

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Monday, March 5, 2012**  
**Misner Room, Collins Library**

Senators Present: Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Kelli Delaney, Leslie Saucedo, Elise Richman, Kris Bartanen, Ross Singleton, Kriszta Kotsis, Sue Hannaford, Steven Neshyba, Gareth Barkin, Bill Barry, Keith Ward, Marcus Luther, Mike Segawa

Guests Present: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

- I. Minutes of February 27, 2012 were approved with minor revisions.
- II. There were no announcements.
- III. There were no special orders.
- IV. Liaison Reports
  - a. Barry reported that the Academic Standards Committee passed the revision of policy concerning staff reporting student violations of academic honesty or integrity. The Senate does not have to take any action unless we would like to recommend changes to the language we most recently saw. It was generally agreed that the Senate did not wish to recommend changes.
- V. Discussion of the report from the ad hoc committee on educational benefits
  - a. Neshyba invited a discussion of the resolutions suggested via email by Neshyba and Barry in response to last week's meeting regarding the recommendation of the Benefit Task Force (BenTF) to Cabinet:
    - i. Neshyba's proposed language is as follows: 1. The Senate endorses the March 1, 2012 proposal of the BenTF. (Rationale: the proposal provides a short term solution to the demise of the NIC exchange, and is the best solution given the constraints of time and money that the Benefits Task Force was presented with); 2. The Senate recommends that the university vigorously pursue an exchange relationship with other private liberal arts schools. (Rationale: Such an exchange will require a high level of administrative commitment and work, and a longer time frame, than is possible to accomplish before the May meeting of the Trustees. However, the benefits of such an exchange are significant enough to merit such commitment as a long-term goal.)

- ii. Barry's proposed language is as follows: The Senate endorses the March 1, 2012 Educational Benefits proposal of the BenTF. The Senate appreciates the hard work of the Ben TF and the Ad Hoc Committee in devising a solution to the Educational Benefits crisis caused by the demise of the NIC tuition exchange. The Senate also recommends that the university continue to pursue an exchange relationship with other private liberal arts schools.
- b. M (Ward)/S/P to adopt Barry's language. (Abstention: Bartanen, who was unable to attend the 2/27/12 special senate session)
  - i. After some discussion of the language, the motion passed.
- c. Neshyba asked if the Senate would like to think about proposing the resolution to the faculty.
  - i. Singleton suggested that Neshyba might indicate the action as a part of the Chair's report to the Faculty. This way, if the faculty wants to discuss it, the faculty will have the prerogative at that time. Bartanen reminded senators that there are still moments for the senate and the faculty to weigh in on the recommendation, for the current resolution is directed toward the Cabinet. Once the Cabinet considers the proposal and prepares a recommendation, the Senate can comment on that recommendation.

#### VI. Update from executive committee on faculty governance practices

- a. MacBain announced that a basic handbook has been drafted and that at this time it consists primarily of information culled from the Faculty By-Laws. She suggested that the most efficient way to proceed would be for senators to assign themselves to certain sections to flesh out the draft. Her idea met with general agreement.
  - i. To senators' questions about what information each sub-category of the handbook will contain, MacBain explained the meanings of section headings and indicated a need for supplementary information not provided by the By-Laws, e.g., examples and descriptions of practices.
  - ii. Singleton suggested that, for instance, we might add to the senate section how the senate relates to the standing committees, in other words, what the nature is of that relationship.
  - iii. Ward suggested that we might think of the document as a place to explain how we do our work, and which processes not governed by the By-Laws we have worked out.
  - iv. Singleton observed that, beyond its definition in the By-Laws, the Senate is a place where people can come and talk about a problem that they're experiencing and ask the senate to address the issue. That is, faculty can request some sort of policy or program designed to improve their experience here. On a related note, Ward suggested that the handbook could explain the function of special orders. MacBain agreed and suggested, moreover, that the section on the Senate Chair could include a description of how an

agenda is created and what each item signifies. Returning to Singleton's idea, Richman said that the handbook could explain how the Senate acts as a forum: there can be more formalized mechanisms, like an ad hoc committee, or simply a body through which people can express concerns and seek representation. Bartanen suggested that two explanations to include would be 1) how something gains standing in the Senate, and 2) the role of the senate in appointing committee members, including information on the length of appointments, the idea of a fallow year, etc. Singleton indicated that he really likes the ideas of spelling out the process of issues gaining standing in the Senate and of thinking of the Senate as a place where people can be heard. He pointed out that, in a sense, we have a committee network that is at our service. We should be able to use it in response to the various issues that come before us. He would rather see an issue originate with the Senate than with the faculty as a whole, for if it were to come to the Senate first, there would be a more careful approach to thinking about the issue. Neshyba said that we should also include, then, what the Senate will do in response to a concern.

- b. Neshyba indicated that as we work on the document we will want to think about the issue of voice, too. Bartanen suggested that we imagine ourselves speaking to potential candidates for the positions. Barry added that we should think in terms of the long-view, what has been done by custom, what is tradition. Barkin noted that it would be difficult for the newer senators to make substantive contributions, to which Hannaford responded that they (herself included) could play the part of prospective senators well.
- c. Barry asked that MacBain explain the differences between the headings "Policies and Procedures" and "Purposes and Duties." MacBain indicated that "Purposes and Duties" involve senators and members of the executive committee whereas Policies and Procedures concern the Senate as a body. Singleton suggested that we include the issue of gaining standing with the Senate under the heading Policies and Procedures. Hannaford suggested that the "Liaisons" section could be swallowed up by the section on the Senate and its committees. Neshyba also believes that the "Liaisons" information will not merit its own section.
- d. It was determined that MacBain would email everyone a list of the categories within the handbook, complete with an indication of what information should go where. (The list will be in outline form.) Once everyone has contributed to her/his section, we will consider and revise/edit the document as a whole. It was also determined that the most junior senators would correspond with one another to generate a list of questions that they, or prospective senators, may have about the operations and function of the Senate. It was decided, too, that student, staff, and administrative ex-officio members of the Senate would draft descriptions of their roles.

VII. By acclamation, the Senate recognized and thanked outgoing ASUPS President Marcus Luther for his year of excellent service on the Faculty Senate.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.