

Faculty Senate Minutes

September 27, 2010

11:00a.m.

GC 5112

In attendance:

Voting and Speaking Non-Voting Members: Judith Mayton, Robert Kiel, Marshal Wright, David Dyson, George Gillen, Tim Norton, Richard Berumen, Gary Pranger, Patti Techanchuk, Sally Shelton, Dana Higeons, Cheryl Bocanegra, Vicki Walker, Audrey Thompson, Paul King, Carol Blan, William Collier, Agena Farmer, Chris Martin, Lenore Mullican, William Epperson, Sophie Liu, LeighAnne Locke, Bob Mansfield, James Norwood, Wendy Shirk, Steve Green, Dominic Halsmer, Tom Mathew, Cheryl Iverson, Mark Bender, Terry Unruh, Debbie Sowell, Linda Gray

1. Dr. Wright called the meeting to order and James Norwood opened in prayer.
2. Dr. Wright reminded the faculty of the upcoming all faculty meeting with Dr. Rutland on October 18th. He briefly discussed the Deans' role and their position in both the Administrative silo and the Faculty silo in the shared governance model. He indicated that the Senate would need to evaluate their functional role as administrators and faculty, the subsequent contractual concerns, tenure, and their position as a voice for the faculty in the office of the President.
3. Dr. Wright reminded the faculty of the future dates for the Senate meetings. They are: October 18th GC 5114, October 25th GC 5112, and November 29th –All Faculty, GC 5114.
4. Discussion was had on the HPE Variable Credit. Dr. Gillen and Dr. Dyson brought the concerns regarding the .5 versus the 1 credit hour for HPE classes. The Senate approved all classes for variation of credit hours. After concerns were brought, a subcommittee composed of Dr. Sowell, Dr. Huber, David Fulmer, Patty Teckhanchuk, the General Education Committee, and Dr. Halsmer-acting as convener, was formed to formulate a recommendation regarding the impact of variable credit upon faculty load and student work.
5. The proposed bylaw revisions were discussed and representatives were encouraged to review them with their Colleges and Schools for the October and November Senate meeting discussions and the November senate meeting vote. The revisions were:

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for the appointment of alternates for the deans when a dean is unable to attend the Senate. (Article IV, Section 3)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for the Clarification of Senate voting procedures on items that are considered "informal" or "procedural." (Article V, Paragraph A; Article VI, Sections 4, 5, 6; Article VII, Sections 4, 5, 6)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for Graduate Department representation and voting processes. (Article IV, Section 6)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for representation by the Dean of Learning Resources. (Article IV, Section 1)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for representation by the Office of the Provost. (Article IV, Section 5)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for representation by the Coordinator of General Education. (Article IV, Section 5)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for participation by the Office of the University Technical Editor. (Article IV, Section 5)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for changing “Representatives” to “Senators.” (Article IV, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6; Article VI, Section 1; Article VII, Section 6)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for changing “Faculty Vice President” and “Faculty President” to “Faculty Senate Vice President” and “Faculty Senate President.” (Article IV, Section 2, Article VI, Sections 1, 2, 3, 5)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide for the inclusion of clarifying language for electing the Faculty Senate Vice President. (Article IV, Section 2)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide that all votes of the Senate require a quorum. (Article VII, Section 4)

The bylaws be revised as proposed to provide language clarifying who can bring a formal proposal before the Senate and that general education proposals must be submitted simultaneously to the General Education Curriculum Committee for evaluation and recommendation. (Article V, Paragraph A)

6. Dr. Wright presented on the four procedures that can be utilized for bringing a formal proposal before the Senate for consideration and vote. They are:
 - a) through an academic university committee, b) through a Faculty Assembly, c) by a petition signed by at least 10% of all university full-time faculty members, or d) by a motion of the Senate itself (through a voting member of the Senate.)
7. Discussion was had regarding a proposal to change the humanities requirement from 12 hours to 6-12 hours as determined by the degree requirements for each major as stated in the catalog.
8. Meeting adjourned by Dr. Marshal Wright.