



Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Monday April 22, 2013
4:00 PM DON 123

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Meeting called to order by Steve Lewis at 4:15.
- II. Approval of the Minutes (January 11 2013 and Feb. 11 2013)
 - a. Minutes from January 11, 2013 were reviewed. Tammy moved for approval of the minutes, Nathan seconded, minutes were approved with pending change to attendance portion.
 - b. Minutes from February 11, 2013 were also reviewed. Tammy moved for approval of minutes, Rick Henry seconded, minutes were approved without changes.
- III. Communications – It was reported that Tia Kelley has been selected as Division Chair and Robin Keising and Becki Gibson were added as full-time employees. Congratulations were extended to these three people.
- IV. Report of Committee
 - a. ASCR – Bryon reported that ASCR has approved new courses and revisions. He also discussed the diversity criteria is now in place and courses are being reviewed and approved or denied based on the new criteria. There was a list of five courses that will be accepted as diversity courses in the fall including ANTY 101, FRCH 101, LIT 228, LIT 230, and NASX 105. We hope to have more in the next catalog.
 - b. There are openings for three new members on ASCR and this will be addressed in new business.

V. Old Business

- a. Proposed Promotion/Tenure Committee language (by law modification)- Steve handed out new language that could be used for repurposing the PDC into a Promotion/Tenure Committee. Steve stated that it is up to those who have been through the process recently to mentor those who will be going through the process.
- b. This new language would replace bylaw section V. item B. Dr. Hartman mentioned that there was both a faculty and institutional professional development committee and he suggested that this be very clear so that there are no blurred lines between union and faculty. Bryon stated that we don't want to confuse this with the promotion committee or the tenure committee so a suggested name change to Professional Advancement Committee. Barb stated that the idea is to help a faculty member become a better faculty member so maybe it should include a word other than Advancement because that sounds like step skipping. Mentoring for the Advancement of Professionals was suggested by Carmen. Faculty liked the MAP acronym as it is somewhat mapping where we are going. John also suggested that in 2) statement be changed to ...colleagues in the academic aspects of the processes...
- c. It was also brought up that should someone in a mentoring position be also allowed to serve on the professional development and tenure committees.
- d. Carmen wanted to know how we came up with the number of three and this was completely random, at this point it was just a suggestion from Steve as it seemed like we could get this many to serve.
- e. Nathan brought up that the wording in #1 be changed to have comma before who and a comma after process. Karen stated this makes it restrictive and it should read "and who have been elected". Steve suggested we just take out the section "who have previously gone through either process". Barb stated we need to spell out process. Rick also added that we are still young in this process and who best understands what is being expected that who has been on the committee so although it may seem as a conflict of interest it is important to have those persons as members. Steve stated that what is asked for is directly spelled out in the CBA

but it would be nice to have mentors through this process. Nathan stated that at this point we have to look at changing it and decide changes. Barb stated there have been too many discussions at this point to make ruling on a first draft. John stated that we have only changed four words, not the overall presentation and that we should be able to move this forward on first reading. Sean stated that we could change the verbage in #1 to be that person mentoring could be either someone who has been through the process or someone who has sat on either committee. Steve said that he will make corrections and send out a draft of completed changes. No vote will be made at this time but it was accepted as first reading.

- f. Course Terminology discussion (arranged/petitioned, multi-instruction, hybrid, online, independent study, internship, self-paced, special topics) – Steve handed out a definition of terms from the Board of Regents that Tia gave to him and Tia has asked that Faculty Senate have input on defining this terminology. Barb stated that we should keep to their terms whenever possible for consistency. Steve stated that they do not have Independent Study or Self-Paced as part of their vernacular. Rick stated that some of the terminology was directed by union contract issues. Joyce stated that our online and hybrid classes fit the blended definition because there is some face to face interaction. It was discussed that there could be a specific testing center where exams can be proctored if the student is truly a distant student for exams that need to be proctored. It was discussed that the language and advising into these classes must be very clear so students have appropriate expectations. Nathan asked if all sections have to abide by the exact same terminology and face to face interaction. Rick stated that this is going to have to be addressed in advising once final determination has been made. Janet added that distinctions need to be made in the online terminology. Steve stated that Tia wanted us to move forward with this discussion but this cannot be settled today and more terms need to be added. Carmen stated that some research be done to look at further terminology. Looking for best practices in terms of ratios of time and Rick stated this should be added to the syllabus so students have clear guidelines.

VI. New Business

- a. Process of articulation agreements
- b. ASCR membership – Bryon stated that membership is a three year term. Steve suggested that we need to expand service of the college and having the same people involved in all of the committees is not appropriate and we need to get more people involved. It was decided to make a nomination slate and
 - i. Robin Keisling volunteered.
 - ii. Jan Campana or someone from nursing will be decided.
 - iii. Chris Matson is also interested but is currently in a non-tenure track position and wondered if this was appropriate. He would like to be considered at this time and Steve will check the bylaws in this regard. It was noted that Chris is eligible.
 - iv. Seth, Todd, or Karl from the trades were also suggested and John will contact these and Steve will send out an email to the trades faculty as a whole.
 - v. There will be no formal nominations or voting at this time.
- c. Grade appeals procedure – Steven handed out the Grade Appeals procedure sheet. Steve explained the process and how there will be an in-process grade appeal process as well as a post grade appeal process. It was suggested by ECOS that this be in the student handbook and the catalog. Nathan asked if the Faculty Senate needed to approve this. Steve stated it was more for feedback and that this process be approved by the faculty prior to this being approved by Student Services. Nathan moved that we approve with the removal of the statement “respective division chair” procedure for grade appeals. Chris seconded. Barb did comment that the instructional supervisor is technically the Associate Dean but it would be preferred that it go to the Division Chair. Motion was passed as amended.
- d. Faculty Handbook (2013-2014 edition?) – This is tabled at this time due to time constraints. Steve pointed out that the current handbook is from 2010 and an ad

hoc committee should be formed to update the handbook. Chris did state that this is rather confusing as the processes in the old handbook are not updated.

- e. Research Committee - Elyse Lovell – Elyse presented the idea of a research committee. Nationally there is a push for two year student institutional research. The research day that was held last week was a very positive experience and many of the students need this for employment. In discussing this with faculty it was brought up that time was an issue. Nathan pointed out as far as tenure and promotion and professional development this could be helpful with those as well. Elyse also said that students involved with research have higher retention rates and this was a positive. John stated that it could be an ad hoc at any time, but if part of Faculty Senate would have to be a standing committee. Dr. Bingham states we need to find out who is interested from a faculty standpoint before we add this as an official committee. John stated that at his most recent conference 25% of the academic posters were from community colleges. Nathan also stated that this is supported by the college's President. Steve suggested an ad hoc committee be formed and this is a good starting point. Bryon moved for the formation of ad hoc committee for research, Bryon seconded, vote was taken, majority agreed, Victor was opposed and is very concerned that extra time is going to be taken away from other classes for research. Nathan said this would have to be addressed as an institution.
- VII. Good and Welfare – John would like to announce that there was a formal accommodation be made to the diversity committee on ASCR that included Sean Scott and Karen. Steve also asked for formal commendation for Bryon, John, and Karen for their service on ASCR.
- VIII. Adjournment - Tammy moved and Carmen seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 5:27 PM.