

Augustana College

Rock Island, IL

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 8, 2011
Hanson Science Building, Room 102
11:30 AM

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by chair, Randy Hengst. Roll call was taken by Katie Hanson.
Members unable to attend: Lendol Calder, Dan Corts, Kevin Geedey, Ian Harrington, Reuben Heine, Dave Hill, Charlie Mahaffey, Paul Olsen, Jayne Rose, Heidi Storl
Members excused: Kelly Daniels, Fen, Doug Parvin, Lori Scott, Peter Xiao, Cyrus Zargar

2. **Approval of minutes from the May 5, 2011 meeting of the 2010-11 Senate**
Motion-Dara Wegman-Geedey, **Second-**Umme Al-wazedi
“To approve the minutes from the May 5, 2011 meeting of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate.”
MOTION CARRIED

3. **Approval of minutes from the May 5, 2011 meeting of the 2011-12 Senate**
Motion-Dara Wegman-Geedey, **Second-**Greene
“To approve the minutes from the May 5, 2011 meeting of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate.”
MOTION CARRIED

4. **Motions**
 - A. **Motion-**C2 Committee [Douglas], **Second-**van Howe
“ To approve the modifications to committee structure listed in Appendix B of “Committee Structure at Augustana College: Recommendations by the 2008-2009 Senate Steering Committee.”
Discussion:
This subcommittee was given the task of evaluating college committees responsible to the faculty and administration to see whether the committee functions were what everyone thought they should be, and to evaluate membership. Since the document was originally posted on Google Docs, a couple of modifications were brought to Kristin Douglas’ attention, and those modifications were projected for the faculty. They are:
Appendix A
Freistat Center Council of Advisor **should be** Freistat Center Council of Advisors (*Advisory Board*)
Appendix B
2009-2010 Steering Committee **should be** 2008-2009 Steering Committee
Accommodations for Student with Special Needs
Add: Remove student members
Advanced Standing and Degree (AS&D)
Add: Remove student members

Motion-Klien, **Second-**Greene
“To remove #8, p. 1 of Appendix B: Faculty Welfare: “The chair is elected from among tenured members of the Committee and will receive administrative support from the Academic Affairs Office.”

Discussion: Steve Klien said that the primary reason for this recommended change is the broader AAUP recommendation of the sorts of committees to be chaired by faculty. The current Faculty Welfare committee structure is that the Dean of the college is an ex-officio member of the committee and serves as chair. When Faculty Welfare and AAUP met some years back, the AAUP representative relayed at the time that while our current structure is atypical and somewhat unusual, if there is something that works better at a particular institution, it is not problematic, as is the case for most all AAUP guidelines. In the case of this particular recommendation, Augustana's Faculty Welfare committee for the past four years has had conversations about this matter and has been asked by the Dean several times if the committee would prefer a faculty chair. Multiple members of Faculty Welfare agreed that they disagree that this is a good idea. The Dean is in a particularly good position to have access to confidential personnel information that Faculty Welfare occasionally has to deal with. The Dean also acts as a primary contact between the President and Faculty Welfare for decisions and advice. A faculty chair would have to coordinate agenda items with the Dean before every single meeting, making it too inefficient, and the costs would outweigh the benefits.

Darrin Good commented that having served on Faculty Welfare, he challenged the statement that there is unanimous consensus among Faculty Welfare members rejecting a faculty chair, and he is in disagreement. He realizes changes will need to be made in how the structure of the committee functions; however, in his opinion Augustana has an unorthodox system compared to other colleges by not having a full faculty body on its promotion committee.

Joe McDowell pointed out that the AAUP recommendation was only one reason for this proposed change. Another one was to bring consistency across committees responsible to the faculty. This move has already been accomplished on the General Education and Educational Policies committees, two committees that had formerly been chaired by someone from the Dean's Office. Joe McDowell made another point in response to Steve Klien's comment, and indicated that the fact that the Dean is a primary contact between Faculty Welfare and the President is part of the problem needing to be addressed by faculty, and he does not see it as a good thing. The idea is to keep it distinctly a faculty committee responsible to the faculty and not a subcommittee of the Dean's Office and of the administration.

Cecilia Vogel pointed out that the proposal does not say that Faculty Welfare will not get any information from the Dean's Office and it does not say that the Dean cannot be in attendance, only that the Dean is not chairing the meeting. Randy Hengst clarified as well that the membership would not be changed, only that the Dean would be ex-officio.

