

APPROVED Minutes for Faculty Senate Meeting  
Wednesday, October 21, 2015  
3-5pm, 300 Student Center

Present: Norton, Kullberg, Hammond, Koehn, Francis, Evett, Quiel, Chou, Orfggen Higgins, Smith, Winning, Curran, Hayworth, Moore, Higbee, Baier, Barton, Millan, Carpenter, Rahman, Isenhour, Orrange, Majeske, Longworth, Bluhm, McVey, Cole, Woods  
(\* indicates item to take to departments)

Beginning with a point of order. FSEB appointed a Parlimentarian -J Kullberg, to ensure Roberts Rules are followed. Kullberg presented handout on RR. Purpose - use rules to facilitate business and maintain decorum.

1. [3:05] Agenda approval - motion to approve agenda with moving up Provost's remarks.  
Passed
2. [3:10] Approval of minutes from 10/7/15 meeting (see attached) - Approved with spelling correction on name - Banerji
3. [3:15] Visitor: Bin Ning on HLC accreditation \* Major part of work is to gather documents to support claims about quality of education. There will be a two day site visit with HLC evaluating 5 criteria. Included on handout. All must be electronic submission. Ning will come to FS to update and updates are on website. Longworth - two parts: quality and compliance. Survey at the time of service in staff advising only - no survey on faculty advising at this time. Q: What is role of faculty? A: Assessment of student learning, department level planning documents. HLC wants demonstration that we have processes in place to support an outcome. Q: For those doing program review now, who is audience? A: Responsibility is to ensure quality. Audience should not change what you say.
4. [3:30] Committee Reports
  - a. Budget Committee (Rob Carpenter) \* CHHS and COT reps still needed. Final numbers of fiscal '15 now. Goal is 5 year budget. What to do to help with high FITIACs and low grad and transfers. Also talked about FY '17. Prioritizing hires. Financial aid. Where BC could have more input. Develop glossary of terms.
  - b. Institutional Issues
    - (i) Presidential Search process \* Discussion limited to 30 minutes. FS approved letter to BOR requesting reconsideration on process in the interest of shared governance. BOR replied in letter through Regent Crumm. They will add two more faculty to Advisory Cmt and what that cmt will do. Group of unions read letter and withdrew support. What should be our next step?  
Discussion:  
Was BOR response adequate?  
UM is used as exemplar of closed search, but they had at least half of the committee comprised of faculty.

Some have polled faculty in their departments. Positions vary: Representation is inadequate at 2-3. Some are adamant that we withdraw from participation. Fundamental mistrust in BOR and some depts don't want to participate in that. Some say it is unwise to withdraw representation.

Cole - student gov't is not happy with the closed process. Students took a stand against it last night. Student gov't has no influence on whether the student rep will stay or go. We should also ask for another student on the Advisory Committee.

Advisory committee function - is it clear? Will only approved candidates move forward to BOR for consideration?

Will we undercut the unions by staying in? A big part of the campus community will not be represented. If student gov't is also withdrawing, the rug could be pulled out from BOR and they may come back and talk with us.

Little hope that BOR will have an epiphany and decide to be more democratic.

**Motion (Higbee)** (made early in the discussion): FS reply to BOR letter that Advisory Committee have half of its members be faculty. If yes, then FS will back down on closed search and participate. If no, then FS withdraws representation. Seconded. Discussion ensued related to tension between giving up a voice at the table in the search and standing for a process that reflects genuine shared governance (reflected in comments above). Later in the discussion, Higbee outlined the motion more specifically.

"The FS thanks Regent Crumm for her letter of October 16, replying to the Senate's letter on the presidential search. We much appreciate her willingness to communicate. However,

"We respectfully withdraw all faculty participation in the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, until the following three goals are accomplished and publicly endorsed by the Board of Regents:

- 1) that Advisory Committee is reorganized so that faculty members on it constitute one half of the Advisory Committee membership;
- 2) the Board publicly pledges now that the Advisory Committee is empowered to conduct interviews with those candidates whom the Advisory Committee judges to be the best candidates; and
- 3) the Board of Regents now publicly pledges to select the next president from among the candidates recommended to the Board of Regents by the Advisory Committee.

We of course still believe that any search process for the university president should include open meetings on campus with finalists for the job. However, we will drop this goal for this search, if the Board of Regents agree to each of the three points listed above."

**Motion withdrawn (Higbee).** Second.

**Motion:** Withdraw all faculty participation in the presidential advisory search committee. 16 in favor; 10 opposed; 2 abstentions. Motion carries.

FS representative will step down.

**Motion (Kullberg):** FSEB will write a letter to the BOR explaining withdrawal of faculty representation on the PSAC and offering alternatives. Motion passed unanimously.

(ii) New Faculty Hires Committee and matrices(Patrick Koehn) \*

- c. Faculty & EEA assessment (Judith Kullberg) \*
- d. Other committee reports \*

- 5. [4:10] Provost's Remarks (Provost Schatzel)-Absent last time due to attendance at meeting -Presidents of 15 publics plus BOR called by Snyder. Topics - student success, collaboration. Suggestion that it is a first step to a system. No -it's not.

Want to do a review on how we manage GAs. What's right number, how are they accounted for and allocated. Academic v. non-academic appointments. Year long process. Tornquist will investigate how other institutions are doing it. Goal: process and guidelines. Q: Rumor: GA's assigned unrelated work to field of study. Is that what's behind this review? A: No. There is no process and we need one. Point of a GA-ship is to advance academic work. They are not considered employees, so they can't do routine work for the university. Q: Where is the GA budget? A: Stipend from college, tuition from central admin. BOR meeting - audited statements are presented. Comparisons - 11% of expenses is scholarships here but 5% elsewhere. Reverse in other institutions. Why? Athletics is not an Auxilliary. If Athletics scholarships went to Auxilliary, EMU scholarships will look like other institutions. This will be fixed. Q: How long is a GA a GA? A: This will also be sorted out in establishing a process. Provost wants to allocate GAs to colleges and colleges need a process to allocate them. Q: Is there an intent to see what Athletics spends. A: Athletics is not responsible for convocation center. SC, McKenny and Pease are all auxiliary.

- 6. [4:30] Committee appointments - reps needed were identified by FSP and noted on Appointments handout. Accept nominations by acclamation. Brenda Reimer, Diversity, and Daryl Barton, DPS.
- 7. Distinguished Faculty motion passes. Where there is a single candidate, approve by acclamation. Discuss additional DFC business next time as item high on agenda.
- 8. [4:45] New Business
  - a. By-law revisions \* Meets tomorrow.
  - b. Education Summit, Student Center, Sat., Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>. Send email and discuss with faculty.
- 9. [5:00] Adjournment. Passes

---

**The next Faculty Senate Executive Board meeting will be held October 28th in McKenny, rm. 304, 3-5. The next full Faculty Senate meeting will be held November 4<sup>th</sup> in SC 310A from 3-5.**

---