

## **Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**

September 26, 2013

### **I. Call to order**

Brad Taggart called to order the regular meeting of the Faculty Senate at 3:35pm on September 26, 2013 in The Academy Room.

### **II. Attendance**

The following persons were present: Brad Taggart, Ron Lamb, Lisa Anderson, Kari Arnoldsen, Ted Olson, Paul Rasmussen, (Cless Young arrived the last 5 minutes). Minutes submitted by MarKay Mullen

### **III. Approval of minutes from last meeting**

The minutes from last meeting were reviewed. The minutes were approved as read.

### **IV. Open issues**

- a) Kari: Issue of mass email from teachers/coaches of students that will be absent from class, does not like this way of communicating classes being missed.
- b) Brad: Still do official forms and have students come around to follow up with teachers on what they missed. No mass emails. There is no responsibility on the student's part. Not sure what the solution would be.
- c) Kari: What is the official policy on this?
- d) Brad: The student needs to bring in an approval paper and get it signed off with the teacher. If you are gone on a Friday and there is a test Friday it needs to be cleared before. If it is not cleared in my classes you lose out on that privilege to take the test again.
- e) Ted: Some students feel that they are exempt from everything because of excusal.
- f) Kari: Snow College catalog there is an excusal form. Page 11 of 14 in the registration section
- g) Ron: Reminder needs to be sent out to everyone not just athletics.
- h) Brad: Students need to be aware of what is going on and get the prior approval so they are not left in the dark. Current policy says it has to be signed by a teacher. It needs to be sent out and attention needs to be brought to the teachers and coaches.
- i) Lisa: Is there an official form? Maybe in the registration office?
- j) Ron: Is this just for test?
- k) Kari: this is about examinations only, maybe in a different section.
- l) Brad: Remind the divisions there is a proper way of doing this and we need to locate the form for distribution.

## V. Curriculum

- a) Kari: Revisiting the cheating policy. Goes on for pages. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph last sentence new language. Evidence prepares new language 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph inserting “likely” Section 5 new language last paragraph cut “if” and added “and” 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph “10 business days” is new. This came to our attention because of an EDNET teacher who caught her student deliberately cheating, teacher let the ball drop and didn’t address it soon enough. Parents came to bat for their daughter about the school not following the 5-day rule. Teacher waited 12 days. Curriculum is revisiting this right now. This is all just FYI.
- b) Brad: Any progress on professional track?
- c) Kari: Haven’t heard yet. October 11 for the packet to be in. Final tenure review, some people were informed that they got it and they really hadn’t yet.
- d) Brad: What do we do with this Curriculum Committee?
- e) Kari: Someone dropped out needing to find another person, staying at the same time.
- f) Brad: Every one of us has an issue with this time.
- g) Ted: A senator needs to be included.
- h) Ron: Have a member on the committee that reports to a senator.
- i) Paul: Would that be available for motion?
- j) Ron: Let’s ask them first before we command if we need to.

## VI. Document Structure

- a) Brad: Ok, Evergreen document and the structure. Marci included link to us and included the document. I really think that we could almost transplant our stuff into the document now. The language is similar and what we are thinking is similar. Are we going to have two reps or do we want X number of reps and let it range from a couple to whatever?
- b) Kari: How many full times in a division, two for a big and one for a small. You can make that magic number whatever you want. We are 31, Humanities 22, Fine Arts 19 or 20, Lisa’s division is 29. In other schools 10-13% of faculty are senators, Snow is at 4%
- c) Brad: Worried departments will be upset if they don’t have the same numbers. Let me read this Evergreen document...If a division fewer than twenty tenure then one senator, if twenty or more two senators. Two at large reps by and from tenured faculty. Two adjunct faculties... no language state that there is a majority of tenured faculty. If we can get this sorted out how we want we are right on top of it. This is it, we have the bulk of it just lay it in and we have it.
- d) Ron: Number of sub committees if we double the senate committees. What if we took membership of sub committees and made them senators. Disadvantage would be two meetings.

- e) Brad: Two members out of the four that don't have committee assignments. Some committees do not need representation for each division. Library committee and others that are sitting idle. They are getting overlooked. Voices freed up to help participate in these discussions. Other issues as far as adjunct positions, Stick to just one or where do we go from that. Waiting on sending out until we get a few things sorted out. Make a decision do we go with the two or two if this or number of X large per division.
- f) Kari: I like that it fluctuated at large.
- g) Brad: Argued that the fine arts could produce a senator, we want that second position.
- h) Ron: Equal rep for numbers on other committees. House based on population, senate becomes our version of the House. Make it even so there is division rep for committees.
- i) Brad: I would lean towards two per division and one must be tenured
- j) Ted: I think we should do it that way, it would work (excuses himself for class)
- k) Brad: How many would agree to two per division and at least one tenured? We will vote on that first thing next meeting. If we can get that through we are good to go.

## **VII. Adjournment**

*Brad Taggart* adjourned the meeting at 4:45pm.

Minutes taken by *MarKay Mullen*