

Minutes for Faculty Senate

December 1, 2010

3:00-5:00PM, SC310

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 11/17/10 meeting (2 abstentions)
3. (3:10) Appointments
 - a. Faculty Senate Technology Issues Committee Chair (Lidia Lee)
 - b. Search Committee for Associate Provost and Assistant Vice President for Research (2) (Candidates: Matt Evett, COSC; Russ Olwell (H&P),
 - c. Student Success Council. (2-year term)
 - i. CHHS
 - d. Gen Ed, Course Vetting (3-year)
 - i. Social Sciences
 - e. AQIP Comm. Category 1 (Helping Students Learn)
 - f. Non-academic IT advisory comm. (2-yr)
 - g. UBC (2 year term, except where noted)
 - i. At-large alternate (Zafar Khan)
 - h. University Transportation Comm. (Shinming Shyu, ET)
- 4.
5. (3:20) Resolution Concerning Promotion Materials [see attached] (tabled)
6. (3:25) Resolution Concerning the Classroom Technology Committee [see attached] (approved)
7. (3:30) President Martin
 - a. Proof that there is a bill for capital outlay. We will know in a few days.
 - b. Ribbon cutting (Reveal) at the Science Center, then Mark J renovation will start.
 - c. Bill to have CCs offer 4 year degrees is effectively dead for this session.
 - d. Lt Gov (elect) is a strong advocate for adding autism to health coverage.
 - e. Enrollment report for Fall 2011. Attracting higher GPAs. Looking like strong enrollment for next fall.
 - f. VP Stevick (Development) will be starting 12/20. Was a national competitive search. Didn't do public forums on the advice of the search company.
 - g. New governor-elect Snyder wrote a piece on educational system reform.
 - h. Q: What do you think is the feeling about the idea of CCs offering 4-year degrees? There's a lot of sentiment *for* it. We have offices in many CCs. There is an illusion that they will produce thousands of degrees.
 - i. Q: What's driving the application increase? Possibly communication (advertisements, etc), 0/0/0 likely helped. Recruiting is strong as well.

8. (3:50) Academic Review [Peggy Liggitt and Bob Neely]
 - a. Handout describing differences between the old Program Review and the new Academic Review.
 - b. Changes were the result of focus groups and external advice. Moved to an “assurance of quality”: if you have disciplinary accreditation, that’s good enough. If not, then you must have a student learning program assessment process. Reduced the department level questions.
 - c. Nothing tangible came out of program review. Now we have 80K to fund initiatives that come out of Academic Review.
 - d. Feedback on Program review was minimal. No real University Review of Program Review. Now we have a peer-review process.
 - e. AR is better, but there is room for improvement. Phase 2 includes an AR advisory committee to help put together focus groups. Focus groups would look at the questions and expected responses for clarity. Also cycle time for AR (rest on handout).
 - f. Q: Is goal-setting still part of AR? Yes. The focus groups might ask whether the ratings are really useful.
 - g. Q: If a department fails the accreditation process, what happens? No black and white answer. Provost and department would get together and figure out what needs to be done. All accreditation materials must go to the Provost’s office before being submitted to the accrediting body.
 - h. Q: Some accrediting bodies don’t use Student Learning Outcomes. What happens then? They will need to be developed.
 - i. Q: So programs that accredited don’t need the full Academic Review? Correct – departments still need to answer questions, but accredited programs do not.
9. (4:15) Resolution Concerning the Associate Provost [see attached] (approved)
10. Motion to invite Honor’s College to participate as a (non-voting) guest in FS.
 - a. Consider for the next meeting
11. (4:20) Early College Alliance [David Dugger]
 - a. Been around since 2007.
 - b. Could pull 2500 students out of schools and putting them in college classrooms.
 - c. Students are chosen by lottery.
 - d. Enrolled in sections over the campus.
 - e. Programs are aligned with what the University is looking for in a student.
 - f. Most students stay here!
12. (4:35) Provost’s Remarks
 - a. Neeley gave an overview of the Budget at the Budget Colloquium. It will be made available to Matt for us to review. Requested suggestions for increasing revenues, taking input on budget matters, etc. There will be a website for this.

- b. Numbers were revealed that need to be shared:
 - i. Way down in extramural research applications.
 - ii. Every year, NAFSA gives the Simon award for campus internationalization. We've submitted an application for nomination.
- 13. (4:45) Should we meet 1/5/11?
 - a. Not unless the EB has pressing business.
- 14. (4:50) Report from the EEFC (Pray Harold and Mark Jefferson projects)
 - a. David asked for concerns about the MJ move.
- 15. (4:55) President's Remarks:
 - a. BoR Meeting 12/16/10
 - b. Next Faculty Senate Meeting will be 1/19/2011 unless otherwise necessary.

A Resolution Concerning Promotion Materials

From Chris Mayda

The Faculty Senate recognizes the value of the efficient use of time and energy by faculty and the sustainable use of materials. Some faculty seeking tenure or promotion have provided boxes of supporting information, using thousands of pieces of paper when a single DVD can include all the necessary information, and in a far more organized format. The Senate suggests that departments consider, wherever possible, the use of digital media in the presentation of supporting materials for promotion and tenure applications. If anything within the promotion package is questioned, the faculty member can deliver the originals or paper facsimiles as requested.

A Resolution Concerning the Classroom Technology Committee

From Faculty Senate Executive Board

The Faculty Senate recognizes and appreciates the hard work of the Classroom Technology Committee in identifying, vetting, and selecting instructional technology to be including in EMU's classrooms. The Senate, however, is troubled that it was not asked to appoint faculty to the committee. The work of the committee is clearly of great importance to the faculty in all our colleges, and faculty input should be sought. The Senate understands that the Classroom Technology Committee will now report to the Educational Environment & Facilities Committee, which does have Faculty Senate appointees, and this change is welcomed.

A Resolution Recognizing the Service of Robert Neely

From Faculty Senate Executive Board

The Faculty Senate recognizes and appreciates the twenty-six years of faithful service Robert Neely has given to Eastern Michigan University. Bob has served Eastern in many capacities, including as a teacher, researcher, department head,

Associate Dean, Associate Provost, Interim Provost, and Associate Vice President of Research. The Faculty Senate wishes him continued success in his future work as Provost at Texas Women's University.

Attending: P Koehn (P&A); C Day (WL); L Lee (SpEd); M Reedy (ART); L Kolopjlo (CHEM); H Sachdu (MKT/LAW); Z Kahn (ACC&FIN); K Saules (PSYCH); R Woods (AAS); J Nims (LIB); J Jones (MATH); B Winning (BIO); S McCracken (CMTA); J Texter (SET); T Brewer (Grad C); D Crary (ECON); M Higbee (H&P); W Zirk (MAD); D Chou (CIS); B Orrange (SAC); T Moreno (HHP); C Mayda (G&G); K Banerji (MGMT); M Evett, (ComSci); K Kustron (STS); S Norton (ENGL); Provost Jack Kay (ex officio)