
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE MEETING

**April 11, 2019
12:50 P.M. ENG 117**

Present: Christina Carmen, Laird Burns, Monica Dillihunt, Carmen Scholz, Jeff Weimer, Mike Banish, Tim Newman, Gang Wang, Vladimir Florinski, Lori Lioce, David Johnson,

- Faculty Senate President Mike Banish called the meeting to order at 12:58 pm.
- **Officer/Committee Reports**
 - Mike Banish, President
 - There are no administrative reports. The President and Provost are with the board of trustees today.
 - The Provost sent us the Academic Misconduct Policy. We will come back to this later.
 - The other thing I asked you all to look at was the Provost sent some information about retention. I did look at some of the websites. The problem is the real document is hidden behind a password.
 - Laird – External or internal links?
 - Mike – I sent that out March 29th. I tried to get into several and wrote her back for the passwords. The abstracts do give interesting ideas. If we can get the password, I think we should start looking at these.
 - I also sent out the response about Chapter 5 as to why it took so long. I don't have any comments about it. My thoughts with the standing order, we will deal with this with the new President.
 - We have the Board of Trustees meeting tomorrow. Anyone want to attend lunch with us tomorrow?
 - I have received responses back about having a sit down with Dr. Dawson. This will happen Wednesday the 24th, 11:15 – 12:30. It will take place in SSB 301C. I would like to set an agenda.
 - Carmen – I would like to add the handbook.
 - Mike – We have a set of items we want to address, but I will take some input.
 - Laird – I would recommend we enforce our time limits on each topic.
 - Monica – I want to know his view on diversity and his plan.
 - Laird – We do want this to be a welcome but address some issues. We don't want to complain the whole time.
 - Lori – Maybe bring up some of our accomplishments.
 - Jeff - We are a representation of our faculty. We need to let him know things that we are proud of and want to see sustained.
 - Mike – I think that you need to bring up RCEU. It is faculty led.

- Monica – I don't want to say what we don't have. From the standpoint of diversity, I want to know his views.
- Laird – Mike has met him before. I have some detailed emails with him. He is very engaging. I have let him know we want to collaborate with him.
- Mike – When I opened up my notebook after he was announced. I had written "stellar" by his name. My fear was that I wouldn't listen to anyone else after Monday because he was so good. He is a doer, engages, listens, and thinks through things. I gave him the example of us falling on the list. I asked how you are going to get us back. He went through them and addressed there were problems. Then he also said that he didn't understand how some ratings were.
- Monica – I know once the announcement came out there was buzz around the campus that we never got to meet him. Hearing you say that, you're probably the second or third person say this candidate was high on their list. I think it would be helpful to the faculty to let them know he was a good candidate. Maybe that can be a statement addressed to the faculty that he wasn't on campus and didn't get to meet. You saying that helped check off a concern of mine.
- Mike – I did push for his first visit here, but we didn't get it. Coming back, someone thought it was important for him to meet faculty. As this goes through, every representative among the campus should meet him. Lori was on the big committee. I think the search firm did some initial checking. During the committee, I considered that Ron Gray put this committee together in an interesting way.
- Jeff – In that framework of informing the faculty and trying to ease the discontent, I might propose that you as Faculty Senate President and member of the committee, put together a memo stating the committee was effective and worked in an ethical process. Also state that we are fully supportive of the elective process. I think you should bring that in at the faculty senate meeting. I think it would be much appreciated. It would then be record in the minutes.
- Monica – I think that would be helpful.
- David – We had an idea that something was going on, but so many didn't have a clue. They thought a Chancellor would be named first.
- Lori – There was an email that came back that stated the process had changed.
- David – Dr. Altenkirch was named a finalist and then came to campus. Then the process has changed.
- Carmen – I encourage you to do what Monica and Jeff suggest. I think it lets the board know that this wasn't appreciated.
- Lori – It was made very clear that the board of trustees select the President.
- Carmen – It is a breakdown of shared governance.
- Lori – They haven't cut us out completely with us having representation with our Faculty Senate President. I hate to always slap their hands.
- Tim – If we are a constitutional body, we need to behave like one and be more open. I know of no other public board that isn't accountable to anyone. They are not accountable to the Governor. I am really

disappointed in this. Each search there has been less public involvement than the one before. During the William's search, there were two that came on campus. I let him know that faculty expected to meet the candidate. This is strange to me. The Chancellor or anyone from the system office did not come and speak to faculty focus groups. I don't understand the step back. I think the bottom line is the board doesn't want to engage in meaningful shared governance. Every time we have a President, the authority can be spent in disadvantageous ways.

