COE Senate Meeting
Minutes
April 28, 2017

Present: Donald Bolger (Chair, HDQM), Robert Lent (CHSE), Robert Marcus (HDQM), Blesilda Lim (Admin Prof Rep Exempt), Lucas Butler (HDQM), Kalia Patricio (Graduate Student, TLPL), Lucas Butler (HDQM), Dennis Kivlighan (CHSE), Ana Taboada Barber (CHSE), Margaret Peterson (At Large), Daniel Levin (TLPL), Paul Gold (CHSE), Lawrence Clark (At Large).

Absent: Donna Wiseman (Dean), Kathryn Wentzel (HDQM), Alanna Rothman (Undergraduate Rep, TLPL), Andrew Brantlinger (TLPL), , Valerie Foster (Admin Prof Rep Non Exempt), Robin Walukonis (Admin Prof Rep Exempt), Kellie Rolstad (TLPL), Michelle Espino (CHSE).

I. Regular Business
Approved minutes from March 2017 Senate Meeting. Vote was 11-0 to approve.

II. Current Issues

Post-op report from Awards Committee; Discussion on number of awards and Awards Ceremony

CoE Awards discussion
  a. Discussion of having too many awards took place (currently 14 nominations—with so many nominations people feel awards are not special/meaningful anymore; One exempt staff award proposed; there was substantial discussion of whether to give fewer awards. Suggestions were made to collapse the mentoring with teaching award with emphasis depending on the opportunities (e.g., some Professional Track faculty don’t have opportunities for mentoring).
  b. Pre tenure Exceptional Scholarship award nature was discussed. The award could focus on one particular piece (e.g., excellent manuscript; best paper award). This will make the award a one time accomplishment and not conflict with overall trajectory. However, this is problematic because of the load on the award nominators and chairs who recommend awardees (having to read several manuscripts of possible awardees).
  c. Discussion on whether we should have the award ceremony during the College Assembly—historically: Awards were given as part of the College Assembly; two years ago the ceremony was too long and just focused on awards. There was general consensus that we could have a College
Assembly, with presentation of the awards, followed by a Dean’s luncheon to honor the awardees (plus guests).

d. Honoring the ‘function”—all who qualify for excellent teaching, excellent scholarship; there was consensus that awards become more meaningful if there are fewer. We could have two tiers: Early career versus more senior faculty (that could be clinical or non clinical). This would also support the college’s initiative of trying to avoid isolating the ‘tracks’ (e.g., professional track).

e. Communicating the process behind the award nomination is important.

7 Awards were proposed

Excellence in teaching / mentoring – Early and late career and late career
Exceptional Scholarship
Distinguished Outreach
Excellence in Service
Staff Award – Exemplary service
Service and Outreach for Faculty
3 student awards

f. A vote on line will take place

**Amendment to College Mission Statement:** Statement has been redrafted; a vote motion will be put forward by DJ Bolger

a. Senate Budget Committee: We passed this in our plan of organization; this needs to be in place especially in view of new Dean; nominations from chairs for each department. Question was posed on whether the same function could be fulfilled in the Senate Steering Committee (discussing the health of the budget is key). A formal motion will be put forward to have the Senate Budget Committee folded or be the same as the Senate Steering Committee.

III. **Future Issues** - started with this because many people were late
We have a nomination for Chair Elect, and for Senate Chair. A vote will be put forward; decisions are made in the Spring. Nominations for most of the at-large positions have been made. Meetings time(s) were discussed; Senate traditionally met consistently first Friday of the month; this may not work with current department schedules so the idea of holding senate mtg. fourth Friday was discussed.