

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MINUTES – MEETING THIRTEEN

May 19, 2010, 3 – 5 p.m.

320 Student Center

www.emich.edu/facultysenate

faculty\_senate@emich.edu

487-0196

**I. Approval of the Minutes of April 7, 2010**

Daryl Barton moved and Perry Francis seconded the approval of the minutes. After correction of a spelling error, the minutes were approved (24 – 0 – 1).

**II. Search Process for a Director of The Honors College**

The following resolution passed 18 – 5 – 3. *The Provost's office is running a search for a new head of the Honors College. The faculty members who comprise the Honors College Advisory Committee—appointed by the Faculty Senate—are serving on the search committee. Unfortunately, the timing of the creation of the search committee precluded the Senate's right to name members to that committee. The Senate recognizes the work being done by the Honors College Advisory Committee, but because the Honors College is a university-wide institution, to qualify as official faculty representation, the members of the search committee should have been appointed by the Senate directly. The Senate calls upon the Provost to ensure that future searches work within the timeframe of the Senate's processes.*

The provost indicated that he is comfortable with the resolution. He added that according to the contract this position is not one on which faculty need to provide input, but he is interested in obtaining faculty input when possible. He also indicated that he appreciates that some faculty preferred that an interim be appointed, but an interim seemed inappropriate to him at this time.

**III. Discussion and Nature of 0 – 0 – 0**

Matt Evett indicated that President Martin mentioned to him that he should have been notified of the proposal at the same time as other administrators; however, Matt was not notified. Other concerns raised were that University Budget Council was not given the opportunity to provide input and that there are inadequate classrooms for the Fall term, especially if there is an increase in enrollment. Multiple faculty indicated that the failure to let faculty know was disrespectful, insulting, and led faculty again to feel out of the loop. Many faculty members felt positive about the proposal but negative about the process followed. As a result many faculty members labeled the proposal with a fourth 0 for lack of faculty input.

**IV. Report by Provost Jack Kay**

**A. Higher Education Commission Visit.** The feedback was very positive. EMU was found to follow the federal code and to be on track for full accreditation in a year. Specific recommendations included showcasing EMU's quality better during the Week of Excellence, collaborating with peer institutions to decrease the workload involved in assessments, integrating better the quality improvement initiatives across campus, and clarifying the process of university strategic planning. The provost thanked the faculty and administrators who created the write-up for the Higher Education Commission.

Bob Neely indicated that he already is in contact with other AQIP schools in the state in order to learn more about possible ways to increase the efficiency of assessments. Further, EMU has been asked to clarify how Continuous

Improvement can apply across campus, even though the office is in Academic Affairs.

Provost Kay indicated that Bob Neely has been extracting the 6 or 7 themes from the different reports on strategic plans. There also is an Institutional Strategic Council which will convene when needed.

Daryl Barton indicated that this planning is an excellent opportunity to get faculty involved. Such involvement increases faculty's motivation to support the goals.

- B. Titles.** Currently the head librarian is called the University Librarian. The provost requested feedback on the pros and cons of making this a dean position. This name change would lead to more consistency with what other universities do. However, Elaine Martin pointed out that this would make the library seem analogous to the other colleges, and this really does not fit. Further, deanships are mentioned in the contract. The provost made clear that it are exactly these different aspects on which he would like feedback. He also would like to have feedback on changing the director of the Honors College to dean of the Honors College.
- C. Course Management Software.** The provost indicated that he is beginning negotiations with e-College to see whether the bulk of conditions required can be met.

**V. Study Rooms in the Library – Daryl Barton**

Daryl Barton checked with Mary Murphy. The concern is that some faculty offices in the library are being used by individuals who have been displaced due to the construction and/or renovation of the Science Complex and Pray-Harrold. Two rooms are floaters which can be used by anyone on a very short-term basis, e.g., hours. This means that the other faculty rooms can be shared by 5 rather than 3 people, and if there is a conflict the faculty involved can settle the issue through time sharing and use of the floaters. This arrangement can be revisited if problems occur.

**VI. Ad Hoc Student Review Committee – Perry Francis**

The Faculty Development Center has wording which faculty are encouraged to use in their syllabi to define or describe cheating, plagiarism, etc. Faculty are encouraged to report infractions. If they already have dealt with the infraction, they should say so. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards will talk with the student only if they are asked to do so by the faculty, or if there are two reports about infractions by a person, so that sequential cheaters get caught. The record is destroyed when the student graduates.

Faculty are asked to differentiate between what is culturally different and what is aggressive. Culturally different actions require education of the student. The Office of the Ombudsman deals with cultural differences and also advocates for students. The office provides advisors to represent the student. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards is more disciplinary in orientation, dealing with cheating, threatening e-mails, etc.

The Ad Hoc Student Review Committee produced a report about creating and promoting academic honesty, respect for self and others, and campus safety and security. The report will be sent to Matt Evett for distribution to faculty. Following the report, the committee was thanked and disbanded.

