

**Faculty Senate Minutes  
October 8, 2001**

**Senators Present:** D. Bahar, D. Balaam, K. Bartanen, W. Breitenbach, T. Cooney, J. Hanson, K. Hummel-Berry, M. Jackson, C. Kline, J. McGruder, H. Ostrom (chair), G. Tomlin

**Visitors:** W. Beardsley, N. Bristow, P. Loeb, T. Mace, M. Pickard

Ostrom called the meeting to order shortly after 4 pm.

**Minutes for the September 10, 2001 meeting were approved as amended.**

**Minutes for the September 24, 2001 meeting were approved.**

**The Faculty Senate recommended that revision of the Faculty Bylaws be included on the agenda for the faculty meeting of October 16.**

Ostrom announced that he received an email from John Finney suggesting that revision of the Bylaws be included as an agenda item for the Oct. 16 faculty meeting. In the ensuing discussion it was noted that these proposed Bylaw revisions were developed several years ago when the Faculty Senate was chaired by Grace Kirchner. The most recent form of these proposed revisions (dated May 28, 1998) are available on the web (<http://www.ups.edu/dean/facgov/byrev.html>). As Cooney pointed out, the Oct. 16 meeting will serve as an opportunity for the "first reading" of these proposed changes in the process that will eventually lead to a vote by the whole faculty.

Bahar (ASB President) requested that faculty announce to their students that student members are needed to serve as members of various faculty senate standing committees such as Student Life, Curriculum, Technology, and Diversity. Interested students should contact him.

**The Faculty Senate was satisfied with the suggested revisions to the Faculty Code's sections on appointment procedures (Chapter II, Part A) developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee and asked Beardsley to transmit these suggestions to the Conference Committee.**

At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate Bristow eloquently outlined the suggested changes to Chapter II, Part A of the Faculty Code developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee. (See the Sept. 24 Faculty Senate Minutes for a detailed description.) Having had two weeks to read carefully the materials distributed by Bristow, Breitenbach, apparently reflecting the general sentiment of the Senate as a whole, professed that he was "happy as a clam" about these changes.

**The Faculty Senate was satisfied with the suggested revisions to Chapter I of the Faculty Code (including the movement of information on "Categories of Faculty" from Chapter II and Appendix A into Chapter I) developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee and asked Beardsley to transmit these suggestions to the Conference Committee.**

At the Sept. 10, 2001 meeting of the Faculty Senate Mace eloquently outlined suggested revisions to Chapter I of the Faculty Code developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee. Since that time Julie Neff-Lippman read through the proposed changes and made a few minor suggestions to improve the style. Mace also noted that at the earlier Senate meeting, during the discussion of the section of the Code (Chapter II, Part A, Section 2b) dealing with appointment of nontenure-line faculty, there were questions about the phrase "or other positions that might be created", and whether this section should be elaborated to include explicit reference to some currently existing positions such as clinical instructor. Mace said that he would be willing

to entertain suggestions regarding such language, but none were forthcoming.

**The Faculty Senate endorses the idea that some attention to instructor salaries is necessary in an environment where Appendix A of the Faculty Code may be superseded.**

Mace noted that the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee was concerned that although much of the material in Appendix A would be moved to Chapter I, the phrase that referred to instructors' compensation being "comparable to career faculty teaching similar courses" would be lost. The Ad Hoc Committee felt that if this phrase was lost from the Code, the issue of instructors' compensation needed to be addressed elsewhere. One possible approach, recommended by Mace and Pickard, was to consider a new instructor salary scale. They presented an example containing 17 levels (covering 25 years) linked to the Assistant 1 salary with scale factors ranging from 0.825 to 1.348. Pickard noted that this proposal was an outgrowth of earlier proposals considered by the Faculty Salary Committee last year. Bartanen asked if this proposal was meant to replace the current merit system for instructors. Pickard replied that it would, and also stated that this proposal would make the instructor compensation scale parallel the system used for tenure-line faculty.

There was an extended discussion on how to move forward on this issue. There was general agreement that this was not an appropriate issue for discussion in the Conference Committee. One logical place for the discussion of instructors' compensation is the Faculty Salary Committee, which in turn could bring it to the attention of the Budget Task Force. But it was suggested that the Faculty Salary Committee would probably want to have a sense of how the full faculty felt about this proposal before moving forward on it. To that end the Senate suggested that Pickard request that the topic of instructor compensation be placed on the agenda for the Oct. 16 faculty meeting.

**The Faculty Senate was satisfied with the general outline of changes to the evaluation process (Faculty Code, Chapter 3) developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee (and amended in the Senate discussion last week), and asked Beardsley to transmit these suggestions to the Conference Committee.**

At the last meeting of the Faculty Senate Keith Maxwell eloquently outlined suggested changes to portions of the Faculty Code dealing with evaluation procedures. (See the Sept. 24 Faculty Senate Minutes for a detailed description.) This outline was in the form of a document containing five general recommendations and a flow chart with an initial "rough cut" of language. Although Maxwell was not able to attend the Senate meeting today, the Senate consensus was that after incorporating the suggestions for changes made at the last meeting the outline was adequate to serve as a general plan for presentation to the Conference Committee. Beardsley will meet with Maxwell to prepare a revised flow chart.

**The Faculty Senate expressed its appreciation to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Conference Committee (Bristow, Mace, and Maxwell) for their work on Faculty Code revisions.**

The meeting was adjourned around 5 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Hanson