

APPROVED MINUTES Faculty Senate 12 .4.2013

[Attendance: K. Schatzel (Provost), M. Rahman (A&F), R. Woods (AA), J. Demarte (Art), B. Winning (Bio), D. Chou (CIS), R. Quiel (CMTA), Z. Bahorski (CS), S. Hayworth (Econ), A. Eydgahi (Eng.Tech), S. Norton (Eng), R. Flowers (Grad), M. Bluhm (HS), J. Koolage (H&P), K. Woodiel (HPHP), P. Francis (L&C), R. Baier (Lib), K. Banerji (MGMT), D. Barton (M&L), G. Dumitrascu (Math), P. Trewn (Nurs), J. Kullberg (PS), R. Longworth (Provost Office), K. Rusiniak (Psych), R. Orrange (SAC), M. Wedenoja (SW), P. Smith (Spc.Ed), N. Monera (Std.Govt), M. McVey (T.Ed), P. Majeske (T.Std), D. Mihaly (WGST), M. Zinggeler (WL)

[Minutes before John arrived:

Notes for December 4

I. 3:04 opened meeting

II. Approval of Agenda

A. Change in agenda. Item 6a: add remarks by Provost, omitted by mistake

B. Other adds? Approved at 3:08

III. Minutes review

A. Approved 3:09.

B. Attendance sheet from last meeting not returned. We will circulate a separate sheet for Nov 20, 2013.

IV. Today's guest: Ombudsperson Dr. Chiara Hensley is in the house. Office of the Ombuds

A. From Ann Arbor, undergrad at UofM MA at EMU, PhD at Nova Southeastern. Experience in California programming.

B. "who am I" – started at a difficult but busy, challenging time

C. my job is to develop the office of the Ombuds (purposely changed to be gender neutral)

so that there can really be an office to support the campus – the term Office is important

D. Ombuds are not "advocates" – > Apart from these > but there should be a space to explore policies and procedures, that there be due process on campus, and to advocate for change that might be positive (to the Provost)

E. Not a friend to any one group – where are the wholes, where things maybe don't work – academic outcomes are not my involvement –

F. She wants faculty to know that her office focuses on the systemic process on campus

G. We direct students to follow the process. Students have to learn system, know how to follow through the procedure that is set up

H. My role concerns the process, what your concerns are.

1. Q: do you have staff and who are they? A – yes, 2 GAs, seasoned with the operations. She wants a secretary for support since she is a 50%

2. Q: Perhaps an example on how you approach thing? A: 2 ways to see this. 1- systemic process 2- working on the personal development “piece” – how students can understand how to work through the process, “everything is not a war” “do you have the evidence” “ any responsibility in what occurred?”

a. Outcomes: did you follow the recommendations

b. Were you successful in resolving your conflict

c. Ensuring that students are OK with the outcome of a situation – she will follow up – “Are you prepared to move forward?” This is an important personal development piece. How to develop a learning point, critical thinking about putting forth an argument. In general people are OK with outcomes if they have been heard.

3. Re: CASES – these can vary.

a. Medical, how to file an appeal, grade complaints

b. Re: parents – important for them to empower a student, not represent the problem

c. There are boundaries on what the Ombuds can engage. S/he should be talking TO the student WITH the student, rather than through

4. Q: how would you see the best practices? A: a macro level position where I can hear what someone’s story is, but I cannot make direct changes, not really empowered that way. But I trace the occurrence of an issue and so forth [REB asked the question, didn’t take notes while listening!!!]

V. Committee Reports

A. Senate on Budget: Mahmud’s report: item 4a

1. Faculty SBC

a. Can ask to get on Budget Council agenda

b. *Does* have interaction between the two – so that both committees are aware of what both are doing

2. Three committees:

a. long term planning

b. flexible budget ???

c. price & ??? didn’t get this

3. All eight reps can now be apt. by FS.

- a. AAUP has withdrawn its reps.
- b. We have 6 right now. Need 2: CAS-Sciences and COB

4. SBC meets Dec 5, invited UBC faculty reps in order to coordinate issues and concerns

5. Will look for AAUP input as well.

6. Q: why did AAUP withdraw from UBC? A: well it was a bit of a departure that they were only union on the UBC – they volunteered to leave, but not sure completely why they withdrew.

