

Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 3, 2013

I. Call to order

Brad Taggart called to order the regular meeting of the *Faculty Senate* at 3:34pm on *October 3, 2013* in the *Academy Room*.

II. Roll call

The following persons were present: *Brad Taggart, Ron Lamb, Lisa Anderson, Kari Arnoldsen, Paul Rasmussen, Cless Young, and Ted Olson*. Minutes submitted by *MarKay Mullen*

III. Approval of minutes from last meeting

There was one spelling error that was asked to be fixed. After the fix is made the minutes were approved as read. *Brad Taggart* entertains a motion, *Ron Lamb* moves and *Ted Olson* second. Unanimous vote to approve minutes from 9/26/13.

IV. Mass Email

- a) Brad: Let's talk to our divisions next Tuesday and then revisit this next week. The mass emails for excusal bothers me. I would reject that policy if it came to us. Let's check again with our divisions to see if maybe we are the only ones who are bugged by this.

V. Dr. Hoods email

- a) Brad: I sent out a last minute email from Dr. Hood. He is not familiar with the faculty senate since at his previous school they did not have a faculty senate. He talked about this a bit in his last email sent out to the College. He is use to his school where they have a faculty meeting once a month or so and includes everyone to review the issues at hand; he is just unfamiliar with the idea of this group. I am not in favor of moving to a full faculty senate, I think what we have works well and has worked well so far. I don't think that he wants to change anything; this is just all new to him.

VI. Document

- a) Brad: I would like to increase the number in the Senate. I would like to entertain a motion to officially put in the document to increase the number to 2 representatives per divisions. I gave you all a week to think about this, want to hear what you think. One person must be tenured and one can be non-tenured. We can add into the language of the document that if there is an "at large" situation we can add another representative.

Kari made the motion to increase to 2 members from each division, one tenured, one not as well as to include adjunct faculty members. Also, to include in the language that there could be a representative added for "at large" situations. Lisa seconds the motion, unanimous vote in favor.

- b) Paul: Suppose this is set, how many can be absent and still meet?
- c) Brad: A senate majority must be present. I like to have at least 4 of the 5 here before we vote on anything.
- d) Ron: So we will be at 10 representatives when this gets passed, the 2/3 rule would mean that there must be at least 6 people present.
- e) Lisa: (*editing of the document*) 2 senators in each division, President elect and other standing members. How do we want to word the adjunct information?
- f) Ron: Senate consists of 2 representatives (*one must be tenured*) plus faculty representative. Adjunct to be elected yearly. I think that it is important for the adjunct to be represented.
- g) Ted: What are the terms for the members divisions?
- h) Lisa: right now it says 2-year term, members elected each year.
- i) Ron: If we stagger the years then it would be a few old leaving and a few new coming.
- j) Brad: President of the Senate it a one year job.
- k) Kari: Who chooses the adjunct, everybody or the adjuncts?
- l) Paul: You could rotate it from division to division each year.
- m) Brad: Adjuncts appointed yearly by the senate, through the academic divisions. Going through alphabetically will make it easier. If we lose an adjunct in the middle of the school year then we just appoint one from that division to finish out the year. Then the following year it will go to the next division. With elections are we going to say that every year a senator will be replaced?
- n) Kari: Every year there will be a new person being added, do we want to find a senate time for the meeting and lock it in? If you are a senator you have to make it work, adjust your class schedule if you need to.
- o) Group discussion on how this is necessary with so many people. It is the only way that everyone will be able to agree on a time. Discussion of the first and third Thursday of every month start time 3:30pm and run until 5pm. Evergreen has a specific time and day of meetings in the document.
- p) Kari: Everyone should be educated on what “faculty at large” means.
- q) Lisa: There is one sentence at the end of the documents stating that at large senator should be tenured.
- r) Brad: I think that should stay. I wouldn’t want to create a bad situation.

- s) Ron: My concern is non-tenured, how safe they would feel (they should feel safe) but to actually make their comments on what they think. If you didn't have tenure and there was a hot topic it might be hard to express your true feelings.
- t) Ted & Ron: At large should probably be tenured.
- u) Ted: I make a motion that at large should be tenured.
- v) Brad: I think that the verbiage should stay the same, keeping at large tenured. Leave it the way it is currently in the Evergreen Document (*reading of the verbiage of the Snow College document*). Maybe what we can do is have Lisa email this out to you the way that we have edited it today for you all to review before next meeting. Print it out and make corrections to it so that you can come next week come with suggestions and changes that you see and we can adjust, sit on it for a week and then hopefully send it along to the faculty in two weeks. Hold this document up to the Evergreen document and compare where we are.
- w) Talk of when does the voting takes place, beginning of the year or end of the year? Most agreed that at the end of the year.
- x) Ron: As far as elections go this year how many are up? I am in my second year up at the end of this year, Brad's term is up, and Kari's will be up as well. (*Some not sure of when their time started and when they will be up*)
- y) Kari: We need a record keeper, maybe that is MarKay's job, I don't know. Someone needs to have record of when faculty members join the senate and when they will be done with their service on this committee.
- z) Brad: (*reading part of the evergreen document*) As far as what needs to be in the document the Evergreen Document is just a "*recommending*" document. Some things that were talked about are: meeting times/schedule, curriculum, degree and certificates, grading policies, student success, faculty rolls, accreditation, etc. We would like our document to be a bit stronger than a "*recommendation*".
- aa) Ted: I would like to add something about if the faculty does not like something that has been passed that they can come to the senate to have the issue addressed again. Let's put a percentage on it like say 25% of the faculty is unhappy or something. Just to make sure the faculty is good with what is happening here. It was also added that Ted would like to see this go to the faculty before it goes to the College Council. He thinks that it is important for the faculty to be on board before it goes any further, is that something we can do?
- bb) Brad: Yes we will send it out to faculty for a 30-day review before it gets sent to College Council. (Everyone agrees and would like to see this done.)

VII. Adjournment

- a) Ron: We need to bring up the salary issue one time soon!!

Meeting adjourned at 4:33pm

Next meeting Thursday October 10, 2013 at 3:30pm