



Faculty Senate 2016–2017

MINUTES: January 18, 2017

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

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

Present: S. Badenas, K. Bailey, A. Baltazar, A. Coria-Navia, D. Davis, D. Fortin, C. Gane, K. Hall, K. Koudele, J. Ledesma, G.

Lovhoiden, S. Moncrieff, T. Newkirk, N. Nosworthy, B. Sedlacek, J. Sigvartsen, M. Ullom, D. Village, L. Weldon, R. Zdor, C. Arthur

Regrets/absent: S. Bell, F. Cortez, S. Brown-Fraser, B. Gibson, J. Lim, R. Perez-Schulz, L. Ruhupatty, C. Sigua, A. Solis, A. Luxton,

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

[2] Minutes of December 7, 2016 Senate Meeting. MOTION: Move to approve minutes as presented (S. Badenas). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[3b] Committee Report: Faculty Development and Policy Council

Report: A new proposal regarding the Joint Appointment policy will be circulated for discussion at the next Senate meeting. The Senate had referred the search committee procedures policy (2:142) back to the FPDC in order to deal with differences between the proposed majority department faculty search committee policy and the practice in the Seminary. The Seminary procedure document was circulated prior to the Senate meeting. The FPDC proposed the addition of a sentence allows for exceptions to the majority department faculty policy following consultation with the Provost.

Discussion: Senators noted that an impetus for this policy was a concern brought to the Senate about a department where departmental faculty were not the majority on the search committee. The discussion centered on the issues of who would be involved in the consultation, and whether the exception essentially defanged the policy, allowing it to be overridden without department faculty consent. We also discussed the Seminary policy, which made it clear that while the committee could be majority faculty, it would not be majority *department* faculty. Several senators questioned whether it might not be better to explicitly identify the Seminary as an exception, and to make the current Seminary process explicitly part of the policy.

MOTION: "That we recommend to the FPDC that an explicit exception for the SDA Theological Seminary be placed in 2:142 and that the FPDC place the content of the Seminary procedures for search committees into working policy 2:142 instead of the proposed clause allowing exceptions in consultation with the Provost." (D. Fortin). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[3i] Committee Report: Annual (January) Report Revision

Report: Five faculty members have agreed to serve on this ad hoc committee.

MOTION: "That the Annual (January) Report Revision ad hoc committee membership be composed of Janine Lim, Margarita Mattingly, Elvin Gabriel, Peter Swanson, and Karl Bailey." (K. Koudele). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[5] Report: Augsburg Teaching Award Update

J. Ledesma

Report: The Augsburg Teaching Award changes proposed by the Effective Teaching and Learning Council and voted by the Senate are being implemented. However, we are under a good deal of time pressure because of deadlines for the awards event. There have been some negative responses to the decision to reduce the number of awards.

Discussion: The Senate noted that all of the concerns were raised during the process, but that our time for explaining that the issues were considered and reasoned decisions were made is limited. The Senate discussed options to deal with the time pressures. Although the ETLC considered the possibility of skipping a year for this award in order to make sure that procedures are in place, the call for nominations is underway. Senators discussed the possibility of skipping a year or delaying the award to Faculty Institute. We will review the process once we know what happens with nominations at the end of February. Senators discussed the importance of advocating for nominations across campus.

MOTION: "That we move forward with the process as currently in progress and that senators advocate with Deans and the larger faculty body to nominate qualifying teachers. To remind those who nominate that they

need to communicate to nominees that they will need to be willing to submit a small portfolio.” (S. Moncrieff).
Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[7] Recommendation: Monitoring Workload Policy

J. Ledesma

Report: The Provost has requested that all faculty complete a workload report based on the new workload policy (2:376, 2:803). Because the Senate is ultimately responsible for this policy, and because we will need to negotiate revisions to the policy next year with the Provost (per his agreement to revisit this policy every two years because we passed a “95% finished” policy), the Executive Committee recommended that the Senate conduct its own review of the workload data.

MOTION: “That the Senate study and review the workload data collected through the Annual (January) Report process in order to independently assess the effects of workload policy on faculty life.” (L. Weldon).
Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[8] Recommendation: Unified Framework of Outcomes Retreat

J. Ledesma

Report: The UFO process was delayed during the Fall semester because of administrative focus on the budget and bulletin, and faculty focus on the second half of the Fall semester. As a result, the proposed committee was never constituted and could not file a report at the December Senate meeting. The Executive Committee discussed the likelihood of constituting a committee during the Spring semester, which includes the end of the fiscal year prior to the end of the Spring semester. Given faculty workloads and the delays of the Fall semester, the officers felt that successful completion of the mandate was unlikely during the semester. The officers proposed a May working retreat for faculty to finish the UFO mandate laid out in the September Senate meeting as an alternative to creating a faculty steering committee during the semester.

