

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 10, 2007

Senators Present: Anderson-Connolly, Bartanen, Beck, Bristow, Cannon (Chair), Foster, Hanson, Holland, McGruder, O'Neil, Ostrom, Racine, Ryken, Segawa, Singleton, Weiss

Guests: Alyce DeMarais, Lydia Fisher, George Tomlin

I. Arrange for Minutes

Despite the manifest injustice of Anderson-Connolly taking minutes at consecutive meetings, it was decided to rotate minute-taking following alphabetical order, beginning at the top.

II. M/S/P Approval of minutes of 5/7/2007

III. Announcements

Dean Bartanen distributed the standing committee assignment sheet, in response to interest expressed at the Senate retreat regarding its potential redesign. She suggested that we revisit it at the end of year.

Chair Cannon reminded the Senators that McCormick is not accessible because of lack of elevator access. For the nonce we will stay but we must look for an accessible room.

Anderson-Connolly reminded the chair as per our retreat discussion that we should add, as permanent agenda items, one-minute rants (referred to as special orders?) and liaison reports.

IV. Duties of Vice-Chair

M/S/P postponement for 2 weeks.

V. Committee on Elections

Hansen offered the motion found in appendix A.

Ostrom seconded the motion and suggested that the committee bring the bigger, structural ideas before the full faculty before doing too much work. Hansen agreed with this suggestion.

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. Charges to Standing Committees

Academic Standards Committee

Ostrom distributed the document in appendix B.

Ostrom suggested that the ASC should consider these scheduling principles. Of particular importance is point #6 regarding an open or protected hour. In fact, he noted, the Senate may wish to consider this on its own in order to get it in place by next year.

The chair volunteered to put the open hour on the agenda for next meeting.

McGruder offered as a charge that the ASC should review this document. The agreed upon wording became: "The ASC should discuss and pursue implementation of the principles in the document."

Bristow noted that the ASC did not give any recommended charges for this year in their end-of-year report. She suggested that we ask the ASC to give us a list of their own recommended charges. Bristow will meet with to convene the ASC and will report back to the Senate in two weeks.

McGruder suggested that we could review minutes and charges from the previous year.

Weiss, reading the Senate minutes of May 7, 2007, noted a request from Peter Wimberger regarding units and honors. This, she added, ought to be a charge.

Ostrom added that Chris Kline recommended a change to the student alert form, so that it might include behavioral issues. This, too, should go ASC.

No motion regarding charges was officially passed. The chair summarized the discussion: Bristow will meet and ask the ASC to send recommended charges to us. The Senate has several ideas already. Of particular importance are the scheduling principles, although the Senate may act independently on the open hour.

Curriculum Committee

The chair noted that four items were sent as recommendations by the CC.

1. Complete remaining business related to the review of the academic internship courses.
2. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including: 5 year reviews of departments and programs, ongoing assessment of core rubrics, review of international study programs.
3. Continue ongoing discussion of the Connections rubric with regard to issue of consistency of approval practices across committees and subcommittees.
4. Consider whether or not it is appropriate for the Curriculum Committee to address the scheduling of class times as part of its ongoing charges.

An additional item was sent by Eric Orlin regarding the Re-Accreditation Steering Committee:

Work with the RSC to provide information necessary to the self-study. (The RSC could send the chair of the CC a list of questions, and hopefully the CC could address them quickly before their normal yearly work of reviewing programs and courses builds up a head of steam.)

Singleton recognized a possible overlap with charge 4 and the potential charges to the ASC. This was not, he averred, necessarily a bad thing, because we may want both perspectives.

DeMarais clarified that the recommend charge brought by the CC was about whether CC ought to consider scheduling as part of its task. Holland answered that scheduling does fall within the jurisdiction of the CC.

Beck opined that it was a strange question for a committee to ask itself. McGruder added that the wording of the charge is odd. We need to let the CC know that the ASC is also working on scheduling.

Bristow suggested that it is appropriate to let the CC decide whether it is in their jurisdiction.

Dean Bartanen, referring to the bylaws, claimed that the topic falls to the ASC.

Hansen moved to strike #4 from charges. Singleton suggested instead that the CC examine scheduling as it relates to the curriculum.

Ryken suggested that Eric Orlin's reworded email also becomes a new charge: Respond to inquiries from the RSC regarding the self-study.

Ostrom M/S/P charges as amended.