## VII. Continuous Improvement of Administrators – Jean McEnery

- A. **Status Report.** Jean mentioned that the data are available. She recommends that the means and SDs of dimensions are presented along with the university average. Comments are listed, and the whole presentation is as neutral as possible. However, some of the comments by faculty were personal and not very professional.

**Discussion** led to the consideration of faculty evaluations as an appropriate model. This means that the comments, that is, qualitative data, are to be provided only to the person being evaluated, whereas numerical answers are presented to others also. One of the problems at this time is that the college councils will not meet before September, so that the councils are not available to provide the data. Yet feedback to the person evaluated and to those who participated in the survey should be provided in a timely matter; otherwise, the evaluations are no longer meaningful and both the data gathered and the process will be seen as ineffectual. Data can be posted on my.emich.edu, so that the data are password protected, or the data can be sent out by e-mail. Both ways lead to making the results public, albeit that the link to the posting should be sent out by e-mail to make sure that people know about the existence of the data and where the data can be found. Only motivated people are likely to look up the posting.

- B. **Resolution about Who Gets the Information.** Sandy Nelson proposed and Daryl Barton seconded that the qualitative results are provided only to the person being evaluated and the quantitative results to the person being evaluated, the person's college council, the faculty of the person's college, and the provost. The quantitative data will be made known to the appropriate individuals by e-mailing a link to the data for the specific college. The motion passed unanimously.
- C. **Resolution about When the Information is Sent.** Mark Higbee moved and Carol Haddad seconded the motion that *the data be provided as expeditiously as possible by the committee which did the evaluation, first to the person who was evaluated and then to the faculty of the college of the evaluated person and the provost.* The motion passed unanimously.

## VIII. Facilities Committee – David Crary

**The Motion.** *While currently the administration believes that there are sufficient classroom spaces, increased enrollment could leave classroom swing space for 2010-11 below projected needs. Therefore, the University needs to continue to identify additional classroom swing space. Without this action, it could be difficult to accommodate the enrollment increases upon which the 2010-11 budget is based.* This motion passed (24 – 0 – 2).

**Background for the Motion.** The faculty were under the impression that the swing space was based on the 2008 enrollment data, and, so far, some classroom assignment are problematic. Bob Neely indicated that the spaces were not based on 2008 enrollment data and that there are adequate classroom spaces. He will send out this information to faculty and also work on ways to permit faculty to check whether assigned classroom spaces are adequate to the needs of specific courses.

## IX. Announcements – Matt Evett

- A. **Evaluation Committee for Academic Programming for First Year Students.** Provost Kay would like to have the names of the individuals who volunteered

but were not elected in order to expand the committee from this group of faculty members. The request was approved unanimously.

- B. Faculty Senate Needs a New GA.** Matt has posted the position and is interviewing candidates.
- C. Search for a Graduate Dean.** Tim Brewer reports that the search committee has met and is writing the ad.
- D. Search for an IRIM Director.** The search is underway.
- E. Assistant VP for Academic Human Resources.** The Board of Regents still needs to approve the appointment, and they are expected to do so at the next meeting. The person would begin on August 1, 2010.
- F. A New University Librarian** has been chosen and will start this Summer.
- G. Electronic Voting, Minutes, Etc.** In order to help the Faculty Senate respond faster, senators are urged to consider using electronic communication. Perhaps electronic voting could be implemented. Should someone object, then the voting can be done at the next meeting. Adopting the minutes electronically would make more time available during meetings for other matters.

**X. Dates of the Next Meetings**

The date for the next Faculty Senate meeting is 6/16. The first meeting in the Fall term will be on September 15.

The Faculty Senate Executive Board will meet on 6/9 and 9/8.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alida Westman

**Present:** Z. Khan (ACC & FIN); J. Myers (ART); J. Eisenbach (BIO); L. Kolopaji (CHEM); D. Chou (CIS); K. Stacey (CMTA); M. Evett (COSC); D. Crary (ECON); S. Norton (ENG); C. Mayda (GEO/GEOL); M. Higbee (HIS/PHIL); S. Levine (HPHP); P. Francis (L & C); J. Nims (LIBRARY); J. Jones (MATH); K. Banerji (MGMT); D. Barton (MKT); W. Zirk (MUSIC & DANCE); M. DeBello (NURSING); E. Martin (PLS); A. Westman (PSY); R. Orrange (SAC); V. Howells (SHS); L. Lee (SPED); C. Haddad (STS); M. Bombyk (SWK); E. Lowenstein (TED); S. Gray (WGST); A. Illingworth (WORLD LANGUAGES)

**Ex-Officio:** J. Kay (PROVOST & EXECUTIVE VICE-PRESIDENT)

**Guests:** Bob Neely (ASSOCIATE PROVOST & ASSOCIATE VP FOR RESEARCH); T. Brewer (CHAIR OF GRAD COUNCIL); J. McEnery (COMMITTEE FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATORS); G. Larcom (COMMUNICATIONS & MEDIA RELATIONS); S. Baines Jr. (EASTERN ECHO); J. Carbone (SHS);

**Absent:** AAS; PHY/AST