MOTION: “In order to allow faculty to focus intentionally on the development of a Unified Framework of Outcomes for Andrews University, and given the difficulty of attracting faculty to this project during the heavy load Fall and Spring semesters, we recommend to the Provost that (1) we develop an action plan for setting up a number of working groups to finalize the different components of the UFO (with representation from all schools), and (2) that the action plan be implemented over the course of a 4-5 day UFO development retreat after Spring grades are submitted in May 2017.” (K. Koudele). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[9] Discussion: Michigan Transfer Agreement

J. Ledesma

Report: The UGC voted on December 5, 2016 to recommend that the Provost sign the MTA on behalf of Andrews University as a receiving institution, with the implementation policy yet to be determined. Prior to the meeting, senators reviewed the FAQ for college personnel and the MTA Articulation handbook at the MTA website. The officers also contacted the MTA and followed up on some of the questions raised by the UGC:

1. Are we agreeing to count all 30 credits towards ACE, or just some towards ACE and all 30 towards 124 credits required for graduation?
2. What does ‘cannot stipulate provisos’ in the new definition mean relative to ‘it is not the intent of the MTA to dictate the general education requirements of receiving institutions’?
3. What happens between the signing of the MTA and development and publication of implementation policy if student present MTA satisfied transcripts?
4. Why have most private institutions not signed on and what are their reasons?
5. Is CLEP counted towards MTA or not? There seem to be conflicts across different documents.

The MTA clarified that the 30 credits need to apply to the overall, but not necessarily to the general education (ACE) package. The stipulation of provisos was intended to prevent schools from rejecting community college courses as college courses outright. The policy would go into effect immediately when signed, so the MTA recommended that an implementation policy precede signing. CLEP is counted based on the policy of the sending institution. We did not ask MTA about why most private institutions had not signed.

Discussion: Senators discussed the possible benefits of this policy for students, faculty, and departments. There are some possible changes to practice—some courses that we do not accept as college-level would need to be accepted if included in the MTA by the sending institution. However, the majority of transfers are already handled in line with the MTA, and nothing precludes us from accepting credits from students with MTA satisfied designations. The Senate wanted clarity on what the benefits are for Andrews University, and how many students would see real benefits if we sign the MTA compared to current articulation practices.

MOTION: “To recommend that the Undergraduate Council revisit the decision to sign the MTA after reviewing the responses to questions about the MTA and getting feedback from other private institutions about why they have not signed. To request that if the Undergraduate Council decides to recommend that the Provost sign the MTA that an implementation plan be proposed.” (K. Koudele). Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Welcome & Prayer

J. Ledesma

- 1 Peter 5:6. We should hope that what students see in us is willingness to serve.
- Welcome to Dr. Trecartin, new Dean of School of Business Administration.

[3a] Committee Report: Undergraduate Council

K. Koudele

Report: (Minutes of December 5, 2016) The UGC voted to recommend that the Provost sign the MTA on behalf of Andrews University as a receiving institution, with the implementation policy yet to be determined. A more complete discussion and vote were held as a separate item [9]. The UGC also voted to support the new AU Online Course Requirements, voted to approve the undergraduate/graduate dual degree policy, and voted to approve a number of dual degrees, undergraduate degree, and program name changes. The Senate Executive Committee recommended that these decisions stand by consensus, and the Senate concurred by consensus. (Minutes of December 12, 2016) The UGC voted a number of changes to the bulletin regarding Credit for Prior Learning and Transfer policies, in addition to a program name change and deactivation of two undergraduate programs.

Discussion: Of these items, the Senate spent the majority of time discussing the actions that should be taken in response the bulletin changes and program changes and how these should be communicated. There was some discussion about whether CTALE should be responsible as part of professional development, but senators also noted the existing spring training for advisors from student success. The Senate will communicate with Student Success to make sure that these changes are noted in this year’s training. The Senate will also contact Enrollment Management to ensure that they are aware of the changes in program names, new majors, and deactivated majors.

[3bdefgh] Graduate Council, Academic Operations Council, Strategic Planning Task Force, Graduate Faith & Integration, Race Relations, Unified Framework of Outcomes Steering Committee: no report

[4] Report: Faculty Senate Communication Survey

J. Ledesma

Report: The Faculty Communication Survey is 6 questions in length and will be sent to faculty on January 19. The Survey will close on February 1 for consideration at the next Executive Committee meeting (February 6) and a report at the next Senate meeting (February 15). Senators should announce this at faculty meetings and remind faculty to respond.

[6] Report: FitThumb and Wellness Initiatives

K. Koudele

Report: Employees will be required to complete a survey about reasons for not using FitThumb (and related issues) as part of the open enrollment process for healthcare plans. Faculty should be encouraged to respond clearly in order to influence decisions that are made about the benefits package. In particular, faculty should consider whether they would be willing to accept that use of FitThumb was a requirement for a healthcare discount and that they should be prepared to provide a rationale for their decision.

[10] Senate Education: Elections Spring 2017

K. Bailey

Report: There are 10 seats up for election this spring as part of Senate elections. Senators were encouraged to remind their colleagues to think about who to nominate for these seats.

Next faculty senate meeting: February 15, 2017 at 6:00 pm in the Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall.