Draft Minutes of the
SU Faculty Senate Meeting
April 3, 2007
HH 119

Senators present –Curtin, DeRidder, Egan, Groth, Hammond, Hopson, Lawler, Mullins, Parker, Rieck, Ritenour, Scott, Shannon, Shipper

Senators absent – Khazeh, Morrison, Robinson, Talbert

1.   Pres. Mullins called the meeting to order at 3:33; a quorum was present. Mullins announced that the date on the agenda should be April 3.

2.   Corrections to the March 13 minutes – Sen. Parker made changes to item 3a. "the (?) Council" should be the "Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)" and the year listed should be 2010.   Corrections to the March 27 minutes – Sen. Curtin suggested that Senator Shannon's motion, on page 1 should be highlighted or repeated closer to the vote on page 2. Sen. Shannon suggested reviving an earlier practice, of listing the motions that are passed at a meeting at the end of the minutes. Both minutes were approved as amended.

3.   Announcements from President Mullins
      a. A consulting firm has been hired to help with enrollment management issues and will be on campus soon. Ellen Neufeldt sent an invitation to the Senate Pres, Senate VP, and members of the Long Range Academic Planning and Admissions & Readmissions Committees to attend a meeting with the consultants on April 12, 3:30 in the Scarborough Center. The Senate will be kept up on the discussions from that meeting and other aspects of this.

      b. Mullins has been informed that a petition challenging the Senate's March 27 approval of the Fulton Curricular proposal is being circulated. The petition also requests that the Senate call a meeting of the faculty to discuss and vote on the issue. Mullins distributed a copy of the draft petition to the senators and asked for any concerns/questions about the process. As the designated senator on the Membership & Elections committee, Sen. Curtin asked what that committee needs to do to prepare for this meeting; will there be a particular time during the meeting for voting? Also, can discussion start before a quorum is present? Parliamentarian Parker said that M&E must provide an accurate list of the faculty to insure that a quorum is present and that only FT faculty vote. (There are 340 FT faculty, so 171 are needed for a quorum). According to Roberts Rules, motions can be made from the floor at the meeting, but a few senators suggested that it would be preferable to have motions in advance. Others asked whether Gen Ed should be handled separately and whether Fulton specific changes should be considered at all. But since UCC and the Senate (both of which have reps from all schools) have already voted on the full proposal, the faculty should be able to as well. In his e-mail to the faculty, Mullins will mention that motions can be submitted in advance and ask whether the Gen Ed portion of the proposal should be handled separately. Mullins felt the petition was not very clear and suggested that any senator involved or knowing those involved might want to make the petition more specific. What is the deadline for receiving the petition? Ten days from official notice of the senate vote – and today is Day 1 as the minutes were accepted (assuming that sending

out the draft minutes constituted notifying the faculty). Mullins proposed that the faculty meeting be held on Tues. April 24 at 3:30.

4. No word from or questions for the administration

5. New Business

    a. <u>Learning Technology Committee Bylaws Change</u> – Mike Scott. The proposal includes 1) changing their name to Learning With Technology Committee to put more emphasis on teaching and learning rather than on technology 2) adding "reviewing and making recommendations for online teaching and learning" to the purposes of the committee and 3) adding a representative from the library to the committee. (Senators had received the proposal attached to the agenda). Sen. Shannon moved that the senate move the proposal along to the Membership and Elections Committee to be put on the ballot. Seconded.

        Voice vote, motion carries.

    b. <u>Sabbatical deadlines</u> – Darrell Mullins. The Faculty Welfare Committee is concerned that the deadlines for submission of sabbatical applications has not been uniformly enforced – as long as the deadline to FWC has been met, other deadlines have been waived in some situations but not in others. Some faculty who were late, were told they couldn't apply, others were let slide. Shannon suggested and others agreed that the deadline for submission by the faculty member to their chair should be a hard deadline (with the possibility of a waiver in extenuating circumstances), but that intermediate deadlines could be more flexible. Since the deadline already exists, there is no need for a motion; instead FWC will be told to hold faculty to their deadline and those that meet it should get full consideration. Sen. Curtin mentioned that confusion on relevant dates on the web site last summer may have contributed to the issue and that seems to be gone now. Shannon mentioned that the "working calendar' on the web functions like the old academic calendar and faculty should be aware that deadlines are listed there.

    c. <u>Catalog Language on Grades of F, WP and WF</u>- Kurt Ludwick. Academic Policies Committee was asked to review this and proposes removing the sentence "The "F" grade is also given for late or unofficial withdrawals" as there is no formal definition of either late or unofficial withdrawals. With regard to WP/WF grades they propose to change "from the University" to "from a course" in part to make the catalog wording identical to that in the faculty handbook and also to give Dean's the option of assigning a WP or WF if/when they waive the deadline for dropping a course (currently they can only give a W in that situation). Senators had received the proposal with the agenda. After a few questions, Shannon moved that we approve the proposal; Scott seconded.

