NAU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Monday, January 23, 2006

Please email corrections to Julie.Hammond@nau.edu

Call to order:

Senate President Marcus Ford called the meeting of the NAU Faculty Senate to order at 3:04 p.m. in the Student Union/Kaibab room.

Members Present: Syl Allred, T.S. Amer, Minnie Andrews, Nancy Barron, Virginia Blankenship, Kathy Bohan, Judith Cloud, Chuck Connell, Dan Cothran, Bill Culbertson, Jim Davis, Sally Doshier, Jack Dustman, Heidi Fogelberg, Marcus Ford, Angela Golden, Tara Green, Glenn Hookstra, Loma Ishii, Gae Johnson, Chunhye Lee, Rich Lei, Louise Lockard, Dave McKell, Helaine McLain, Janet McShane, Larry Mohrweis, Cecilia Ojeda, Lon Owen, Nancy Paxton, Jim Pinto, Mary Reid, Jon Reyhner, Reed Riner, Blase Scarnati, Nando Schellen, Astrid Sheil, David Sherry, Bill Stone, Marty Sommerness and Marsha Yowell.

Members Excused: Mary Dereshiwsky

Others Present: Steven Barger, Susanna Maxwell, Karen Pugliesi

<u>Acceptance of Agenda/Minutes</u>: Senate President Marcus Ford asked for an approval of the agenda. A motion made and seconded to approve the agenda. Motion Passed. Senate President Marcus Ford asked for an approval of the minutes from the December meeting. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.

<u>Opening Comments - Senate President</u>: President Ford said he had four things to update everyone on:

- At the most recent meeting of the Council of Academic Chairs, there was a good deal of support from the Chairs for moving back to the multiple commencement exercises, as opposed to one large one in the dome, which was seen by most as impersonal. Based on that discussion, I assume that the Chairs will at some point put forth a motion to resume college-based graduation ceremonies. As the Faculty Senate, we might wish to support this effort with our own motion or oppose it.
- ➤ I have also heard multiple presentations from the NAU Bookstore about why it is important for faculty to use the campus bookstore and to get their book orders in early. Two of the strongest arguments are for some scholarship students. Their scholarship money for books is only valid at the NAU Bookstore. This is the case with Native American students who have tribal scholarships, and with athletes. If the book orders are in on time, the NAU Bookstore can buy back textbooks at 50% of their original value, as opposed to 10%. Considering that on average, students spend \$500 to \$600 per semester on books which represents a significant amount of savings. It also assures a good supply of used books for students the following semester. NAU Bookstore must, by law, share text information with all other bookstores in town. Also, they are willing to pay back books at 50% even if the books will not be used the next semester if the course is taught on an every other semester basis. In my opinion, the single easiest thing that we can do as a faculty to bring down the cost of books for our students is to use the NAU bookstore and to get our orders in early. I would like the

Faculty Senate to adopt a textbook ordering policy, with no penalties and some incentives, to use the NAU Bookstore, and get their orders in on a timely basis.

- As you may know, the Governors budget includes a 7.5% pay raise for all state employees, and the budget for NAU includes an additional \$4 million or so, for the same end. Is it possible that there could be significant pay increases next year? The state legislature is proposing only a 5% increase for state employees. There are those who would like to see university faculty excluded from these raises, and there are those legislators who believe that the governor's budget request for the university is too generous. It is by no means a sure bet that we will see a significant increase in our salaries. When all is said and done, you must remember that we live in Arizona.
- ➤ The Senate decided that it would be best for us to hire legal counsel to look over all the substantive changes to the COFS document. I have sent out a letter to all chairs asking them to forward it to members of their departments requesting contributions to be used for this purpose. We need to get these funds and hire a lawyer in a timely fashion in order to complete our work this semester. Let me encourage each of you to talk with your chairs and your colleagues and to solicit their support. Checks should be made out to the Faculty Legal Advise Fund [FLAF] and sent to the Faculty Senate office.

<u>Opening Comments - Senate Vice- President</u>: Marsha Yowell welcomed Roger Bacon back from his sabbatical leave and thanked Senator Gae Johnson for filling for him in as Parliamentarian for the fall semester.

<u>Proposed Policies: Academic Standards Committee</u>: Associate Provost Ron Pitt presented drafts on three different policies:

- 1. Proposed policy Mid-Term grades
- 2. Proposed policy Appeal of Charge of Academic Dishonesty
- 3. Proposed policy Plus/Minus Grading

Dr. Pitt asked for feedback and took a hand vote to get an idea where the group stood on the various policies. Dr. Pitt's objective at this meeting was to obtain a sense of the Senate about how they feel about these proposed policies. Any additional comments should be forwarded to Dr. Pitt at Ron.Pitt@nau.edu by January 30, 2006.

<u>COFS Rewrite Update</u>: Four documents summarizing proposed changes were distributed to all faculty for review prior to this meeting

- 1. COFS summary of changes
- 2. COFS nontenure track
- 3. COFS ombuds/informal resolution
- 4. COFS sabbatical leave

Janet McShane said that the committee has received feedback from NAU faculty and asked for comments from the Senate and their constituents so that the committee can move forward with the document and make changes as appropriate.

Chuck Connell started with the COFS - ombuds and informal resolution and asked for feedback. Marsha Yowell suggested that rather than holding an election, the committee be composed of every associate or full professor and maybe include senior lecturers on

multiple-year contract. Her rationale is that this group has been employed with NAU for a while, is well known, and can be trusted with confidential information.

Marsha suggested that the training might be done through University Council's office

Chuck mentioned some other suggestions that came from faculty input that were slightly different from the committee's original proposal. A screening process could be implemented for those individuals who are genuinely interested in serving on this committee and have experience in doing so. A recommendation or confirmation of service would be made to President Haeger. Another suggestion was to employ a half time coordinator that already has experience. For example, someone who served on the previous ombuds committee would be an option. Some comments received were concerned with about neutrality and the close relationship with the proposed committee and the President's Office. These are slight variations from the original proposal.

A pool of 20 was suggested because that would allow a range of diversity among members and adequate representation from each of the six colleges. Susanna Maxwell clarified that we are not talking about mediation or the grievance process. The proposed Ombuds office is a perspective taking process and follows the Ombuds Association set of guidelines. The process is confidential, is independent in nature, and information is not recorded or documented. Susanna said the training will be an extensive commitment for those who serve. Faculty who serve on this committee may use the experience for professional development. The initial budget would cover the half time coordinator and training.

Janet McShane discussed and answered questions on the nontenure track classifications. Susanna Maxwell commented that this is not an attempt to eliminate tenure track positions but to reclassify them. Janet took a quick hand vote to get a sense of the Senate to find out if the committee is moving in the right direction. The majority of the group was in favor of the changes.

Janet asked for input regarding the sabbatical leave section of the COFS document. The committee received some feedback on #7 of the sabbatical proposal. Some faculty disagreed saying the statement "Once the sabbatical leave is approved, the Statement of Expectation developed for the semester or year of leave must incorporate objectives and effort distribution of the sabbatical plan" may present some limitations. Janet asked for a show of hands to get an idea of how the group felt about the proposed changes and it was favorable.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m. The next meeting will be from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Monday, February 20, 2006 in the Student Union/Kaibab room.