B. Academic Issues:

1. Kullberg –International Center

- a. Committee will meet twice a month to get the ?

- b. Goal to coordinate international efforts on campus and develop the infrastructure on campus – to make links and support : “coordinate collaborate and communicate” (McVey’s quote)

2. Kullberg & Koolage – GenEd Review Comm.

- a. Will meet this month

- b. Please let colleagues know about this committee and its process – sending feedback to the GenEdRevComm]

C. Technology Issues (Bahorski)

- 1. The AUP construction is ongoing, and there are weekly meetings
- 2. The computer refresh committee has not yet met.

D. Other committee reports

- 1. R. W. Collins Awards (Barton): Some changes are coming to the award process, including possibly the implementation of online applications, a request for more student evaluations for the teaching awards, and administrator letters being eliminated.
- 2. Some discussion of Title IX issues.

VI. EMU as a Non-Smoking campus (Woodiel)

- A. In a recent student government poll, 70% of respondents (of 3200 members of EMU’s community) report they desire a smoke-free campus, the student government has supported a proposal to this effect, and a draft letter to the Board of Regents has been prepared.
- B. U of M has already converted to a smoke-free campus
- C. MOTION: Accept letter as amended. (Letter available)
- D. VOTE: For 20, Against 5, Abstain 2 {Motion Passes}

VII. COE and EAA affiliation

A. MOTION: Accept the resolution as originally passed. (Resolution was circulated electronically)

B. The central piece of Faculty Senate's concern on this matter is the process by which EMU was partnered with the EAA and some resultant effects of that process

C. This is time sensitive, as the next Board of Regents meeting will have a number of presentations on this matter

D. MOTION (AMENDED): Accept the resolution as amended. (Resolution available, and circulated at the meeting)

E. The Provost is very concerned that there appears to have been a sudden and dramatic shift in COE's (and faculty in general) concerns regarding the EAA. The process may have been smoother with earlier, and clearer, communications on all related issues.

F. MOTION (AMENDED AGAIN): Accept the resolution as amended, in the hand out, and strike the third paragraph (the second WHEREAS).

G. VOTE: For 26, Against 0, Abstain 2 {Motion Passes}

H. President's Comment: requests to have "closed door" sessions should be considered very carefully and not taken lightly, and taking action with letters should be strongly considered, over adversarial, directive resolutions.

VIII. Provost's Remarks

- A. Search for Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs has been launched. This is a key hire for the institution. This will be an excellent way of coordinating many of our services.
- B. As a note, dropping our Football program would drop us from the MAC. That would be costly to our other, very successful teams.
- C. The recent Graduate Fair was extremely successful.
- D. The search for the Dean of COT is awaiting (a) discussion with COT faculty, (b) a mission, and (c) timing in order to generate a good applicant pool. Winter is possible, but the goal is to start for no later than Fall, 2014.

IX. . Committee Appointments

A. Computer Refresh Committee

B. Gen Ed Course Vetting

- 1. Some courses have actually been hung up due to lack of participation from Social Science and Arts
- 2. Judith Kullberg and Ray Quiel both volunteered to serve, which completes the needed membership for this committee

C. Global Engagement Council

1, Discussion regarding expanding the six to seven, for two CAS representatives

2, MOTION: close discussion on the above.

3. VOTE: For 27, Against 1 {Motion Passed}
4. Discussion regarding all the candidates ensued
5. Elected: Lisa Klopfer (LIB), D. Victor (COB), C. Haddad (COT), H. Neff (CAS), T. Wu (CHHS)

D. Learning Management System – Paul Majeske (COT)

E. University Budget Council – S. Newell (COB)

X. COT proposed realignment “standing group”: Senate may form a standing group to be on call to provide Faculty Senate input in a timely manner regarding this proposal, drafting Senate’s official input response

XI. Adjournment