

Faculty Senate Minutes
Wednesday, April 27, 2016
3:00 PM: General Classroom Building 118
Hyperlinks to supporting documents are included
**As approved at the Faculty Senate meeting on August 31, 2016*

I. Call to Order and Welcome – Faculty Senate Chair Steven Emge called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

a. Attending:

Daniel Althoff	Kay Daigle	Chris Moretti
Martin Bressler	Blythe Duell	Hal Poovey
Han-Sheng Chen	Steven Emge	Krista Ramirez
Riley Coker	William Fridley	
Diane Dixon	Brad Ludrick	

b. Not Attending

Jeremy Blackwood
Randy Clark
Tom Harvey
Patrick Schoettmer

c. Guests –

Tim Boatmun
Karl Frinkle
Carolyn Fridley
Crystal Jensen
Alistair Maeer

II. Approval of the minutes from April 20, 2016

Sen. Ludrick moved to accept the minutes, Sen. Coker seconded. The motion passed 10 in favor - 0 opposed - 1 abstention. Changes included adding the following hyperlinks in Section III: e. Personnel Policies – Two motions were presented in recommending a policy change in section [3.32 through 3.4](#) and in section [3.5](#) of the current APPM.

III. Invited guest, Dr. Tim Boatmun addressed questions regarding the Freshman Orientation Courses (FOC) and the recommended textbooks for these courses

- a. A group was formed of those who haven't taught FOCs and veteran teachers of the FOCs to review the courses in terms of objectives, retention, and historical data. The group met three times and asked how the courses are assessed, how the course content differs depending on students' major, and what are the courses' objectives? Approximately over-half of these courses are taught by full time faculty, and all instructors are paid at the adjunct rate for these courses.
- b. Research indicates that *institution specific* information is of most help in these courses. The question was raised as to whether the increasing cost of textbooks (and the standard text used

for these courses) was a barrier for completion and success in these courses. The standard text used cost over \$100. In April, 2015, [Boatmun] sent all FOC instructors an email “heads-up” of a recommendation to no longer use the standard text and to transition to online-centered course materials at a lower cost. (see FOC website)

c. Dr. Boatmun entertained questions:

- Who houses the FOCs? Academic Affairs. The FOCs began in 2001 in Student Affairs and has since moved (coinciding with Boatmun’s move) to Academic Affairs. This move offers advantages of being closer linked to academic advisement.
- Are the FOCs graded? Yes, and they count for two hours credit.
- Would you address the Senate’s original concern about faculty input in curricular decisions and the concern that expense be the determining factor in text selection? Boatmun acknowledged he could have done a better job of informing faculty, and he will actively solicit faculty generated material and input in order to “fill in” the curricular content gaps on the website.
- Why are the FOCs not required for all freshman? That may be because, historically, it would increase the required hours for ELED majors over the Regents’ cap of 124 hours.

III. Committee Year-End Reports

- a. [Executive Committee Report](#)-- Senator Emge noted that the meetings of the Executive Committee (EC) had decreased, due in part to handling communication via email, particularly in regard to the Shared Governance Forums and meetings between the EC and President Burrage.
- A question was raised as to whether there are *administrative drops* for non-attending students. Yes, for those students who are *non-attending* in all classes (i.e. not just in individual classes).
 - A question was raised as to whether the increase in required EARs might be onerous. It was noted that this recommendation originated with the Presidential Advisory Committee for Academics as a pilot effort to gauge if the time spent in completing the EARs resulted in increased retention. Therefore, it might be helpful if faculty measured the time required to complete the EARs. It was also suggested that it might be more efficient if the *filing* and *sending* processes were separated in the Campus Connect functioning.
- b. [University Affairs Report](#)-- Senator Bressler noted that the Report would be amended to include the Brown Bag Lunches that were presented in the fall.
- c. [Committee on Committees Report](#)-- Senator Dixon made a motion that the committee appointments from the April 20 Committee on Committees Minutes be approved. Senator Fridley seconded. The motion passed 13 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions.
- d. [Planning Report](#)-- Senator Coker made note of some of the possible changes in the Senate awards policy and the committee’s charges for next year.

e. [Personnel Policies Report](#) – Senator Fridley discussed the desire to work with the Executive Committee and VPAA Clark over the summer to edit and update the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual. Priorities include non-substantive edits, updates resulting from administrative restructuring, and the backlog of approved Faculty Senate recommendations including—most importantly—the university committee and council structure (APPM 3.3.2—3.6), and the Post-Tenure Review Policy that was implemented in January of 2016 (the placement in the APPM is yet to be determined).

f. [Budget Report](#)— Senator Daigle noted the charges in the report.

g. [Treasurer's Report](#)—Senator Daigle discussed the budget requests for next year, and noted the expenses for this year's awards.

IV. Old Business

- a. Finals Week Lunches—the Senate will once again host pot luck lunches in the Faculty Lounge on Monday and Tuesday of finals week. Sign-up sheets were made available and will also be emailed to senators.
- b. Reduction in Force Survey—it was noted that 88 responses were received for the survey. There was discussion about what we intend to do with this data. Will the Faculty Senate create guidelines and/or draft a policy? If so, when? Should we forward this data to the administration? If guidelines were adopted, how would that relate to timelines and budget plans? It was noted that there may have been some misunderstanding about the relative weight of tenure in reduction in force decisions, given that the grounds for dismissal of tenured faculty in relation to financial retrenchment is already addressed in university policy (e.g. APPM 4.6.7 and 4.6.8). It was also noted that other universities (e.g. OU and OSU) have reduction in force policies. It was agreed that we would clean up the data and in the fall give serious consideration to developing guidelines and drafting a policy.

Postscript (8-29-2016): The Reduction in Force Survey Data was included in the [Faculty Senate Survey Results](#) (quantitative data without comments) and posted on the website in August, 2016.

- c. It was noted that the Faculty Senate Survey will be open until May 13.

Postscript (8-29-2016): [The Faculty Senate Survey Results](#) (with comments) were posted on the website in August, 2016 as a password protected document. The password: FSSurvey016 (case sensitive)

VII. Adjournment: Senator Bressler moved the Senate adjourn. Senator Coker seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:19 PM.

Respectfully submitted by William Lloyd Fridley, Faculty Senate Archivist