

Faculty Handbook

Minutes

November 16, 2018

In attendance: Jeff Johansen (chair), Matt Berg, Brent Brossmann, Bill Elliott, Mark Waner, Sheri Young.

### **Electronic Version proposals**

Proposal to get amendments into the Faculty Handbook. The question becomes whether there is a need to print a copy of the Faculty Handbook each time it is amended. The answer is no, but a revision of the Faculty Handbook does require a new printing. However, we are also online, and that version is also out of date.

The current intent is that we should send paper copies to update the Handbook.

One proposal is to pass an amendment to allow for electronic updates.

There is a need to verify the results of last semester's amendment, verify that the Board approved them, and then get them updated electronically and in print for new faculty.

### **Amendments to the voting process**

Announce draft proposals of the amendments at the November 28 meeting, but we will not actually bring them to the faculty until January. They will be put on the faculty sensitive business site. Once they are formally presented in January, they will be voted on formally in February, and have them to the Board in March.

There was an extensive discussion about the lack of understanding why the faculty don't vote. Sheri Young indicated a strong desire to go to each department to ask why people didn't vote. She noted that the primary message from the Faculty Handbook Committee may represent the position that the committee wanted certain issues to pass, and that position is problematic. Mark Waner indicated that the goal is to make sure that people indicate decisions, not support or objection to any particular issue. Matt Berg argued that the goal is to make each vote count. Dr. Young reaffirmed her position that a lack of understanding why people didn't vote is key, and expressed concern that a vote on this proposal opens up the faculty to a wide variety of other issues.

Arguments were made that faculty don't understand the role of the FH. They typically hear about it from the outside. It makes us a more powerful faculty. Our junior colleagues, especially, don't understand the relationship of the handbook and life issues for faculty members.

The counter position was that we need to make the Handbook more flexible to adapt to changing situations.

Dr. Young argued that the status quo protects us from poorly worded proposals. Drs. Berg and Johansen countered the FHC and the faculty need to protect us from those poorly worded proposals.