Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  Friday, Jan. 15 11:00 Mahood Conference Room


I. Call to Order
II. Roy Pruett made motion to approve November and December meeting minutes; Michelle Cofer second the motion, and all were in favor.

III. Old Business-

Senate meetings will continue to be the 3rd Friday at 11 this semester.

Steve Bourne indicated the first paragraph looked like a vote of no confidence, but we haven’t done a vote of no confidence. Ozyavas recommended “diminished trust, faith, and confidence” be used.

Norm Mirsky explained he’s opposed because we “should not threaten” the BOG. He asked what we wanted the board to do and explained the letter was insulting to members who give their time. Discussion followed concerning the role and expectations for the BOG.

Steve Bourne asked if the BOG ever discussed the points presented from faculty last year, and Mirsky said no because they met so infrequently. Darrel Malamisura explained that the problems are more with the board’s leadership and wasteful spending on campus. Michelle Cofer explained the responsibility of the board is advisory. Steve Bourne said that was true prior to the new law, but now the role of the board is to govern, and they run the institution. Mirsky explained they have authority and asked again, “What actions do you want?” Bourne explained the board now has more authority. Malamisura explained that the board is never given negative information. Mirsky said that one of the problems was that the board met infrequently but now will meet monthly. He said “My biggest problem is that the board doesn’t meet about finances.” Malamisura explained that the President was planning to have Marshall justify IT but said that was tabled, but they are really moving forward with the plan to use Business Skype instead of using a free system that works. Mirsky said that these were problems with the executive committee and the board was told they should not be involved in that, but they do have fiduciary responsibility and can ask about spending. Picanco said we agree this is not the time for a vote of no confidence, but we do need to show our discontent and expressing our discontent could go further. He recommended we write two short paragraphs indicating all issues that worry us; the lack of transparency and the lack of realistic information being presented to the board. He volunteered to draft the short letter.

Steve Bourne explained it is “critical to examine systemic problems” and “we want them to be more active.” Malamisura explained enrollment is down 140 from last spring and 260 down from fall. He does not want to meet with the president again because she doesn’t give answers. The transparency is
an illusion and Connor is hamstrung. Bourne said we need to identify systemic issues and give the board a chance; monthly meetings may be good. Malamisura explained the board doesn’t get the entire picture. Bourne said that we stand ready to meet. We are concerned about spending and much of what we spend is available for free. We can have a more effective system.

Discussion included what information is presented in reports to the BOG. Malamisura explained they need more discussion time and less review of reports. Mirsky explained state money is not based on enrollment.

Baldwin asked if Mirsky presented faculty concerns to the BOG. Michelle Cofer asked if we give Mirsky our concerns in a statement for the board like the classified staff do. Malamisura explained that we can do that. Discussion followed including the process followed when Topling came to senate and how senate can communicate with the BOG.

Discussion followed concerning how forceful the letter should be when revised. Picanco said, “we will not force; we can only show we aren’t part of the process.” Mirsky said “You antagonize the board, they won’t do anything.”

Malamisura questioned what time frame would be reasonable and Picanco recommended senate ask as soon as convenient. Baldwin explained approving a letter would take time. Mirsky explained the next meeting is the 3rd Thursday in Feb..

Hunter explained that with decreasing revenue, the college will eventually have a “cash-flow problem.” He recommended we be “nice and respectful” yet express a “sense of urgency.”

Cofer asked if we have an action item. Picanco explained a meeting is needed, and Malimasura explained we also need to consider a timeline. He explained a revised letter would be distributed for comments and then reviewed at the next meeting.

Pruett said that BSC was listed at the bottom of a retention list which looks bad.

Brief discussion about processes for payment of tuition followed.

IV. Pruett made a motion to adjourn, and Malimasura seconded it.