FACULTY SENATE MEETING #550
September 11, 2014
12:45 P.M. in BAB 114

Present: *Wai Mok, Charles Hickman, Tim Landry, Eric Fong, Xiatong Li, Jill Johnson, Pavica Sheldon, Joe Conway, Joe Taylor, Linda Maier, John Kvach, Carolyn Sanders, Deborah Heikes, Anne Marie Choup, Eric Seemann, Kyle Knight, Mitch Berbrier, R. Michael Banish, Kader Frendi, Ken Zuo, Kristen Herrin, Azita Amiri, Monica Beck, Cheryl Emich, Lenora Smith, Larry Carey, Luciano Matzkin, Debra Moriarity, Jeff Weimer, Peter Slater, Letha Etzkorn, Mark Pekker, Lingze Duan, Seyed Sadeghi*

Absent with proxy: *Jack Schnell, Nick Jones, James Swain, Babak Shotorban, Mark Lin, Ellise Adams, Marlena Primeau, Udaysankar Nair, Carmen Scholz*

Absent without proxy: *Derrick Smith, John Kvach, Ying-Cheng Lin, Richard Fork, B. Earl Wells, Junpeng Guo, Nikolai Pogorelov*

➢ Faculty Senate President Wai Mok called the meeting to order at 12:45.

➢ Discussion of Policy on Policies

❖ History
President Altenkirch passed it on to us in the Faculty Executive Committee when we met in August. The Senate has 3 versions before us: the original, a markup, and one with very minor changes ("2 weeks" changed). Deadline for comment review is the end of this month.

❖ 2 Issues to Address:
1. Shared Governance. Entire Chapter 6 of Faculty Handbook is about Shared Governance. How does this affect us? (For this senate and future senates.)
2. Who will decide what policy comes to this Senate?

Deborah Heikes: We need to consider what happens to Senate Bills. If we are writing a bill, at some point it becomes a policy. So does it go through the 3 readings here and then we send it through this process?

Wai Mok: Here is the game plan: our comments will be distributed. We will think about them. Then we will vote on September 25th. Then we will turn our comments over to the President.

o Charles Hickman: In regards to policies that come to the Senate, the way it's written everything comes to the Senate. My perspective is that there's no other way to do it. We are going to get something that we don't want. All draft policies will be sent to us. We are explicitly included on the distribution list. I don't see any other way to handle it. Some level of subjectivity comes into play if we do it any other way. My suggestion is to set up a committee, or designate someone, to review these things. We only have one month for the

reviews. Everything should come to us and then we decide what we comment on and what we don't.

- o Kader Frendi: If we bring all 24 policies (the amount in the first wave) here, we will be bogged down. The Executive Committee doesn't have the power to make decisions, but someone needs to screen them. We cannot handle 24 policies all at once in this open forum.
- o Carolyn Sanders: I agree with Kader. We are already bogged down. There's already a discussion about how to minimize the discussion time in here.
- o Charles Hickman: I think we are on the same page. The Provost talked about the number of all existing policies being applied to this procedure. They will come in waves as they work through it and the first has 24. Ultimately, the President has the authority. He's putting this out there in the spirit of openness. We have to pick and choose which ones to review.
- o Deb Moriarity: I think everyone will agree with what's been said that we need some kind of screening mechanism. The Executive Committee discussed this and the issue was how to create that committee, because the Executive Committee doesn't do that. We already have a number of committees for different areas. This almost needs to be representatives from each of those committees, but perhaps not the chairs. What is in the by-laws that will allow for this?
- o Deborah Heikes: Wai can make an Ad-Hoc Committee any time he wants. We tell Wai what we want, and he can make it happen.

Deb Moriarity **motions** that we put together a committee to screen the policies. Deborah Heikes seconds that motion.
Mitch Berbrier **amends the motion** that we make it an Ad Hoc Committee for a temporary period to screen. Deb Moriarity agrees with this amendment.

- o Wai Mok: The first wave will be 20-24 policies.
- o Letha Etzkorn: In the long term, I'm not sure we need a separate committee. Perhaps at that point, the Executive Committee can decide and then send to the Faculty Senate with a comment that we've decided this isn't worth our time.
- o Wai Mok: I think the President or Provost will pass to the Faculty Senate President first, who will pass to the Executive Committee.

- o Mitch Berbrier: Whatever we get should go up on the webpage, so there's a period of comment, and then a decision is made.
- o Deb Moriarity: That's in the Policy on Policies.
- o Mitch Berbrier: Yes, but on our Faculty Senate webpage.
- o Deborah Heikes: And be sent via an email.
- o Wai Mok: What is passed to me, I will send in a massive email saying there's something in the pipeline, and I will ask Kala to post it online.
- o Deborah Heikes: Is that future policy?
- o Wai Mok: That's the way I will do it.
- o Mitch Berbrier: I would suggest that it's a written direction.

- o Jeff Weimer: We might have an easier situation given that in 2 weeks or one month, any policy that isn't commented on is automatically approved, so our job isn't to sit and look minutely, or flag important ones as we would like to review them. So we vote TO CONSIDER rather than vote NOT TO CONSIDER.
- o Charles Hickman: The default is to be apathetic. If it isn't someone's responsibility to read

them, then they won't be read and maybe one will slip through and there will be repercussions later on.

- o Wai Mok: I can take a first reading.

- o Michael Banish: One of the solutions is for the administration to identify what Faculty Senate Committee they fall under and have them do some leg work at the beginning and then start to portion them from there. Then they can go down to that committee from there. We don't want to overwhelm a committee, but...
- o Jill Johnson: Do we want administration to decide what we look at, or do we want to decide ourselves? Also, will this Ad Hoc Committee be reviewing re-established policies or new policies?
- o Deb Moriarity: Re-established policies.
- o Charles Hickman: I think someone needs to sit down and read every one of them. They will all be posted, so everyone here will have access to them. Someone needs to look at them and a decision needs to be made. Transparency and Accountability.
- o Deb Moriarity: There is suggestion for a committee because when there is a single point for entry, you lead yourself to being swayed by one person. So we need a small group to look at them. Also, everyone knows they're out there to look at. So we have 2 levels looking at them, and if one slips through it won't be on one person.

Deborah Heikes: We need to vote on the motion.

- o Jeff Weimer: With the structure of the Ad Hoc Committee—what do you envision in terms of the choice of which ones are brought forward to the Faculty Senate. Is the Ad Hoc Committee the only one who brings the policy forward? If I feel one should be brought forward, do I go through the committee?
- o Deborah Heikes: No, anyone can bring one forward to the Senate directly.

Wai Mok: There is a motion on the floor.

Mitch Berbrier makes another **amendment to the motion** that the President puts the committee together.

Call to question
Ayes carry the motion
No oppositions
*Motion that the Faculty Senate President puts together an Ad Hoc Committee for a temporary period to screen policies **passes***

- o Wai Mok: I am going to meet with the Provost and the President. There is a Board of Trustees meeting next week in Tuscaloosa. The President really wants to hear our comments.

- o Wai Mok: One thing that's really concerned some people is the Shared Governance. After meeting in August, the President made some significant changes.

- o Kader Frendi: Number 7 still says "2 weeks," not one month.

- o Wai Mok: The Faculty Senate has the power of Shared Governance that no other body has, not the Staff Senate or the SGA.

- o Charles Hickman: The President has the power to adopt policies, and he has proposed this Policy on Policies, which makes it more inclusive. If the feedback is reasonable, then he changes it. I don't know how to make it more inclusive.
- o Wai Mok: We need to make sure that this will protect the future. We need to look long-term. It will have an impact 10 to 20 years from now.
- o Mitch Berbrier: You're right, Chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook is about Shared Governance: "The Faculty Senate is the permanent body representing the faculty for the formulation of university policy and procedures in matters pertaining to institutional purpose, general academic considerations, curricular matters, university resources, and faculty personnel (appointments, promotion, and tenure)" (passage from 6.2).
Shared governance is an inherent part of our role. It's not recognized as part of this document. We need to think in terms of long-term. The stronger this is, with respect to our role, the better off we are. Do we want to push for stronger wording that recognizes the unique role of Faculty Senate and the unique role of Shared Governance? Should that be in here?
- o Letha Etzkorn: Do you have some ideas for how to word it? It's hard to vote until we do.
- o Mitch Berbrier: I was proposing a discussion.
- o Jeff Weimer: I don't see a way for Faculty Senate to reject a proposal. I see that a Vice President can reject one, but not that we, as Faculty Senate, can. I think that's one place where wording can be made stronger.
- o Carolyn Sanders: I totally agree with Mitch. I feel like our role is now being equalized with the other bodies. What's to keep some of these other entities, if it's a faculty-related concern, to vote?
- o Charles Hickman: We can reject it. We don't have veto power, but we can strongly disagree with it. Somehow we will have the ability to make comments in the myuah.
- o Deb Moriarity: I get what Dr. Weimer is saying, though. We don't take our comments to the President—we take them to the Vice President. So there's this go-between between the Faculty Senate and the President.
- o Jeff Weimer: For clarification, we do reviews and we provide comments. I think the language I'm looking for is that we provide comments and a recommendation not to approve the policy. It's implicit in there, yes, but in the strength of Shared Governance, I think that the wording needs to be there.

