**Faculty Senate Minutes**

**April 3, 2009**

Call to Order by Louella Moore at 3:05.

**Old Business**

Motion was made to accept the minutes by Grippo, second by Mishra. The need for a correction on the name of SGA visitor was noted. Minutes (as corrected) were approved unanimously.

1. **Shared Governance Items**
	1. Campus Smoking Ban, 09SP-10. Motion to approved the proposal made by Freer, second Haran. Ryan Beaird of SGA began the discussion with an update that the legislature had recently passed a smoking ban on college campuses to begin August 2010. Senator Wang noted that ACT 734, passed April 1 was similar to 09SP-10 but without the smoking cessation provisions. Beaird also noted that 09SP-10 would take effect earlier and would put ASUJ ahead of the curve. Senator Rowe asked the question why the proposal excluded fraternity houses. Some senators expressed concerns about enforcement issues. One comment was made questioning how the smoking cessation program would be funded. Freer noted the proposal was a positive step in promoting campus health. Horton emphasized that there could be two different reasons for a ban with the effect of second hand smoke being more important than trying to control individual choices. Pfreimer expressed concerns about physical safety with pedestrians crossing Johnson to get off campus to smoke. The motion passed 10 in favor, 8 opposed, 3 abstain.
	2. Building on Leased Ground, 09SP-15, system proposal. Motion by Haran, second by McDaniel. The chair noted that this proposal might or might not be applicable to faculty. No major concerns or problems were expressed. The vote on the motion was 8 in favor, 1 opposed, 9 abstain.
	3. Freedom of Expression, 09SP-18. Motion by Hall, second by Haran. Freer noted the proposal had the potential to restrict free speech. Sydorenko offered that the Faculty Handbook Committee found the language too restrictive in their deliberations. Wang noted that the possibility of having different campuses set their own policies could lead to embarrassing situations of speaking engagements being withdrawn merely because constituents disagreed with a speaker’s political stance. Pfreimer noted 72 hours advance requirement for approval would be too restrictive in the case of a demonstration after a specific event such as a campus death. Freer & Hall noted that section D which allowed control over ‘time, place & manner of speeches’ was troubling. Sydorenko offered that some sort of controls over speech was not unreasonable if it prevented students or others from being unduly harrassed – limiting the place would give people the opportunity to avoid the speeches. Other comments include that if the criteria were clearly spelled out it would be unnecessary to have separate campus policies or specific approval from the Vice Chancellor. There were also issues raised about noise problems in public demonstrations or events and causes that would be important enough to violate written policy. Rowe noted that faculty should have input into the actual writing process for this type of proposal. The vote on the motion was 0 in favor, 19 opposed, 2 abstain. After the vote Moore asked for show of hands to get a sense of reasons for opposition for purposes of making comments back to the shared governance committee. Majority opposed to too much administrative discretion for denial, about ¼ concerned about potential for inter-campus discrepancies in policy , about ½ opposed to the language in D that allowed administrative control over the ‘manner of speeches’.
	4. Changing GSC funding relationship 09SP-07. Motion by Rowe, second by Grippo. Ryan Beaird (SGA) and Nathan Gastineau (GSC) were available for comment. Beaird reported that the two groups are actually working toward a revised proposal but would still like faculty to comment on this phase of the proposal. Rowe expressed the sentiment that this is a very mature proposal. That ASU does not provide insurance for its graduate assistants and because graduate assistants teach SGA members, they should not have to go to the SGA for funding. Freer suggested we table the motion and wait for the revised proposal. No one offered a second at that time so discussion continued. McDaniel noted he did not see the division of money as a part of the shared governance process. Grippo noted he would like to respond to the proposal and send a message of support at this time. Beaird and Gastineau were questioned about the nature of possible future revisions. They responded that certain changes were need in the status of the GSC constitution to clarify the relationship between the SGA and GSC and to make sure that there would not continue to be additional splintering of groups wanting direct access to student activity fees. Bridges again brought up the possibility of tabling until the revised proposal comes through. The Chair asked if that was intended to Second Freer’s motion to table. Bridges reply it was. The vote on tabling was 12 in favor ; 8 opposed; 1 abstain. Dr. Wang made a motion that rather than a formal vote the Senate send forward a comment on the general sense of the Senate that it supports the efforts to date and encourages continuation of constructive discussion between GSC and SGA. The motion was seconded by Rowe. Bridges expressed discomfort about the continuation of discussion after a motion to continue. The Chair maintained that the motion was a different action. A show of hands indicated that the majority were in favor of the motion.
2. Attendance/Recordkeeping for International Students, 09SP-26. Motion to accept the policy as written by Syamil, second Haran. Moore began with background on the proposal which was originally begun under the old AGOC in Spring 2008 and with an interim policy going into effect June 1, 2008 which had included the language ‘monitor attendance and participation in educational activities’ rather than “record daily classroom attendance’. The proposal appears to have reverted to the uncorrected version from Spring 2008 which in her opinion technically should have been assigned to old AGOC rather than SGOC since it appears to be a proposal that was already in the system. However, it came to SGOC where a motion to assign the proposal to the Faculty Handbook committee failed, and the proposal was instead assigned to the Institutional Governance Committee for International Students & Scholars. Rowe noted that this should clearly be an issue of academic primacy. Horton asked how faculty can identify who is and is not an international student. McDaniel noted the policy discriminates between recordkeeping for international students and non-internationals. McDaniel asked Dr. Howard if the WN process would take care of the issue. Dr. Howard responded that might take care of attendance but not academic progress aspects of the federal law. Horton wondered whether the goals of the federal legislation might be better accomplished by having international students report to International Students office once a week. The vote on the proposal as worded in the proposal was 4 in favor, 11 opposed, 6 abstain. In order to provide feedback on the reasons for the opposition, the Chair asked for straw vote on whether the Senators would have been in favor of the proposal if the revised language – monitor vs. daily attendance - had been used. A majority indicated they probably would have approved with the revised language.
3. Conflict of Interest – Chair noted documents in the packet of system policy and prior ASUJ interim policy. The proposal has not been formally entered into the system by SGOC butis on the agenda for April 6.
4. Transition to New Leadership – Dr. Beverly Gilbert will assume leadership as President of the Faculty Association and Chair of the Senate April 7. Association Meeting in Osage, Student Union at 3-3:30 on that day just prior to Retiree and Faculty Awards Convocation. Election for Secretary/Treasurer of the Association to occur just prior to the Business meeting with Dr. Richard Grippo running unopposed. Senator McDaniel made a motion to formally enter into the record appreciation for Dr. Moore’s service. Seconded. Passed unanimously.
5. Committee reports. None presented.
6. Other issues or concerns. Dr. Wang asked about the status of faculty raises in the budget process. Dr. Moore replied that 1) UPC has had only one meeting, another is anticipated April 10[[1]](#footnote-1), 2) Academic Budget Committee has not been proactive, 3) Dr. Potts’ position is that retaining faculty/staff lines rather than making strategic cuts is better for campus morale, therefore, 4) the budget process appears to be in a holding pattern waiting to see what salary increases will be available in the legislative budget. There is no evidence that any plan is in play for equity adjustments to faculty salaries.
7. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15pm.
1. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)