



FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

Thursday, December 4, 2014 - Taylor 306

In attendance: McGraw (Speaker); Accounting: Louwers; Art, Design & Art History: Welter; Biology: Rife; Comm. Sci. & Disorders: DePaolis; Comm. Studies: Nelson; Computer Information Sys: Wang; Engineering: Harper; English: Rankin; Exceptional Ed.: Desportes; Finance & Bus. Law: Parker; Foreign Languages: O'Donnell; Health Sciences: Burnett; History: Borg (alt.); Hosp., Sports & Rec MGT: Shonk; ISAT: Benton; Justice Studies: Parsons; Kinesiology: Sackett (alt.); Learning, Tech & Leadership Ed.: Griffin; Lib & Ed Tech: Mungin; Management: Stark; Marketing: Larsen; Media Arts & Design: Leidholdt; Middle, Secondary, & Math: Carbaugh; Music: Dabback; Philosophy & Religion: Piper; Physics: Giovanetti; Political Science: Lubert; Psychology: DuVall; Social Work: Bryson; Theater & Dance: Sherrill; Writing Rhetoric & Tech Comm: McDonnell; Part-time Faculty Rep: Harlacker; **Guests** – Vice-Provost: Gonzalez; ACE Fellow: Parsons-Pollard.

I. Call to Order – 3:32 p.m.

II. Provost's Report

Given by Vice Provost Teresa Gonzalez. The Great Colleges to Work For information will be posted on the Provost's web site. Vice Provost Gonzalez also gave an update on several faculty awards: the Cahill-Goodman (two awardees), Ford, and Alger faculty awards. The latter will be \$1k annually and is non-renewable. Nominations for these awards come from unit heads, deans, PACs. The first two are focused toward teaching; the Alger award criteria are still being determined, but will probably focus on engagement; the application will probably require a personal statement along with other nomination materials, like the Ford. The criteria for the other two awards have been shared through the deans and could be posted online. Deadlines usually are around February 1. It's hoped that other donors will be encouraged to establish additional awards.

III. Speaker's Report

1. State-wide issues. Speaker McGraw characterized the mood in Richmond as being very bad for us. The state seems to be in cost-cutting mode, and new funding seems unlikely. Also, the JLARC process has just ended; Speaker McGraw characterized it as having had a negative ending with the final report. (A quick review: the second JLARC report was negative for JMU due to high spending on athletics; the third, dealing with workload and academic spending, was positive as JMU came out above average; the fourth, administrative costs, report was also favorable to JMU as our administration costs are fairly low compared to other state universities.) The previous three reports had numerous constructive suggestions and information that looked useful to legislators. However, Speaker McGraw characterized the fifth as being somewhat divorced from the others. It is very focused on cutting costs, and on the idea that higher education in Virginia is too expensive. Given the cost-cutting mood, this report has the potential to be damaging. Speaker McGraw will be addressing this on legislative advocacy day, which will be the Thursday of the second week of classes. The upshot is that this report and the mood is such that it will be very difficult to ask for initiatives that require more funding.

The lobbying priority is still the tuition waiver/scholarship for dependents; the plan is to ask this year for a fully-funded model, as the no-funding version failed last year, but the outlook for success isn't positive. There's also a problem with the law – an Attorney General opinion from 1966 states that it's not legal under Virginia law to award scholarships based on something other than financial need or merit. But, it might be possible using privately raised funds. Old Dominion University seems to have asked about/started doing something like that in 1970.

McGraw suggested that perhaps the private-donations model to fund these dependent scholarships might be the way to go; this could be a way for people to be solicited to contribute to something specific. He asked if anyone might be willing/interested in doing legwork to move forward along these lines.

2. January BoV Meeting. Reminder – McGraw is open for suggestions of things to raise in his BoV reports. At the last meeting, he presented some of the Great Colleges to Work For information; some Board members expressed interest and asked for more information. McGraw presented to us some of the information he'll be presenting at January's meeting. In many categories, we are close to being on the honor roll, and are generally in line with or near the top of universities our size, and in our region. A suggestion was made to break out the opinion data from the faculty, to show the BoV the true faculty point of view. Discussion ensued concerning how the data should be presented to the BoV.
3. Faculty Handbook Proposals. The handbook committee has been meeting. The faculty absences policy is not up for change this year – the handbook committee has said they aren't planning to alter the language this time. So, we're running off the new language put in place last year, after the modifications made in response to Senate input (<http://www.jmu.edu/facultysenate/facultyhandbook/iii-policies-procedures/a-rights.shtml>; policy III.A.20). But there is another recommendation to institute a third year AUPAC review, coming from the New Faculty Academy Task Force. Essentially, the idea is to institute a third year review, in which PACs would rate candidates in teaching, research, and service – currently, in many cases there aren't actual ratings. Discussion ensued – many Senators were in favor, but concerns were raised about the specific wording. The senate voted to accept the proposal as a first reading.
4. University-wide Faculty Meeting? A suggestion has been made by a faculty member for a JMU-wide faculty meeting, with Senate support. McGraw is not opposed, but would like to see a structure such that it would be productive – a theme or topic that would attract attendance/participation. Possibilities include something related to the Vision statement, or how we can make JMU a “great college to work for.” Themes for the latter could include communication, collaboration, and/or shared governance. The suggestion was made that simply having a place for faculty to come together (like a Faculty Club) and talk about issues would be useful. McGraw says this idea does keep coming up in discussions with administration.

5. Moving forward with Vision project. At this point, we have two main ideas that people have supported – the faculty awards (Rankin proposal); a modified version of that motion will be forthcoming. The second proposal is for the mini-grants; McGraw presented a draft motion, asking Senators to think about how we want to proceed: run with both ideas, including how much we might want to devote of the money to each; or focus on just one of the ideas. The goal was a straw poll at the meeting, and possibly a final vote in January.

IV. Treasurer’s Report

- \$5,366.08 balance; computer lottery thru 31 December; 4 departments submitted dues.

V. Committee Reports

- A. Faculty Concerns – meeting next Tuesday 3-4.
- B. Academic Policies – Continuing work with the registrar’s office on the half credit courses. Gave feedback on the proposed language changes and policy changes re: Latin honors at graduation.
- C. Student Relations – will be meeting in January, continuing the service/therapy/comfort animals issue.
- D. Faculty Appeals – no cases.
- E. Budget and Compensation – met to talk about the Advancement “gift tax.” The money goes into the gifts reinvestment fund. The reinvestment money is new money; its purpose is seen as providing three new advancement positions (two for new fundraising, one for stewardship of what we already have). The committee put together a list of questions, which were e-mailed to relevant vice presidents. There will probably be a meeting in January with the committee.
- F. Nominations and Elections – No report.
- G. Other Committee Reports – None.

VI. Old Business No old business.

VII. New Business No new business.

VIII. Open Discussion of Vision Grant Task Force recommendations.

McGraw’s Vision Mini-Grants was introduced by Harper officially, and seconded, so was deemed to have had a first reading. Discussion ensued regarding the desirability of keeping the mini grants separate from the teaching awards, rather than bundling them as a single thing to be dealt with by a single committee. Harper also reminded people to look at their pay advice and make sure their pay raise showed up.

A second topic raised during the open discussion period was the recent Rolling Stone article (<http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/features/a-rape-on-campus-20141119>) on fraternity gang rapes at UVA and the desirability of faculty having a discussion/response to this. Possibly this is something that could be a topic for a university-wide faculty conversation. There is also the Title IX issue surrounding mandatory reporting; guidance is still being developed and advice will be forthcoming by next semester.

IX. Adjournment – 5:06 p.m.