

Faculty Senate Minutes February 3, 2011

Call to Order: Chair McCormick called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm; Riggle Room; ADUC. Chair McCormick welcomed Robert Boram as a new Senator, replacing Verdie Craig. Chair McCormick informed the Senate that Senator Pam Ryan suffered a heart attack earlier in the week, but is out of the hospital and doing well. She has resigned from the Senate.

Senators Absent: Jason Applegate, Cyndi Gibbs, Stephanie Johnson, Rebecca Miculinich, Manuel Probst, Pam Ryan, Rodney Stanley, Yuqiu You

Visitors: Emma Perkins, Rebecca McGinnis, Charlie Patrick, Scott Wymer

Minutes: Senator Chatham moved to approve the minutes of January 20, 2011. Senator Berglee seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Committee Reports:

Academic Issues: Will have a motion to present and BB/Moodle information

Evaluation: Will have a report

Faculty Welfare and Concerns: Second reading of PACs

Governance: Propose a new Special Rule of Order; Discuss upcoming Regent election

Senate Committee on Issues: Report on Faculty 180 and Ombudsman

Reports:

Chair's Report:

Reported on the President's Leadership Council meeting

- Provided a copy of UARs pertaining to credit for prior learning and electronic communication
- Encouraged reading the QEP report
- Received a copy of the results of the survey "Are We Making Progress"; A Senator noted that there were 8 categories on the survey, but only 7 on the report; Chair McCormick encouraged Senators and faculty to review the report

Open Chair Segment:

Emma Perkins provided the Senators with handouts of three opportunities for faculty and staff for professional development.

- Call for Applications for Faculty/Professional Staff Associates for Learning Communities – Deadline February 15, 2011. Encouraged faculty to develop a proposal that is important to the University and student learning. Course releases are available and support is provided.
- President's Leadership Academy – Deadline February 18, 2011. Encouraged faculty to apply on the website.
- Center for Leadership and Professional Development SOTL Grants – Deadline March 7, 2011. The two grant themes are 1) Promoting a Culture for Student Success and 2) Internationalizing the Curriculum." Details are provided in the handouts.

Ann Rathbun talked about the concept of shared governance.

"I come to you today in reference to recent discussions regarding the concept of SHARED GOVERNANCE.

On September 3, 2009, President Andrews appeared before this body and stated:...."that he is a strong believer in shared governance. The administration and the faculty must work together to govern better to address the challenges facing higher education."

Last year, we updated our own constitution. The preamble of this document states: **'The faculty of Morehead State University supports a system of shared governance in decision making which promotes mutual understanding and coordination of efforts among faculty, staff, administrators, and students as they strive to meet the university's mission.'**

It appears we have a huge disconnect! I am not sure where the disconnect is. And before we start pointing fingers, or falling back on our own positions, I ask that we all consider several things.

We talk about shared governance **A LOT**, and the discussion probably is one that ebbs and flows in the institution depending on what year it is, and what is happening. What makes this concept so tricky and seemingly so elusive.

First, we have no really good, working definition of the term.

Second, accrediting agencies do not have a policy for shared governance nor is the institution formally held accountable for true shared governance.

Third, we, as individuals in an institutional setting, may or may not have effective, healthy models of what 'this' looks like.

According to Olsen (2009), shared governance can represent 2 overlapping (and supposedly) complimentary concepts:

1. "Giving various groups of people a share in key decision making processes
AND
2. Allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making."

In my opinion, shared governance is NOT:

1. Putting up a website to gather input or inform about processes.
2. Ignoring it and hoping it will go away.
3. Continuing to "TALK" about it but taking no action toward "DOING" something about it.
4. Shared Governance is NOT A threat to leadership power and control, and should not be perceived as one. As Colin Powell says, (and forgive the military analogy) "Leadership is solving problems. The day soldiers stop bringing you their problems is the day you have stopped leading them. They have either lost confidence that you can help or concluded you do not care. Either case is a failure of leadership."
5. SG is NOT: Usurping faculty academic freedoms in their area of primary responsibility in areas of their expertise; teaching, research and service.
6. Usurping administration freedoms in their areas of primary responsibility in their areas of expertise (keeping the joint running, day to day).
7. Nor is the concept related to becoming "one of them", "rolling over", "going to the dark side" or "kissing up."