- o Mitch Berbrier: In terms of being more specific, are there alternative models to how this is done out there? Yes, there are: Indiana University and Utah Valley State. Dr. Sitaraman, a previous Faculty Senator, did some research to help us with this. At Indiana, there's a policy; it goes to stakeholders and there's a comment period. Then there's a roundtable where the Vice Presidents get to make recommendations to the President. The process goes: Development, Review, and Comment; Approval Procedure, which involves 4 entities—the Vice Presidents, the President, the Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty Council. That's Shared Governance. So the University Faculty Council is up there with the Vice Presidents, the President, and the Board of Trustees. At Utah Valley State, there's a President's Committee, which includes the Vice Presidents and the Faculty Senate President. So if we asked to be up there then we would be asking for a more traditional version of shared governance.
- o Letha Etzkorn: Do we need a bill?

- o Deborah Heikes: We don't have time.

- o Jill Johnson: In this statement, it equates us with the SGA and Staff Senate, so if that could be pulled out—if the status of the Faculty Senate could be elevated in the language, that could help.
- o Monica Beck: Problem with the word "simultaneously" in number 6.
- o Wai Mok: I think we can write down that we want to elevate the Faculty Senate, and then we want.
- o Joe Conway: Can we have our own number? As a way of delineating and marking ourselves as different?

- o Deborah Heikes: We seem to agree that we want to be special.
- o Mitch Berbrier: Without being insulting.
- o Deborah Heikes: We need to work on the language. We can hash it out here or we can make a committee. We need to rewrite number 6 to pull out SGA and Staff Senate.

- o Kader Frendi: Along the same line of thinking, we can take "Faculty Senate" out of number 6 and put it with number 5.

Kader Frendi **motions** to move "Faculty Senate" from number 6 to number 5 to be with the Chief University Counsel.
Michael Banish makes a friendly **amendment to the motion** to move "Faculty Senate" to number 4, and not to number 5.
Kader Frendi **motions** to move "Faculty Senate" from number 6 to both number 4 and number 5.
Michael Banish seconds.

- o Deborah Heikes: We need the wording.
- o Wai Mok: I don't know how to word it to be able to put Faculty Senate in 4 or 5.
- o Mitch Berbrier suggests putting "Faculty Senate President."
- o Michael Banish: Add, "simultaneously, the policy goes to the Faculty Senate," to number 5.

- o Deborah Heikes: I think we need our own section and it needs to emphasize Shared Governance. I just don't know how to word it.
- o Deb Moriarity suggests that the wording be pulled out of the Handbook.

- o Luciano Matzkin: No matter how high we put the Senate, numbers 7 and 8 are the issue because that's where the policy is reviewed. I agree with everyone, but 7 and 8 is where it's reviewed in the process.
- o Deborah Heikes: If we are adding a paragraph, then we can include that too—our power to review it and our opinion on accepting or not accepting it.
- o Charles Hickman: Adding someone creates an additional layer. We can propose whatever we want, but there are 2 things: one is the time factor. Any time you add steps it takes longer. I'm looking at this from the perspective that we are a legislative body. We are equals.
- o Jill Johnson: Yes we are, but if that language isn't in the policy, and we have a President later on down the road who doesn't agree...
- o Mitch Berbrier: It's a moot point for how long it's going to take. It's more about moving around pieces than adding a layer. We can show the President the precedent.

- o   Wai Mok: Who sits on the Executive Council?
- o   Michael Banish: The Vice Presidents. I still think we add it to number 4. I'm not sure that in this document, there's no explanation for why anyone gets to see anything.
- o   Kader Frendi: For the policy, adding the Senate President to the Executive Council is an important thing we need to do. We need to be in numbers 4 and 5. Maybe we should suggest Faculty Senate President be part of Executive Council for part of the policy making.
- o   Deborah Heikes: I'm all for adding Faculty Senate President to this, I don't think it adds a layer to it. If we pull "Faculty Senate" out of number 6, leave the "simultaneously" because it leaves the same timetable, and in 5b say, "the Senate in its role [plus whatever is in the Handbook] gets this policy to review and to comment on, and to 'reject'"—a loose definition of "reject"—and then go on to "simultaneously," and with the one month timetable, it doesn't change the time at all, so if we get a president who will use things against us, we can show them this.

Deborah Heikes **motions** to vote down the previous motions, and corresponding amendments, regarding moving around "Faculty Senate" (made by Kader Frendi and Michael Banish).
Ayes carry the motion
No oppositions
Motion to vote down the previous two motions with one amendment **passes**

Deborah Heikes **motions** to rewrite the Policy on Policies in order to incorporate language of Shared Governance on behalf of the Faculty Senate. Michael Banish seconds.
Call to question
Ayes carry the motion
No oppositions
Motion to rewrite the Policy on Policies to include language of Shared Governance **passes**

Deborah Heikes has volunteered to ask for volunteers to help with developing language for the Policy on Policies.

<div align="center">

Faculty Senate Meeting #550 adjourned
September 11, 2014 at 2:00 P.M.

</div>