

---

*Faculty Senate*

---

March 28, 2019

Mulder Hall, Room 302

Present: Mary Kay Sunderhaus, Missy LaBorde, Kent Lachney, Christof Stumpf, Melissa Parks, Chris Stacey, Richard Elder, Bendan Walls (SGA rep), Prakash Ghimire, Jennifer Innerarity

Absent: Melissa Whitley, Michelle Riggs

Guest: Dr. Rowan

Meeting called to order 2:32 p.m.

Minutes: R Elder made a motion to accept the minutes; K Lachney seconded. It passed 7-0-2.

M Sunderhaus presented the President's Report, noting that the Improvement of Instruction Committee was having problems with finding the right days and times to meet so that they had enough people present for a quorum.

Dr. Rowan asked members to help decide what the best begin/end option would be for online summer classes. He explained that one option was to have Summer 3 courses end the week of August 19, which would also be the week that faculty would need to return after the summer break. Another option would be to not have a week break in between Summer 2 and Summer 3 courses. After discussion, it was decided that it would be preferred to run the summer courses back to back with no break so that Summer 3 classes would be completed before the start of the fall semester.

Commencement will be held Thursday, May 9 at 10:00 a.m. This semester there will be designated photo areas and times for faculty/student pictures for 30 minutes before the ceremonies start.

Dr. Rowan reported that progress with the PS 202 committee was going well. He mentioned that two issues—tenure and promotion—were still being ardently discussed. The definition of a terminal degree was examined, and it was noted that a terminal degree would be needed for promotion except in “extraordinary” exceptions. The definition of scholarship was read as was what could/could not constitute scholarship. C Stumpf wondered if we would be moving to a focus on research instead of teaching and questioned how the peer review process would fit in. K Lachney wondered if discipline-related experience years would be accepted as part of track experience. Dr. Rowan advised that it is possible that those years could be negotiated offering the acceptance of a Nobel Prize winner as an example. C Stacey and R Elder discussed how those selected to conduct the peer review process during the promotion process do not have to be on the provided list and can be from anywhere.

---

*Faculty Senate*

---

M Sunderhaus asked whether or not nursing accreditations would be considered scholarship. Dr. Rowan stated that other universities, including those with nursing programs, included the peer review and dissemination process. He noted that the Chancellor is very adamant to implement this standard of scholarship so that we can move from a 2-year to a 4-year college. M Sunderhaus advised that a terminal degree requirement could be detrimental to their associate degree program, because those teaching for that specific degree need only to have a master's degree. She mentioned that faculty members were going above and beyond to acquire the specialized certifications and that these should be included as scholarship. Dr. Rowan agreed that the certifications were useful but advised that all of the hard work that goes into the certification process could be put into a poster presentation or something similar so their efforts would be distributed to others in their field.

J Innerarity noted that, considering the substantial workload of some faculty members, the research process could be executed only with the help of additional support staff personnel. Dr. Rowan explained that he would support the following: 1) terminal requirement would not be required until support staff in place, 2) more fully-invested support systems, and 3) move advising to specialized advisors, so that faculty could do what is expected of them.

K Lachney questioned whether there would be a required number of scholarly articles, presentations, etc. required; R Elder stated that there should not be set numbers. Dr. Rowan also explained that publications at previous institutions could be utilized as long as the work was part of on-going research. R Elder advised that the process needed to be clear, fair, and empowering, and have room for diversity and interpretation. The policy would apply to new faculty members and be part of the annual review of faculty plans. Also, in the revised 202 policy, new salary adjustments would be included.

M Sunderhaus presented the C&C minutes. After review of the minutes by those present, R Elder made a motion for them to be approved. It passed 9-0-0.

Committee rotations were next discussed. Emails had been sent out and selections included the following: PSYC-R Elder, HIPS-K Ordes, MAPS- P Ghimire. NURS still had not made a selection. M Sunderhaus wondered if there was an option for her to stay on Faculty Senate. The by-laws were reviewed, and it was confirmed that there is a 2-term limit, meaning the nursing program would have to find a replacement.

M Sunderhaus noted a charge had been sent to the Improvement of Instruction Committee for the review of the IDEA form for improved results. Recommendations would include fewer and more applicable questions as well as any information that could improve the student response rate.

C Stacey thanked everyone as he noted that he would be ending his term and would be replaced by K Orders. M Laborde discussed the Planning Council's necessity to meet to discuss spending. She then suggested that a formal resolution be made for a faculty member to have a seat on the Chancellor's Cabinet. C Stacey confirmed that a faculty member should be there. J

---

*Faculty Senate*

---

Innerarity noted that Dr. Rowan represents the faculty at the Chancellor's Cabinet meetings. Dr. Rowan confirmed that the meetings were more about reporting information than about changes. M Laborde advised that the Planning Council would be meeting in the future since it had been three years since they met. The goal would be to prioritize what was needed to put everyone on the same page. Dr. Rowan understood everyone's concern about faculty input. It was mentioned that there had been difficulty in previous administrations where the faculty's voice was not heard. Currently, it was noted that the Faculty Senate President and Vice-President is meeting regularly with Vice-Chancellor Rowan about every two weeks and with the Chancellor as needed.

Finally, efforts would continue to link the University Plan to departments' goals and to decide what is important and what isn't.

Meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.