

Faculty Senate Minutes
18 March 1996

Present: Bartanen (for Potts), Beardsley, Bristow, Butcher, Chandler, Farmer, Goleeke, Kay, Kirchner, Mace, Matthews, Rocchi, Smith, Stirling

Visitors: Moore

Kirchner called the meeting to order at 4:04.

1. **Minutes.** The minutes of 4 March 1996 were approved as written.

2. **Announcements.** There were no announcements.

3. **Chair's Report.** Kirchner reported that the executive committee, having noted the gap between the senate meetings scheduled for April 15th and May 6th, recommended that senators consider meeting on April 29th with the possibility of eliminating the meeting during finals week. Senators agreed to the April 29th meeting. The decision on whether to cancel the final meeting on May 6th will be considered later, and will depend on the senate's ability to move through its remaining business.

4. Continued Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on the Academic Standards Committee (ASC).

Chandler circulated a new list of proposed bylaws changes. Discussion of those proposed changes ensued, and confronted a variety of issues. Regarding the original charge included in Bylaws V.6.A.b.1, Chandler raised the issue of who actually oversees and recommends the goals and priorities for the university. Discussion of this question raised the additional issue of whether the senate should seek to bring the bylaws into agreement with current practice. Beardsley asked why the faculty should give up this responsibility, given that it is assigned to the faculty in the bylaws. Moore noted the ASC's concern about being the only committee charged with this responsibility. Debate about where this responsibility should be housed ensued. Mace then raised the issue that the original charge seems to cover two different kinds of duties. He suggested that studying, formulating, and recommending policies and practices are similar duties, and that the studying, formulating and recommending of goals and priorities are similar to one another, but are separate from the preceding two areas of concern. The senate agreed that the original charge listed in Bylaws V.6.A.b.1 should be rewritten into two charges.

Discussions of the charges listed in Bylaws V.6.A.b.2-6 followed, and the senate agreed on minor changes to those charges. A discussion of the final component of the charge in the original v.6.A.b.1 then ensued. (As a result of the ad hoc committee's work, the charge "to study, formulate and recommend the...structure of the academic year" which had formerly been a part of v.6.A.b.1 had already been isolated into a new and separate charge.) Discussion of this charge concluded that this duty refers not to responsibility for establishing the specifics of the academic calendar, but rather to a responsibility for considering the nature of our academic year, for instance whether we will use a semester or quarter system structure. The senate concluded this discussion by renumbering the charge in accordance with other changes already made. Chandler agreed to rewrite the proposals for changes to the bylaws to reflect the senate's discussions and will introduce these proposals as a motion at the next senate meeting. The newest version of these proposals, reflecting the senate's discussions, is attached to these minutes.

5. Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). Mace led the senate through his committee's report. He closed by encouraging an open discussion, suggesting that the committee did not reach an obvious consensus on what are some major issues. In particular, he noted the question surrounding the responsibilities of the PSC and the issues of whether it should be a policymaking body or only serve to interpret policy, and of whether the role of adjudication should be separated from that of code writing.

Beardsley emphasized the tension between the two roles the PSC is asked to play, that of policymaking and that of adjudication, suggesting it is like two committees. Rocchi noted that the former dean, Tom Davis, had once suggested the PSC could follow the model of the Academic Standards Committee, which has a petitions sub-committee. Mace suggested that the bylaws give a very serious duty--the establishment of standards for promotion

and tenure--to a small and busy committee. Stirling raised the issue of the distribution of committee time in performing its two roles, suggesting that only one meeting has been devoted to what was the committee's primary task of reviewing criteria. All other meetings have been devoted to adjudicative responsibilities. Kay returned the senate to the issue of a parallel between the ASC and the PSC, and suggested there is a hearing board separate from the ASC that handles serious issues such as academic honesty, so the parallel is not clear. She suggested we might want to establish a separate hearing board, and have the PSC continue to set policy. Beardsley noted that the rulings themselves establish the policies to some extent, and Kay argued that with a separate board you could have one body fulfill the policymaking role, and the other to act on those policies. Beardsley suggested that it could be dangerous to attempt to split the two roles. Kay maintained there might still be room for a separate body. Stirling wondered about how a second committee with a solely judicial role could be established, particularly within our current governance structure.

Mace inquired about the workings of the academic hearing board. Bartanen maintained in this context that there is a parallel between the ASC and the PSC; the ASC does not send petition decisions for senate approval, and the PSC has hearing boards that also do not report to the senate. Bristow asked Beardsley for clarification about his views of the tensions within the PSC and Beardsley noted again the two very different sets of responsibilities the PSC faces. Mace suggested we could consider a larger PSC with two sub-committees fulfilling the two sets of responsibilities. Kay asked about the possibility of considering elected hearing boards. Returning to the ad hoc committee's concern regarding dean membership on the PSC, Stirling raised the question of how to handle dean membership in the context of sub-committees. Rocchi also addressed problems connected to an elected hearing board, noting the need to eliminate conflicts of interest for parties involved. Kay suggested a hearing board pool of elected members, which would encourage interest and experience among those members. Butcher discussed the existing distribution of adjudication responsibilities between the PSC and hearing boards and noted the PSC hears a lot of cases. Rocchi returned to the issue of an elected hearing board and expressed concern for the political quality of elections, noting that random and arbitrary selection eliminates this problem. Kay suggested she did not feel strongly about elections, and also suggested that having a separate hearing board arrangement for tenure cases does not seem ideal, and wondered if all adjudication could be handled by the same body.

