

Faculty Chairperson's Report December 2007

After asking Dr. Pogatshnik to come to our November Faculty Senate Meeting, a great deal has occurred. Dr. Pogatshnik developed a timeline clarifying the history of university involvement with these issues. This was sent to me and to all the Deans. He has continued the development of the work group to review the policies.

In addition, Dr. Pogatshnik took advantage of a visit by Tom Champagne, our external consultant from Huron. Mr. Champagne helped the University develop our response to an audit conducted by the Department of Homeland Security. The forum was held in Perkins Quad A on November 29, 2007, from 9:00 a.m. – noon. He invited the Deans to attend and to send a representative as well. He specifically invited Senators May, Petronio, Schuester, Frisbie; and any members of the Executive committee that might be able to attend on short notice. Revised versions of all the policies [except for the policy on redistribution of indirects] were included in his invitation.

Senator May commented that "the new policies and the new drafts appear to have addressed the primary College of Justice and Safety faculty concerns". As Chair of Senate I had the opportunity to personally speak with President Whitlock about all of these issues and concerns at our regular meeting.

Dr. Sherry Robinson was in attendance at our most recent Executive Committee meeting to discuss working with the Senate on faculty handbook revisions. In 2001-2002, there was a University Committee in existence to work on the Faculty Handbook. I spoke with the President about the possibility of simply reforming this committee to help Dr. Robinson. Such a committee would of course have Senate representation. I also asked Dr. Robinson to discuss this issue with the Provost – to procure his advice.

I had asked Heidi Terry to come to Executive Committee to clarify any changes in the Major/Minor Declaration process since her office would now be handling them. She was unable to attend for health reasons. At the request of the Executive Committee, I contacted Tina Davis and asked if she could provide some clarification. Her response has been included in your Senate packet. A representative from the Registrar's Office will be at our next Senate meeting. I thought that having these comments would help you to frame questions and avoid misunderstandings regarding the change of responsibility. It is clear to me that there have been no changes in policies or procedures at this point. The Registrar's Office is simply seeking our input and advice as to how to handle this process in the future.

Senator Hartch was in attendance to discuss the possibility for faculty to have free membership to the Student Wellness Center. He felt this would benefit faculty in several ways: [1] a recruitment and retention tool for new faculty; [2] incentive for faculty to participate in the wellness program; [3] an extra perk for faculty. Senator Shadur posed two questions that should be answered first. One, how much revenue would be lost if faculty were given free membership? Two, how much would the cost increase if more people used the facility?

Senator Johnson reminded us that from the first, the funds generated for the building were student specific with maintenance and operation of the building included as part of the student fees. After much deliberation, faculty were offered the chance to participate by paying a membership fee. At the request of the Executive Committee, I took this issue directly to President Whitlock for discussion and to tap into his immense institutional memory. He reminded me again of the support from student fees and wondered how the students would view faculty having free memberships. Perhaps this is another opportunity to work jointly with the Student Government Association.