

## **ASU FACULTY SENATE MINUTES** **January 26, 2011 (revised – updates in red)**

### **I. Roll Call**

**A. Senators Present:** Russell Wilke (Faculty Senate President), Martha Sleutel (Faculty Senate Vice President), Bruce Bechtol (Center for Security Studies), Loree Branham (Agriculture), Mark Crouch (Computer Science), Donna Gee (Teacher Education), John Glassford (Political Science), Murat Kara (Accounting, Economics, Finance), Lynne C. Hughes (Physical Therapy), Cathy Johnson (Communication, Mass Media and Theatre), Kim Livengood (Curriculum & Instruction), María de los Santos Onofre-Madrid (Modern Languages), Jason E. Pierce (History), Valerie J. Reid (Aerospace Studies), William E. Renforth (Management & Marketing), Hardin R. Dunham for Joseph Satterfield (Physics), Jeffrey Schonberg (English), Andrew F. Siefker (Mathematics), Sangeeta Singg (Psychology & Sociology), Steven R. Snowden (Kinesiology), José Velásquez, (Chemistry & Biochemistry)

**B. Invited Guests:** None, due to other commitments, change in command, or scheduled lab.

**II. Approval of December Minutes:** Senator William Renforth moved to approve the minutes, and Senator Branham seconded the motion. Minutes were approved.

### **III. Unfinished Business:**

**A. CITR, e-learning Collaboration** – The senators were informed that combining CITR and e-learning had been declined.

**B. Faculty Awards and Banquet Revisions** – The senators were informed of the date change to Tuesday, April 26, 2011. They were asked to encourage colleagues to apply or nominate someone. Everyone's meal plus two drinks will be paid for by Mr. Mickey Long (Board of Regents).

**C. Faculty IDEA Evaluations** – Senators Sleutel (from the University Affairs Committee) gave an update. She received more information from Sarah Logan, and recommended that we leave the IDEA evaluation process as is, and that we not interfere with it. She stressed the fact that we do not have to evaluate every section of every course **every semester**. **The university requirement is for faculty to evaluate one section of each course in the Fall. Courses not evaluated in the Fall must be evaluated in the Spring or Summer, so that all courses are evaluated annually. But again, it is only one section of each course that is required. This is the minimum required by SACS so it is not an option to evaluate courses less often. Instructors may evaluate more frequently and may choose to evaluate all sections of a course. Thus, the current rule is sufficiently flexible within the minimum requirements established by the university and SACS.**

**D. Operating Procedure Review Process** – Senate President Wilke presented an update that included that the compromise was that 5 faculty members from the Faculty Senate would serve on the committee. He proceeded to ask for volunteers, preferably one from each college, to help review and/or rewrite the policies. There were questions from the floor with respect to time line and if senators whose term was ending this semester would be able to serve. There is an urgency to have this committee in place; therefore, it was recommended that the committee be made up of Faculty Senate members. Senators Schonberg and Glassford volunteered from the College of Liberal and Fine Arts. Senators Hughes (Nursing and Allied Health), Kara (College of Business) and Wilke (College of Sciences) also volunteered. Senators Singg (LFA) and Gee (College of Education) will be alternates. Another information item was that a ballot for OP 6.23 (Tenure and Promotion) will go out to “Faculty At-Large”, but not to department heads.

**E. Faculty Development Leave Proposal** – Faculty Senate President Wilke asked that any comments be sent to Dr. Wegner (CITR). Some discussion followed with respect to the existence of a policy. Senator Sleutel voiced that the Faculty Senate should **acknowledge the understanding that there is no money to consider faculty development leave**. Until such time as there is money, providing faculty development leave is not realistic. Some discussion followed with respect to the existence of a policy. **The group agreed that CITR should continue work on completing the policy.**

**F. The “Gary Rodgers” Faculty, Staff, and Administrative Awards** – The Development Office plan is to have a Faculty Senate ad-hoc committee which will serve with an identical Staff Senate committee to come up with criteria and to present the award at the Fall 2011 State of the University meeting. Senator Womack volunteered to serve on the committee, and Faculty Senate President Wilke indicated that he would ask Senator Satterfield to help out. The Student Senate will include department heads with the faculty for their evaluations.

