

Faculty Senate Minutes February 11, 2002

Senators Present: David Balaam, Kris Bartanen, David Bahar, Terry Cooney, David Droge, John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Martin Jackson, Christine Kline, Hans Ostrom (Chair), Karen Porter, George Tomlin, Alexa Tullis, Roberta Wilson.

Visitors: John Finney, Wayne Rickoll, Steve Rodgers, Jack Roundy

Minutes of December 3 were approved as previously distributed. Minutes of January 28, were approved as corrected and clarified. Two abstentions were noted.

Special Orders:

Hummel-Berry reported that Physical Therapy applications were 140% above last year and that from those reviewed thus far, there were many strong applicants. It was noted that the applicant numbers had surpassed this year and next year's "benchmark" number.

Tomlin announced that the Occupational Therapy program had passed accreditation with flying colors and that the application numbers were at or better than last year. It appears that the department will meet their application target.

Tomlin also pointed out that when the Senate Chair is not able to attend Board of Trustees meetings, (as was the case last week), there is no provision in the faculty Bylaws for the Vice Chair to take his place. The job description of the Vice-Chair of the Senate, according to the Bylaws, is only to "call and preside at Senate meetings in the absence of the Chairperson". Cooney indicated that the Chair of the Senate serves as faculty representative to the Executive Committee of the board and is not a representative of the Senate. The Trustees' by-laws is more specific to the issue and Jeff Johnson is the person to contact for further clarification. The general business meeting of the trustees is open to all faculty and each trustee committee has a faculty member who was also present at the general business meeting.

Cooney announced that the Board of Trustees had approved the Honorary Degrees for the 2002 commencement and that the Faculty by-laws were passed as submitted with a clarification that the Student Life Committee is not recognized as a court of appeals. The by-laws should appear on the University's Web Site soon and after some discussion it was believed that the date of final approval was the date to begin implementation.

Agenda Items:

Electronic Add-Drop/Class Rosters

A lengthy discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of the new electronic add-drop procedures occurred.

Problems: Tullis as well as visitors who taught classes with labs (Rickoll from Biology and Rodgers from Foreign Languages) indicated that the current procedure for changing lab sections entailed dropping both the lab and the lecture and then adding the lecture and the new lab. This meant that four codes had to be distributed per student, which was cumbersome and resulted in more work for the faculty member. Finney indicated that this could be remedied. Finney also said that the old paper add/drop slip could be used.

Droge was concerned that no advisor signature was required in the electronic procedures. Finney indicated that advisors' signatures are no longer required for the add/drop process.

Bahar had not heard complaints or praises from students although Tullis had heard students complain about having more to track. Tomlin questioned the efficiency of getting class rosters off the web rather than in the mailbox. He experienced several difficulties in the process of retrieving his class lists and after two hours of attempts had still not been entirely successful. Rickoll indicated that retrieving class lists was not a problem but that the lab add/drop process was. Cooney reminded the senators that the faculty had asked for technology advances for on-line registration and add/drop.

Advantages: Hansen did not find the process overly burdensome and liked distributing codes over email so he did not have to be available for a signature. Hummel-Berry liked the process and suggested that for those who did not want to learn how to access the class lists, departmental secretaries could be trained to print class lists which could be distributed as in the past. Secretaries can get access to this without having faculty passwords.

Consensus and Appeal: There was a general consensus that there were bugs to be worked out. However, as long as faculty had a choice to use the new electronic or the old paper method, everyone would be accommodated and eventually all faculty may choose to transfer to the electronic method as the glitches and bugs are removed. Finney made an appeal for feedback on other problems that were encountered and ideas to make it work better and more efficiently.

“Cluster Courses” in the new Core

Ostrom reported that Bill Barry had asked him to approach the Senate regarding whether the pairing of related courses, formerly referred to as “cluster courses”, should be encouraged, paired informally or more formally pursued. The general consensus was that “cluster courses” should be allowed to evolve naturally, and that we do not need a procedure to formally approve linkage of these courses. Hummel-Berry suggested that a statement in the catalogue’s course description could inform students of other courses that were well paired thus allowing the student choice in their curriculum.

State of the Faculty

Droge stated that the biggest drain on the faculty’s time and energy was the evaluation process. With so many formal evaluations, we risked the squandering of faculty innovation and volunteerism. Cooney suggested that unless a full review was requested, a different evaluation process that was still within the existing Faculty Code guidelines might be used for routine 3 year associate or 5 year reviews. Balaam wondered if there were ways to streamline the number of people within the department who were involved. Jackson indicated that his department set up committees and that not all members were involved in all aspects of the evaluation. Tomlin suggested that the Chairs’ meeting would be a good place to discuss streamlining departmental practices on evaluation. Kline asked if, as earlier posed by Bartanen, there is a process of launching into Phase II of Code revisions.

MSP: It was moved by Droge and seconded by Hummel-Berry to ask the Professional Standards Committee to investigate ways of streamlining the evaluation process within existing Faculty-Code guidelines and to report back to the Senate.

It was noted that Phase I of the revisions to the faculty code is in conference committee.

Adjourned about 5PM

Respectfully submitted

Roberta A. Wilson