

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 8, 2002

Senate Members Present: D. Balaam, K. Bartanen, T. Cooney, D. Droge, J. Hanson, M. Jackson, C. Kline, J. McGruder, H. Ostrom, (Chair), B. Shelton, A. Tullis, R. Wilson
Visitors Present: D. Share

Ostrom called the meeting together around 4 pm. **M/S/P Minutes for March 25, 2002 were approved.**

Ostrom called for Special Orders. Cooney clarified his earlier comments (see minutes from the March 25, 2002 Faculty Senate meeting) about the difficulty that a faculty group without administrative representation might have in getting the necessary cooperation from staff members. He stated that the issue is not really one of staff cooperation, but rather one of very busy staff members being unclear on how to apportion their work time to cope with various demands on them. In addition, a faculty group without administrative representation might have difficulty in determining where to go for information.

Droge wondered about the potential problems with the Cascade computer database system that were mentioned in a recent email. In particular he wondered how serious the problem was and whether it would have an impact on registration. No one present had any detailed information, but we did learn that Shelton was able to register without problems.

Shelton announced that the Foolish Pleasures Film Festival was a big success and that his film had won. He also mentioned that campus visit day had gone well. He announced that the Student Senate was looking for a faculty representative. Wayne Rickoll was not able to continue in this role since he has a conflict during the meeting time (Thursdays at 5 pm).

Ostrom announced that there are two faculty senate meetings left this year. They will be mostly spent considering year-end reports from faculty committees.

Ostrom also announced that Don Share had resigned from the Study Abroad Task Force and had promptly been replaced by John Lear.

The Faculty Senate then received the year-end report from the Professional Standards Committee, presented by the chair Don Share.

The PSC continued to work on approving departmental statements on evaluation criteria, procedures and guidelines. The PSC approved completed documents from Art, Biology, Classics, and Religion. This process of reviewing and approving departmental statements has been ongoing for many years and is finally winding down, with only two departments remaining to be completed: C&TA and Exercise Science.

The PSC also reviewed the use of departmental statements and guidelines concerning the use of Teaching Assistants. The committee approved statements from the following departments: Biology, Chemistry, C&TA, Economics, Math and Computer Science, OT/PT, Physics, and Psychology. Share reported that the statements from Geology and Art had not yet been approved. There was a question raised as to the status of Exercise Science. Apparently they have also not had their statement approved yet.

Cooney commented that the departments were very responsive and that this had been a useful process. Share noted that initially there had been some apprehension that the use of TA's might have raised serious concerns, but that in fact few concerns were found.

Share noted that the PSC has sent to the Faculty Senate a proposed revision to a Code Interpretation that would replace the term Teaching Assistant with Course Assistant. Bartanan

noted that if we act on this before April 29 that it can be brought before the Board of Trustees at their next meeting. Ostrom said that we will take up this matter at the next meeting.

Share reported that the PSC also dealt with three informal code interpretations and a tenure appeal Hearing Board.

Although the PSC had some preliminary discussions related to the review of the current Instructor Evaluation Form, this will need to be addressed next year. The PSC has also not had time to consider the charge from the senate to investigate ways to streamline the evaluation process.

Jackson announced that there was a new opening on the Faculty Advancement Committee since Anne Wood is resigning due to other obligations next year. Since the faculty just finished making nominations for another opening on the FAC, Jackson wanted to know how the Faculty Senate wished to proceed given this new opening. After a discussion of various options, **Balaam M/S/P to extend the nomination period for FAC candidates and to inform faculty by email about this new opening and the possibility for further nominations.**

Ostrom then called for continued discussion on the topic of managing the faculty's time and energy.

McGruder raised a concern that the new electronic registration procedures had shifted more of the burden from staff to faculty. There was some discussion about whether or not secretaries had the ability to print out registration codes and other information for faculty members who preferred to have paper copies of this information. Cooney noted that departments might want to sit down and discuss what priorities the departmental secretary should have given the changing nature of these positions. He also noted that he would be happy to arrange training sessions to help department secretaries who need help learning how to access the various types of electronic information that is now available on the Cascade database system. There was discussion about asking the Academic Standards Committee to look at some of the issues surrounding electronic advising and registration, but there was a general feeling that it might be better to wait for a while to see how it shakes down over the next year first. Tullis mentioned that it might be helpful to simply inform faculty who dislike the electronic system, that there might be other options; for example, getting department secretaries to print out information for them.

Kline expressed concern about the struggles that new/junior faculty go through as they deal with the many demands placed on them and raised the question of whether there were opportunities to inform them that they don't have to do everything all the time. McGruder picked up this theme by suggesting that it might be helpful to have a workshop for junior faculty that might make the evaluation process more transparent to them since there seem to be many misconceptions. Balaam supported this idea, and in particular was concerned that junior faculty sometimes misinterpret what is being said in their 3rd year evaluation letters. Cooney and Bartanen both noted that meetings with junior faculty to discuss these types of issues have been held in the past.

There was also some discussion of issues related to the length and content of the statements in faculty members evaluation files. McGruder noted that it is important that faculty realize that they have two audiences, their departmental colleagues and the FAC. There was also discussion about the appropriate length for these statements, with the implication that in some cases they are much too long. Cooney suggested that it might be useful to ask certain senior faculty members with particularly effective statements to make them available as examples.

The committee adjourned shortly before 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

John Hanson