

Minutes
 ULM Faculty Senate
 September 15, 2016
 12:30 pm to 2:00 pm
 Hemphill Hall Room 124

* indicates excused absence;
 Name/Name indicates Moved/Seconded

Senators Present: Jeffrey Anderson, Roger Carpenter, Melanie Chapman, Chris Gissendanner, Lyle Marty Holin, Cecil Hutto, Kioh Kim, Heather Pilcher, Savannah Posey, Will Rogers, Joshua Stockley, Vonny Thornton, Claire Vangelisti

Senators Absent: Sandy Bailey, Emad El-Giar, David McGraw, Tina Mullone, *Adam Pate, *Paul Wiedemeier

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes-August 25, 2016
 - A. Stockley/Kim - Approved
- IV. Election of President-Elect
 - A. Nominations
 - i. Hutto nominated, accepted – Holin
 - ii. Kim nominated, declined – Vangelisti
 - iii. Stockley, self-nominated
 - B. Election
 - i. Stockley elected
- V. Committee Charges – Reviewed by Gissendanner, see list posted in Faculty Senate Moodle Page
 - A. Academic Standards
 - B. Constitution and By-Laws
 - C. Faculty Welfare
 - D. Fiscal Affairs
 - E. Elections Committee
 - F. Ad Hoc Handbook Committee
- VI. Executive Committee Report – Topics covered reviewed by Anderson
 - A. Discussion of enrollment, potential midyear budget cuts, constitutional amendment giving university systems the ability to change tuition rates, workload policy, building access, handbook revision, and funding formula changes
- VII. Unfinished Business
 - A. University Committees – Reviewed by Gissendanner, see list posted on Faculty Senate Moodle Page

- i. Anderson has rotated off General Education Committee
 - B. Policy on policies
 - i. In August, senate recommended it be involved in policy review. VPAA stated that the handbook would clearly give the senate the right to review all policies before they become official.
 - C. Building Access
 - i. This was done for safety purposes. No need-based requests for after-hours access have been rejected.
- VIII. New Business
 - A. Grade Appeals Policy
 - i. Policy is to protect students from unfair grades and protect faculty members' professional judgment. See "Grade Appeals Policy" for details.
 - ii. No objections to the policy were voiced.
 - B. Faculty Workload Policy
 - i. An earlier attempt was very complex and frowned upon by administration.
 - ii. The new policy, which involved deans to a greater degree, is very broad.
 - 1. It is based on system guidelines but emphasizes the ability of schools and colleges to make exceptions and adjustments.
 - a. Included recommended percentages for workload categories of teaching, research, and service.
 - 2. Basic expectation is that professors would work for approximately forty hours per week.
 - 3. Deans and VPAA specified that school directors can make recommendations of adjustments, such as reduced course loads for increased research and/or service.
 - a. Deans would have to approve requests of directors.
 - 4. The flexible nature gives greater freedom to schools.
 - iii. Does not trump tenure and promotion guidelines.
 - iv. Concerns
 - 1. Thornton asked for input from experienced senators about the impact of the policy.
 - a. Gissendanner expressed possibility that it may have "no teeth."
 - i. In other words, it may not make changes.
 - 2. Vangelisti expressed the concern that evaluations might be affected by the new policy. Would the policy lead to evaluators judging someone harshly for perceived lower workload in one or more categories?
 - a. Stockley responded that the document was designed to reduce workload, not serve as a punitive plan. Deans all support the plan.
 - 3. Vangelisti asked whether deans would support director suggestions.

- a. Unclear at this point.
 4. Chapman asked whether there was an established level of course load reduction. In other words, how low could it go?
 - a. It is not established in the document, per Gissendanner and Stockley.
 - b. Gissendanner doubts that more than one-course reductions would be normal.
 5. Vangelisti questioned whether this document or the handbook should explicitly state that tenure and promotion guidelines supersede the workload policy.
 - a. Gissendanner suggested that it should.
 6. Posey stated the concern that in her department course reductions are not feasible because of accreditation requirements.
 - a. Per Gissendanner, accreditation would take precedence.
 - b. Thornton also expressed need to maintain accreditation standards.
 7. Thornton expressed concern that there is an effort to fit all programs and schools into a single pattern. Some want “one size fits all,” but this is not feasible because of the differences between programs.
 - a. Kim brought up comments from VPAA to the effect that graduate teaching loads should reduce hours to nine maximum.
 8. Rogers stated doubt that Humanities would ever benefit from reductions because of desired 780 student credit hour (SCH) average.
 - a. Gissendanner states that he suspects that SCH requirements will take precedence.
 9. Thornton expressed the need to approach the policy in a positive manner.
 - a. Gissendanner expressed appreciation for the gesture of the deans.
 - b. Chapman emphasized the positive feature that deans seem interested in implementing it.
 - i. Adjuncts might make these things possible.
 10. Vangelisti asks whether each school should have a specific document. It could matter to avoid penalization if merit-based pay ever comes into play. How will it work, practically?
 - a. Gissendanner stressed that evaluations will be a key part of this. Evaluations themselves can specify differences.
- C. Elevate Louisiana
- i. VPAA sent out an e-mail in mid-August about a September 30 faculty forum in Alexandria.

- ii. Basic purpose of Elevate Louisiana is to deal with assumed permanently inadequate budgets.
 - 1. Threshold cutoffs to eliminate programs will be elevated.
 - a. Emphasis seems to be to eliminate graduate programs.
 - iii. Whether this is set in stone is unclear. The role of faculty input is unclear.
 - 1. Anderson suggested that absence from the forum indicates disinterest.
 - D. Improving Faculty Senate Communications and Faculty Interest in the Senate
 - i. Various important tasks have kept us from promoting the importance of the senate and its work.
 - ii. Suggestions
 - 1. A newsletter, or something of the sort, has been proposed
 - 2. Posting agendas on the website
 - 3. Limited access to the Moodle section for non-senators
 - 4. Comment section in Moodle
 - 5. E-mails with bulleted points
 - 6. Senate Moodle page for all faculty
 - 7. Senate forums, as Academic Affairs conducts
 - iii. Gissendanner and Anderson will work on e-mail of points
- IX. Insurance Cost Increase
 - A. Brought up by Anderson on behalf of Carpenter.
 - B. Vangelisti brought up statements that Affinity will not be covered by Blue Cross/Blue Shield
- X. Adjournment – 1:59 pm