Laura Greene commented that she understood the rationale for C2's recommendations. She believes, however, that the issue as Steve Klien stated, has much to do with efficiency. If a faculty member were chair, this would increase their already large workload. None of the members of Faculty Welfare feel they cannot contribute to the agenda or control what gets talked about. She believes the Dean would be the most efficient chair for this committee.

Jon Hurty asked if the issue of who is chair has to do with access to the President in a way that would be substantially different than it is right now, because currently the chair of the committee has that kind of access in multiple ways. If a faculty member was made chair would that mean that person needs to meet more one-on-one with the President to help determine certain outcomes of that committee, and if so it becomes a much more critical issue. Hurty

wanted to know if the trade-off for that faculty member to be a Faculty Welfare chair would be worth it to them.

Steve Klien said it would mean much more of that kind of contact and conversation. It would mean the necessity to have more ready access to not only confidential faculty information that most faculty members do not have, but also knowing what is happening administratively in regards to areas like budget and benefits and how they impact things like pools of money available for merit increase or professional meeting allowances. If a faculty member must have access to all that information in order to know what items come on the agenda at any given time, the only way to do that is to have conversations with the Dean and President every week before Faculty Welfare meetings. It does not make sense if the Dean already has this information.

Kristin Douglas said that one of the things that C2 originally recommended was to break Faculty Welfare into two groups; one that focused on merit pay and benefits; and the other tenure and promotion. When this was presented at faculty forum it was not well received. It was proposed as a way to tease apart personnel issues, but not knowing if it would help with efficiency.

Dara Wegman-Geedey asked if serving as chair meant more release time for that faculty member. Jim van Howe asked if there was a way to extract governance issues so that there does not have to be more release time.

Steve Klien clarified that separating the committee does not take the Dean out of the room. Tenure and promotion discussions still require the Dean's presence. Apart from that, the governance aspect of the chair has to do with what items are on the agenda. The primary point is not just to make the job easier, but by making the job easier makes governance easier.

Darrin Good said it is inaccurate to say that the Dean must be at the meetings, although it is in our present handbook. He surveyed several colleges (Luther, Gustavus Aldophus, St. Olaf) and none of them have a dean in the room at their Faculty Welfare meetings, except for Wesleyan, and there the dean is ex-officio. Our college is very atypical in having a committee that works for faculty in tenure and promotion which has a dean attend the meetings. The other schools take their faculty and tenure and promotion recommendations and convey them to the president. Darrin Good agreed there is a benefit to having the Dean present, but other times it is not beneficial. One way to reduce workload on a faculty welfare chair would be to make a true Tenure & Promotion Committee and have another committee called Dean's Cabinet to deal with all other issues.

Mike Wolf added that EPC made this parallel change a year ago, where previously the Dean was the chair of the committee. He was initially against this recommendation because having the Dean as chair was efficient. Mike Wolf admitted that there is additional workload serving as EPC chair, but he does not feel less efficient than when he was not the chair. He finds having a representative of the Dean's Office very useful at the meetings, however.

Kathy Jakielski spoke as a member of the Committee on Committees and indicated that this discussion all started because faculty were feeling burdened by their workload. C2 is trying to decrease workload by making some very simple changes, as well as some changes with more substance. She also added that just because

something is working now, does not mean it will work well in the future when new people are on committees and in the administration; therefore, she asked the senators to be guided by principles.

Marsha Smith added that she has been on Faculty Welfare three years and has worked with three deans during that time and it has all seemed to work smoothly no matter whom the dean has been and it has not changed the nature of the work. This may change with a faculty member chair.

Norm Moline respectfully asked Ellen Hay, former Interim Dean, if she would like to comment. Ellen Hay replied that she is in favor of faculty rights and feels that this is a committee where it is important for faculty to be there, and faculty should not want a dean in charge.

Tom Bengtson commented that he does not believe there would be a large increase in workload. The Faculty Welfare committee does not have an agenda that must be adhered to except when someone is up for a tenure review. The committee conducts the business that comes before them regardless of the source.

