

UHD Faculty Senate Meeting

March 19, 2013

Minutes

Present: G. Preuss (President), T. Hale (President Elect), S. Henney (Secretary), A. Allen (Past President), R. Beebe, C. Bachman, D. Epstein, V. Hrynkiv, S. Farris, J. Schmertz, C. Nguyen, C. Rubinson, M. Duncan, J. Herrera, S. Koshkin, J. Tito-Izquierdo, W. Nowak, E. Padilla, C. Burnett, R. Davidson, R. Johnson, J. Johnson, P. Li, S. Penkar,

Absent: J. Ahmad, M. Benavides, P. Deo, F. Khoja, P. Mandell, S. Yuan, I. Wang

Minutes

March 5, 2013 minutes approved unanimously.

Faculty Senate President's Report

- Update on Provost Search Committee: Timeline has changed slightly due to the addition of SSEM to Provost's duties. Now campus visits for candidates will be late May to early June. It is acknowledged that this is not ideal timing, but faculty and staff will have the chance to interact with candidates both in person and remotely. The new job posting, including SSEM duties, is up on the UHD website.

An audience member asked to what extent will academic issues be prioritized in the search process? Provost Hugetz responded that SSEM needed should be under Academic Affairs because this allows for more attention to the synergy between their goals, processes, and mission. SSEM is integral to Academic Affairs' mission.

- Preuss reminds Senators that there is only one more regularly scheduled Senate meeting this year (4/2). The 4/16 meeting is the Faculty Awards Assembly.
- There may be one more General Assembly of the University before the end of the year. The purpose is for explaining and addressing questions about the Budget and Planning Process.
- Elections are upcoming for Senate seats and for President-Elect. The call for nominees for President-Elect will come out this week.
- Preuss received an email from SGA President Sanchez about the issue of student dorms. He is looking for faculty who are in favor of dorms to help with this issue.
- Update on Faculty Climate Survey: President-Elect Hale reports that the survey is finalized and will come out via Survey Monkey. The Survey Monkey site is a private license through the Provost's office password controlled through L. Bowen. Changes include people in new jobs and addition of a question about child care, but most questions have remained the same.

Guest: Akif Uzman, Interim Dean of College of Science and Technology

Uzman is proposing a restructuring of CST by separating Computer Sciences from Math and Statistics, which would remain one department, and combining CS and Engineering Technology for a second

department. This change would better distribute the administrative load and create a better split of faculty numbers. It may also open the door for exploring a “Computing Engineering” program. Uzman has already solicited feedback from faculty. The next step is the UCC, although the BOR must ultimately approve the change.

There will be no degree changes right now, but hopefully the more degrees will come out of the change. Grants should not be a problem, as we have done cross-department grants before. This change will roll out slowly.

President’s Report Continued

- The AAC agenda and the February minutes came out yesterday. One new policy was added to the list of policies (Assessment of Educational Programs). This came out of UCC. Preuss requests feedback on this policy.
- Preuss notes that UCC doesn’t report on policies to the Senate like FAC and APC do.

An audience member notes that there is a lot of confusion about where policies originate. Are they going back for changes to a different committee or to the originating committee? We need better tracking of which committee has primary responsibility and which committees are reviewing and commenting.

A Senator requests that Senate be provided a summary of changes in policy from original policy to new policy. Currently, Senate needs this summary for the Academic Assessment Policy.

Provost Hugetz indicates that UCC doesn’t communicate in the same way as FAC, APC, & AAC. It might be an improvement if communication were similar across all of these committees. Also, AAC might have a special meeting to catch up on policy approvals.

A FSEC member indicates that there are two important policies that must be brought into alignment soon, the Academic Appointment Policy and the Grievance Policy. The language of these two policies is in direct conflict as to the issue of grieving non-reappointment.

Presentation of Revised Shared Governance Policy Draft: Senator Schmertz

Presented Section 3.3.3 of the draft and reviewed the changes. These include the addition of Faculty Senate into the policy approval process; Senate can send policy back to the originating committee with recommendations.

A FSEC member commented that this would obligate Senate time to discuss and vote on all policies coming out of all policy-writing committees. This is an intense obligation of Senate time, perhaps even necessitating additional Senate meetings during the semester to clear out policies. It was noted that the single policy we addressed last semester took up a whole Senate meeting. Is it possible that adding Senate to the process might create a road block to timely policy development? The policy process is already painfully slow at UHD without the Senate in an approval role; will adding the Senate to the process make the process better?

An audience member commented that this addition actually puts Senate back in the formal policy process, which is a benefit to faculty. Senators represent the faculty as a whole, and the faculty’s voice should be heard in the policy development process. A Senator voiced agreement with this position.

A Senator commented that we should trust in the members of the policy-writing committees who we have elected to do their jobs. These elected faculty members have considered these issues and worked on the policies. They know the policies and the issues very well.

Preuss stated that we must have a policy-writing structure that is efficient and transparent. Faculty Senate should have “a” role in all policy development, but not necessarily an approval role.

A FSEC member commented that we have a problem with policy backlog. How does this policy address this?

An audience member comments that having fewer people review policy is not the answer to backlog. A Senator concurred. It may be that some policies, like curriculum-relevant policies, are more appropriate for Faculty Senate input.

Provost Hugetz comments that you can divide up the type of policies that are the purview of Senate; curriculum-relevant policies are an example. He comments that faculty governance and shared governance are different things. Shared governance necessitates a balance between administration and faculty on relevant issues. There is a model for a “University Senate” that seats both faculty and administration; this is a true “shared governance” structure. Faculty Senate is a faculty governance structure.

A Senator suggests that the policy should be worded so that Senate doesn’t have to discuss every policy. Some can just go forward that are outside of the Senate’s purview.

The Senate discussed what the policy approval process would be for the new Shared Governance Policy. Will the Senate shepherd this policy? Will the Shared Governance Task Force continue? Will the policy go through the current policy process? Is this a different type of policy that needs its own policy process?

Motion: “That the Shared Governance Task Force will continue making revision to the policy until it is ready for approval, with Senate supplying additional members as needed.” Motion was seconded.

It was discussed that the policy needs a group to physically make revisions to the policy and to incorporate feedback.

A FSEC member requested that a more specific charge be given to the Task Force describing its exact duties and goals, as the Task Force has fulfilled its original charge.

An amendment was offered: “Revisions will come from the Senate.” There was no second to this amendment.

Motion to table passed with two opposed.

Adjourn: 4:05 pm