

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
January 22, 1996**

**Present:** Beardsley, Bristow, Butcher, Chandler, Farmer, Goleeke, Holm, Kay, Kirchner, Mace, Matthews, Potts, Rocchi, Smith, Stirling

**Guests:** Krueger, Lear, Merz, Ostrom

Kirchner called the meeting to order shortly after 4:00

**Minutes of December 4 meeting:**

Holm was identified as the author of the December 4 minutes.

The suggestion (which appears twice) that there be a review of committee practices and internal documents yearly should read to suggest that committees should periodically undertake a review of committee procedures and internal documents.

On page 2 (Curriculum Committee discussions) under Actions the first sentence should read: It was noted that duty #5 in the bylaws should be changed.

The minutes were approved as emended.

**Announcements:**

1. Goleeke announced the Faculty reception Friday, Jan. 26.
2. The Chair welcomed Beardsley to the Senate.
3. The Budget Task Force will report at a special meeting of the Senate on Monday, Jan. 29.

**Chair's Report:**

The Chair reported that she had written to President Pierce:

"At the meeting on December 8, you indicated that you would remove the footnote in the Faculty Code that refers to the Early Retirement Policy. Several faculty have inquired as to whether or not that change has taken place. Could you confirm that it has been removed? Thank you for your attention."

The Chair reported that she had received a voice mail from Alan Smith (Assistant to the President) that the footnote had been removed from the copy of the Faculty Code stored on the University's gopher, and that the footnote would be removed from the next printing of the Faculty Code.

**Ad Hoc Committee Review Presentation, Discussion, and Actions:  
Curriculum Committee:**

**Discussion:** Stirling led the ongoing discussion of the ad hoc committee's document on the curriculum committee. Beardsley asked if reviewing departments every five years was too often. ~~M/S/withdrawn~~ to change "five years" to "periodic". Matthews argued that a fixed period for departmental reviews was needed to allow the curriculum committee to review the core on a periodic basis during the committee's "fallow year", noting that we appear to be doing so now on an ad-hoc basis. Stirling asked if there was enough confidence in the curriculum committee for it to undertake core reviews. Beardsley argued that the curriculum committee already had too much to do, and that core review had not been the intent of the curriculum committee's "fallow year". Merz noted that core reviews appear in response to special issues, and that the role of the curriculum committee is instead to monitor and review. Kay and Rocchi thought that a periodic core review should be somewhere, and Matthews argued that it was in the purview of the curriculum committee. Mace suggested that should the curriculum committee be charged with core reviews that it be given some flexibility to decide how to proceed in core reviews: either by reviewing the core or by calling for the election of a committee to review the core.

The issue of committee size was raised, along with the problem of implementing the suggestion that a member of a department undergoing review serve on the departmental review subcommittee. Finally Potts expressed concern with the campus perception of the committee and this issue was discussed at some length.

**Action:** The portion of the subcommittee report containing recommendations for consideration by the Curriculum Committee was forwarded to that body. Stirling was asked to revise the recommendations in light of the discussion. This issue will be consider at the Feb. 5 meeting.

**Ad Hoc Committee Review Presentation, Discussion, and Actions:  
Diversity Committee:**

**Presentation:** Bristow presented the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Diversity Committee Review. The review committee consisted of current and previous members of the diversity committee, including Bristow, Lear, Neel, and Ostrom. In several extensive meetings, the subcommittee concluded, first, that the

committee was necessary, and, second, that there were changes that could be made to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the committee. Bristow then walked the Senate through the report.

**Discussion:** Ostrom noted that the diversity committee is the youngest standing committee, and that it is still working out what it does and how to do it. It is a proactive committee. Krueger suggested that the committee needed to be increased in size to permit a greater continuity from year to year, and argued that faculty members of the committee should generally be tenured. Kay said that students look to the committee for support. The active role of administrative colleagues as integral members of the committee was discussed. Further issues included the membership of a representative of the President, whether the Director of Access to College Initiative should be asked to join the committee, and whether or not graduate students should be added. In general discussion (with no formal action taken) it was generally agreed that the Director of Access to College Initiative should be invited, and that two graduate students should be added to the committee without decreasing the student membership. Finally, the issue of trustee membership was raised. Beardsley suggested that both the President and the Chair of the Board of Trustees be made ex-officio members of the committee with the understanding that they would then be able to appoint someone to represent them on the committee. The Chair was asked to discuss this possibility with the President and the Board. The size of the committee was raised by several people. In response, it was pointed out that most of the work of the diversity committee was done in subcommittees (currently admission, faculty recruitment, campus climate, and curriculum), and that it would not be necessary for the full committee to meet very often. Matthews suggested that, with substantial representation by administration, faculty, staff, and students that perhaps this should not be a Faculty committee but should instead be a University committee. There was some discussion of this idea, but no general enthusiasm for it. Potts in particular noted that it was important for faculty to have ownership of the committee.

**Action:** We agreed to continue discussions during our next regularly scheduled meeting (Feb. 5, Jan. 29 being a special meeting to hear the presentation of the Budget Task Force).

The meeting adjourned shortly after 5:30.

Respectfully submitted  
Bob Matthews