

Faculty Senate Meeting
January 17, 2013

The Senate met Thursday, January 17, 2013 at the Alumni House.

Marty Smith, Faculty Senate Vice President, Presiding

Members Present: Glen Bauer, Juraj Bohus, Carla Colletti, Sally Howald, Don Conway-Long, Victoria McMullen, Stephanie Schroeder, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Xiaoyuan Suo, Roy Tamashiro, Emily Thompson, Carole Tucker, Gwyneth Williams

Announcements

Marty had everyone introduce themselves as there were four new senators and she introduced Lisa Gjerswald who is filling in for Cynthia.

Marty sent flowers on behalf of the senate to the funeral home for the wake for Ralph's father.

. A Senator requested that the discussion on new department being proposed and the possibility of discussion of a new profession school not take place at the same assembly. The discussion about them being in a new school should be in a separate meeting; it is not dependent on these being in their own school. All agreed to push to another assembly meeting.

Senate agrees we will need three assembly meetings this Semester due to upcoming business.

Marty announced that Barbara O'Malley and Paul Carney should be at next meeting. It is not going to be a presentation from them, they will be answering questions. The Senate does not want to limit them to the questions that were submitted earlier. Marty will confirm with Ralph that they are still attending the meeting.

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be January 24, 2013.

The Senate had already approved the minutes from the December 6, 2012 meeting as it was just a luncheon with a few minor issues.

Nurse Anesthesia Program

Jill Stulce attended the Senate meeting to present a proposal for Departmentalization of the Nurse Anesthesia Program. The Nurse Anesthesia Program would like to have more involvement as a stand-alone department with continued collaboration with Biological Sciences in regards to research and ongoing development.

Professor Stulce reported that the student body and faculty have increased and currently meets the criteria necessary to become a stand-alone department. The program currently operates on its own with curricula, operating budget, accreditation processes, and a non-traditional teaching schedule. There are four full-time faculty that teach basic science courses and two of them teach 50% of their load in the Nurse Anesthesia Program. Faculty are not designated as clinical but there have been discussions about making that designation. Faculty in the program are not evaluated the same as other faculty but clinical instructors are evaluating students. It is an impetuous notion of developing a program school because they share nonconventional teaching.

Several Senate members were in agreement that joint appointments do not always work out. Jill had asked if the Senate knew of any joint appointments in the past or currently in place. It was recommended that she speak with others who have held joint appointments and see what problems they have run into. The Senate was in support of the proposal but they felt it needed language pertaining to joint appointments. Members stated they would be reluctant to vote without this information described in the proposal.

Concerns were:

Q. Does that mean two department meetings and two evaluations? Yes

R. In the past we have done our separate meetings anyway and then we have one together.

Q. Does the person get to vote in one department or both?

A. No person gets two votes on an issue.

Q. What areas would overlap or create conflict; can things be delineated between graduate and undergraduate?

A. Undergraduate and nurse anesthesia classes do not overlap in curriculum and most nursing courses are not in the nurse anesthesia program.

R. There would be potential conflict though if person transferred from another school and also if a faculty member had joint appointment at another school. There would be problems with both deans, working for one and having them held accountable in one area but teaching in two.

Q. On the “no cost”, will the new department have a chair and department associates?

A. They already have their own department associates and staff. Jill is being compensated as program director so her title would change but pay would stay the same and there are clinical faculty already in place.

R. Our faculty will grow but there will not be a lot of changes. We have a lot to contribute as a stand-alone department. We have full support of science department and the dean.

Senate members agreed that they are all supportive but they need to see some changes in the proposal before they will agree to vote on it. The next step is for Jill to revise the proposal document for next week’s Senate meeting January 24 and the senate will discuss.

Jill was invited back to the next meeting and thanked for attending today.

Global Citizen Program

Proposal was introduced from the College of Arts and Sciences that a motion is taken to the Faculty Assembly regarding an amendment to Global Citizenship Program. “An international language course may be used to fulfill GCP requirements, if the student is not majoring in the specific language.”

Gwyneth Williams presented the following - A few years ago the College of Arts and Sciences had a push for 3 credit hour language requirement for Arts and Sciences. It was intended as a College requirement and it was voted that it would also count as a Gen Ed under the old Gen Ed program. When the new GCP was instituted it did not allow A&S students to use this 3 credit language course to fulfill GCP content, “language required for primary major cannot be used to fill a content area”. This put additional burden on students to meet the 3 hrs of language for the College requirement. An additional reason for the change is it only affects some students, there are other majors that require a language but it does not count toward that major. We discovered in the fall when the GCP rolled this out that nobody was aware of the change and we had still been advising students based on information in catalog.

