

Faculty Senate Minutes

Thursday, September 20, 2018 at the Alumni House, 1:30 p.m.

I. Attendance

K. Armbruster, K. Corley, G. Glasgow, T. Green, J. Haldeman, D. MacCartney, J. Palmer, KK Pease, G. Renz, L. Risik, C. Sagovac, H. Singaravelu, P. Witkowski

II. Approval of Minutes

Upon motion by G. Renz, seconded by J. Palmer, the Senate unanimously approved the following minutes, as a group:

- Faculty Senate Minutes of August 30, 2018
- Faculty Senate Minutes of June 7, 2018
- Faculty Senate Minutes of May 17, 2018
- Faculty Senate Minutes of May 3, 2018
- Faculty Assembly Minutes of September 18, 2018
- Faculty Assembly Minutes of April 24, 2018

III. Old Business

1. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by G. Renz, seconded by P. Witkowski, to appoint ***Yin Lam (Nicole) Lee-Johnson to the open At-Large seat on Multicultural Studies Committee*** for a three-year term ending May 2021.
 2. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by K. Pease, seconded by K. Armbruster, to appoint ***David Pennington to replace Steve Lattimore on the open elected At-Large seat of Publications Board*** for a term ending May 2020.
 3. P. Witkowski will ask B. Rodney if he would like to fill her position on the Graduate Council.
 4. C. Sagovac said that the School of Communications is spread too thin for anyone to sit on any more committees.
 5. The Senate unanimously agreed that because T. Green and P. Witkowski are able to represent the School of Education on the Senate and the seat left open by the resignation of B. Rodney will remain open for the rest of Academic Year 2018-2019. The open School of Education seat will be placed on the ballot again in the spring.
 6. The Senate unanimously approved a motion by K. Armbruster, seconded by D. MacCartney, to draft a motion to be forwarded to all Committee Chairs requesting that they review their committees concerning structure and membership. This is due to the inability to fill all committee seats because of conflicts in scheduling, not enough people in departments to volunteer, morale, as well as other reasons. (see Attachment A)
- IV. The Senate unanimously agreed to CIO Margie Muthukumar's request to address the Senate in the future.

V. New Business

K. Pease presented a letter from the College of Arts & Sciences Council of Chairs addressed to the Faculty Senate. (See Attachment B.)

The Chairs would like to see the review process of programs to have a strategic plan to include faculty, criteria, actions, and justifications for actions taken. They would like to see the review process spread to non-academic programs as well, including study abroad, athletics, career planning, advising, etc.

The Senate agreed that they would formally respond to the letter at the next Senate meeting.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:30 p.m.

Attachment A

Because there has been a consistent problem filling open committee seats in the past few years, likely due to the increased demands on the time of faculty, the Senate requests that you evaluate the structure and number of seats on your committee: Could you accomplish your goals with fewer members? If your committee currently has representation from each school and college, is that absolutely necessary (considering that some schools and colleges have more faculty, and thus more ability to staff committees, than others)? Please send your thoughts to Gary Renz by December 1, 2018.

September 19, 2018

To the Faculty Senate:

The council of chairs in the College of Arts & Sciences is ready and eager to participate in the upcoming program review. We see this as an opportunity to gain a better understanding of where our university stands in terms of curriculum, budgetary efficiencies, and strategic focus. Because of our commitment to shared governance, the faculty and administration should partner, with both playing active roles in all the stages of the program review process from planning and design through implementation and analysis.

We understand that the administration plans to work with the Senate on developing committees for program review. We strongly encourage a pro-active approach, where the Faculty Senate initially provides a draft framework document outlining process, criteria/measures, and potential actions, along with justification for the framework design. This document can be a starting point for conversations with the administration about additions, modifications, and process. By taking the first step, the Faculty Senate can ensure faculty buy-in for the process and engage with the administration in a cooperative and meaningful way.

Our 2012 program review can be used as a baseline for designing the next phase. That review only covered academic majors at the University. While this is a good starting point, it only gives a snapshot of a part of the University. In order to get a comprehensive view of how our University functions, we must review both academic and non-academic programs. Examples of non-academic programs include Athletics, Study Abroad, Chess Team, Career Planning and Development, Advising, and Dining Services. It will be important to understand how each of these non-academic programs integrates with the academic programs, and how each contributes strategically and/or financially. The model to be recommended by the small program sustainability implementation team can perhaps helpfully supplement the work of 2012.

Our university currently faces complex problems, and we hope that this Program Review can be used in a constructive way to identify strengths and weaknesses, as well as provide direction for growth opportunities and investment.

Thank you,

Mary Lai Preuss and Bruce Umbaugh
(speaking on behalf of the council of chairs in CAS)

 ;h-1