The official charges to the 2007-08 Curriculum Committee are:

- 1. Complete remaining business related to the review of the academic internship courses.*
- 2. Continue the on-going business of the Committee including: 5 year reviews of departments and programs, ongoing assessment of core rubrics, review of international study programs.*
- 3. Continue ongoing discussion of the Connections rubric with regard to issue of consistency of approval practices across committees and subcommittees.*
- 4. Respond to inquiries from the ASC regarding curricular impact of scheduling principles.*
- 5. Respond to inquiries from the RSC regarding the self-study.*

University Enrichment Committee

Chair Cannon noted the three recommended charges from the UEC from the prior year.

1. Review proposals for travel and research grants (faculty and students) and disperse funds according to UEC guidelines.
2. Review and rank the released time proposals and forward recommendations to Dean Bartanen.
3. Determine the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award

Bristow offered a new Charge: Consider whether travel to fulfill professional organizational duties (including journal duties) is appropriate. If so, the UEC can make a request to the BTF via the Associate Dean for this purpose.

Holland suggested another charge: Consider streamlining conference funding process.

McGruder opined that the current procedures are not that burdensome. Ostrom inquired whether there was some legal requirement for the treasurer involving the paperwork. Dean Bartanen responded in the affirmative.

It was noted (although the secretary did not catch the speaker) that the Register Lecturer should be added to charge #3.

Ostrom M/S/P charges as amended.

The official charges to the 2007-08 University Enrichment Committee are:

1. *Review proposals for travel and research grants (faculty and students) and disperse funds according to UEC guidelines.*
2. *Review and rank the released time proposals and forward recommendations to Dean Bartanen.*
3. *Determine the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award recipient and the Register Lecture speaker.*
4. *Consider whether funding for travel to fulfill professional organizational duties (including journal duties) is appropriate. If so, the UEC should make a request to the BTF via the Associate Dean for this purpose.*
5. *Consider streamlining conference funding process.*

Faculty Advancement Committee

Chair Cannon offered as the first charge that the FAC perform its ongoing reviews.

McGruder offered a second charge: The FAC should appoint a chair in its first meeting as called for in bylaws. If the FAC disagrees with the need for a chair, the FAC is charged with bringing the language of a bylaws' change to the Senate to remove the need for a chair.

Anderson-Connolly noted that there were 12 “issues and recommendations” in the end-of-year report. Should, he wondered, any of these become charges? The chair and the dean agreed that none were truly charges.

The chair offered a charge whereby the FAC would suggest code changes to the PSC.

Ostrom suggested that the Senate look at the FAC suggestions and send new charges to the PSC later. Foster added that the chair’s suggestion was consistent with ideas coming out of the Senate regarding the benefit of greater communication between the committees.

Bartanen offered wording for this charge: The FAC is encouraged to communicate with the PSC regarding issues of mutual concern suggested in the FAC’s year end report.

Singleton noted that the “issues and recommendations” in the FAC’s end-of-year report contained good information and we might want to think about a better way to disseminate this. The chair replied that some of this will come before the Senate. McGruder wondered how you get people to pay attention to the buff document. Bartanen suggested that some of these could go to the chairs’ meeting.

McGruder observed, in conclusion, that we can send more charges later as they come up.

Ostrom M/S/P charges as amended.

The official charges to the 2007-08 Faculty Advancement Committee are:

- 1. Perform its ongoing reviews.*
- 2. The FAC should appoint a chair in its first meeting as called for in bylaws. If the FAC disagrees with the need for a chair, the FAC is charged with bringing the language of a bylaws’ change to the Senate to remove the need for a chair.*
- 3. The FAC is encouraged to communicate with the PSC regarding issues of mutual concern suggested in the FAC’s year end report.*

Professional Standards Committee

Chair Cannon recognized the chair of the PSC, George Tomlin.

Tomlin, referring to the list of 2006-07 charges, noted that item #1 was passed already and sent to the board. The remaining items are still pending. The committee has not prioritized them as yet and the Senate might wish to do this.

Tomlin ask the Senate whether it wanted another self-assessment from the PSC.

McGruder noted that all standing committees were charged with this.

Hansen reminded the Senators that there is a set of questions about the self-assessment. Anderson-Connolly, recognizing his ignorance on the subject, offered that it would be

good to see the questionnaire. Chair Cannon reminded the liaisons that they should read the self-assessment reports.

