

Senate Minutes for 3/20/06

Senators Present: Anton, Bartanen, Bristow, Haltom, Hanson, Maxwell, Singleton, Sousa, Wimberger

Guests: Choudhury, Decker, McGruder

The meeting was called to order at 4:51 after finally achieving a quorum.

The February 20 and 27 minutes were approved.

Announcements:

Reminder: There will be a Senate Meeting in one week on March 27.

The Walter Lowrie Distinguished Service Award has found a home outside the Misner Room. The Senate thanks Karen Fischer and Facilities for their assistance in finding a permanent home for the award.

New Business:

The Committee on Honorary Degrees submitted their recommendations for Honorary Degree recipients. These were approved by the Senate.

Old Business:

The Senate returned to discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation. The question was what to do with the various recommendations.

Recommendation 1 has been carried out by the Senate. Discussion of recommendations 3, 4, 11 and 12a has been placed on hold until the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards reports back to the Senate.

Bartanen reported that the Academic Vice President's office is addressing Recommendation 6 by scheduling a meeting of second year faculty and is working on Recommendation 7. The Senate awaits the report of Buescher and Orlin from their meeting with junior faculty that will provide more insight into Recommendations 5, 8 and 14. By discussing the report, the Senate is addressing Recommendation 2.

Singleton asked for clarification of Recommendation 15. Bristow said that it was written to confirm the importance of the PSC in reviewing departmental criteria, and that the Ad Hoc Committee's review suggested that the Senate should consider charging the PSC to review to departmental criteria while giving increased scrutiny to irregularities, such as Code-violations, instances of selective empowerment, and instances of non-objective criteria.

Maxwell stated that there were two classes of recommendations: those that required further study and those that required a change to the Code or Bylaws such as

Recommendation 9. Bristow replied that the intent of Recommendation 9 was to encourage the Senate to discuss external members on evaluation committees and/or a University ombudsperson. In writing many of these recommendations the committee was not necessarily calling for a change but a discussion of the issues associated with the potential change.

At this point in the meeting Haltom noted that we had just lost our quorum and that we could continue to discuss but we could not act on anything. Bristow suggested that we might want more Senators in attendance. Wimberger noted that there were no junior faculty to hear from.

Haltom suggested that Chair Anton provide the Senate with an order of recommendations from which we could proceed. Chair Anton said that the next agenda would order the recommendations.

Hanson wondered what the fate of the recommendations in Appendix B was. Bristow reminded the Senate that we had officially received that report in Spring 2005 and that those recommendations still merited discussion.

With that the Senate adjourned quorumless at 5:20.

Peter Wimberger  
Secretary for a Day