- Mike – When we finally meet with him, I think the opinion can be put forward. If he is as smart as I think he is, I don't think that will be a surprising statement to him.
- Lori – The board changed the process. He may have wanted to meet with faculty.
- Monica – This wasn't his fault. We don't want the faculty to resent him. I think we can start building a relationship to work together.
- David – I think there is a way to make a statement of the dissatisfaction but not with him.
- Carmen – This isn't with him but with the board.
- Lori – Maybe we write a letter to the board. We did ask the faculty to list characteristics we want. We did look over those.
- Monica – Those things you are saying were questions to us. We didn't know they really happened.
- Tim – I am not blaming either of you, Mike and Lori.
- Monica - I think we would have a total different conversation if you all stated that he was the last on your list, but that wasn't the case.
- Christina – When you came on to the committee, were you informed of the new process?
- Mike – Yes, we were told upfront.
- Christina – Were you under the nondisclosure to state that?
- Lori – We could tell that but nothing after. Maybe we should have made that clear to the senate so they could share that to their department.
- Christina – When did the process change? Was it documented?
- Lori – I just remember them telling us at the meeting. They want to streamline policies among the three of us. I understand the bigger vision, but I don't know how it rolled out.
- Monica – It sounds like we are moving into that UT process.
- Laird – They are going to have some kind of engagement with the President and the faculty. Are there some preferences to this?
- Mike – I think that is a discussion we have on the 24th. We can ask what his opinion is.
- Lori – Maybe we ask his vision for working with the faculty. He may have all this planned and is being proactive.
- Jeff – I would ask that we keep all this discussion about the board out of that meeting.
- Carmen – It has nothing to do with the new President, but our leadership.
- Laird Burns, President Elect
 - No report.

- Carmen Scholz, Past President
 - No report.
- Tim Newman, Parliamentarian
 - No report.
- Christina Carmen, Ombudsperson
 - No report.
- Gang Wang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair
 - We finished a lot of changes. We have a few we are reviewing now.
- Jeff Weimer, Finance and Resource Committee Chair
 - The students now have to go through a background check.
 - Laird – That process was supposed to be fixed when I was Chair.
- David Johnson, Faculty and Student Development Committee Chair
 - All but five departments have returned the surveys. They are due tomorrow. I sent out a reminder this morning and another tomorrow.
- Monica Dillihunt, Undergraduate Scholastic Affairs Committee Chair
 - No report.
- Vladimir Florinski, Personnel Committee Chair
 - We reviewed the Telecommunications Policy. I will send a version to you later today. I have some corrections.
 - Mike – Is it okay enough to add to the agenda? Who else was supposed to look at this policy?
 - Jeff – Maybe my committee?
- Lori Lioce, Governance and Operations Committee Chair
 - I have been working to see if we have the right number of representatives. It took a while to find out how many senators we should have. I have asked for counts by department.
 - Tim – Is this counting nontenured?
 - Lori – It does. The bylaws state that some of the nontenured count in this.
 - Tim – You can't do that.
 - Lori – We are trying to get an accurate count with the bylaws. We need clarifications with this. Every department is different. I would like for us to look at this.
 - Tim – You want full time tenured, tenure track, clinical, or research. You then divide by seven. That is how you get your number. Some departments won't meet their number being a small department. Clinical and research are not tenure track.
 - Monica – We have clinical that are tenured and nontenured.
 - Tim – That is out of order.
 - Monica – The University does, because in nursing.
 - Mike – What do we do about business?
 - Tim – Their rep numbers are correct.
 - Mike – As far as elections, what do we do about them? They aren't departments anymore?
 - Tim – They are two departments. You get the numbers for units, then go to college and do the same. If the unit is larger that is ok. Another thing when we vote for senators and officers, the lecturers do not vote, correct?
 - Mike – Yes.

