

Faculty Senate Minutes September 9, 2002

Senate Members Present: B. Anton, J. Edgoose, T. Cooney, J. Hanson, B. Haltom, C. Kline, J. McGruder, H. Ostrom (Chair), D. Tinsley, A. Tullis, K. Porter, C. Sanders (ASUPS), R. Wilson

Visitors Present: W. Barry, W. Beardsley, D. Macey, S. Moore

Ostrom called the meeting to order in the McCormick Room of the library around 4:00 PM. New and continuing members of the Senate introduced themselves. Minutes of May 2002 were approved with one abstention.

Special Order: Tinsley & Hanson discussed the current meetings on the presidential search. Hanson suggested that J. Finney be asked to report to the Senate on how well the new class schedule is working.

Update on the Presidential-Search Web-Board: Haltom and Tullis reported on the status of the presidential-search web-board. Haltom passed out the University's "Guidelines for Using Electronic Discussion Tools". He indicated that the web-board was not accessible. Problems included OIS password-verification, which did not work and kept many members of the community off the web board. Some irregularities in the deletion and misplacing of postings have occurred by unknowns. He suggested taking the web board off campus or the possibility of switching to Blackboard. The consensus of opinion was that Haltom & Tullis try to keep the discussion board on campus using Blackboard.

Faculty Code Revisions, Conference-committee Report: Beardsley and Moore (members of the conference-committee) reported on the proposed Faculty Code revisions to be presented to the full faculty at its first meeting on September 25. Beardsley recapped the long history of the code revisions and how the conference-committee was appointed to meet with the board of trustees to work out changes, which could be acceptable to both faculty and trustees. It was pointed out that the changes would be presented as a single amendment to be voted up or down by the faculty without any amendments to the proposed revisions. Beardsley & Moore discussed the three major changes to be presented. The first two concerning initial faculty appointments and the deletion of Appendix A was less controversial than changes to the evaluation procedures. The trustees approved the proposed changes. Highlights of the changes are as follows:

- 1) Chapter 2- Section 3 & 4: Initial Appointment (page 4 of side-by-side copy or pages 8 & 9 A-C of the proposed new code)

- The new changes keep the fundamentals of A, B & G of the old code but remove the specific details such as who has the right to participate in the search. It was suggested that the Professional Standards Committee could write a clear document outlining procedures for conducting the search. The trustees approved the changes.
- Changing language in Chapter 2 (using generic language for faculty when referring to instructors) and striking Appendix A.
- Chapter 3 Evaluation Process-
This was the area of greatest discussion and compromise with the board of trustees. It presents a large fundamental change from how evaluations are currently done. It provides for a review of the evaluation at different stages giving the evaluatee a chance to comment earlier in the procedures.

Haltom expressed his opinion that the proposed changes were superior to the current code. It allows for clearing-up matters at the departmental level before it get to FAC & appeals would be based on fairness and completeness and not just on procedural technicalities.

Hanson pointed out that Phase I of the changes to the code was to be more technical and not about substance and yet there appeared to be considerable substance to the changes. Beardsley concurred that the report addressed substantive changes and again pointed out that

the faculty would have to accept or reject the entire conference committee report as written without changes.

Charges for Standing Committees, 2002-2003:

Academic Standards Committee-

Anton asked about the faculty advisor's responsibility for insuring advisee graduate on time given that the new registration system does not require advisors to approve changes in student's schedules. A lengthy discussion followed which also addressed the new policy that requires students to have an advisor in their major.

MSP with one abstention to approve the charges to ASC with the addition of two charges. They are as follows:

6. Examine the consequences--for advisors and advising--of students now being able to drop and add courses on-line, without having to inform their advisors. (Might the *Logger*, for example, need to include even stronger language indicating that the ultimate responsibility for taking appropriate classes and graduating on time lies with the student?)

7. Reconsider the policy that requires all students to have an advisor in their majors. [Note: Normally the Senate is reluctant to have a committee reconsider a policy the committee just approved the previous year, but in the fall faculty conversation and elsewhere, several colleagues have noted a dramatic and potentially unwarranted increase in the number of their advisees.]

- Minutes amended to include the following:
- #8 To consider referring some routine petitions to Associate Dean's office.

Curriculum Committee-

Charge # 5 (Consider making Coolidge Otis Chapman Honors not dependent upon the completion of a thesis) dealt with the problem that some Honors students were ill prepared to conduct a thesis and were doing one only to get the honors at graduation. Hanson pointed out that eliminating a thesis requirement moves against the university's desire to have more students write theses. Cooney suggested we may want to look at the structure of awarding honors and or the criteria for receiving university honors. Klein did not think that it was the appropriate time to look at the larger question of university honors. Hanson suggested that eligibility standards for writing a thesis should be establish for honors students.

A brief discussion on charge # 6 occurred. Some rewording was suggested which did not substantially change the charge.

MSP with one abstention to approve the charges to the CC with the rephrasing of charge #5 & #6 as follows:

#5. Consider making some extra-departmental honors not dependent upon the completion of a thesis, and (in the context of the regularly scheduled review of the Honors Program) consider recommending the establishment of eligibility standards for students writing a Coolidge Otis Chapman Honors thesis.

6. In all reviews of new-course proposals, operate from the presumption that the proposal is satisfactory. The goal is to make the course-approval process less burdensome and stressful for the faculty (proposers and committee-members alike). An even broader goal is to create a "culture of trust" among the faculty in the course-approval process.

Diversity Committee- A discussion occurred about the second sentence in charge # 1 (Continue to work with the Office of Admission staff on ways to evaluate and regularize the telephoning project. *[Recommend that such telephoning be properly counted as "service" on faculty member's record?]). Senators were aware that many myths existed regarding what counted as service to the university. Present and past members of the FAC assured the Senate that service is what the faculty member defines it to be.

MSP with one abstention to approve the charges with the elimination of the second sentence in #1.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 with the approval of charges to standing committees to be continued at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted

Roberta Wilson
Secretary for the Day