

MINUTES
College Senate Meeting
Friday, April 3, 2009

Attendees: Ed Kingston, Jennie Patteson, Aimee Dumaresq, Rebecca Ward, Bill Hurd, Brian Wisniewski, Amy Gillespie, Kris Swanson, Laurie Thurneck, Terry Clore, Bruce Glassco, Crystal Newell

The March minutes were approved unanimously.

Smoking Huts

The Student Services Committee will have a proposal for the smoking huts by next meeting (May 1). The subcommittee met with Dr. Jackameit and Byron Sorg, who is researching a design and the cost for the huts.

Sex Offender Policy

Only one faculty member, Kit Decker, responded with comments. He asked for clarification on several points and suggested changes or additions, including adding the phrase "to the college" to section 2, Policy, first sentence. He also asked if the College could remove offenders from class once they have started attending if they are convicted of a crime. The second sentence of Section 2, Policy implies that, yes, they may be removed. It also was decided to separate and to reorder the last two sentences of section 2, Policy in order to provide clarification. As to how the College will publicize sex offenders, these procedures will be addressed in more depth by the administration.

PASS also requested clarification on or made suggestions to the policy. They asked how the Dean and Vice President will make the admission decision. Section 3.4 vaguely addresses this issue, but more information and clarification is needed. What are the criteria for admission or denial? If the student is a danger to him/herself or others, clearly admission will be denied; what about other cases? Although we have suggested procedures right now, the administration will determine the exact criteria and process necessary to determine admission. The Senate's role is to provide a policy statement. However, the Senate's recommendation is to ask the administration to ensure clear criteria are given within the procedures with the caveat that the Senate would like to see those procedures eventually.

The SGA has yet to discuss the policy, but will do so at their next meeting (the first Monday of the month). If comments or suggestions are made, Aimee Dumaresq will e-mail them to Ed Kingston. These comments, as well as those made by PASS or the FPA, will be incorporated into the policy in time for the next Senate meeting. The Senate will vote on the policy at that time.

Summer Pay Policy

The Personal and Benefits Committee brought forth a final proposal for the summer pay policy. The policy was presented to the FPA as well who passed it 36 to four with two people abstaining. The recommendation is as follows:

"Full-time faculty who teach during summer session 2009 shall be compensated at the equivalent full-time salary rate as applied during summer session 2008 for the first four credits of their summer teaching load (down from six credit hours in 2008) and at adjunct salary rate, rather than the enhanced adjunct salary rate (as presently defined by college policy), for the remainder of their load for up to 10 credits.

The summer pay policy is to be reviewed annually by the FPA who will present recommendations to the Personnel and Benefits Committee. The Committee's review is to be completed by March 1 in order to give administration time to plan for the upcoming summer session."

The Senate unanimously passed the above recommendation. Some questions and concerns were voiced regarding the impact of this policy. Since the College does not have funds to pay full-time faculty at the current summer rate, changes had to be made. As the committee stated, it is not just a "cost-saving measure," but a budgeting tool to help plan for the summer session. However, some voiced concern that this policy may become permanent and hard to repeal (which is why the FPA insisted on an annual review). Other concerns included the impact on the summer schedule. Will classes be canceled or changed? No, but it may affect who teaches the scheduled classes. Will this policy extend to the Fall Semester? No. Will class size be affected? Classes surely will have to have a cut-off (no more classes of 10-12). The French classes are already instituting cut-offs. By filling up the classes, fewer adjuncts are needed. This, in part, addresses a national trend whereby more adjuncts are teaching than full-time faculty. In the end, most felt it was a best-case scenario.

College Council

Last academic year, the Senate looked at decreasing the size of the standing committees. This review was in response to faculty concerns regarding over-representation on committees (per division). In the end, the president did not act on this proposal because FPA and PASS are not the official voices of the faculty and staff respectively. Senate asked the FPA to draft a proposal to address this issue.

In response, FPA created a proposal for a College Council. Amy Gillespie explained the history behind the proposal and the FPA recommendations. The proposal essentially addresses two main points: the reorganization of the governance structure to ensure all constituencies have an official voice, and the removal of the standing committees from the purview of the Senate. The Senate is seen as extra layer of bureaucracy. Also, the Senate is not doing what is important. Originally, the Senate was formed, in part, to decrease the number of task forces, e.g. those formed to write the SACS documentation.

Some asked why the Senate would approve policies created by the standing committees when they have been researched and written by experts.

Currently, the FPA and PASS do not act as the official voice of the faculty or staff; the only official voice is the Senate. Therefore, no other group has a role in the governance structure. This is a major concern of the FPA. With the reorganization, official recognition would be given to all groups (SGA is the official body now; FPA would no longer charge dues). And although the College Council would be faculty heavy, all groups would be represented on it. By making FPA and PASS official, they would assume a primary role within the governance structure; thereby releasing them from the purview of the Senate/College Council.

According to the FPA proposal, the new College Council, should it be formed, would consist of approximately 12 representatives. The main duties of the College Council would include concerns and policies relating to the College as a whole. A fundamental change would be no longer overseeing the standing committees. This would allow the governing process to become more streamlined and eliminate redundancies. The standing committees also would retain their current number of representatives.

One suggestion from the Senate was to review the bylaws to address the main points of the proposal. As it stands, the bylaws only say cooperation with FPA/PASS/SGA is necessary. Bruce Glassco

suggested that each point be addressed and voted on separately, i.e. vote on reducing the size of the Senate and then vote on removing the standing committees from its purview.

Amy Gillespie suggested that a larger fundamental change is needed. The main question is whether the Senate or FPA/PASS/SGA is the primary governing authority. Should the Senate/College Council be an advisory committee or the main body in the governance structure? She clarified that the goals of this proposal are not to eliminate the Senate necessarily or eliminate the current representation rather that the FPA feels it is not appropriate for the Senate to be the only official body when FPA/PASS/SGA can represent their various groups. For example, she asked why PASS would need to go through the Senate when they represent the staff, but PASS, at this moment, feels the Senate *is* their official voice.

The current bylaws outline the representation and the duties of the standing committees. Some asked if the Senate should strengthen its relationship with them instead of removing them from the Senate's purview. Others asked who will decide what issues are college-wide.

Amy Gillespie will forward FPA's written proposal by next meeting.

Plagiarism

Bruce Glassco requested that the plagiarism policy be reviewed by the FPA. A subcommittee was formed to address the issue (Bruce Glassco and Kit Decker), but another person is needed. A proposal may be submitted to the Senate by next meeting.

The subcommittee will look at possibly revising the Student/Faculty handbooks as well as providing guidelines to faculty and creating a default policy statement. Currently there are no guidelines for faculty to follow; no mention is made of what type of penalties are appropriate, etc. For instance, some colleges expel students (UVa); others make students redo the assignment. The subcommittee would like to present a range of options to faculty.

Jennie Patteson stated how important it is to keep the dual-enrollment students in mind. Should the onus fall on the College or the high school? Aimee Dumaresq suggested that students be introduced to the plagiarism policy and the penalties in orientation. Even signing an honor statement may help. At the very least, a clear statement should be printed on the syllabus and reviewed in class.

Kathy Hudson requested assistance on this matter after a delicate situation with an adjunct arose.

Other Business

Ed Kingston presented suggestions from students in his class to Aimee Dumaresq. If the SGA feels that action is necessary, then they may present a proposal to the Senate.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

The next meeting will be held at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, May 1, 2009.

Submitted by,
Crystal Newell