Steve Klien made two additional points: Faculty Welfare, given its current structure and charge in the handbook, is different than other committees responsible to the faculty in that it deals intimately with confidential personnel matters and also matters of administration and budget for which faculty members do not have regular working activity. The second point is clarification regarding the past proposal of splitting the committee. There were some compelling arguments for splitting, but the reason why many on Faculty Welfare decided that would not be a good idea is because splitting apart questions of merit pay, raises and benefits are so closely tied to questions of post-tenure review and the process of tenure & promotion, that it did not make sense to have two bodies talking about issues when those issues intersect on a continual basis. From an efficiency standpoint and also for the benefit of having an administrator who talks to the President to be the one that is always there and who always hears what we have to say seems logical.

Randy Hengst pointed out that Faculty Welfare functions nothing like a Faculty Senate meeting. He said the six years he was on Faculty Welfare everyone voiced what needed to be done, people brought other ideas from their divisions to ensure they got on the agenda. The Dean acted as a conveyor of the meeting, rather than a chair who set the agenda or told members what was to be talked about. No one ever told Welfare what to talk about. He added that he agrees with the motion, but stated the Dean does not set the agenda, yet does make sure the members have the material they need.

Steve Klien pointed out that the Dean brings things to the table that faculty members could not because they are not in a position to.

Sharon Varallo asked if one additional release would be possible and if that would take care of the additional workload. Joe McDowell replied that all faculty chairs of Gen Ed and EPC have been given release time to do the extra work, and he added that there is always a member of the Dean's Office in the meeting. The Dean's Office has been generous with their time and resources. It is a matter of principle to him that committees responsible to faculty should be chaired by faculty.

Jane Simonsen asked if the biggest concern about additional workload would be having to meet with the Dean and President on a weekly basis for an hour. Steve Klien replied it also involves access to institutional data and other kinds of conversations, access to information and resources. Jane Simonsen then asked if a chair could delegate that. Steve Klien answered that they potentially could do that, but it would potentially take a much longer time to get questions answered.

Jon Hurty felt that the lack of access issue for a faculty member is of primary concern. He feels that they should be granted the same access as the Dean.

In response to Jane Simonsen's question about workload, Mike Wolf replied that he spends about 5-10 hours per week on EPC business and estimates that it would be double that for Faculty Welfare.

CALL THE QUESTION – Vogel

“To remove #8, p. 1 of Appendix B: Faculty Welfare: “The chair is elected from among tenured members of the Committee and will receive administrative support from the Academic Affairs Office.”

MOTION FAILED

Tim Bloser asked Kristin Douglas the rationale and implications for moving Honor Council from a committee responsible to administration to a committee responsible to faculty. Kristin Douglas responded that C2 made this decision based on curricular issues and academic integrity and thought that those were more academic areas and should belong with the faculty.

Margaret Farrar expressed concern for this potential change to the Honor Council committee. At present, the chairs of the Honor Council committee are student chairs, not administrators. Margaret Farrar manages the affairs of the Honor Council in terms of paper pushing and seeing that penalties are carried forth. She asked if C2 is proposing taking the chair-ship away from students and giving it to faculty in order to following AAUP guidelines. If so, would that chair have the additional management responsibilities for that committee as is with EPC and Gen Ed? She asked for the practical implications of what this would be.

Motion-Dehnel, Second-Klien

“To remove #11 on p. 3 of Appendix B to ensure the Honor Council committee remains a committee responsible primarily to administration.”

Discussion:

Steve Klien added that Honor Council and the body for it is largely driven by students and is seen as something students manage. This change would have a huge symbolic implication--if you tell students that this responsibility is being taken away from them and that a faculty member will now chair this committee is a bad idea.

MOTION CARRIED.

Mike Wolf spoke on #4 of p. 1 of Appendix B: Removing students from EPC. He informed the senators that EPC gave students full voting rights two years ago and finds student input valuable. Student members are very thoughtful and participate fully on this committee, and he believes it would be a travesty to delete them after giving them full voting rights.

Motion-Wolf, Second-Ellis

“To delete the recommendation of removing student members on the Educational Policies Committee under #4, p. 1 of Appendix B.”

Discussion:

John Pfautz noticed that there were a number of committees appearing on the C2 report that removed student members and asked what the overarching reasons were for that.

Kristin Douglas replied that C2 thought that when sensitive or confidential issues were discussed in committee meetings, often times it was better not to have students in the room. One way to handle that is to ask them to leave the room. Another way is to remove them from the committee membership. She added that some students contribute fabulously, yet others in a haphazard way.

