

Minutes – Faculty Senate meeting, Dec. 6, 2019

Meeting called to order at 12:48

Minutes from November meeting approved.

Information Items

BFA in Creative Writing pushed back indefinitely.

Kelly Oquist on FLAC: Faculty Load and Compensation (FLAC) will go live in January 2020. Allows faculty to review and acknowledge workloads. Once it is acknowledged it becomes locked and then can be approved by administration. However, it does not need to be acknowledged for you to be compensated. But it will allow faculty to see details of workload and earnings. There will be a training session next Friday, and there is also a PowerPoint demonstration of how to use it.

Independent studies or other adjustments will be made throughout the semester.

First reading: Bulletin Policy & Procedures

The policy and procedures reflects what our current practices are. The University Bulletin is a contract, and every year it is updated. Programs need to make sure that changes are reflected in the Bulletin.

There is not a legislative authority that would govern this.

First reading: BA in Music: Education Concentration

We think that our wonderful Music Program will be improved with the addition of this Education Concentration and we have good reason to believe this will increase our enrollment.

Q: Does it involve certification?

A: Yes.

C: I strongly support this.

Q: It is called a “certification concentration” and I wonder if there is a simpler name for it.

A: This name is based on how the state titles it.

C: There are more credits required than the 128 for graduation.

A: We can look at these numbers again but we have a lot of workshop classes that are required. So it is not unusual for Music majors to go beyond the required 128.

C: The numbers for credits do not add up. This looks like typo.

A: Yes, it is.

Q: Do we have data on anticipated enrollment?

A: We do not have those data, but we can find out and provide it at the second reading.

C: The Hanover Report contradicts some of what you say.

A: That is why we will provide more data for this area.

First reading: Academic Honesty Procedures

The last time we looked at this was in 2005, which is why we are considering this again. There was not a lot of change made but we tried to make some parts clearer. We also included a link to our library's website discussing plagiarism.

Q: Why is it that the Provost will consider cases before the hearing? Also, it used to be that we had one person from each school, but now it is just a few faculty members included on hearings. If this is done because it is difficult to find faculty, then we can have alternates. I have also been at hearing where parents participate and are disruptive. So I suggest we include language saying we will have disruptive people removed. I also suggest that only tenured faculty members serve on this given potential pressure from the Provost during these hearings.

A (John Smith): Regarding membership, we do send out calls for membership from all schools. We include a panel of 3-5 faculty members but sometimes it is difficult to find faculty to participate. So it is a University-wide panel. I would also like to say that the changes here are to include greater discussion of discipline/sanction that may be imposed. Finally, the original proposal required students to participate in an on-line tutorial, and we are in the process of producing such a tutorial.

C: I support having records of whether students have completed an online tutorial.

C: I also support this.

C: Shouldn't graduate students also go through this?

A: Anyone who registers will have to do the online tutorial.

C: It would be good to see how many times students have gone through the online tutorial.

First reading: Resolution on Academic Honesty Tutorial with e-VerificationQ:

This is an online tutorial that students will do to learn about academic honesty.

C: I support having records of whether students have completed an online tutorial.

C: I also support this.

C: Shouldn't graduate students also go through this?

A: Anyone who registers will have to do the online tutorial.

C: It would be good to see how many times students have gone through the online tutorial.

Motion to move to close session

Meeting closed.

Second reading: Declaration of Declining Confidence

I met with the Board of Trustees and they are taking this very seriously and asked me to ask the Senate to delay the vote while they "take care of the matter." So it seems that they want to handle this quietly rather than having a full Faculty Assembly vote of no confidence in the context of the University getting large grants.

Q: I'm concerned about the potential cost to delaying the vote. Have you received any reassurance that anything drastic will not change if we delay?

- No. But they are aware that there is a full Faculty Assembly meeting in January and that we can take matters into our own hands.

Motion to delay vote.
Second.

I support delaying the vote because the BOT have reached out to us about this, and they know that we are not going away on this. And we know that these new big contributions are much needed, so we do not want to threaten those. I support tabling this until January.

Speaking as the voice of the Union, I would like to speak to why we might not want to delay this. I think if we delay we might reduce the pressure we have now put on the Provost, which has resulted in her giving greater consideration to our voices. We could have major changes made between now and our next meeting.

C: I support delaying because there is still the threat that we will vote to support this and because we have already achieved what we wanted to by putting this out there and it is already public.

C: The chances that a major change would happen during a delay is unlikely.

C: This isn't true. They could start a search for a Dean for the proposed new school.

C: I also support delaying for the reasons expressed by others. I also think the President knows what's going on. Why is she the one getting all the heat? So I support delaying because we need to consider including others beyond the Provost.

C: If we delay wouldn't this motivate us to move to a vote of no confidence if something drastic is done between now and the January meeting? And can we send this to the entire faculty?

A: We can post her response to the Senate website after the meeting.

C: I'm concerned this is a broader issue with organization than about the Provost.

Several pre-tenure faculty express support for the part of the letter related to the meeting with pre-tenure faculty.

C: Is this the first time the BOT has come to us asking something like this?

A: Yes.

C: I support delaying because I don't want to threaten the possibility of getting more money for the University.

C: There was a meeting today between the Provost and the coordinators of interdisciplinary minors. The Provost said she was told by the Union that these matters needed to be negotiated with the Union, but that she wanted to go around the Union to negotiate with us. She seemed to be trying to undermine the Senate and the Union.

Further expressions of support for delaying the vote.

Vote on delaying: passes 19-11.

Meeting is adjourned at 1:55.