

Minutes for the Faculty Senate Rules Committee (RC) meeting on January 6, 2016

In attendance were Marilyn Billings, Richard Bogartz, Steve Brewer, Dave Gross, Yemisi Jimoh, MJ Peterson, Susan Whitbourne

1. MINUTES

Minutes from previous meetings were postponed to next meeting. Moved and seconded.

2. FACULTY SENATE AGENDA ITEMS (For January 28, 2016)

There was discussion regarding what questions might be asked of President Meehan regarding football. The RC decided that tough questions are appropriate, and that they will arise naturally in the question period following his presentation. We anticipate a 20-minute presentation followed by questions.

The IT presentation on cybersecurity is by a panel, not just Julie Buehler. Steve B. is on the panel. The hope is for 20 minutes of presentation. Probably could compress to 15 minutes, but we will aim to give them the full 20 minutes.

There was concern about the projected length of the meeting. It was suggested that the announcements be limited to the Chancellor & Provost. There will be a parenthetical note in the agenda saying that the announcements will be abbreviated.

Item F on the draft agenda: Change this to something like “The Senate approves the actions of the Rules Committee” unless bylaws say otherwise about Senate approval of RC actions. Also, all future agenda motions will say “MOTION:” rather than “MOVED:”

The Research Council report will be deferred to the next Senate meeting to permit further editing of the report.

3. ACTION ITEM

Approval of the four courses described in the RC meeting agenda were moved and seconded, some discussion ensued, and then the motion was approved.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. SRTIs

There was a question about effects on evaluation scores and response rates for the trial of online SRTI evaluations this year. Anecdotal evidence suggests that faculty are divided on online vs. in-person SRTIs.

We should ask to have a discussion of this put on the next Rules/Admin meeting to which Martha Stassen will be invited to talk about the outcome of the trial this past semester and about the newly formed committee on course evaluations that she and Gabriela Weaver co-chair.

B. Incomplete Policy

Did the policy on the need to supply one's department with detailed information about INC grades come through the Faculty Senate? This seems to be an intrusion on academic freedom. The question that the Secretary will research is “What is the policy and what is the authority for the policy?”

C. Current state of Council consideration of major proposals

Research Council report on internationalization plan. International Studies Council is working on this.

Revisions to Academic Honesty Policy have been approved by Academic Matters Councils. Needs to be reviewed by Graduate Council.

The review of the Shorelight proposal is ongoing.

Submitted by David Gross