For our intents and purposes, a vision of shared governance might look something like:

Affected, interested parties sitting around the table, talking with each other, understanding reasons why things are as they are, and making decisions together. Maybe this sounds naive to you. I prefer to think of the vision in terms of optimism. The decisions may not always be PERFECT, but at least we can be imperfect TOGETHER.

Finally, I am suggesting that we adopt the term **SHARED RESPONSIBILITY** in our institution. I am suggesting that we share responsibility with administration and staff to work toward a model of developing strategies and cultivating relationships that promote shared responsibility for the future.

To that end, I am willing to actively participate in any effort or efforts to move toward a vision of shared responsibility on our campus. I will take the advice of those present: Senate leadership, administrators or

fellow senators as to how to proceed. Please let me know if you are interested in working with me to be a part of the solution.

Thank you.

Senator LaFleur moved that the content of the talk be included in the minutes. Senator Sharp seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Chair McCormick suggested Senator Rathbun join the Shared Governance Learning Community chaired by Eric Jerde.

Provost's Report:

- Charlie Patrick reported that the focus report of the SACS effort has been completed.
- The QEP report on the website needs to be updated because revisions have been completed; Dr. Patrick encouraged particularly First Year Seminar (FYS) Faculty to review the report, at least the executive report
- On behalf of her constituents, Senator Baker asked when the search for a Dean of Library Services might begin. Dr. Patrick did not have an answer, but will pass the question on to the Provost.
- Senator Rathbun asked about the list of questions developed and provided to the Provost regarding how Data Strategies relates to General Education. Dr. Patrick will pass the question on to the Provost.

Regent's Report: The Board of Regents will have a work session on February 24, 2011; Regent Morrison also encouraged faculty to review and provide him with comments on the results of the survey "Are We Making Progress".

General Education Report: Accepting First Year Seminar proposals for next year – deadline is February 7, but is flexible; writing the guidelines for Capstone and Exchange Courses - Proposals will be due on March 7; The following General Education Statement was approved by the General Education Council to be added to the General Education syllabus template located on the General Education Reform website:

GENERAL EDUCATION: The Foundation of a University Education

This is an approved course in the General Education Program. Morehead State University's General Education Program recognizes that a university education is more than preparation for a career. Learning to "live well" should have equal consideration with "making a living." The General Education Program adds to students' major field of study by providing them with a foundation of knowledge and skills in reading, math, writing, communication, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. General education prepares students to participate intelligently and responsibly in their community.

In response to a question, Dr. Patrick stated **"if you have an approved First Year Seminar course, you do not have to submit another proposal."** Deadline for FYS proposals for next spring is not February 7; the entire proposal submission process will be opened in the fall; FYS approved courses and the topic are approved for three years; discussion followed regarding unpaid teaching/overload teaching of FYS and incentives to teach FYS; class size for FYS will be capped at 27 unless approved by the faculty teaching the course. Dr. Patrick asked for ideas for incentives to teach FYS.

The MSU General Education Council unanimously passed the following motion at their January 28, 2011 meeting - Re: General Education Distribution Course Selection.

"Based on feedback from faculty, chairs, and deans, the General Education Council recommends that the limitation of 10 regular and 4 interdisciplinary distribution courses previously established by the Faculty Senate be exceeded for two categories, SBS2 and HUM1, for a period of 2 years. The GEC recommends allowing **eleven (11) regular SBS2 courses and five (5) interdisciplinary HUM1 courses** until May 2013 at which time the number of courses for these categories will be revised by the GEC." Chair

McCormick stated that she would like to see the Council have the flexibility to do whatever mixture is required as long they don't exceed 14. After discussion, Senator Chatham moved to approve the GEC motion as presented. Senator Creahan seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Senator Chatham moved to commit the Chair's ideas to the Academic Issues Committee for review. Senator LaFleur seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Senate Actions:

Academic Issues:

Senator Julia Hypes informed the Senators that on today's agenda, Academic Issues: a. the Blackboard versus Moodle Feedback website is actually an email address and not a website. The email address for feedback is: BbMr@moreheadstate.edu. The Chair strongly encouraged faculty to provide feedback regarding Blackboard/Moodle. The President and the Provost confirmed at the College of Business and Public Affairs meeting, that the decision on Blackboard/Moodle will be made during spring break.