Segawa offered a new charge: Review the Campus Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy.

Bartanen suggested two additional charges: Review draft policy on background checks; Review draft policy on shared appointments.

Bartanen noted that there is a list of other issues the PSC is working on.

The chair asserted that the main question was about priorities. Foster revealed a hesitancy to prioritize the work of the PSC. Holland agreed. The chair asked the liaison to report on priorities as established by the PSC.

McGruder moved that we remove the date from the self-assessment charge.

Bartanen, seeking symmetry in all things, and noting that since the FAC was charged with communicating with the PSC, offered as a charge: The PSC is encouraged to communicate with the FAC regarding issues of mutual concern suggested in the PSC's year end report.

The chair offered the following as the preamble to the charges: The Senate recognizes the considerable workload and the discretion of the PSC to prioritize its tasks.

He further offered that the first charge should be the continuation of ongoing duties.

Ostrom M/S/P charges as amended.

The official charges to the 2007-08 Professional Standards Committee are:

The Senate recognizes the considerable workload and the discretion of the PSC to prioritize its tasks:

1. *Continue ongoing duties.*
2. *Propose "housekeeping amendments" to the Code to correct typos and inaccurate internal Code citations and to replace "days" with "working days."*
3. *Consider revising formal Code interpretations to include "partners" in places where "spouses" are mentioned.*
4. *Revise the formal Code interpretation of Chapter III, Section 6, in the old Code ("Whether a five-year evaluation of a full professor entails 'altering the status of the evaluated faculty member's appointment' so as to be subject to appeals procedures") to update internal Code citations. This formal interpretation was approved in 1997, but was inadvertently omitted from the appendix of formal Code interpretations and consequently was not revised last year along with the other formal interpretations.*

5. *Examine the evaluation process for three-year visiting faculty members, which is not currently addressed in the Code. The committee recommends that the Senate charge the PSC to examine this issue next year.*
6. *Revise the University Evaluation Standards published in the buff document to correct errors.*
7. *Clarify the definition of “tenure-line faculty” by a Code amendment or formal interpretation.*
8. *Examine Chapter III, Section 4.b.(4), with reference to the relationship between the informal and the formal challenges that an evaluatee may make to an evaluation conducted by a department, school, or program.*
9. *Examine Chapter III, Section 5, to consider questions that have arisen about the so-called streamlined five-year evaluations of full professors (for example, questions about classroom visitation and about the participation of departmental colleagues in these evaluations).*
10. *Examine how departments, schools, and programs in their statements of evaluation guidelines handle the assessment of an evaluatee’s teaching in non-departmental courses.*
11. *Complete a self-assessment.*
12. *Review the Campus Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Policy.*
13. *Review draft policy on background checks.*
14. *Review draft policy on shared appointments.*
15. *The PSC is encouraged to communicate with the FAC regarding issues of mutual concern suggested in the PSC’s year end report.*

VIII. Adjournment

M/S/P to adjourn at 5:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard Anderson-Connnolly

Appendix A

Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections

I move that the Faculty Senate create an Ad Hoc Committee on Elections to discuss and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures used in faculty elections. The membership of the committee will consist of John Hanson (Chair), Richard Anderson-Connolly, Randy Bentson, Nancy Bristow, and Terrence Beck.

The committee is charged to investigate the issues discussed below, as well as other issues related to elections that it identifies during its deliberations.

How should votes be cast? Should electronic voting be used, and if so what system should be implemented? What safeguards are necessary for ensuring secure and accurate elections? For the past two years we have used electronic voting using the ASUPS uvote system. While electronic voting seems to be popular among many faculty members, others have voiced concerns about the security and validity of electronic voting, especially using a system that we do not control and that we have not validated.

Who runs the election and who certifies the results? The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is currently charged with distributing and collecting ballots for the election. But there is no indication as to who should be involved in certifying the election that the Secretary ran. This is a potential weak point in the process, especially since the Bylaws don't provide any provision for what should happen if the Secretary of the Faculty Senate is also running for a position!

Should the procedures used for electing the Faculty Senate Chair be the same as for Faculty Senate members? There are currently no procedures outlined in the bylaws for the election of the Faculty Senate Chair. For example, if there are three candidates should the winner of the election be declared the new Faculty Senate Chair, or should there be a runoff, as is stipulated for the election of Faculty Senate members.

