

# Minutes for Faculty Senate

March 21, 2012

3:00-5:00PM, SC310A

Attending: M Peters (AAS), M Reedy (ART), B Winning (BIOL), T Brewer (CHEM), K Stacey (CMTA), M Evett (COSC), D Crary (ECON), S Norton (ENG), C Mayda (G&G), J Koolage (H&P), W Zirk (M&D), P Koehn (P&A), K Saules (PSYCH), R Orrange (SAC), S Gray (WGST), M Zinggeler (WL), J Carbone (HS), M Rahman (ACC&FIN), D Chou (CIS), K Banerji (MGMT), D Barton (MKT&LAW), L Stevens (SPED), P Smith (TED), J Texter (ET), K Kustron (TS), T Brewer (Grad Council), R Baier (LIB), K Schatzel (Provost)

Not attending: G Dumitrascu (MATH), M Bombyk (SW), S Nelson (NURS), E Martin (PS), T Moreno (HPHP), P Francis (L&C),

1. (3:00) Approval of agenda (Approved)
2. (3:05) Approval of the minutes of the 3/7 meeting (attached) (Approved, one abstention)
3. (3:10) Committee Appointments
  - a. Computer Refresh Committee (3)
    - i. Aaron Liepman (BIO)
    - ii. James Banfield (STS)
    - iii. Carole Pawlowski (Art)
    - iv. Memet Yaya (ECON)
    - v. Matt Sauber (COB)
    - vi. David Winters (SED)
    - vii. Sauber and Banfield received a plurality of votes, a run-off for the third position commenced.
    - viii. Carol Pawlowski was approved as the third representative.
  - b. University Research and Sabbatical Leave Committee (URSLC) (1 from COT, 1 from CHHS)
  - c. eFellows Committee (1 from COT and 1 from LIB)
    - i. Ali Eydgahi (SET)
    - ii. Randall Baier (LIB) (Sara Memet, alt)
    - iii. Both approved unanimously by acclamation
4. (3:25) Resolution (2<sup>nd</sup> reading) supporting new eFellows charter [Randy Baier] [See <http://www.emich.edu/facdev/efellows/index.html>]
  - a. Meeting on Friday, holding off until next meeting (4/4)
5. (3:40) Resolution regarding the CAC's request to appoint representatives to university committees (see below)
  - a. Jill Dieterle spoke in favor of the change, Matt Evett spoke against it.
  - b. Largest change proposed by the CAC: Whenever there is a committee that has memberships divided over colleges, the college councils will make the appointments.

- c. Council groups doing the appointments do not have enough information to appoint appropriate members for University-level service.
  - d. Again, representatives appointed by the FS are on a given committee to represent the entire faculty, not their individual colleges.
  - e. Comment: If the CAC proposal passes, it seems likely that there will be a reduction in the number of committees, as the administration may risk a grievance for going to the wrong meeting.
  - f. Comment: Representatives in general (regardless of appointing body) represent the faculty in general, rarely their own department or college.
  - g. Comment: We should speak with a single voice, and the current system provides for that.
  - h. Comment: Complaints by the CAC do not substantively show any defects in the current system. We could raise the bar on our current system and discuss it in a calm manner, but there is no problem to be fixed.
  - i. Comment: The problem cited springs from a misinterpretation in roles by one of our appointees. We should do more to instruct our appointees about their roles.
  - j. Comment: There are issues with the Research vetting committees, many internal and systemic.
  - k. Comment: In our resolution, we should not be concerned with arguing the CAC's points. We represent the entire faculty, including members of the CAC.
  - l. Comment: The arguments here slice the logic fairly thinly. We need to explicitly state the distinction between serving on a College committee and a University committee.
  - m. Calling the question: Vote to close debate: 5 ayes, motion fails.
  - n. Union Comment: What is the normal procedure for resolutions? Ans: First reading, then a second reading with a vote.
  - o. Executive board will meet on Monday and wordsmith.
6. (3:55) Resolution requesting action on the CAC's request to change BA/BS nomenclature
- a. This resolution urges action on our prior two resolutions (from 2/2010 (passed), and then again in 5/2011(tabled)).
  - b. This resolution officially starts the 30-day clock.
  - c. Passes unanimously.
7. (4:05) Provost Office's "Minutes"
- a. Funds referred to for the coming year are a one-time-only increase. A tuition increase is forever. EMU has not looked at separate increases for Graduate and Undergraduate tuition. The performance language from Lansing refers only to Undergraduate tuition.
  - b. We have two individuals in the Provost Office, R Longworth and J Carroll. Kim Shatzel would like to make them permanent.

