

Faculty Senate Meeting
April 7, 2014
McCormick Room, Library

Present: Brad Dillman (chair), Haley Andres, Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Andrew Gardner, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Andrea Kueter (staff senate representative), Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

Guest: Bill Haltom

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:02.

Approval of Minutes

M/S/P to accept minutes of March 24, 2014 as revised. (Underlined sentence on page 2 was cut off in editing and will be corrected.)

Liaison reports

LMIS has been working on Senate charge #2. To that end, they believe Peoplesoft will be safe for sensitive data storage. FERPA is under the purview of the Academic Dean's office. The committee would like to address FERPA violations at a faculty meeting. They were addressed by Travis Nation regarding how Peoplesoft is progressing, particularly regarding the planning of the portal portion of Peoplesoft's implementation. An advisory group has been created with user-friendliness of Peoplesoft being a priority.

ASC is moving ahead with sending a letter to students about their first academic integrity incidence. When sent a notice of a second incidence, many students have been surprised that there was a first incidence on file.

COD has sent a letter to the *Trail* concerning the recent letters of two students. One in *Wetlands* magazine and one in the *Trail*. The COD sent the letters to the Faculty Senate and asked the Senate to read and discuss them. The Dean of Diversity is going to send a letter to the entire campus community regarding this issue. The COD recommends that a charge be given to the COD for next year so the matter of these letters can be brought up at a future faculty meeting.

The Senate discussed putting this matter on a future agenda. Bartanen mentioned discussing these letters in the Faculty Senate needs to be taken under caution. This is a very complex issue and there are many perceptions that should be considered.

Dillman suggested that more information about the incidents is needed, and noted that the KNOW proposal vote is still open at this time. Therefore, delaying discussions may be wise.

Stockdale inquired if an investigation is currently underway.

Buescher asked if security and the Dean's office were working together to disseminate information for better communication.

Mifflin wondered if other committees that are already discussing campus climate might be addressing this topic already.

Dillman noted a really full agenda for the next three meetings. Thus, unless there is a strong wish among the senators, the Senate will probably not have adequate time to discuss this issue this year.

Gardner asked if there was pressure on the Senate to evaluate this matter.

Tubert noted that the letter from the COD will be showing up in the next issue of the Trail.

Discussion of issues related to electronic voting by faculty

Wiese noted that electronic voting on the KNOW proposal was currently open. Electronic voting is new territory for the campus. If electronic voting is done again, there are several questions that need to be answered. A policy may need to be created for the full faculty to consider. Two questions that came up for example were:

1. Who is eligible to vote? This is not exactly clear from the Bylaws. Is it only the instructional faculty or all the faculty, which would include the President and the Academic Dean and Dean of Students. A related issue is whether Associate Deans who are also on the faculty (but not actively teaching due to their positions) should be eligible to vote.

2. Who should run the election? Clarifying the administrative responsibility for running an electronic voting process on a motion passed at a faculty meeting (vs. a Senate matter), might help address issues of security and integrity raised by some faculty.

Buescher inquired if in Sturgis the presiding officer break ties. Haltom researched and responded that the president is entitled to break a tie provided that he did not vote in the previous vote, neither voice nor hand vote. Buescher also asked if a dean who is also teaching is eligible to vote.

Bartanen suggested that the executive officers of the Senate should bring a proposal for future electronic voting.

Dillman queried whether the Senate should turn off the faculty listserv during an electronic vote. The listserv is under the control of the Senate. Recent communications over the listserv could be viewed as influential or campaigning for a certain side of a discussion.

Kessel noted the need for a common hour so that everyone can vote in person. We would not need electronic voting and would not need to address the many issues that come with electronic voting.

Buescher sees no need to shut down the listserv. He feels that conversation is healthy and the electronic communication is remote so as to not exert any undue influence.

Saucedo also does not see a need to shut down the listserv during an electronic vote.

Dillman said the executive committee decides which emails get through the listserv. Therefore, if an inappropriate comment were to come through they could prevent it from going out to the listserv.

Tubert indicated that a policy is needed for the future.

Mifflin thought that perhaps a period of open discussion via listserv before an electronic vote took place might be a better option.

Kessel believes that it is better to allow conversation than to shut down the server.

Saucedo also does not view the listserv as an intimidation factor but rather a conversation.

Haltom noted that in a voice vote there may still be reasons to reconsider a proposal. Someone who voted in the minority, for example, may ask for a proposal to be reconsidered.¹ This becomes a new motion at the next faculty meeting. This process is akin to keeping the listserv open during an electronic vote.

Scheduling for the rest of the year

Dillman will not be able to attend the meeting on April 21. There are 10 year end reports that need to be presented. Dillman will finalize details and get a schedule out to the Senate.

Wiese mentioned that election results will be available around May 5.

The senate still needs to discuss the recipient of the Walter Lowrie Distinguished Service Award.

The results of the faculty governance survey will be ready for discussion at any of the remaining meetings.

Bartanen noted that the FAC year-end report would be ready for the April 21 meeting.

Bartanen congratulated Tubert for coaching the Ethics Bowl team at a recent competition. She also noted that it was Hopfenbeck's last senate meeting as ASUPS president and thanked him for his service during the last year.

Wiese reported that there are currently 30 nominations for the FAC, 15 nominations for the Senate and 6 for Senate Chair. Dillman cautioned that the majority of those nominated will not accept their nominations.

Buescher inquired if the Senate could discuss making the entire campus non-smoking. Having smokers several feet away from buildings is not enough to keep their smoke from entering buildings.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05.

Respectfully submitted by Cynthia Gibson

¹ According to Sturgis, any member of the faculty can ask for a proposal or motion to be reconsidered.