Who decides on election questions not addressed in the Faculty Code or Bylaws? (For example, should vote counts be announced?) What mechanism should be used to inform the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, and others charged with overseeing the election, about the answers to these types of questions, as well as providing practical information about running the election?

Should the structure of elections be changed? For example, should instant runoff voting be implemented? Are there ways of structuring the elections such that the Faculty Senate is more representative of the faculty as a whole?

Appendix B

Senate Task-Force Barry Anton, Hans Ostrom, David Sousa, et al. April 2007

Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes

1. The schedule should reflect an efficient and effective use of the classrooms available, of the five working-days available per week, and of the hours from 8:00 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. It is understood, of course, that there are other teaching-spaces besides actual classrooms, such as laboratories and studios. “Classrooms” here is used in a broad sense, therefore. It is also understood that although the academic day may stretch from 8:00 a.m. to 9:50 p.m., in practice the vast majority of classes are scheduled sometime between 9:00 a.m. (starting-time) and 5:00 p.m. (ending-time).
2. In academia, the 50-minute and 80/90-minute periods remain effective and venerable. It is understood that, for sound pedagogical reasons, some colleagues prefer the former, some the latter, and some a combination of both. It is understood that neither period is inherently better pedagogically even if individual professors strongly prefer one to the other. Personal preference does not reflect an inherent pedagogical value of either time-slot. Therefore, the schedule should reflect an appropriate mixture of the 50-minute and 80-minute time-slots for classes.
3. No classes should begin before 8:00 a.m., and no classes should end later than 9:50 p.m. However, the schedule should reflect the majority of the faculty’s preference for teaching between the hours of 9:00 a.m. (starting-time) and 5:00 p.m. (ending-time). In other words, the schedule should force no colleague to teach before 9:00 a.m. or after 5:00. Moreover, as has been the custom at the university, individuals, departments, the staff, and the administration should attempt to accommodate reasonable preferences for a class-schedule. The main scheduling-custom now seems to involve good communication among individuals, departments, associate deans, the advising office, and the Registrar. There appears to be no reason to change this customary practice of reasonable negotiation and accommodation.
4. One-day-per-week, three-hour classes should be limited to 300- and 400-level courses and graduate courses. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no professor should teach more than one of these classes per term. Currently, such classes are rarely scheduled; therefore, debate about the drawbacks and merits of such courses is probably unnecessary and wasteful. However, the 3:00-6:00 p.m. slot should be available to teach in, as long as the class is not the only section of a required class for a major (see #7 below).

5. On M-W, M-F, and W-F, 80-minute classes may be scheduled, as long as they do not erode the effectiveness and efficiency of 50-minute classes on M-W-F. [Such classes shall begin no earlier than 2:00 p.m.] One fact to consider, of course, is that 80-minute classes require two hours of a classroom's time but use only 20 minutes of the second hour, whereas 50-minute classes leave only 10 minutes of each classroom-hour unspent. Nonetheless, the schedule appears to be able logistically to accommodate a number of 80-minute slots on M-W, M-F, and W-F. Individuals, departments, programs, and schedulers may wish to make use of M-F and W-F schedules, not only the M-W 80-minute schedule. They may also wish to make use of the **5:00-6:20** and **6:00-7:20 p.m.** slots in these M-W, M-F, and W-F schedules. [Associate Dean Finney implemented interim guidelines by which some 80-minute classes on M-W, W-F, and M-F may be scheduled.]
6. For many years, some faculty-members have expressed a wish for a protected hour for faculty meetings and other activities. The current discussion of scheduling offers an opportunity to determine whether faculty and others think the need for a protected hour should be a guiding principle in scheduling. If we choose to try to protect a time, one possibility is that for a trial-period of two years, and in alternating semesters, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 4-5 p.m. shall be protected meeting-times each week, when no classes or labs may be scheduled. A different day of the week, that is, would be chosen for each of the four trial-semesters.
7. The university's primary mission is to educate the whole student; therefore, in addition to providing an academic education, the university continues to value students' participation in athletics; in the performing, visual, and literary arts; in media; in the ASUPS; and so on. Therefore, departments should try to avoid scheduling required classes for the majors, of which classes there are not multiple sections, after 4:00 p.m. Legitimate exceptions to this guideline may arise, and there are different kinds of "required classes," but in general, departments should include this guideline in the several considerations that go into scheduling classes.