- i. Comment: Given the importance of research here, the VP for research should have research credentials. Our existing Interim VP for Research has little. Resp: This position is more oriented toward ORD and grant writing.
  - ii. Comment: The existing interims were not selected as part of a search – it was by fiat. There should be a national search.
  - iii. Comment: A national search would raise our expectations and gain us a better pool of applicants.
  - iv. Question: When will the decision be made? Resp: Waiting for input from FS, definitely not over the Summer.
  - v. Comment: The FS passed a resolution a while back about recommendations and search committees for making interim positions permanent.
- 8. (4:15) Committee Reports
  - a. EEFC [David Crary]
    - i. Tomorrow's (3/22) meeting: Looking at a systematic budget for outfitting the rest of the classrooms with technology, and then putting a 7-year refresh cycle in place.
  - b. Univ. Budget Comm. [Mahmud Rahman]
    - i. Mahmud has produced a written report for distribution at this meeting (attached)
    - ii. Recommendation of a tuition increase no less than 4% for FY13.
    - iii. Comment: Block pricing at UM probably would not work here, taking 15 credits for the price break will end in failure.
    - iv. Comment: This is just another way to make more money – it only puts more pressure on our students to take more credits.
      - 1. Many of our courses are 4-5 credits, if we work on a course-block system it may help the students (need clarification here)
    - v. Comment: It seems logical that if the bar is set at 12, and a student takes a high-credit course, it could bump them up over the bar and cost them more.
  - c. Student Success Council [Marti Bombyk]
  - d. eFellows/FDC [Randy Baier]
    - i. Question from eFellows: There have been a number of requests from part-time faculty for funding – they are not eligible. Perhaps we could have part-time faculty partner with full-time faculty for these grants.
    - ii. There seems to be two sides here.
      - 1. The ultimate question is whether it benefits the students. It does benefit the students, so this side makes sense.
      - 2. On the other hand, full-time faculty members do a large amount of independent development, so it is appropriate to limit eligibility.

- iii. Comment: We have a limited pot of money, and restricting eligibility will benefit students in the long run – the equipment purchased stays with the department. As eFellows includes both tenure track and full-time lecturers, there are plenty of applicants.
    - iv. Comment: Our part-timers are exploited as they are, so denying the chance for official recognition and professional development.
    - v. Comment: If we support a national search for administrative positions, why not a broader search for eFellows?
    - vi. These comments will be taken back to the eFellows committee.
  - e. Search for Chief of Police [Matt Evett]
    - i. 5 candidates will be invited to the campus for interviews. One of them is an internal candidate. All of the candidates are good.
  - f. University Strategic Planning [Matt Evett]
    - i. Organization seems akin to herding cats. Timeline remains the same; the formal input process for the documents will come out in the Fall semester.
- 9. (4:40) President's Remarks
  - a. Congratulations to John Koolage on winning a DFA in Teaching.
    - i. Applause ensued.
    - ii. Reminder to attend the Award ceremony next Wednesday.
  - b. New Senate Office
    - i. We are moved.
    - ii. The phones have not.
  - c. Additional business: Students may not be forbidden from coming to class with their infants. What are we as individuals doing about it?
    - i. Executive Board will discuss it.
  - d. Faculty Awards, Wednesday, March 28, 3-5PM.
  - e. Next FS meeting: April 4, 2012, in SC310. Next FSEB meeting is *Monday, March 26, 2012, SC304.*

## **Resolutions**

### **Resolution 20120321.1: Opposing the CAC's Request to Name Members to University Committees**

Faculty Senate Executive Board

*Whereas* the College Advisory Council of the College of Arts and Science has introduced a proposal to the AAUP Bargaining Council to change the way faculty are appointed to some university committees. The proposal asks that whenever a representative to a university committee is to be appointed to a position reserved for a particular college that the faculty council of the respective college make that appointment rather than the Senate. (The term "college" will refer to the five colleges as well as the library for the rest of this resolution.)

