**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

December 11, 2013

Bump Conference Room

**I. Call to order**

Chair Ed Corwin called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

**II. Roll call**

Senators present: Drs. David Boyles, Al Boysen (late arrival), Robert Corey, William Cross, Marius Ellingsen (late arrival), Thomas Fontaine, Adam French, Patrick Gilcrease, Travis Kowalski, Frank Matejcik, Charles Tolle, Purushotham PT Tukkaraja, and Frank Van Nuys.

Also attending: Dr. Dean Jensen.

**III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**IV. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the November 14, 2013 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved.

**V. Report from the chair**

* A search committee for a new Vice President for Research Affairs needs to be constituted, hopefully to have a candidate available by late Spring 2014. Dr. Corwin’s understanding is that current VP Ron White will continue until a new VP is found.

**VI. Committee reports**

* The standing committees had nothing to report.

**VII. Old Business**

1. *Emeritus policy*. The Senate discussed the proposed, modified Emeritus Policy. Some minor issues of wordsmithing aside, the major point of discussion concerned the protocol for initiating the emeritus process: specifically, should the retiring faculty member be responsible for starting the recommendation process, or is it the responsibility of the department (or its head)? Some Senators felt uncomfortable with the former choice (as emeritus status is typically an *honor* bestowed upon someone for their work, rather than requested); others felt that leaving the responsibility solely with the department might result in the “overlooking” of a worthy candidate (and was that not precisely the problem this new policy was meant, in part, to address?). The general consensus emerging from discussion was that *every retiring professor should get an emeritus recommendation (either for or against) within a year of his or her retirement*. Motion to approve the modified emeritus policy passed unanimously.

**VIII. New business**

1. *Recommendation on emeritus rank*. The Senate discussed the recommendation for granting emeritus rank to Dr. James McReynolds, who retires this year. The Senate noted with appreciation his work in the Department of Social Sciences, including his time as Department Chair; his teaching and curricular work in psychology and abnormal behavior; his invaluable contributions to the university as CAMP faculty; and his community work with both WAVI and Big Brothers/Big Sisters. The motion to recommend emeritus rank for Dr. McReynolds passed unanimously.
2. *Publication of emeritus faculty*. Dr. Corwin brought forward the question of *where* should the information regarding emeritus faculty be published, and suggested that the University catalog, the campus directory, and the department webpage were three reasonable choices. The Senate generally agreed the need for this, citing both the emeritus benefit of a university affiliation for later publication and the current difficulty in finding this information. Some Senators noted this was a part of a larger issue: how do we preserve the University’s sense of history (just *who* was Devereaux? Surbeck? etc.). After some discussion of other locations to publish emeritus information (building marquees, for example), the Senate agreed that the catalog, directory, and department webpages were a good place to start.
3. *StraighterLine*. As per request by the VPAA, the Senate discussed StraighterLine, an education company that offers low-price higher-educational courses online. Though StraighterLine is itself unaccredited, it has formed partnerships with a number of accredited colleges and universities. As related by Dr. Corwin, the Regents have requested campus policies regarding what (if any) courses may be taken through StraighterLine for university credit. Senators expressed uncertainty regarding the rigor of the online classes, as well as the notion of an SDSMT degree with ever fewer SDSMT classes contributing to it. The general consensus among Senators was that SDSMT should not accept many, *if any*, courses through StraighterLine. The Senate also requested that this discussion, coupled with the previous discussion of MOOCs, might be better served by the inclusion of Provost Hrncir, Barb Dolan, and the Department Chairs.
4. *Certificate program recognition.* As pithily summarized by Dr. Cross, what do we provide students who complete a certificate program other than a hearty handshake? Dr. Jensen discussed the current Six Sigma Greenbelt certificate program, in which students take a number of IENG courses, implement a project, and pass a content exam. Currently, students earn acknowledgment of the certificate on their transcript, but students who wish to continue to the Blackbelt certificate with the American Society for Quality require something *other* than the transcript annotation. Such certificate programs package a nice collection of subject matter related to but generally outside of a discipline (such as a chemical engineer with an interest in safety); they are helpful for providing specialization and/or distinction in professional fields. To address the problem at the time, Dr. Jensen made a mocked up paper certificate for these students, but as certificate programs are becoming increasingly popular, he foresees a need for consistency in the design and distribution of such physical certificates. It was moved that

*The Senate recommends that students completing an SDSMT certificate program receive a frameable, signed hardcopy of the certificate/certification.*

The motion passed unanimously.

1. *Nominating committee*. As Dr. Corwin’s term is ending, a new nominating committee is required to secure the next Chair of the Faculty. The committee is to be composed of 5 people selected *by* the Senate (though not necessarily *from* it). Drs. Cross and Ellingsen volunteered to serve on the committee, with Dr. Van Nuys offering to recruit further members.
2. *Student Honor Code*. Dr. Tolle, noting the previous instances the Senate had discussed student cheating and academic dishonesty, brought up the notion of a student Honor Code, and in particular, should SDSMT have one? Senators discussed their experiences with previous institutional Honor Codes and generally felt it was an idea worth investigating. It was recommended that the Student Affairs Committee work with the Student Association on this issue.

**IX. Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 12:40 PM.