        Voice vote, motion carries.

    d. <u>Deregistration Policy</u> – Kurt Ludwick. The current policy of missing two consecutive classes allows an instructor the option of deregistering a student works well for most courses, but means that deregistration would occur proportionately late in summer or winter terms or in a course that meets only once

a week. So the Academic Policies Committee proposes that in these situations missing the first class of a course constitutes cause for an instructor to deregister a student (unless the student has informed the instructor of their wish to remain in the course). The committee submitted two versions of the re-worked copy, one with the specific changes added to the current version and a second more simplified version, but with the same meaning. (Senators had received an attachment with both versions). Sen. Parker moved to accept the second, simplified version; seconded. Discussion included what to do with courses with labs, the fact that attendance needs to be taken to do this and that most instructors only use when there are students wanting to get into a course. In response to concern about poor attendance at the first class meeting, senators suggested advisors talking with advisees about the importance of the first class, use of the IT class list or Web CT to send out the first assignment even before the first class session. A comment for the need for reliable e-mail on campus was made.

Voice vote, motion carries.

e. Graduate Council Curriculum review Process – Joaquín Vilá. At the Sept. 2006 Senate meeting, the UCC and Graduate Council were "directed to meet and discuss the exact mechanism used for graduate curricular changes and report back to the senate with any recommendations". Since then the committees have met and both have discussed this issue and made recommendations. The recommendations from the grad council were included as an attachment with the agenda. As those from the UCC were not sent out prior to the meeting, Sen. Ritenour stated them: 1) The UCC suggests its name be changed to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; 2) recommends consistency in all University curriculum review, including parallel processes for both committees, all process being outlined in University's Curriculum Approval Guide and membership in the GCC should be clearly defined with members elected from the graduate faculty at large and 3) the UCC expresses its concern that graduate curriculum approval is determined by the Graduate Council where only some 1/3 are elected members. Sen. Rieck suggested that part of the problems and misunderstandings have come from the fact that the Graduate Council is not a standing committee of the senate and has not consistently had a senate liaison.   Sen. Shannon made a motion to ask the Graduate Council to draft appropriate bylaws to establish them as a standing committee of the senate. Seconded. Discussion included clarification that this means the Grad Council (not the GCC which is a subcommittee of it), that if there are specification for membership on Grad Council that can be written into the bylaws, that although the GCC (which is a non-elected subcommittee) makes the recommendations regarding curriculum, the whole council (which is elected) votes on these, and concerns that not all proposals received by the Grad Council had gone through the appropriate school review process first. Vilá indicated that this was not due to variation in the process by the GCC but rather to some schools sending proposals to them that were signed off by the school, without being reviewed by the school committee; Curtin suggested that some Fulton proposal had slipped through when the FCC chair had changed. Mullins suggested that that problem could be eliminated by bylaws wording. A friendly amendment to the motion changing the name of the UCC to the Undergraduate CC was suggested, but it was decided to wait on that until the Grad Council bylaws are approved.

Voice vote, motion carries.

6.   Pres. Mullins reminded senators that, even though this and one additional meeting in April were added after the original schedule, that agreeing to serve as senators means being available on all Tuesdays, 3:30 – 5 PM and giving high priority to attending those meetings.

7.   Meeting adjoined at 4:30 PM.

Motions made and passed during the meeting;

1. A motion that the senate move the proposed Learning Technology Committee Bylaws Changes along to the Membership and Elections Committee to be put on the ballot

2. A motion that we approve the changes proposed by the Academic Policies Committee to the catalog language on grades of F, WP and WF.

3. A motion that we approve the changes proposed by the Academic Policies Committee regarding the Deregistration Policy.

4. A motion to ask the Graduate Council to draft appropriate bylaws to establish them as a standing committee of the senate.

Also,

FWC will be told to hold faculty to their deadline to turn their sabbatical applications in to their department chairs and faculty that meet that deadline should get full consideration of their application.

Respectfully submitted by Ellen Lawler, Secretary