*Whereas* for more than thirty years the Faculty Council/Senate has been contractually mandated to appoint faculty members to all university committees unless otherwise expressly noted by the Contract, and

*Whereas* at several times during those years the administration has claimed that they received "input" from committees because they included faculty members, though those members were not named by the Senate, resulting in grievances filed through the AAUP, and

*Whereas* the need for such grievances now rarely arise because the Senate president regularly receives requests for the creation of committees and for appointments to committees from all levels of the administration, and

*Whereas* on some committees positions are reserved for faculty from particular colleges not so the appointees can "represent" their college, but rather to ensure a breadth of experience and knowledge on those committees, and

*Whereas* allowing the college councils to approve university committee members rather than the Senate would have several deleterious effects including:

- A weakened Senate: Lessening the power of the Senate by weakening the strength and value of the Senate in the eyes of the administration.
- An increased number of grievances: The administration would then need to contact six different representative bodies to obtain committee appointments, greatly increasing the probability of miscommunication leading to possible grievances.
- A less informed appointment process: Senate members are better acquainted than their college council colleagues with the workings of university committees because they regularly receive reports from them. This familiarity informs the Senate's votes as to which committee candidates

would best serve on behalf of the faculty on the committees. The proposed change would yield a less informed appointment process.

- Less cross-college interaction: When the Senate is discussing candidates for committee positions it is very often the case that senators from departments or colleges other than the candidates' will speak on behalf of the candidates. Senators may have served on a committee with a candidate, or have developed a program or co-taught a course with them. This knowledge is particularly valuable in placing someone on a university level committee where the candidate will have to represent *all* faculty, not just those of their college. This cross-college knowledge would be lost if appointments were made by the college councils.
- Duplication of effort: The responsibility of determining which committee positions are open, and of advertising and making assignments to those positions is currently centralized in the Senate. This results in a significant amount of work (*many* hours) that would now be duplicated across every college.

*Whereas* the CAC proposal presupposes two misconceptions as its basis:

- 1) It assumes that committee members act to support or advocate for their own college over the needs of other colleges. Our experience has been that in every case the faculty representatives have been primarily interested in advocating for the *whole* faculty and our students and not for the interests of their own colleges. The benefit of multi-college membership on a committee is the diversity of viewpoints rather than somehow ensuring that resources are divided equitably among the colleges.
- 2) It assumes that senators, when making appointments to positions reserved for colleges other than their own are not working for what is best for those other colleges. On the contrary, in all votes senators aim to choose the candidate they think will best represent the whole faculty, in the context of that candidate's background.

*Therefore* be it resolved that the Faculty Senate calls upon the AAUP Bargaining Council not to adopt the CAC proposal. Moreover the Senate strongly encourages the college councils to nominate candidates for any committee position keeping in mind that such an endorsement would significantly improve a candidate's election prospects within the Senate.

## CAC Representation to the URLSC

### Some background from the current contract:

#### ARTICLE XII. SABBATICAL LEAVES, RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY FELLOWSHIPS, AND OTHER AWARDS

361 D.

##### Screening Committee

A broadly representative screening committee, consisting of six (6) Faculty Members appointed by the Faculty Senate, one (1) academic Dean, and two (2) academic Department Heads appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Provost and Executive Vice President, shall have the following duties:

1. Review and rank all applications for Sabbatical Leaves and Research/Creative Activity Fellowships and transmit the findings to the Provost and Executive Vice President who shall review them and make his/her recommendation to the President.
2. Make an annual report containing an account of the operation of the Sabbatical Leave and Research/Creative Activity Fellowship program during the preceding year, and recommendations concerning any matter relevant to the program, a copy of which shall be made available to the Association.

