

Faculty Senate 11/20/2006 Minutes

Senators Present Barry Anton (Chair), Kris Bartanen, Terry Beck, Nancy Bristow, Robin Foster, John Hanson, Priti Joshi, Julie McGruder, Hans Ostrom, Jessie Rowe, Amy Ryken, Ross Singleton, David Sousa

Visitors Ron Thomas, David Beers, Jeff Matthews

Senate Chair Anton called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.

Ostrom's detailed minutes of the November 6, 2006 meeting were approved.

Presentation

Campaign Planning: Pathways to the Vision: President Ron Thomas and Vice President for University Relations David Beers gave an overview of the capital campaign planning process. The process involves determining the cost implications of the objectives contained in the university's strategic plan, setting priorities, and formulating a time-frame for the campaign. A President's Advisory Committee for Campaign Planning, formed by the Board of Trustees, has been working since October 2005 to determine fundraising priorities, align campaign goals with the strategic plan, and review a feasibility study designed to evaluate the match between the campaign fundraising priorities and donor capacity and interest. In May 2007 the final draft of the capital campaign plan will be considered by the Board of Trustees. President Thomas emphasized that a primary emphasis for the energy, effort, and travel associated with the campaign will be implementation of an Alumni Council Executive Committee, a range of sub-committees, and volunteer opportunities for alumni. In addition, he noted that building a well developed alumni network is central to building a culture of philanthropy and achieving the ambitious goals of the strategic plan.

Announcements

Bartanen announced that John Finney and Brad Tomhave have revised the 2007-2008 class schedule to expand the number of time slots for 80-minute classes and to reduce late-afternoon conflicts with co-curricular activities. The class schedule will operate as described in the September 26, 2006 class schedule memorandum with the changes noted below. Departments will have an opportunity to make adjustments to the 2007-2008 schedules.

MWF 2:00-3:20 p.m. becomes primarily committed to 80-minute classes.

Departments can offer these 80-minute classes on MW, MF, and WF in equal proportions. There will be no 80-minute classes on MW, MF, and WF from 3:00-4:20 p.m.

2:00-2:50 p.m. and 3:00-3:50 p.m. are available for MWF classes as classrooms remain available after the 80-minute classes are accommodated. The Registrar's Office will schedule the 2:00-3:20 p.m. MW, MF, and WF classes in a common set of classrooms to minimize the impact on those wishing to teach 50-minute MWF classes at 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m.

Bartanen noted that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Class Schedule should continue its work. Sousa noted that with Jean Kim's departure the Committee will need a new chair. Anton volunteered to chair the committee.

Old and Older Business

Senators discussed how to proceed with the two sets of recommendations that have been received by the Senate, 1) Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation and 2) Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards. Should the recommendations be considered sequentially in the order received?

Hanson suggested going through each recommendation in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards, making motions on each recommendation, and then sending a set of recommendations to the PSC, before taking recommendations to the full faculty.

Ostrom wondered if Bartanen should make a report at the next meeting based on a recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation.

Singleton asked Hanson if the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards would like a chance to present its report in a more formal way. He noted at the last meeting process and procedures were discussed, rather than specific recommendations.

Hanson noted that would happen if the Senate dealt with the reports sequentially. He had hoped to field questions at the last meeting to see what Senators would like to discuss, thus avoiding discussing each recommendation in detail. Foster explained that she would like an overview of the committee's ideas about where to go next, to hear how the committee would like the process to unfold.

Ostrom suggested that each Senator could review the two reports for overlap and then decide at the next meeting how to proceed with the recommendations. Bristow suggested that the Senate have the procedural conversation now so that future meetings can be devoted to consideration of the recommendations. Singleton suggested that the Senate identify areas of overlap and address those first.

Joshi observed that many of the Evaluation recommendations contain suggestions about the climate of the campus and are not specific changes in the Code.

Bartanen wondered about the relationship of the Anton/Haltom document to the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation report. Anton clarified that it was an inventory of recommendations in the report.

Hanson shared his concern that the Senate may lose sight of recommendations and the big picture if it discusses the two reports in fragmented parts.

Singleton suggested the Senate take up the most recent report (Professional Standards) and turn to Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation report when there is overlap.

Bristow agreed, noting that Code changes require a lengthy approval process. She suggested that the Senate get those recommendations into the process quickly.

Sousa explained that a number of the recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards report, especially those under item 6, are housekeeping changes designed to make the language clearer. He suggested that those recommendations be fast tracked.

Ostrom suggested that the Senate start with house keeping recommendations and then work through other ones. Sousa asked, would it help if someone identified the intersecting points? Foster and Bristow volunteered to do just that.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Submitted by Amy Ryken