



**Faculty Senate Minutes
April 20, 2015 4pm
Don 112**

Attendance: Steve Lewis, Ben Nickol, Joyce Walborn, Dave Jones, Curtis Peterson, Nathan Munn, Tammy Burke, Bryon Steinwand, Barbara Yahvah, Karen Henderson, Robyn Kiesling, Karen Raphael-Conley, Karmen Williams, Joe Zimmerman, Della Dubbe, Kim Haughee

- I. Call to Order - Steve called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.
- II. Approval of the Minutes (February 12, 2015) - Tod moved and Robyn seconded, minutes passed with correction.
- III. Communications - Steve stated that he met with Kim Worthy to discuss open enrollment and will be sending out some information on clarification. He also stated that the Y:Drive is being deleted and so if any faculty that have information out there it should be removed at this time. Also faculty need to RSVP to the faculty luncheon in May and need to include their names and food preference. There was also some discussion regarding the changes to the Ged Ed Core to correlate better with the MUS. Faculty should be aware of these changes for advising purposes.
- IV. Report of Committee
 - a. ASCR (Robyn K. CAS in the Office Technology program....see handouts) - Robyn stated that they are in the process of creating a new certificate which offers all courses that we are currently offering but with a different delivery method. This will be a competency based program that is geared toward students who are most likely already in the workforce but would like to earn some credentials. It includes a lot of skills and students can complete a skill and then move forward. The courses will be offered in six week increments and they are not allowed to

move on prior to completion. There will not be random enrollment dates but students will be able to move at their own pace. She stated that there will never be more than 20 students in a course at one time. There will be an advisor or navigator assigned to each student that will be in constant communication with the student and the instructor. Robyn stated that the position will most likely be funded from the adjunct pool and Sarah Dellwo has expressed interest in being the navigator. She clarified that it is a certificate with a new delivery method in an already established program. She stated that if approved here it will move forward to the Board of Regents and hopefully begin in May. Steve asked for clarification that these courses must be taken in order and Robyn confirmed. Karmen asked if there were any new courses and Robyn stated that there are no new courses just a different delivery method. Robyn also stated that over the course of the year the most an adjunct would teach would be three courses or nine credits. Nathan moved that we approved and Bryon seconded. Motion passed.

- b. Professional Advancement (PAC) - Steve stated there is no new business at this time.

V. Unfinished Business

- a. Academic Integrity Policy - Steve stated that after discussing this with ECOS and Denise he was informed that the statement that we created needs to be a policy and not just a statement according to NWCCU. Steve stated that under section four there is a statement regarding filing of a grievance (see handout.). Steve reviewed the CBA that states that there would be an informal review and Denise supported this but Steve wanted to make clear that it was not the clear understanding at the beginning of this process that this was expected to be a policy. Steve stated that he preferred the word complaint but Denise stated that we do not have a complaint process but we do have a grievance process so the language has to state grievance. Barbara stated that she was concerned that this would be in the student handbook but Steve stated that it would not be in the student handbook but in the catalog and online as a policy. Barbara was also concerned that there are four bodies of people that could have a grievance. Other members including Bryon and Kim agreed that perhaps the community should not

be included. Kim proposed that we cannot actually vote on this at this time because we do not know how it will affect other entities including staff. If it were only about faculty then it could be voted on but as there is not a clear understanding of the people that would be affected. Kim moved and Ben seconded that this be postponed at this time.

- b. Amended Disruptive student removal discussion/policy recommendation - Steve presented our concerns to Elizabeth. Barbara was concerned that what is in the student handbook will be the policy and Steve stated that yes there would be consistency between both. Elizabeth also added an auxiliary contact in case she is not available during a time of need. Kim stated that she was fully supportive of this policy and it was a great starting point. Steve asked if there was anyone uncomfortable with voting today as there were minimal changes. Bryon moved to approve the policy as presented and Karmen seconded, motion passed and policy was approved.
- c. Administration Evaluation survey - Steve stated that each of the faculty received an email regarding the administration evaluation survey. Steve strongly encouraged the faculty to complete the survey before the close of business hours tomorrow. Mike Brown did confirm that the survey was confidential and he can see how many have opened and completed the survey but cannot trace back to any specific individuals. ECOS will get the final report and present it to leadership per the bylaws.
- d. Evaluation/Assessment of advising process discussion

VI. New Business

- a. Hiring Committees make-up/process discussion - Steve handed out a document based on information in the AAUP and asked for feedback. Nathan stated that he feels that we need to be more aggressive in our objections to what the current hiring process is. Kim stated that she agreed with both Steve and Nathan in that the document is a great supporting document but we need definite points to be recommended. Steve replied that the recommendations were clear and definite.
- b. Articulation Agreement process discussion - Steve stated that again this is a first viewing of this process and will be voted on at the next meeting. He stated that

the consistency and transparency is important. Steve asked that comments be sent to ECOS to be voted on next fall. Barbara commented that she recommends strong communication and that her overall comment should be going from Program to Division, the ASCRC and then Senate. She also stated that when things come from the top down they are not as well received. Steve stated that because we do not have division meetings very often that we need to perhaps communicate via email etc.

- c. Call for nominations - There are currently seven members of ECOS, Becki and Dave have one year before they transition off and they will be retained for continuity. We therefore have five slots open for nomination for members to be filled. Tammy and Tod have stated that they would be willing to continue if there were not enough. Barbara would like to nominate Robyn Kiesling, Nathan Munn, and Tod Dumas. Nathan Munn nominated Karen Henderson. Steve nominated Tammy Burke and Joe Zimmerman. Steve agreed to keep nominations open until the end of the semester and will accept nominations via email. Bryon moved that nominations be closed May 12th and Karen R. seconded.

- d. Instructor Initiated Withdrawal discussion

VII. Good and Welfare

VIII. Adjournment