#### ARTICLE XIII: FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE

386 C.

The Faculty Senate shall provide recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice President, with copies to the EMU-AAUP on all credit producing areas and instructional matters including but not limited to admissions, advising, withdrawals and incompletes, grading, attendance, assessment, General Education, Continuing Education, research, and other instructional matters affecting more than one (1) college. The Provost and Executive Vice President or designee shall respond in writing to written recommendations in a timely manner.

### A note from the president of the College Advisory Council (of the CAS)

From: "Jill Dieterle" <[jdieterle@emich.edu](mailto:jdieterle@emich.edu)>

To: "elaine martin" <[elaine.martin@emich.edu](mailto:elaine.martin@emich.edu)>, [smoeller@emich.edu](mailto:smoeller@emich.edu)

Cc: [jegge@emich.edu](mailto:jegge@emich.edu), [wkoolage@emich.edu](mailto:wkoolage@emich.edu), [mstrasma@emich.edu](mailto:mstrasma@emich.edu)

Sent: Monday, March 5, 2012 7:48:34 AM

Subject: Fwd: College Council input to Bargaining Council

Elaine and Susan,

I am forwarding to you a proposal for the Bargaining Council from the CAS CAC. As you can see from the email below, I have also forwarded the proposal to the other college council chairs for consideration by the other colleges.

The current method of electing representatives is very strange. Just last month, the CAS rep to the Student Success Council came to CAC to solicit input. We did not elect this individual, which made the discussion very odd. If an individual is supposed to represent us, we should be the body who elects that representative.

The representation to URLSC is especially important. Historically, the rankings coming out of URLSC diverge greatly from the rankings coming out of CCRSL. CCRSL puts in a tremendous amount of time and effort discussing and ranking the proposals, and, given the way things are now, all of that gets lost when the proposals move forward to URLSC. The proposal aims to fix this problem. College councils will have the option of appointing a rep from the college level screening committee to the URLSC.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Jill

I've cc'd my departmental representatives to the Bargaining Council.

Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2012 07:32:33 -0500

To: [ptartalo@emich.edu](mailto:ptartalo@emich.edu), [mkinneys@emich.edu](mailto:mkinneys@emich.edu), [dtanguay@emich.edu](mailto:dtanguay@emich.edu),  
[smoeller@emich.edu](mailto:smoeller@emich.edu), [pwalsh@emich.edu](mailto:pwalsh@emich.edu)

From: Jill Dieterle <[jdieterle@emich.edu](mailto:jdieterle@emich.edu)>

Subject: College Council input to Bargaining Council

College Council Chairs:

Our last contract gave Faculty Senate the right to appoint all faculty representatives to university-wide committees. The intent was to make sure that representatives were elected by faculty, not appointed by the administration. However, giving such authority to the Faculty Senate has resulted in many oddities. College Councils used to appoint their own representatives to things like the Library Advisory Council, the Extended Programs Advisory Council, etc., but now those representatives are appointed by the Faculty Senate. As a result, people from all colleges are voting on representatives from specific colleges. This is undemocratic. When a faculty representative is supposed to represent a particular college, the representative really should be elected by the College Council in question, not the Faculty Senate.

The attached proposal is aimed at fixing this problem. The CAS CAC unanimously voted in favor of it and I am forwarding it to the Bargaining Council as input from CAS. It would be stronger, though, if it had the support of all of the colleges, and so I request that you put it on the agenda for your College Council to consider.

Note also that the proposal specifically addresses the election of representatives to the University Research and Sabbatical Leaves Committee. Giving the College Councils the right to appoint their own representative to URSLC is a much more democratic and transparent method for selecting representatives to this important committee. Furthermore, it will allow more continuity between college-level and university-level screening committees.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I am more than happy to attend your meetings to discuss the proposal if you think that would be helpful.