Gwyneth continued, On November 28, 2012 the College met and agreed to ask the Faculty Assembly to amend the GCP requirement and add this sentence “An international language course may be used to fulfill GCP requirements, if the student is not majoring in that specific language.” We asked for the motion to be taken to the Faculty Assembly Meeting February 12, 2013. We had over 50 attendees at our meeting on the 28th and this passed unanimously. Bruce Umbaugh did not attend the College meeting on November 28 but as someone who disagrees and a member of the GCP, I asked him if he would write up his concerns. This document was given to Senate members. Bruce wrote, there are a lot of majors that don’t have a lot of required hours, leaving plenty of latitude within remaining hours to meet requirement for major, GCP and multiple minors and the language requirement. They stand to benefit from greater global study and they may not take another global understanding course. To insure breadth of study by the students, the Faculty Assembly required that GCP requirements be satisfied in addition to meeting requirements imposed on specific majors.

Senate Discussion Followed

The College originally settled on going directly to Faculty Assembly on this because they are the ones that will ultimately make the decision, but after speaking to Ralph, his suggestion was to bring it to Senate first to they can answer any questions from the Faculty Assembly to avoid having it kicked back to them before a vote would take place. Everyone agreed to take it to the Senate first but still wanted it presented at the February 12 Faculty Assembly and that is where it stands.

When this is pulled out of the catalog it really seems that it is not a College requirement but it is a major requirement. Each department/major has different requirements and exemptions should be considered on a case-by-case basis. The College was told by the GCP that no exemptions would be made for low credit majors. The GCP believes there is enough wiggle room to fit in another language course. The Curriculum Committee wanted it under major requirements.

A Senator asked if a College has the right to make requirements for the entire college and then grant some exemptions?

When the College decided to require that students in A&S should have one language course it was because as a global university 3 hours of language was seen as a bare minimum. The College does not demand competence but exposure to a language.

One Senator suggested the Assembly should hear thoughts from the GCP. The College voted to have the proposal submitted at the Faculty Assembly Meeting on February 12 with the proposed language. It will be reported that the Faculty Senate had mixed reactions to the proposal.

Spring Institute

The topic is still diversity – “diversity in the classroom”. A senate member commented perhaps it should include diversity among faculty.

Vienna Governance

Keith Welsh was in attendance and reported the following. The Senate was asked a year ago to look into what was going on at the Vienna campus with regards to faculty concerns. The relationship of the Vienna Art Major and our Webster Art Department has been voided under the leadership of the new director. She doesn't see a place for applied arts at the Austrian campus. The university and the school for applied arts are separate schools. More importantly many faculty want shared governance but feel they have had little input since the hiring of the new academic director.

The Vienna faculty want some sort of shared governance and they have been in communication with Keith Welsh. In 1994-1995 the Faculty Executive Committee endorsed the faculty governance concept for extended campuses suggesting that every site can have its own model. This is a provision in the University Handbook. Following the language in the Handbook, the Vienna faculty held an election and created a Faculty Senate. Keith Welsh provided the government structure proposal created by the new Vienna Faculty Senate requesting endorsement from the Webster Home Campus Faculty Senate.

Questions:

Who has last word in curriculum, major decisions?

Do they have their own budget?

Do they have their own coordinated efforts for diversity?

Should the dean or provost make those decisions?

What are justifications for founding governance organization?

There are serious objections by the Vienna Administration. At the start of the school year Peter Sunley received an email from Arthur Hirsch, Director of Vienna Campus, with his objections.

Arthur Hirsch said they cannot recognize their group as the Faculty Senate because the faculty represented are not full-time and 75% of the faculty members did not participate in the vote. He is insistent that the full-time faculty are the ones most engaged in the campus.

R. It is not in the governance that representatives must be full-time faculty. None of the full-time Vienna faculty nominated themselves and there are only 10 full-time faculty on the campus out of 75 faculty.

Not all of the academic areas at the international campus are represented on the Senate.

R. Not a valid objection, not every department has a seat on the Webster Home Campus Faculty Senate.

Adjuncts are not salaried employees of the university

R. Here at the home campus, adjuncts can serve on the assembly. They are not salaried employees at the home campus.

According to Peter Sunley, there was a response from the faculty in Vienna after nominations were made and an online election followed. Seven faculty members were elected. 32 out of 75 faculty voted and all of them are involved in the Vienna campus and do research; so Peter Sunley believes it was a legitimate process that created the Vienna Faculty Senate. A variety of committed faculty are being represented. The proposal from the Vienna Faculty Senate was submitted to the Webster Home Campus Senate for comments and approval.

It was mentioned that by Austrian law, the creation of a Works Council that represents the interest of faculty and staff is guided by an industrial model. The Works Council would not include adjuncts. A concern was raised if the Vienna campus has deviated too far from the American model.

The Vienna faculty elected a Faculty Senate who constructed a plan to submit to the Webster Home Campus Faculty Senate. Peter Sunley, who was elected President of the Vienna Faculty Senate, sent a letter to all Vienna faculty regarding the first meeting date and time, along with who was on the faculty senate and explained that they are now working toward a governance structure. Peter Sunley's letter encouraged feedback from everyone on issues that are important to them and indicate if their concern was confidential.. Many Vienna faculty want to have a voice and be part of the solution but they feel they do not have job security.

Gwyneth suggested that Ralph, Dottie Marshall Englis and Jim Brasfield meet prior to the Webster Senate's response. Jim Brasfield indicated there was previously a similar issue in Thailand. After this groups meets, the Senate will then review the proposal.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.