Randy Hengst said that on the Teacher Education Committee the members feel it is important to remove the students because of the confidential information discussed, such as students’ grade points, dropping programs, etc.

MOTION CARRIED (2 NAY)

Motion-Schusheim-Anderson, Second-Pfautz

“To delete the recommendation of removing student members on the General Education Committee under #9, p. 1 of Appendix B.”

Discussion:

Margaret Farrar serves ex-officio on the Gen Ed Committee and would prefer students leave the room if needed rather than eliminate them from the committee. Students often provide valuable insight and she would be sorry to see them go.

MOTION PASSED.

Rowen Schusheim-Anderson expressed concern about the C2 recommendation for General Education, #9, 3rd paragraph, stipulating adding 2 LSFY, 2 LP and 1 LC instructor. She said that if there are predominantly LSFY people teaching learning communities, a lot of other perspectives get lost. People from each division may or may not be representing LSFY and learning communities. She also added that Gen Ed was not consulted this year or last year on this change and has not had a chance to discuss it.

Jane Simonsen asked how it is determined whether you are an LSFY instructor or not—she is unclear what the criteria is for being an LSFY teacher. How much experience is necessary?

Brian Katz added that he is uncomfortable with the specificity. In his division someone who teaches a PN could be chosen for Gen Ed, but someone who teaches a "Q" from his department could not. He, a present member, could not have been chosen for the Gen Ed committee with this language.

Katie Hanson said that C2 is not uncomfortable with the lack of specificity because the language came from the Gen Ed committee, and that everything on Appendix B was in consultation with the Gen Ed committee. Kristin Douglas indicated this occurred when she served as chair. Joe McDowell concurred that it was vetted by Gen Ed.

Steve Klien added that he sees no concern whether or not diversity will be present on the committee if there are 11 members, and the suggestion is that 5 of them need to be involved in Gen Ed teaching.

Joe McDowell also added that Nominations & Rules is in charge of choosing members and they keep the criteria in mind.

Margaret Farrar said that she is not uncomfortable with the substance of having experience designated here, but she is also unclear about how these things would be determined. She asks if it is a possibility to table this section until Gen Ed can work on the language in consultation with Nominations & Rules or C2.

Motion-Varallo, Second-Schusheim-Anderson

"To table the third paragraph of #9, p. 1, Appendix B until the current Gen Ed committee can review the language."

Discussion:

Dave Dehnel felt that this should not be tabled. He suggests replacing proposed language with:

Nominations and Rules is expected to select faculty with substantial interest in and experience with general education, including faculty with experience in LSFY, LPs, and LCs (for three-year staggered terms)."

MOTION FAILED.

Motion-Dehnel, Second-Schroeder

"To replace the corresponding language in the third paragraph of Appendix B, #9 with "Nominations and Rules is expected to select faculty with substantial interest in and experience with general education, including faculty with experience in LSFY, LPs, and LCs (for three-year staggered terms)."

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion-Varallo, Second-Egan

"To modify the membership of the language in the proposed Nominations & Rules committee handbook change #14, p. 2 of Appendix B, to replace the words "six tenured faculty" with the words "Majority of tenured faculty."

Discussion:

Dave Dehnel felt that this could not be enforced, as these faculty are elected individually by divisions. This committee should have tenured faculty on it.

Sharon Varallo agrees that it is a complication; however, she feels that untenured faculty give incredible insight for putting people on committees. Our untenured members have been fantastically helpful and the committee has sometimes mandated untenured faculty.

MOTION FAILED.

Joe McDowell announced that today's faculty senate vote becomes effective when the revised faculty handbook gets approved.

CALL THE QUESTION TO ADOPT PACKAGE OF COLLEGE COMMITTEE CHANGES (Appendix B) AS AMENDED.

MOTION APPROVED.

Motion-Klien, Second-Greene

"That Faculty Senate make inquiry with the Dean's and President's Offices regarding the feasibility of a course release for a Faculty Welfare committee chair."

MOTION CARRIED.

6. Other business

No other business was discussed as time ran out.

7. Adjournment

Motion-Klien, Second-Katz

"To adjourn the Faculty Senate Meeting of 9-8-11."

MOTION CARRIED.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski
Academic Affairs Office