Thanks for your consideration,  
Jill



Jill Dieterle, Ph.D.  
Chair, College of Arts and Sciences Advisory Council  
Professor, Department of History and Philosophy  
Eastern Michigan University

---

**Resolution 20120321.2: Urging Action on Labeling Bachelor's Degrees as "of Arts" or "of Science"**

Whereas the College Advisory Council (CAC) of the College of Arts and Sciences passed a resolution on October 30, 2011, calling for the Provost's Office to adopt a policy allowing each program/department to determine the naming of its bachelors degrees (for example, "Bachelor of Arts" or "Bachelor of Science") and

Whereas the Faculty Senate unanimously passed a resolution on February 17, 2010, supporting an earlier resolution by the CAC, stating that "*Each academic program should determine the degree type that is appropriate for its graduates (B.A., B.S., etc.). Remove one year of college credit in a foreign language as the distinction between the B.A. and the B.S.*" and

Whereas in a memo on May 5, 2011 Provost Jack Kay suggested three different frameworks for determining the naming of bachelor's degrees and

Whereas at the Senate meeting of September 7, 2011 the Provost's office requested that the Faculty Senate and the CAC consider formal written criteria to determine whether a BA or BS should be awarded and

Whereas the CAC has surveyed many of Eastern's peer institution and determined that most of them do not require a written criteria but instead rely on their individual departments to determine the name of their bachelors' degrees, and

Whereas the CAC's resolution calls for the use of the usual, contractual, faculty input process to vet any changes to the names of program degrees, thereby involving all departments and colleges in the process and providing a reasoned, careful evaluation of degree name changes, and

Whereas a similar resolution to this one, 20111116.2, was read and discussed at the Faculty Senate meeting of November 16, 2011, but the resolution was tabled until a permanent provost could be appointed and that has now occurred, therefore

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the CAC's response of October 30, 2011 and asks that the Provost's Office move to implement this policy change as

soon as possible, and report back to the Senate on this issue no later than April 18, 2012.

**Background:** The central paragraphs in the CAC's resolution are:

**We suggest, rather, that the criterion for each degree should be the program of study.** The unifying experience for our students should be at the level of *bachelors degree* (i.e., all students who earn a bachelors degree from EMU must...), not at the level of *Bachelor of Arts* and *Bachelor of Science*. We have requirements in place for the bachelors degree: university graduation requirements (including General Education). The "... of Arts" and "... of Sciences" should be appropriate to the program of study.

Proposals for each program's degree type should be subject to the standard input process: proposed by programs/departments and reviewed by all of the college councils.

The full text of the CAC resolution is appended here:

To: Rhonda Longworth, Associate Provost  
From: Jill Dieterle, College of Arts and Sciences Advisory Council  
Cc: Tom Venner, CAS Dean; Matt Evett, Faculty Senate President  
Provost Kay's memo of 5/5/2011 suggests three different frameworks for awarding Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. Below is the response from CAC.

Framework (1) suggests that the B.S remain the default; Framework (2) suggests that the B.A. become the default. But to make either degree a "default" is to denigrate the default degree, suggesting that it is lesser than the other degree. This is not the case; the B.A. is the preferred degree for the arts and humanities, whereas the B.S. is the preferred degree for the sciences. We therefore do not endorse either of these frameworks.

Framework (3) suggests that EMU institute different criteria for the B.S. and the B.A., and then programs must meet the criteria for their graduates to qualify for the degree in question.

**We suggest, rather, that the criterion for each degree should be the program of study.**

The unifying experience for our students should be at the level of *bachelors degree* (i.e., all students who earn a bachelors degree from EMU must...), not at the level of *Bachelor of Arts* and *Bachelor of Science*. We have requirements in place for the bachelors degree: university graduation requirements (including General Education). The "... of Arts" and "... of Sciences" should be appropriate to the program of study.

Proposals for each program's degree type should be subject to the standard input process: proposed by programs/departments and reviewed by all of the college councils.

Provost Kay's memo suggests that it is the norm that there be some criteria distinguishing the B.A. from the B.S. However, our research does not support this conclusion. We surveyed all of the Michigan Publics, all of the MAC schools, and all of the EMU identified peer institutions (38 schools). While some of the schools do have specific criteria for the two degrees, they are not

consistent about what those criteria are. Furthermore and most importantly, 23 of the 38 institutions make the degree type dependent on the program of study.