhart stated that the teaching excellence award nominations are coming in slowly. We need more people to apply. Question about whether Senate’s new procedure has discouraged college level awards.
- 6) New business
- a) Speaker’s report
 - i) Spencer requested that the April 18, 2014 scheduled Faculty Senate meeting be moved to April 25. Larkin moved, Moreno seconded, motion passed.
 - ii) Strategic Planning – The committee that will bring together all of the goals and activities into one document has not met since the Nov. 20 meeting of all theme group participants.
 - (1) Momentum 20/20- Over 200 people had an opportunity to have a voice.
 - iii) Mid-year faculty compensation – this is only for people who were told by chairs that they were rated above average, and each college was awarded 2% of faculty salaries to award up to 4% in merit to any faculty member the department chair rated as above standard performance. Last year’s compensation increase placed a major emphasis on equity, with relatively little funding for merit. This year, the strong emphasis and most funding were for merit; the administration decided that only those who received merit would also be considered for an equity adjustment.
 - (1) Senator stated that in the COE they have nine slots-down five, so even with the workload the chair was ordered not to rate faculty above standard.
 - (2) Spencer discussed three rumors from faculty, repeating remarks made to them by department chairs: department chairs were told to rate only standard or below, though only in rare cases were they to rate faculty as above standard performance. Staff and administrators were not held to same standard for equity, perhaps not for merit.
 - (3) Question: Are our administrators’ salaries comparable to those of our peer institutions?
 - (4) Griffith reported that faculty could already view their February salaries in HR Connect, so they can see whether they received a merit, and possibly equity, raises.

- (5) Bowden mentioned the Provost had explained that the colleges had different standards and the university created a standard evaluation – seems to be a lack of transparency as well as consistency.
- (6) Chambers stated there is a five tier structure in evaluation.
- (7) Concern was expressed that Provost was not attending this meeting and that his update excluded pertinent information concerning compensation.
- (8) Griffith discussed catalog changes, checks and balances (in house college/graduate studies/senate). Do not just assume they are moving forward.
- (9) A concern was expressed whether Faculty Senate is reactionary versus being proactive.
- (10) Concern: Dissemination of information as being of key importance and asked about having the speaker publish updates.
- (11) Larkin reminded senators of their status as representatives and that the responsibility for providing updates is that of each senator.
- (12) Concern that the five tier system could foment conflict. The alternative is to act in solidarity.
- (13) Question: Why the model proposed by Senate last year was not used this year?
- (14) Comment: We don't feel like we are being heard.

b) Committee reports

i) Academic Affairs

- (1) Griffith briefly explained that various departments have proposed changes to catalog copy; Larkin moved to approve, Bowden seconded, motion passed unanimously.
- (2) Chen referenced the proposal brought forward to establish an electrical engineering program. There are specific criteria components that make this program unique to our campus:
 - (a) Students can set aside nine credit hours for a 2nd focus area. Can accomplish this through renewable energy, business/entrepreneurship, non-engineering/non-science.
 - (b) Senators were reminded that we have only one decision-making power, and curriculum is it.
 - (c) Larkin stated it was a good proposal and asked whether some faculty are being double counted as in both Mechanical Engineering Technology(MET) and Electrical Engineering Technology (EET).
 - (d) Chen clarifies that the MET program had low enrollment, which indicated the need for this new program.
 - (e) Senator mentioned that this program did not meet the deadlines to submit it to Senate.
 - (f) Spencer stated it was held up beyond the deadline to reach FS but we still need to approve curriculum.
 - (g) Spencer opened the floor for a vote via show of hands. 10 were in favor, 6 opposed, 2 abstentions.

ii) Awards, Bylaws and Elections – No report

iii) Budget Analysis – No report

iv) Committee on Committees – No report

v) Faculty Affairs

- (1) Spencer mentioned that Senator Jennifer Anderson is working closely with the Provost's office on this proposal. Anderson stated revisions appear to be complete.
 - (2) Hearne mentioned faculty recruitment and new staff members.
 - (3) Araiza stated that AVP Margaret Dechant will discuss admissions. Dechant has been given a list of questions concerning recruitment and retention, with a focus on alternate admits. Knowing who our students are is very important.
 - (4) Swint asked about any developments concerning dependent tuition. Spencer said there is no information on whether a proposal is moving forward.
- c) Spencer called for any other topics. None were presented.
- 7) Motion to adjourn at 3:58 p.m.