



Faculty Senate 2016–2017

MINUTES: December 7, 2016

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

J. Ledesma, Chair; K. Bailey, recording secretary

Present: S. Badenas, K. Bailey, A. Baltazar, S. Bell, S. Brown-Fraser, A. Coria-Navia, F. Cortez, D. Davis, D. Fortin, K. Hall, K. Koudele, J. Ledesma, J. Lim, G. Lovhoiden, S. Moncrieff, T. Newkirk, N. Nosworthy, L. Ruhupatty, B. Sedlacek, C. Sigua, J. Sigvartsen, M. Ullom, L. Weldon, R. Zdor, A. Luxton, C. Arthur

Regrets/absent: C. Gane, B. Gibson, R. Perez-Schulz, A. Solis, D. Village,

Guests: T. Reeve, N. Miller, M. Myers

Votes & Actions taken (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)

[2] Minutes of November 16, 2016 Senate Meeting. MOTION: Move to approve minutes as presented (S. Moncrieff). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[5] Daniel A. Augsburg

J. Ledesma & T. Reeve

Report: J. Warwick chaired a committee invited by the Effective Teaching & Learning Council and the Provost to revisit the Daniel A. Augsburg Award Guidelines. The committee recommended the following parameters: One award each year; nomination by students, staff, faculty, administration, or self; new nominations required each year; receive award only once; minimum qualifications: 3 years teaching at AU—full, associate, or assistant professor; 8 Nomination criteria; nominated via written nomination narrative; creation of an Augsburg Teaching Award Committee: 3 from ET&LC, 2 former recipients, 1 member of administration; documentation: CV, teaching evaluations, evidence of creativity/innovation; cash award, medallion, award on base for desk + permanent recognition on master plaque. Recommendations were passed at Deans' Council, except that the Deans recommended four awards to parallel the Horn disciplinary research awards.

Discussion: Senators discussed whether faculty would find the greater difficulty in receiving the award to be demoralizing, or whether faculty would perceive the award to be more meaningful because of the rigorous guidelines. Senators also discussed whether this award would be more accessible to faculty with large classes. We noted that while students can nominate, the award decision is made by the committee, and faculty can nominate (and self-nominate). A major problem with the status quo is that there is no consistency in the decisions about awards across the university, and some faculty have received the award but do not feel comfortable mentoring other faculty because they do not know why they received the award and do not consider themselves to be master teachers. Senators wondered whether nominees who are investigated by the committee and meet certain standards could be recognized.

MOTION: "To accept the benchmarked recommendation of the ad hoc committee of the Effective Teaching and Learning Council that was formed to revise the Daniel A. Augsburg Excellence in Teaching Award and to develop criteria for the award. To recommend that one to two awards be given each year at the discretion of the award committee." (L. Weldon). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[6] Revision of the January Report

C. Arthur & J. Ledesma

Report: A number of faculty and faculty committees have requested that the Annual Report (January Report) be modified so that faculty can work toward promotion as part of their yearly planning. The Deans' Council passed a modified document that aims to achieve this while retaining the existing structure. The Provost also wants to collect information about workload in order to gauge the consequences of new faculty workload policies. The proposed document was presented at the General Faculty Meeting on December 5. A number of concerns were raised about the document during and after the meeting. The Provost immediately agreed to postpone a new report format and to use the existing Annual Report document with an added workload report based on the new workload policy.

Discussion: Senators agreed with the Provost's postponement of the new report format, and agreed that faculty should have a major role in the development of the new document. The Senators asked the Provost if any new report format would be considered as a dynamic document and received an affirmative response.

MOTION: "To recommend to the Senate, in keeping with the Duties and Purview of the Senate, and with the responsibility of faculty in hiring and promoting qualified individuals, that: (1) we request that the status quo

January Report be used in the January 2017 evaluation period. (2) the Senate create a strategic ad hoc committee to design a faculty-driven revision of the January report. In the selection of this committee, the Senate should consider no more than four individuals, and include members of committees with responsibility for faculty development (Rank and Tenure, Effective Teaching and Learning Council, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence). (3) the ad hoc committee return a draft proposal to the Faculty Senate prior to the March 2017 Senate Executive Committee meeting, working with the Faculty Policy and Development Council as appropriate.” (J. Lim). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED**.

Discussion: The Senators discussed a number of individuals who would be contacted about the possibility of serving on a small committee to revise the Annual Report document, working from the aims of the existing revision.

[7] Faculty Survey Concerning Senate Awareness and Effectiveness

J. Ledesma

Report: The Senate Executive Committee would like to conduct a survey of faculty perceptions regarding the Senate.

MOTION: “To recommend to the Senate a survey of faculty perceptions to be conducted early in Spring Semester 2017. To motivate responses with a gift card raffle.” (K. Koudele). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED**.

[9] Senate Constitution Revision Schedule

K. Bailey

Report: The Senate Executive Committee received comments about other possible revisions of the Senate Constitution during and after the last General Faculty Meeting. The Executive Committee would like to collect all recommendations and deal with them during the summer for introduction at the first meeting of the school year.

MOTION: “To recommend to the Senate that the Executive Committee prepare any recommended updates to the Senate Constitution during the summer and return those recommendations at the first fall semester meeting.” (K. Bailey). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED**.

[10] Enhanced and Stackable Scholarships Proposal

J. Ledesma

Report: The Deans’ Council passed a proposal for (1) making decisions about how to use targeted scholarships to attract students into particular programs and (2) allowing donors who so desire to make scholarships stackable. The proposal also removes the penalty for students who receive non-stackable scholarships that reduce their APS.

MOTION: “To affirm the plan as voted by the Dean’ Council and revised by the Provost with faculty input.” (J. Lim). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED**.

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Welcome & Prayer

A. Luxton

Papa Panov's Special Christmas by Ruben Sallens, translated and retold by Leo Tolstoy.

[3a] Undergraduate Council report

K. Koudele

Information: Senators were informed that they need to review the Michigan Transfer Agreement in order to prepare for January's discussion of the UGC minutes. Senators should start at:

<https://www.macrao.org/Publications/MTA.asp>

[3g] Race Relations Committee

B. Sedlacek

Report: Senators interested in joining this committee or aware of individuals who would be a good addition to the committee should contact the chair (B. Sedlacek) as the committee needs additional members when it resumes work in the Spring Semester.

[3bcdefh] Graduate Council, Faculty Policy and Development Council, Academic Operations Council, Strategic Planning Task Force, Graduate Faith & Integration, UFO Steering Committee reports – no reports at this time.

[4] Recognition of Individuals Involved in Developing Faculty Senate

J. Ledesma

The Senate Officers presented A. Luxton, N. Miller, T. Reeve, M. Myers, and D. Randall (in absentia) with a certificate recognizing their efforts in developing and implementing the Faculty Senate.

[8] Gathering Information about Faculty Load Implementation

K. Bailey

Report: The Senate needs to be involved in monitoring the faculty workload policy that we passed last year. In order to prepare for a discussion of this implementation next semester, Senators are requested to gather the following information at faculty meetings next January: (1) What percentage of faculty have an overload using the new policy? (2) What percentage of faculty are now meeting load and would not be otherwise? (3) Has the new workload solved any problems for faculty or departments? (4) Has the new workload raised any problems for faculty or departments?

[11] Senate Education: How the Senate Relates to Other Committees

K. Bailey

Report: The Senate receives recommendations from four standing committees that each oversee a number of other committees. The Senate also has a reciprocal reporting responsibility with the Deans' Council and student life.

Next faculty senate meeting: January 18, 2016 at 6:30 pm in the Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall. **Note the change in time for this meeting only.**