

Minutes for January 31, 2005

Senators present: Keith Maxwell, Eric Orlin, Robin Foster, Karen Porter, Bill Haltom, Peter Wimberger, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Ryan Cunningham, Alyce DeMarais, Barry Anton, David Tinsley

Guests: Bill Barry, Sherry Mondou, Andy Rex, Kate Stirling, Kevin David

The Action

The meeting was called to order at 4:05.

The November 29 and December 13 minutes were approved.

Professional Standards Committee sent us their interpretation of working days (see attached).

Special Orders

We received an update on Teaching Evaluations online. There are currently 104 reviews by 65 students on 73 faculty in 32 departments. 87% of the reviews are positive, 11% ambivalent, and 2% negative. Ryan's assessment was that evaluations are informative about courses.

Budget Task Force Recommendations

Sherry Mondou, Kris Bartanen, Kate Stirling and Andy Rex presented the BTF recommendations, which can be found at

http://www.ups.edu/financeadmin/budget_recommendations_0506.pdf

Their presentation outlined the highlights in the report.

Regarding benefits, Senator Holland asked whether there had been any success in UPS pursuing a coalition of schools so that we would have a larger pool. Financial Vice President Mondou related that an attempt by Oregon independent schools succeeded, while an attempt by Washington schools failed because two of the larger schools didn't want to join. Oregon is trying to work it out so that Washington schools can join them.

Other comments during the meeting not covered in the BTF document:

There is a move to reducing endowment payout to 4-4.5% among colleges. The Board wants to move below the current 5% but felt that this year wasn't the best year to do it.

In response to a question about benefits—salaries account for half the budget. Tuition remission benefits cost about \$1 million/year.

Other business

Senators Holland and DeMarais discussed their course evaluation designed for team teaching. Some senators opined that a different form for team-taught courses was a good idea. Some

questioned the usefulness of the forms for evaluation purposes as opposed to feedback. The question was raised about how to go about making changes to the evaluation form. Senate Chair Beardsley stated that his understanding was that we would formulate suggestions for change with faculty perhaps rewriting the forms and submitting them to the Senate. After passing through the Senate, the forms could move to a first reading at a Faculty Meeting. At that point the PSC could take them up if they wished, or any faculty member could refer the proposed form to the PSC. Senator Tinsley suggested that we also solicit student input once we had a good draft.

Then the discussion turned to what our next steps with the evaluations should be. The questions raised were:

- Should we start with a master evaluation form and then modify it for team-taught courses, or should we focus on team-taught courses?
- Should we hire a consultant to look at our existing form?
- Should we discuss the goals of our evaluation process before we proceed further?
- Do we need to address the question of what is broken about our current form before we redesign it?

The evaluation subcommittee was going to grapple with these questions and report back to us.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Wimberger

Date: January 27, 2005

To: William Beardsley, Chair, Faculty Senate

From: William Breitenbach, Chair, Professional Standards Committee

Re: Formal Code interpretation of “working days”

As instructed by Chapter I, Part G, Section 1, of the Faculty Code, I am delivering to you for distribution to the Faculty Senate and inclusion in the Senate minutes a formal written interpretation by the Professional Standards Committee of the phrase “working days” as it appears in the Faculty Code. The Professional Standards Committee deems this interpretation to be of significant merit, so it should be forwarded to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees for its concurrence.

Following the interpretation, I have listed the places in the Code where this phrase currently appears. The citations come from the online version of the Code

Interpretation of “working days” in the Faculty Code (citations provided below)

Many processes described in the Code (such as but not limited to processes for appealing interpretations of the Code; for conducting evaluations, appeals of evaluations, and hearing boards; for dismissing a faculty member; and for conducting grievances) specify a particular number of "working days" during which a stage of the process is to be completed. In these Code processes, "working days" means those weekdays during the regular academic year (i.e., fall and spring semesters) when classes are in session, plus the weekdays of reading and final examination periods. If all parties consent, Code processes can proceed on non-working days. Completing one stage of a process during non-working days does not, however, oblige parties to complete all subsequent stages of the process during non-working days.

This interpretation applies to the phrase “working days” as it appears in these and any other places in the Code, now and in the future:

- Chapter I, Part G, Section 2
- Chapter III, Section 4. b (3)
- Chapter III, Section 4. b (4) [twice]
- Chapter III, Section 4. c (2)
- Chapter III, Section 4. c (3)
- Chapter III, Section 4. c (6)
- Chapter III, Section 4. e (2)
- Chapter III, Section 6. a (3) [misabeled as Sect. 6. h (3) in the web version of the Code]
- Chapter III, Section 6. c
- Chapter III, Section 6. c (6)
- Chapter III, Section 6. d (2)
- Chapter III, Section 7. j
- Chapter V, Part A, Section 2. c (3)
- Chapter V, Part A, Section 3. b
- Chapter V, Part A, Section 3. c (2)
- Chapter V, Part B, Section 3. c
- Chapter V, Part C
- Chapter VI, Section 2. a [thrice; subsection “a” is not identified in the text of the web version of the Code]
- Chapter VI, Section 2. c
- Chapter VI, Section 3. a
- Chapter VI, Section 4. c (9)
- Chapter VI, Section 5
- Chapter VI, Section 6