UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

April 2, 2013

Minutes

Present: G. Preuss (President), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), R. Beebe, C. Bachman, D. Epstein, S. Farris, J. Schmertz, C. Nguyen, C. Rubinson, M. Duncan, J. Herrera, S. Koshkin, J. Tito-Izquierdo, W. Nowak, E. Padilla, C. Burnett, R. Davidson, R. Johnson, J. Johnson, P. Li, S. Penkar, J. Ahmad, M. Benavides, P. Deo, F. Khoja, P. Mandell, S. Yuan, I. Wang

Absent: T. Hale (President Elect), V. Hrynkiv,

Minutes

March 19, 2013 minutes approved unanimously.

The Senate reflected on the passing of our colleague and friend, Janet Heitmiller, with a moment of silence.

Guest: Tomikia LeGrande

We are currently engaged in a search for a Director of Admission. There is a group of people from around the university working hard on recruitment issues. However, there are 11 open positions within the admissions office and much work to do.

We are working toward a 3% admissions increase, even within the context of admissions standards. However, we are 48% down in complete applications for FTIC students, although our target for this group is only 1,100 students. We will expect to increase the number of transfer students to compensate for lower number of FTIC students.

Question and Answer:

Senator: What is the average GPA of incoming students?

LeGrande: Can share the Admitted Student Profile at a later date.

Senator: Do we have scholarships based on GPA?

LeGrande: Yes, about $6,000 in merit-based scholarship is available per student. We get about a 40% return on this.

FSEC: Whose job was it to ensure that admissions vacancies were filled?

Hugetz: This is part of why SSEM was restructured. This is our highest priority.

FSEC: If retention is one mechanism for growth, how are we going to systematically do this?

LeGrande: There will be some incentives for timely registration.

Hugetz: We need to use hard data to make better informed decisions. Hiring of more advisors will help.

Senator: What about dorms?

Hugetz: We are in the process of developing a campus master plan. In order to build dorms, we must solve the land issue.

Faculty Senate President's Report

1. Courses for the May mini-mester and for summer will be on a different Blackboard URL. Faculty have received an email about this from IT. Please make sure you can access your courses.
2. Senate elections are underway. Election for the President-Elect will close at noon on Thursday.
3. The Faculty Awards Ceremony will be April 16 at 2:30.
4. Thank you to those who served on the Teaching and Learning Center Task Force. Against a very compressed time frame, they succeeded in producing a document that was <u>more</u> than we asked for.
5. A General Assembly on the budget and planning process is being organized. The purpose is to increase the transparency of the budgetary process and to be a learning opportunity as to how the economics of the university works. More information will be forthcoming.
6. The legislative situation remains in flux. On the table are the guaranteed tuition bill, the bill having to do with handguns on campus, and outcome-based funding. A bill was introduced that puts 25% of state funding contingent on outcomes.
7. The chancellor appears to be open to a 3.95% increase in tuition, which would generate maybe a couple of million dollars in new revenue. We are in the bottom quartile of whole state in tuition, and there is interest in addressing this.

Old Business: Johanna Schmertz, Shared Governance Draft

What are Senators hearing from their constituents?

1. We need a feedback loop to constituents to let people know where things are in the process. This is particularly true for curriculum issues (like program or course proposals). There is a new tracking system for curriculum which might be able to be used for tracking policies also. L. Bowen is looking in to how best to track policies.
2. How will policy-writing committees deal with prioritizing policies and how will they deal with administrative mandates?
3. Policies should go to DT_all users or to some repository that users can access themselves so that all stakeholders may see the process of revision.
4. There are concerns regarding the role of the Senate. One concern is about redundancy of function, especially at the faculty level. There is faculty representation on all standing policy committees. What additional expertise does the Senate bring in the approval process? It becomes unclear which faculty are the authoritative representatives of faculty interests.
5. Does Senate work only as a block in the new policy process? A Senator comments that the Senate can make recommendations, but it appears that the Senate's primary new function is as a roadblock in the policy process.

6. There are concerns about equity. This is a shared governance policy, not a faculty governance policy. For example, why are Staff Council and SGA not involved in the approval process, but Senate is?
    a. A Senator responded that this policy is about faculty's primary role in shaping the academic environment, hence the title "Academic Shared Governance."
    b. A FSEC member commented that the current policy includes all constituents. Why is a body composed only of faculty able to put a full stop on policy? How is this shared government?
7. Excerpts of the Senate resolution establishing the Shared Governance Task Force were read aloud to the Senate. This resolution can be found at: http://www.uhd.edu/facultyandstaff/facultysenate/documents/UHDSenateResolutiononAcademic SharedGovernance09-06-2011.pdf .

Motion: To send the shared governance draft to the standing committees.

In specific: The revised Shared Governance Policy will be forwarded to FAC and APC for review and revision with the following charge:

1. Both committees will individually review and discuss changes to the policy.
2. The chair of APC will take the lead in soliciting feedback from UCC, SGA, Staff Council, and the Provost's Office. As feedback is received, it will be shared with the chair of FAC and APC.
3. After the committees finish their individual work, the Chairs of both committees will meet to discuss changes their committees have made to the policy.
4. Should the changes be substantive and different between the two committees, a subcommittee will be formed with three members from each committee to come to a compromise on changes.
5. The chairs of APC and FAC will report back to the Senate on changes to the policy by no later than the second scheduled Senate meeting in the fall. The report should include a written and specific description of changes from the revised Shared Governance Policy.

Several Senators commented that faculty should be included in those who review and give feedback on the process.

A Senator commented that this policy is outside of the normal policy process.

A FSEC member commented that this is a question of legitimacy. We are quick to criticize when administration doesn't follow established policy. We need to send this policy through our established policy process.

An audience member commented that it is essential for Senate to maintain control of the feedback and approval process for this policy. The Senate is the primary architect of the shared governance process, along with the President. This is also a workload issue for APC and FAC

A FSEC member asked if there is really a fear that this policy will get lost in the process?

An audience member replied that this policy is too big for the regular policy process.

An Amendment was proposed as follows:

Change '2' to read: The Faculty Senate President will take the lead in soliciting feedback from UCC, SGA, Staff Council, the President, and the Faculty Assembly. As feedback is received, it will be shared with the chair of FAC and APC.

Change '5' from "second scheduled meeting in the fall" to "last scheduled meeting in the fall."

Motion to vote on the Amendment. In favor: 20; opposed: 2; abstentions: 1.

A Senator reports that the previous Senate had approved a process for revising this policy.

Motion: The Senate will decide how the revision process will proceed when the policy comes back to the Senate in the fall. In favor: 20; opposed: 2; abstentions: 0.

Main Motion: To send the shared governance draft to the standing committees.

In specific: The revised Shared Governance Policy will be forwarded to FAC and APC for review and revision with the following charge:

1. Both committees will individually review and discuss changes to the policy.
2. The Faculty Senate President will take the lead in soliciting feedback from UCC, SGA, Staff Council, the President, and the Faculty Assembly. As feedback is received, it will be shared with the chair of FAC and APC.
3. After the committees finish their individual work, the Chairs of both committees will meet to discuss changes their committees have made to the policy.
4. Should the changes be substantive and different between the two committees, a subcommittee will be formed with three members from each committee to come to a compromise on changes.
5. The chairs of APC and FAC will report back to the Senate on changes to the policy by no later than the last scheduled Senate meeting in the fall. The report should include a written and specific description of changes from the revised Shared Governance Policy.

Vote is called on the main motion, as amended. In favor: 22; opposed: 0; abstentions: 0.

Adjourn: 4:03 pm