

MISSING SENATORS:

Stephen McKinzie (dropping his son off at college)

ACTION ITEM – Dr. Michael Bitzer Requests Leave from Committee Work

Bitzer asks that the senate approve a leave from committee work due to serving on the presidential search committee.

Currently, he's on the curriculum committee, which has nine members. Doug Brown feels certain that the committee could survive without him.

Missy Barnes votes to approve, and Doug Brown seconds.

During discussion, it comes up that this may effect his committee rotation. Should he switch rotation years?

David Schroeder offers a friendly amendment to grant his leave with the caveat that his rotation year may be up for discussion.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

THE FACULTY HANDBOOK

Sharon Sullivan took all of the faculty actions of last year and put them into the "old handbook" to create the "new handbook" and the handbook is complete.

Kim Smith edited the handbook.

Then, Linda and Dr. Oxendine held it up because they are concerned about some of the language involving the trustees.

Essentially, it has not been passed on from Dr. Oxendine and is currently in administrative limbo.

Gary Freeze hasn't been able to meet with Oxendine to find out why it's in limbo. In addition, it's unclear if it is possible for the president to squash the handbook.

This is disconcerting because the faculty do not have a clear understanding of the rules and procedures that they are being held to—the old or the new handbook.

The plan of action is for Gary to set up a meeting with Dr. Oxendine and the communicate the results of that meeting to the Faculty Senate by email.

An Email from Sharon Sullivan

Copy of Sharon Sullivan's email concerning "comments from faculty gathered during the forums and through email."

It is a list of sixteen changes to the handbook, but none of them have been acted on by the faculty as policy.

Here are the list of major changes:

- 1) Appointments (section 1.5b)
- 2) Committee chairs (section 1.6i) tenured and serve at most 4 consecutive years as chair
- 3) ISC reviewing professional travel requests (Section 1.6c(vi)h and 4.2b#1)
- 4) Duties of the Senate executive committee (Section 1.8b)
- 5) New subcommittee of the Senate (Section 1.8c)
- 6) Meetings of the faculty-clarified voting privileges (Section 1.9)
- 7) Reword criteria (Section 2.3a #3g in particular)
- 8) Linking tenure and promotion to associate (Note: pg. 37 and 45)
- 9) Post tenure review (Section 2.5d)
- 10) Office Hours (Section 4.1d#6)
- 11) Faculty Processional Order (Section 4.1d #14)
- 12) Mentorship (Section 4.2c)
- 13) Family and Medical Leave (Section 4.3c)
- 14) Updated Section 5.2
- 15) Whistleblower policy (Section 5.13)
- 16) Title IX Grievance procedure (Section 5.14)

Sharon Sullivan argues that there was adequate invitation for anyone to read the draft and make comments. Sullivan has one question and one suggestion for the senate:

- 1) Is there any more need for additional comments?
- 2) The list she provided above can be used as a guide to understand the changes between the old and the new catalog.

Linda Kesler says that there's a perception amongst the faculty that we haven't discussed the changes (even though that's not entirely true). How can we provide for more discussion opportunities?

Gary Freeze suggests that each of us (as senate members) take one of these items from the catalog and write a memo about it whether it's understandable and how it differs from the previous handbook. Then, as a group, we could review these memos and see what we think.

The only hitch in this plan is that "#9 Post tenure review" is brand new and may not be necessary to the handbook.

Also, there is some question about the number of drafts to the handbook and which draft is the right draft.

Freeze is in possession of the “Bitzer draft” and says we should use that draft by default. And he suggests that we parse through the list of sixteen major changes in that draft of the handbook.

Kesler asks if it’s okay to be particularly close to an issue in the handbook. Freeze says that it’s okay to work with what you know best.

Here’s the division of the handbook as assigned to each senator:

- | | |
|----|-------------------|
| 1 | Gary Freeze |
| 2 | Mirren H |
| 3 | Linda |
| 4 | |
| 5 | Forrest Anderson |
| 6 | Lynn Bolter |
| 7 | |
| 8 | Skipping This One |
| 9 | |
| 10 | David Schroeder |
| 11 | David Pulliam |
| 12 | Sue C |
| 13 | Doug B |
| 14 | |
| 15 | Missy Barnes |
| 16 | Connie |

* Steve McKinzie will choose from what’s left on the list.

Each senate member should be:

- 1) Checking for clarity and logic
- 2) Explaining the changes from the old handbook to the new

On Friday, August 19, we will have a copy of the handbook emailed to us. We should have our memo written by the next faculty senate meeting.

REPORT ON MEETING WITH THE PROVOST – LYN BOLTER AND GARY FREEZE

Overall, the provost thinks that proceeding with the handbook slowly is in the faculty’s best interest. He worries that the handbook isn’t clear, and wants it to be as forthright and open as possible. He continues to stand by his policy that it’s best to implement changes in small groups, which seems like it’ll work well in terms of handbook edits.

The provost understands that the linking of tenure and promotion may be problematic, but he’s okay with delaying that discussion.

David Schroeder wants to know that when the handbook eventually comes to the faculty if there will be an opportunity to offer amendments.

Gary Freeze says that the culture of our College is to bring everything in front of the faculty with the ability for it to be amended. It's okay, though, to tell the faculty which aspects of the handbooks aren't up for discussion or debate. The faculty really should bring up suggestions to the senate prior to the full faculty discussion.

FOR NEXT MEETING

The provost would like to talk to us about J-Term and the Calendar... In addition, at some point, the senate needs to talk to the provost about the handbook because we'll make more progress. That said, however, our next meeting probably isn't the best time to handle the handbook. Our next meeting with the provost should only be about the linked items of J-Term and Calendar.

Connie Lowery suggests that if the provost has a pre-formed thought about J-Term then we ought to ask for it in writing prior to the meeting.

It is agreed to get the provost's thoughts in writing and to meet with him at our next meeting on September 1st.