The agenda for the meeting included: Academic Issues: b. Blackboard **9.1 Button Bar** has been placed under the link <http://www2.moreheadstate.edu/bbmr/> showing an application form to TRY Blackboard 9.1 Thirty day tutorial--FREE of charge. A Senator attempted this and encountered problems/questions. Dr. Patrick indicated that Misty Hanks could help with any problem that faculty might have. Senator Hypes encourage all faculty to go to the site and try Blackboard 9.1 and provide feedback. Chair McCormick informed the Senators that the President stated that a decision has not been made. A Senator asked which faculty members will be included in the decision making. Every faculty member who provides feedback, was the answer. Dr. Patrick stated that the final decision is made by the President and Provost. Another Senator indicated the hope that the decision would be more than reading email and that faculty could actually sit at a table with the President and Provost and have a discussion regarding the decision. Chair McCormick will make the request. Senator Rathbun volunteered to participate in this discussion. Senator Royar stated that the Moodle pilot group of faculty members have met and discussed the issue with Charlie Patrick and Misty Hanks. Senator Sharp suggested that in the future, pilot groups for technology include faculty who may not be quite as proficient with technology in order to present a perspective other than one of a technology proficient faculty member.

Senator Hypes presented the following motion: The Faculty Senate requests that Charlie Patrick submit the general education computer competency plan to the General Education Committee at their next meeting. The Faculty Senate requests that updates be provided to the Senate on the status of implementation of the computer competency plan by Dr. Patrick or a General Education Committee representative. Senator Sharp seconded the motion. Charlie Patrick provided history of what happened. The plan provided by Director of the Testing Center and members of the Information Systems department was stopped at the Deans Council due to complaints of the extensive nature of the listing of competencies in the report. The Deans Council requested nothing be done the first year in order to conduct a Delphi study of faculty regarding the list of competencies that would be appropriate. Dr. Patrick has not been able to enlist the help of any faculty to conduct the study. Dr. Patrick asked for volunteers to help set the competency standards. Dr. Patrick stated that the Faculty Senate approved the FGEAC document that removed computer competency from the Gen Ed process, and that there would be a computer competency placement test and modules/instruction developed. Dr. Patrick stated that computer competency is not part of the Gen Ed Program. Dr. Patrick is not sure how to handle this issue. The General Education document states that there would be testing and modules developed to ensure students have the computing skills necessary. The Information Systems Department, along with the Testing Center, developed and provided a General Education Computer Competency Exam & Remediation Plan to Dr. Patrick for the General Education Council.

Senator Katz moved to develop an ad hoc committee to address the issue of student computer competency in order to develop a computer competency test. Senator LaFleur seconded the motion. Dr. Scott Wymer spoke regarding the competency plan developed by Information Systems.

Senator McCoy distributed a resolution written by Dr. Scott Wymer for Senate review. Dr. Wymer read the following **Resolution for Faculty Senate for Gen. Ed. Computer Competency**;

We move that the General Education Council immediately take up this issue to implement a testing and remediation program. Further, considering the very late implementation of this requirement, to expedite this process based upon the decision already made regarding the proposal that was submitted to the University Faculty Senate and recommended by the Testing Center, and Information Systems Department.

Senator Katz withdrew the motion to develop an ad hoc committee to address the issue of student computer competency in order to develop a computer competency test.

Discussion of student computer competency continued at length. Several Senators asked questions and made suggestions about how to address the issue. Dr. Wymer stated that the computer competency assessment instrument has been developed and Type II proposals are ready to be submitted for the remediation courses. Charlie Patrick stated that the GEC would be glad to take the issue to the proper place, but he stated that it is not the GEC's decision. He will speak to the Provost regarding the issue of student computer competency. Discussion continued between Senators, Dr. Wymer and Dr. Patrick.

Senator Chatham moved to suspend the rules and extend the meeting to 6:15 pm. A vote by a show of hands did not render the 2/3 majority needed so Senator Chatham moved to adjourn. Senator Berglee made a point of order that the meeting started at 4:15 p.m. and 110 minutes would make it end at 6:05 p.m.

Senator Hypes withdrew the original motion by the Academic Issues Committee and moved to replace it with the resolution from Dr. Wymer and Senator McCoy. Senator McCoy seconded the motion. Senator Creahan called for the question and it passed. Chair McCormick called for a vote on the motion. Motion passed with 2 nays.

Adjournment: 6:05 p.m.