

Faculty Senate Minutes December 6, 2007

Call to Order:

Call to order: 4:15 pm; Riggle Room; ADUC.

Senators Absent: Ali Ahmadi, Ann Andaloro, Roland Buck, Sam Nataraj, Granuaile O'Flanagan, Cathy Thomas, Greg Wing

Visitors: Beth Patrick, Debbie Abell, Larry Albert, Misty Hanks, Sheri White

Minutes: Senator Breschel moved to approve the minutes of November 15, 2007, as submitted. Senator Macintosh seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Committee Review:

Academic Policies: Will have a resolution to present for a second reading during committee reports

Communications: No Report

Evaluation: Committee asked Senators to submit ideas regarding FEP's and PBSI; Will be looking at how to evaluate Directors and Chairs; asked for assistance from anyone with experience in this area

Fiscal Affairs: Benefits committee is reviewing UAR 304.01: Sick Leave Pool

Governance: Met with Dr. Hughes to discuss evaluating committees (standing, ad-hoc etc.) and committee structures across campus; Second reading on committee descriptions

Professional Policies: Reviewing PAc 27 with intention of having a revised draft early in the spring semester

Discussion:

Chair Jerde introduced Larry Albert and Misty Hanks from the Center for Teaching and Learning who provided the members with information on the New Faculty Institute that was brought before the Senate last year.

Dr. Albert and Ms. Hanks represent the committee that began last year to create a proposal for a New Faculty Institute. The committee last year consisted of Mike Moore, Debbie Abell, Misty Hanks, Charlie Patrick and Larry Albert. Dr. Albert provided background information on the development and progress of the New Faculty Institute concept. Dr. Albert asked for input from the Senate in the continuing development of the New Faculty Institute in the following three areas:

1. General principles governing the Institute (content, form)
2. Logistics (time of implementation, who should participate)
3. Process for Faculty Senate input (Dr. Albert suggested adding two Senators to the committee)

Dr. Albert asked the Senate members what process they would suggest for gathering input to facilitate the development of the New Faculty Institute.

Dr. Albert stated that last year, the President agreed to provide three hours of release time for new faculty members participating in the Institute.

Questions and/or suggestions from the Senators:

- Will it be compulsory for new faculty?
- Will new faculty to Morehead who are not new to teaching be required to participate?
- Will this be graduate credit for faculty?
- The content should orient people to the practices of the institution (i.e. forms, advising, Datatel/Colleague).
- Rather than being for new faculty, faculty should, at some point in their career, apply to improve a particular area of teaching.
- Three different tracks: (a) One for new faculty to be trained to convey their content to students, (b) one for faculty who want to improve in a particular area and (c) one for adjuncts.
- Problem with the institute being compulsory, should have to compete to get into.
- Should be presented as a plus (something that people get to do with the release time being a benefit earned for people interested in improving).
- Should be seeking information from faculty who have been here a year or two to find out what they wish they had been told when they first started.
- Inform participants about MSU and how it works and the challenges to Appalachia.
- Open seminar on developing teaching skills.
- Send out an anonymous survey with questions such as (what preparation did you receive prior to starting at MSU).
- Focus on faculty development in all areas (research, portfolio development, professional achievement and service).
- How will the program be evaluated? Do you know what the expected outcomes are? How will the outcomes be measured?
- A week for new faculty prior to beginning rather than just one or two days.
- In light of the changes that are taking place, need a faculty institute rather than just a new faculty institute?
- All faculty need to get a better idea of the variety of students on this campus.
- Charlie Patrick suggested a person from Professional Development be added to the committee.

Charlie Patrick stated that the content for the institute is very open and probably will start small with a pilot program and continue to gather feedback and develop the idea.

Charlie Patrick asked the Senators to discuss the New Faculty Institute with their colleagues in order for everyone to have input into the plan for the New Faculty Institute.

Chair Jerde asked the Senators to provide comments and suggestions to the New Faculty Institute committee members.

Discussion:

Chair Jerde introduced Beth Patrick who provided an update on the implementation of Datatel/Colleague.

Ms. Patrick provided the background and history of why the Aims system had to be replaced. The Aims system was unique to Morehead State University and was outdated. She explained that the University had to take a step backwards in some areas to link to a larger system that was capable of much more than the Aims system. Ms. Patrick listed some of the modules that had been taken offline but would be back online in the spring, and listed some of the new modules that will be added to the systems. Ms. Patrick explained the Datatel Campus Portal that each person will customize for themselves. This portal will be used to access email, blackboard, colleague, etc. She provided a view of what Datatel

envisions for the next generation of the registration process. Morehead State University is building collaborative relationships with other institutions using Datatel in order to take advantage of a variety of resources.

A question and answer session followed.

The Senators asked questions about where to find things on the system. Ms. Patrick asked the Senators what would be the best way to provide the faculty with information regarding the Datatel system since the general training sessions were not very successful? A member suggested a training CD that faculty could use at their convenience. Ms. Patrick asked the members what is currently missing from the system that is most critical? A member suggested distributing a survey asking faculty to list the most critical functions that were available on Aims that need to be available on Datatel. A workgroup is being formed to begin customization of critical items.

The Senators appreciated Ms. Patrick providing the presentation on the Datatel system and asked if they could have a copy of the PowerPoint slide for their respective departments.

Reports:

Chairs Report:

PG-61, Code of Ethics, was approved by the Board of Regents. Next meeting will be January 17, 2008.

Regents Report:

The Board of Regents approved the Business Plan. The Board adopted a compensation plan that will evaluate the President's performance on goals related to the ASPIRE strategic plan and based on the evaluation, he will be eligible for an incentive bonus.

Adjournment: 5:54 pm.