

Faculty Meeting Minutes September 25, 2002

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Fifty-one voting members of the faculty were present at 4:45 p.m.

Associate Dean John Finney was elected secretary for the 2002-2003 academic year.

Minutes of the February 4, 2002 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

In response to President Pierce's call for announcements, Bill Barry announced that Sharon Chambers-Gordon is the new Fellowships Coordinator. He urged faculty to send good students her way. President Pierce asked that we help locate talented freshmen and sophomores since it is advantageous to our students to begin the process earlier rather than later in their time here.

Barry also announced that the "new, real deadline" for all proposals for new core courses to be offered during 2003-2004 is October 11, 2002.

Kris Bartanen announced the Anita Hill lecture on October 3, 2002 at 8:00 p.m. in the Fieldhouse, on "Speaking Truth To Power: Social Change and Workplace Realities."

President Pierce had no report.

Dean Cooney had no report except to ask faculty to be conscious of the need to be gracious in their email communications, with staff in particular.

Faculty Senate Chair Hans Ostrom had no report except to say that about half the Faculty Senate charges to committees were on the web and that the other half would be shortly. He said the next meeting of the Faculty Senate is October 7.

We turned to the main agenda item, consideration of amendment to the *Faculty Code*. **Bill Beardsley M/S/vote reported later "to accept the amendment to the *Faculty Code* put forward by the joint conference committee of the faculty and trustees."** Beardsley, a faculty member along with Bruce Mann and Sarah Moore on the joint faculty-trustee conference committee, then gave a brief history of deliberations leading to the present proposed amendment. He said the conference committee was appointed to resolve differences of both sides after trustees were unable to approve the original amendment proposed by faculty. The trustees asked to address three issues within this process of amending the Code.

Beardsley said that today we would either approve or reject the amendment; that we could not entertain changes at this point. He said the current amendment addressed three main problems in the code: (1) the detailed evaluation procedures in Chapter II that seemed out of place because of the need for frequent adjustment in response to such external conditions as changes in federal law; (2) appendix A, dealing with instructors, a document whose status and history seemed unclear; and (3) Chapter III on the evaluation process, thought to be cumbersome, awkward and difficult to apply.

Beardsley said that the conference committee's solution to the first problem was to retain the foundational material on evaluation procedures and to move the details to a document maintained by the Professional Standards Committee that can be adjusted as needed. He said the PSC is working on this now. He said the trustees support this amendment.

Beardsley said that the conference committee's solution to the second problem was to eliminate appendix A and to add a new sentence to what is now Part B.2 in Chapter I: "Non-tenure-line faculty members' roles, rights, and responsibilities are the same as those of tenure-line faculty as described in Chapter 1 of the Faculty Code with exceptions as noted in this code." He said the trustees support this change also.

Sarah Moore discussed the conference committee's solution to the third problem, the cumbersome language in Chapter III on the evaluation process. She said the proposed new

language differs from the current language in three ways. First, whenever the evaluatee's file advances to the next level there is an opportunity for the evaluatee to raise objections before the file goes forward. She said it is up to the evaluatee to make sure he or she raises these objections at the appropriate time because if the window of opportunity closes, the evaluatee cannot at a later point go back and argue that something was mishandled. Second, if the president makes a recommendation that the evaluatee disagrees with and if the evaluatee believes that the president "has acted with abuse of discretion or unlawful discrimination in reaching a decision. . . ." [4.e.(3) in Chapter III], then the evaluatee can write a statement that goes forward with the president's recommendation to trustees. Third, "other variations in the procedures are permitted provided they are mutually agreed to by the evaluatee, head officer, the dean, and the Advancement Committee" [4.a.(3).(e) in Chapter III]. She said the trustees support these changes.

Moore added that there were also minor wording changes, but the three problems addressed were the major issues the conference committee needed to resolve.

President Pierce then opened the floor for discussion. Curt Mehlhaff said there was a conflict between section 4.a.(3).(e) that would allow variations in procedures and the existing section 4.a that said the PSC must approve any exceptions to procedures. Beardsley said he recognized the potential conflict, but believed the conflict could be resolved by our agreement that the existing section 4.a. describes the PSC's role in approving department procedures, while the proposed language in 4.a.(3).(e) deals with a particular professor's evaluation.

Mehlhaff responded that the full faculty, not just the various parties, had a vested interest in procedures, and that therefore the parties should not be able to adjust procedures because then "the faculty becomes extraneous to what's going on."

Bill Haltom said that if we agree to read the text as Beardsley has suggested, then we can do that. He argued that we should interpret the language as Beardsley has suggested and "have the minutes here record that." Keith Ward agreed that 4.a.(3).(e) addressed unusual situations that are atypical, rather than the regular process referred to in 4.a.

Ted Taranovski suggested that a copy editor go through the document before we approve it to make sure all wording is consistent. Dean Cooney pointed out that any change at this point is a code amendment requiring that we go through the whole process again. Bruce Mann, who this past summer attempted to identify all inconsistencies in language, argued that we should make the big change now and go through the code again later to edit in these "fine-tuned changes."

Mehlhaff said that our decision today "would affect future generations of faculty more than ourselves." He said the proposed amendment "alters their rights." He said we would be giving away rights and that we should not approve the amendment. Beardsley responded he didn't think rights were being given away. He said that for example, evaluatees cannot currently address trustees directly about a president's decision, but that that was allowed in the new language. Haltom agreed that "nothing is taken away;" that "abuse of discretion" was not an empty term; that the amendment "has more content than the current code."

Taranovski M/S/P to close debate. The motion to close debate was approved on a voice vote. A paper ballot was called for. The motion "to accept the amendment to the Faculty Code put forward by the joint conference committee of the faculty and trustees" then passed, with 46 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

President Pierce thanked the faculty who served on the code revision drafting committee and on the conference committee for their work.

Dean Cooney suggested that we clarify when the amended code goes into effect. **Juli McGruder M/S/P "that the amended code go into effect for the 2003-2004 academic year." The motion passed on a voice vote.**

We then moved to a discussion of a proposed revision to the Fine Arts Approaches Rubric. Associate Dean Barry distributed hard copies of a revision that the Curriculum Committee (CC) had approved last year. The revision was forwarded to the Faculty Senate, which sent it on to the

full faculty. The proposed revision strikes “both orally and” from the third Guideline: “These courses introduce students to methods of aesthetic and formal analysis and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing, about art and the creative process.”

Barry explained that the CC had a difficult time approving courses for the new fine arts approaches core rubric because the language was too restrictive. Research into the origins of “both orally and” suggested the language was probably unintentionally restrictive. The task force that drafted the fine arts approaches rubric language felt it was important to include “in writing,” and the words “both orally and” were apparently carried in from old guidelines or from “a verbal reflexive accident,” according to task force members. He said the CC decided to eliminate the wording rather than to ignore it. He said the CC revision would stand unless the faculty voted today to nullify it.

Then followed a lengthy debate between those who liked the change and those who did not, and between those who felt the process for revision required full faculty action and those who did not. Finally, **Judith Kay M/S/vote reported below “to accept the Curriculum Committee’s recommendation to delete “both orally and” and two commas from the third guideline in the fine arts approaches rubric.” Taranovski M/ to table the motion. The motion to table failed for lack of a second. McGruder M/S/P to close debate. The motion to close debate passed on a voice vote. The Kay motion then passed on a voice vote.**

We adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty