At 3:20 p.m. on January 12, 2004, Chair Gates convened the Faculty Senate meeting in the University Conference Room (224 I. G. Greer Hall).

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Chair Gates welcomed visitors and asked that they introduce themselves.
(See voting sheet for visitors’ names.)

Gates noted that several senators planned to attend the Faculty Senate meeting but the meeting coincided with the first day of classes. Regrettably, those senators who could not make it to the meeting found themselves, obliged to mend hectic first-of-the-semester classroom-related problems and to help students. Gates also noted that Dr. Peacock could not attend the meeting because he was at a fundraising meeting but Dr. Burwell would sit in on his behalf. Gates also announced and asked senators to let him know if they would like to attend the Chancellor Advisory Committee meetings scheduled for February 2, 2004 and April 5, 2004 at 3:00 p.m. Senators who volunteered to attend either one or both of the CAC meetings included: Moore, Weitz, Simon, Hall, McGarry, Lambert, Muir, Marking, McCaughey. There were no visitor announcements.

II. MINUTES – December 8, 2003
Gates noted that the minutes included hard copy attachments from Dr. Peacock’s report at the December meeting. Senator Anderson and Senator Koch asked for clarification on under heading V. concerning a discussion about DPC reform. Senator Anderson said the wording should be changed to read: “The joint committee is committed to the issue of DPC reform, but it was pretty clear that the COC only reluctantly entered into this joint committee to study the issue.” Senator Moore suggested striking the word “unproductive” from the third sentence. Senator Anderson responded, “The joint committee met one time and that the COC did not like the Senate’s proposal and that they (COC) voted against it and did not want to address it again and only reluctantly agreed to a joint COC/Senate Committee.” A brief discussion transpired about the COC’s voting process and procedural issues. Senator Anderson pointed out that there is no official voting record at the COC (unlike the Faculty Senate which records its votes). Senator Simon had concerns about the most recent resolution passed by the Senate regarding DPC reform. She said that not sticking to procedure, miscommunications, lack of rationale, and hasty discussions about the DPC proposal, made convincing the COC to approve the Senate’s DPC resolution futile.

Senator Anderson disagreed with the notion “that there was nothing that preceded this motion that reflects the sentiment of the Senate and I would even say a larger number of faculty.” She noted that DPC reform had been raised often over the past 10 years, “So there’s plenty of context…more than enough context” and preparation. Anderson said that her belief was that the COC did not want to hear this anymore. “They’ve heard it in the past. It has been presented with motions about DPC reform, in the past plenty of times.” Most COC members had been members
of COC for several years and knew that DPC reform had been on the table repeatedly. Senator Hall noted that in section V.A.2. under Rationale the word “amount” needed to read “amounts.” Senator Koch moved and Senator Hall seconded to approve December 8, 2003 minutes as amended.

VOTE 1. Motion approve the December 8, 2003 Minutes (as amended).
17 YES 0 NO 2 ABSTAIN
The motion passed.

III. MOTIONS/RESOLUTIONS STATUS – Gates noted the motions and resolutions were up-to-date and available online.

IV. PROVOST’S BUDGET AND RESOLUTION STATUS REPORTS
Associate Vice-Chancellor Tim Burwell noted that so far there is no request for further reversions of money to the state. He said that the provost’s office was being conservative with this year’s budget as it awaits developments. Senator Waring asked Burwell about the status of funding new teaching positions. Burwell replied that there was hope for an increase in enrollment funding.

Chair Gates brought Senate up-to-date about the chancellor search process and on-campus meetings with candidates.

V. DISCUSSION OF GOVERNANCE ISSUES & DISCUSSION OF SENATE ELECTIONS
Chair Gates raised concerns about the willingness of faculty to serve on university committees and even the Senate. He noted that in faculty elections “have a small number of votes cast. We often have, unopposed candidates. We have people elected by a few write-in votes. Of course, worst of all, we have Senate positions filled by Chair appointment, which flies directly in the face of a democratic process. It has to be done but such appointments are certainly a last resort. What can we do to make the system work better?”

Senator Waring thought that changing representation on the Senate to department representation instead of college representation would get more involved and at least the views of departments would be represented.

Senator Yaukey expressed concern at the lack of information about candidates, since there is no longer a biography or statement of position included with candidates names for faculty consideration. She also warned that department representation might result in chairs appointing a Senator, which would unnecessarily politicize the process.
Senator Rardin expressed concern that departmental representation might only increase departmental influence at the expense of faculty influence. He said that faculty often have different concerns than departments and that Senate must represent faculty as a group. Rardin suggested making service on Senate more rewarding by putting on the annual report a line saying, “Did you serve on the Faculty Senate.” Several other senators supported this idea.

Senator Weitz noted that the ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Governance had motions ready for presentation at the next Faculty Senate meeting dealing with improving faculty communication and addressing issues of faculty governance.

Senator Lambert noted that it seemed difficult for faculty to get information about serving on the Senate, and that some faculty discouraged service for what they thought were more important professional uses of time.

Senator Yaukey noted that service was another part of our workload problem.

Senator McKinney agreed that workload was involved, and since it appeared that little that Senate proposed was ever acted on by administration, the frustration of serving on Senate to no avail was a major problem.

Senator Weitz said that since Faculty Senate is a recommending body that can neither make policy nor set procedure that it holds little or no power. She also reminded senators that most committees and councils on campus are merely recommending bodies and cannot make policy. Senator Moore said that administration had a responsibility to work with Senate as the representative body of the faculty and that appointing faculty members to committees without working first with the Senate diminished the value of the Senate. Thus, he concluded that Senate and administration should find ways in which to work more cooperatively.

Senator Waring said he thought faculty would serve on Senate if they were convinced that it was not just a waste of time.

Senator Staub suggested that the important issues should be put to a faculty referendum. Senators Hall and Simon agreed.

Chair Gates expressed reservations about polling faculty via e-mail, since past attempts to do this have not brought much response. He noted that faculty elections via electronic balloting two
years ago was a disaster. He thought faculty think e-mail volume is excessive and they just use their delete key too quickly.

Senator Arnold encouraged greater faculty outreach by the Senate.

VI. BUDGET COMMITTEE – Report
Senator Anderson reported on a meeting she and Senator Staub had in December with Provost Peacock and vice-chancellor Burwell where they argued that the first priority is funding faculty positions that have come to the university as a result of enrollment increases. She noted that Provost Peacock had agreed this was a priority. A second issue raised was for budgeting to involve faculty input on the front end and to be continuing throughout the year. She said that Provost Peacock is supportive of the budget committee filling that role for the time being – especially with the Chancellor and Provost’s positions presently being interim appointments. A third issue was to have some sort of faculty committee in place to advise on the use of tuition raises to fund faculty and other salaries and student costs. She noted that Provost Peacock seemed supportive of that as well and suggested it might well be the Budget Committee’s responsibility.

Due to a lack of quorum, the meeting ended at 5:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Moore, Secretary
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Name of Senator 1
ANDERSON, STELLA Y
ARNOLD, EDWIN Y
BUSH, ROBERT - excused
CRAMER, BETH - excused
DEL PLIEGO, BENITO -excused
GATES, PAUL Y
HALL, KIM Y
JAMISON, TOM - excused
KEASLER, TERRY Y
KOCH, ANDREW Y
LAMBERT, MONICA Y
MARKING, MARTHA Y
McCAUGHEY, MARTHA Y
McGARRY, RICK Y
McKINNEY, HAROLD Y
MOORE, MICHAEL Y
MUIR, KEN Y
OLSON, GEORGE - excused
RARDIN, PATRICK A
SIMON, KATHLEEN Y
STAUB, SUSAN Y
TRUETT, CAROL - excused
WARING, DOUG Y
WEISS, AMY -excused
WEITZ, GAYLE A
YAUKEY, MARGARET Y
Open seat
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