- Mike – You should be able to tell us our nominations because the nominations are closed.
- Lori – Peggy will send out the ballot. For all fairness, are we supposed to announce it? Tim, is it always disclosed?
- Monica – I think we said who it was and called Peggy and she sent it out.
- Tim – That is an okay way to do it.
- Lori – Monica and Tim for President-Elect. Jason O’Brien, Elizabeth Barnby, and Carmen Scholz for Ombudsperson.
- Mike – Is Jason a seating senator? Or incoming? He cannot be on the ballot.
- Lori – I would like to move the President and President-Elect up and replace them on the attendance roster.
- Christina – When this ballot is sent out to the faculty eligible, I think it would be nice to have a bio statement and not just vote on names.
- Laird – I think you can invite them to do that.
- Lori – Sometimes it is a random checkmark.
- Mike – You can ask them to do a campaign statement.
- Lori – How do we handle permanent proxies?
- Mike – You should put him on the email list. We try to have a member from each college on each committee. In the College of Education, there are only two people. Monica has a permanent proxy that she informs these committee members. That is different than Vinny with David.
- Mike – Who has read the latest version on the bylaws?
- Lori – It just needs to be cleaned up a little.
- Mike – Do we want to have a link to the standing rule on the faculty senate page or the entire text? My thought is to post the entire text. What do you all think?
 - Jeff – What is the intent of the front page of the senate page? The faculty should be able to go there and see what they need to find. I am afraid it will clutter the page.
 - Lori – I know you want to put pressure on the administration.
 - David - I think that is the intent?
 - Mike – It was published under the old administration.
 - Lori – You also have a bunch of new senators coming in?
 - Jeff – I disagree. I don’t think they need to see the whole thing.
 - Tim – I just think it needs to be somewhere prominent.
 - Christina – How long is it?
 - Tim – About a page.
 - Lori – What if you put it with the minutes?
 - Tim – My idea was this would be posted with passed resolutions.
 - Lori – Maybe put in parenthesis what standing order means.
- Mike – Academic Misconduct Policy. I would like to discuss that in the senate. I don’t want to pass it out of here.
 - Tim – I have several issues but one is that Chapter 8 already addresses this. One concern is that we are setting up a parallel set of rules to the handbook.
 - Mike – I think we could declare that this policy is a mirror to Chapter 8 and we won’t consider it.
 - Monica – Some of the processes and it was very reactive. We didn’t have anything in place for them to legally move forward.

- Lori – Who would it go back to if we sent it back to be merged?
 - Mike – It goes back to the Provost and we state that we have Chapter 8.
 - Monica – This was students.
 - Mike – Chapter 8 includes students.
 - Monica – But not procedure. Is it handled in the handbook?
 - Tim – The verbiage in the handbook is not in the policy. It basically says to handle your course.
 - Monica – I may deal with plagiarism different if it wasn't intentional. There wasn't anything procedural wise listed. We tried to leave a lot of it in the hands of the faculty member.
 - Christina – When a student goes into a classroom, that isn't associated with a particular professor.
 - Mike – We are running parallel documents.
 - Monica – Is that detail of the process in the handbook?
 - Tim – I don't know the procedure needs to be in the handbook. The two need to be in harmony. I think another section of Chapter 8 should be brought forward. Do we want to have a statement that says refer to the policy? With the current system, an advantage we have is I can give a penalty and then file a complaint for an additional sanction. This policy doesn't seem to show that. There are parallel penalty tracks.
 - Monica – It wasn't supposed to.
 - Jeff – It seems to me the discussion is the faculty handbook is supposed to be set in stone. The policies are things we have the flexibility to change. We don't want things established in policies that can be changed on a whim. You can have something written in the handbook but procedures listed in policy that may need to change.
 - Mike – The administration loves to put interim policies in place. Some of these things are so important that they need to be set in stone. Plagiarism and cheating needs to be set in stone. There is no reason not to. I see setting up an interim policy to show how to handle the most recent situation, but we work to match the handbook to that. The policies shouldn't be the primary document.
 - Lori – What is the process?
 - Mike – We will discuss it in faculty senate and my recommendation will be it represents a parallel to the handbook. The handbook needs to be revised first.
 - Tim – We have tried to be proactive on that with an instructor policy. We have put a timeline on it and let it go as an interim policy.
 - Mike – Modified Duties doesn't exist anymore, it expired.
 - Christina – Having a deadline on these policies is a great idea.
 - Tim – I think it needs some reworking. A revision to 8.32 should come at the same time. I also think Bob and Christine need to respond on 7 and 9.
 - Mike – Also 5.
 - Monica – We need something in place right away.
- Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting:
- Bylaws.
 - Committee Chair Elections.
 - Discussion of Academic Misconduct Policy.
 - All in favor. Ayes carry.
- Meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.