

Faculty Senate Minutes September 14, 1998

Present: Bill Beardsley, Michele Birnbaum, Terry Cooney, Cathy Hale, Bill Haltom (Chair), Duane Hulbert, Cathy Hummel-Berry, Hans Ostrom, Bob Steiner, George Tomlin, Ann Neel, Ann Wood.

Haltom called meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

1. Minutes: Haltom M/S/P to approve minutes May 11, 1998.

2. Announcements: Hale informed Senate that faculty ballots for the Faculty Advancement Committee had been mailed.

3. Chair's Report: Chair reports that he does not have one.

4. "Special Orders" by Senators:

- a. Hale recommended that Senators read Standards #2, #4, and #6 for re-accreditation, and reminded us that RASCAL needs feedback by month's end.
- b. Hulbert requested clarification on advising responsibilities, and suggested we invite in Jack Roundy to answer queries. Cooney mentioned debates about faculty willingness to embrace a formal system of evaluating advising.
- c. Beardsley suggested that the Curriculum Committee be charged with finding a way to approve, at least provisionally, Core course proposals over the summer. Cooney characterized the current process of approval when Curriculum Committee does not formally meet.

5. Charges to Standing Committees: Haltom invited senators to review copies of the charges from Standing Committees' final reports last Spring.

a. Re: Academic Standards Committee -- Cooney asked to change item #2 to "re-examine issues of class scheduling, with attention to creation of a common hour or hours during which students and faculty would be free, and with concern for providing time for co-curricular activities." Amended change M/S/P unanimously.

b. Re: Curriculum Committee -- Beardsley moved to add an item #4, to read: "study ways in which to approve provisionally courses for the core during the summer." Language of the added charge discussed and M/S/P unanimously. Ostrom asked to add focus to item #2 so as to read: "review Communication I Core Guidelines, with regard to such issues as the use of computers and the teaching of 'expository' writing." M/S/P unanimously.

c. Re: Diversity Committee -- Birnbaum forwarded request from the Diversity Committee Chair, Carolyn Weisz, to add a charge regarding the solicitation of student involvement in issues of diversity. Beardsley suggested folding this addition into the existing item #2 to read: "solicit broader faculty and student input by organizing one or more informal discussions about diversity." Amendment to item #2 M/S/P unanimously. Ostrom proposed another charge, which originally read: "In 1998-99, the Diversity Committee shall assess the progress the University has made in its diversity initiatives since the University Diversity Committee, appointed by President Phibbs, issued its extensive report in May 1990. Because the report set out a detailed plan of action, with goals and time-lines, it will serve as one important guide by which to measure progress; for example, page 9 of the report established specific recruiting goals. In reporting its assessment to the Faculty Senate, the Diversity Committee shall highlight goals that have been achieved and areas in which the University has made significant progress." Much discussion ensued between Cooney, Neel, Birnbaum, Hale, Beardsley, Hummel-Berry and Ostrom about whether or not the report submitted by Phibb's appointed Committee was endorsed or accepted by the Trustees, whether or not it should serve as the most appropriate guide to measure advancement in diversity, and whether or not the proposed charge required the current Diversity Committee to serve as an "advocate" rather than "resource." Based on these discussions, the Senate revised the language to the proposed charge to read: "assess the progress the University has made in its diversity initiatives since the University Diversity Committee, appointed by President Phibbs, issued its extensive report in May, 1990" with a Faculty Senate Annotation to read: "Because the report set out a detailed plan of action, with goals and

timetables, it could serve as one important guide by which to measure progress; for example, page nine of the report established specific recruiting goals. In reporting its assessment to the Faculty Senate, the Diversity Committee shall highlight goals that have been achieved and areas in which the University has and has not made significant progress." M/S/P unanimously; all agreed to place the added charge as item #1. Also as a result of this conversation, items #5 and #6 ("focus concern on faculty diversity" and "focus concern on diversity in the student body," respectively) were modified and combined to read as "serve as a resource regarding faculty diversity and diversity in the student body," and to be listed as item #6. Modifications M/S/P unanimously.

d. Re: Faculty Advancement Committee -- no charges listed from nor submitted to the Faculty Advancement Committee. Senate decided it would be redundant to charge the FAC with working with Professional Standards, which already has a charge to that effect.

e. Re: Institutional Review Board -- Senate agreed to accept current charges as written.

f. Re: Library, Media, and Academic Computing Committee -- Cooney rejected item #1 because it posited an advocacy role for the Committee. Ostrom asked how the Committee could express recommendations regarding library funding; Cooney stated that committees cannot advocate because they have no budgets and cannot fully assess university funding priorities. Beardsley recommended striking item #1, revising item #2 to read "collect information from faculty and students to define funding adequacy and long range development plans for the library and academic computing resources," and revising item #3 to read, simply, "advise library staff in the review of plans for the library renovation." Revised items #2 and #3 to be identified as #1 and #2, respectively. Strike and modifications M/S/P.

g. Re: Professional Standards Committee -- General discussion of need for clarity in the charges. Item #1 revised to read, more simply: "Continue to work with the Advancement Committee and the Dean to complete revision of the 'University Evaluation Criteria'" and item #3 revised to read "consider consolidating the letters issued from the PSC to department chairs, deans, and school heads with information that is sent to faculty being evaluated in the coming year." M/S/P unanimously.

h. Re: University Enrichment Committee -- Haltom proposed to strike item #1 ("discuss ways to increase the number of applications for release units"). Beardsley, Birnbaum, Neel pointed out that we had not challenged the relevancy of other committees' self-appointed charges. Cooney stated that the Committee had extended the deadline for release-unit applications because so few faculty had submitted requests. Haltom suggested a friendly amendment to excise item #1 with the argument that the Committee does not require a charge to discuss ways to increase the number of applications if it wishes to do so. Item #2 revised to read "review release-unit eligibility guidelines."

Several members of the Senate had to leave and so approval of amendments postponed until next meeting.

Haltom moved that Senate continue discussing UEC and Student Life Committee charges at the next meeting.

Haltom adjourned meeting at 5: 35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele Birnbaum