**G. University Budget Advisory Team** – The procedures seem to be questionable. There were remarks about no voting and no minutes being taken, and that decisions made by different groups may be different, but that ultimately, the president will decide. We will continue to receive an update from the senators who are members of the UBAT (Renforth and Wilke); however, it is a difficult time and there is a need to be more efficient.

Senator Renforth made a motion to quit having refreshments at the Faculty Senate meetings. Senator Branham seconded the motion. Senator Kara made a friendly amendment to take donations. Senator Schonberg abstained; Senator voted against the motion; the rest of the senators voted in favor of the motion.

#### **IV. New Business:**

**A. Review of Shared Governance Document** – The Faculty Senators were asked to solicit feedback from their constituents about the shared governance document sent by the Provost, and to forward them to the University Affairs Committee (Martha Sleutel). The target date for a statement from the Faculty Senate is March 9, 2011. Some discussion followed.

Senator Schonberg made a motion to send this to committee to solicit comments. Senator Snowden seconded the motion. Senator Sleutel recommended that all should look at the document and provide feedback. She stated that the senators should ask colleagues to provide information and to send it to the

University Affairs Committee by the deadline stated above. The vote was taken, and Senator Sleutel opposed the motion. All of the other senators voted in favor of it.

**B. Review of Previous Senate Action Items** – The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate compiled a list of questions in regards to **unresolved** Action Items from the fall and will submit each item to the proper authorities to check on its implementation or response status (a handout with a preliminary list of the items was given to the senators). Faculty Senate President Wilke presented the list as a motion from the Executive Committee. Senator Renforth seconded the motion. There was some discussion which included adding “office hours” to the list. A question was raised with respect to the need to change the bylaws when Shared Governance is instituted, and to require a majority vote by the faculty beforehand, by mail. All senators voted in favor of the motion.

**C. Senator Terms and Elections** – Senators were reminded by the By-Laws Committee to check their senate term (printed documentation was provided with this information) and to prepare for departmental elections by April. New senators will be presented at the May meeting; the election of new officers and committee chairs will also take place at that meeting.

**D. Graduation Speaker Selection** – Speakers since 2005 have all been males (printed documentation was provided), which may violate ASU’s diversity and mission statements. The following was presented as a motion from the Executive Committee: Academic Affairs is charged with investigating the process of how speakers are chosen and making a recommendation (via the Faculty Senate) that diversity be considered in the selection process.

There was some discussion **about the issue of speakers who are politicians and turn the graduation speech** into a **political** pep rally, and that we need to ask for diversity. A question was raised: is this a Faculty Senate issue? Other discussion included that there needs to be a mechanism to make this observation, maybe ask the President the question. The motion failed.

Senator Kara made a recommendation that diversity be considered in the selection process. Senator Sleutel seconded the motion. Senator Siefker was opposed. The other senators approved.

**E. Questions for President Rallo** – Dr. Rallo will meet with the Executive committee on February 2, 2011, to answer Faculty Senate questions. Due to scheduling conflicts he could not attend this meeting, and he could not attend the February 9, 2011, meeting. Senators were asked to submit questions that they or their constituents would like answered to Faculty Senate President Wilke, by the end of the next week.

Senator Snowden voiced a concern with respect to enrollment management, as he has received different responses from different entities.

## **V. Standing Committee Reports:**

**A. Academic Affairs:** No report.

**B. By-Laws and Standing Rules:** No report.

**C. University Affairs:** No report.

**D. Student Affairs:** No report.

**E. External Affairs:** No report.

**VI. Roundtable:**

- Senate Glassford circulated a document (FYI) on a proposal he will submit. There should be a pamphlet on what faculty can and can't do (the handout contains the summary of **Phelan v Texas (2008)**)
- Senator Hughes voiced the concern that for clinical faculty there are no promotions; there are no guidelines.
- Senator Renforth mentioned the summer school time line mechanism.
- Senator Gee commented on CTR cuts (a rumor?), and that off-campus programs were cut.
- Senator Siefker asked that we not drop the ball on the Zarnowski memo.
- Senator Schonberg commented that the e-mail from the system lawyer provides no blanket statement; there need to be individual issues.
- Senator Glassford commented that rules are unfolding.
- Senator Sleutel informed her committee members to meet after the Faculty Senate meeting.

**VII. Adjournment:** Faculty Senator Siefker moved to adjourn. Senator Renforth seconded.  
Meeting adjourned at 4:25 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

María de los Santos Onofre-Madrid  
Secretary, Faculty Senate