Stirling asked Mace his view of how to best solve the problem he posed regarding the tension between policymaking and adjudication in the PSC's responsibilities. Mace suggested he could see separating the two duties, but noted the importance of having people involved with adjudication who were familiar with the code. Beardsley suggested he would not want to mess with the code, but rather would look at changes in the bylaws. Rocchi suggested that an operating document for the PSC, like that modeled by the Curriculum Committee, could be useful. Bristow suggested the creation of this kind of document for all committees might be a useful charge to committees next year. Goleeke suggested his desire to put in a word for people have not served on the PSC to be available for service on a hearing board. He noted they could make important contributions, and also suggested that there might be a slight potential risk in having the same people doing all of this work all of the time. Kirchner asked if the PSC's role in adjudication could be shifted. She then suggested that the hour was late, and asked that senators think about the issues raised during the day's conversation, and that they also review the relevant sections in the code.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30.

Submitted by Nancy Bristow

Sec. 6. Standing Committees.

A. The Academic Standards Committee

a. Membership on the committee:

Considerations for Change of the Faculty Bylaws	Current Faculty Bylaws
The Committee shall consist of no fewer than ten appointed members of the Faculty, the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Dean of the Students (ex-officio), the Director of Academic Advising (ex-officio), the Registrar (ex-officio), two undergraduate students and one graduate student members.	a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Registrar (ex-officio), no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two student members.

Suggested changes in the bylaw and rationale for changes.

Seven faculty to ten. The ASC has two substantive roles, petitions and policy making. With ten faculty it will be possible to assign four faculty to the petitions committee and six to the policy board. The chair of the committee calls a meeting of the whole if that is advisable.

Adding the Dean of Students (ex-officio) and the Director of Academic Advising (ex-officio) acknowledges the important contribution of those administrators who are currently active members of the committee.

Adding a graduate student acknowledges the importance of the graduate perspective on this campus.

Faculty have been listed first to acknowledge that this is a faculty committee. This was done to invite discussion and was not a committee decision,

b. The duties of the Committee:

<p style="text-align: center;">Considerations for Change of the Faculty Bylaws</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Current Faculty Bylaws</p>
<p>1. To study, formulate, and recommend academic goals and priorities of the university.</p>	<p>1. To study, formulate, and recommend the educational policies, practices, goals, structure of the academic year, and priorities of the University.</p>
<p>2. To study, formulate, and recommend academic policies and practices within the context of the academic goals of the University.</p>	<p>(See 1 above)</p>
<p>3. To formulate standards of admission, rules for probation and dismissal for unsatisfactory work, grading procedures and student evaluation policies, and policies that ensure eligibility for a degree is consistent with the University's educational philosophy and ideals.</p>	<p>2. To apply the educational philosophy and ideals in undergraduate and graduate programs of the University to the formulation of policies which determine the composition of the student body through standards of admission, rules for probation and dismissal for unsatisfactory work, grading procedures and student evaluation policies, and eligibility for a degree.</p>
<p>4. To assist the Deans in the interpretation and the administration of academic policies.</p>	<p>3. To assist the Deans in the administration of adopted policies.</p>
<p>5. To establish and interpret policies for advising.</p>	<p>4. To establish policies for advising, and to interpret those policies.</p>
<p>6. To hear student petitions for waivers of academic policies.</p>	<p>6. To hear petitions of students in regard to University decisions and policies.</p>
<p>7. To recommend University and Departmental standards for Honors at graduation.</p>	<p>5. To recommend the standards for Honors at graduation, both University and Departmental, and to nominate students who should receive such Honors.</p>
<p>8. To study, formulate and recommend the structure of the academic year.</p>	<p>(See 1 above)</p>
<p>9. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.</p>	<p>7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.</p>

Rationale for changing the language of the "duties" of the ASC.

b. 1. , b. 2. , and b. 8. have been derived from b1.

Editorial changes. "to formulate policies" replaces "to ensure the formulation of" Reads cleaner and locates authority more precisely.

b.3. Renumbered; was 2. "policies which determine the composition of the student body through" has been taken out as redundant.

b. 4. Renumbered; was 3. Adding "the interpretation" acknowledges what goes on in both the petition and policy committees of the ASC.

b. 5. Renumbered; was 4. Editorial changes.

b. 6. Editorial changes. Petitions are a request for "waivers" of academic policies.

b. 7. The ASC does not nominate students to receive Honors and therefore we recommend deleting "and to nominate students who should receive such Honors". Remaining changes are editorial.

b. 8. See b.1.

b. 9. Renumbered; was 7. No changes made.

Sec. 6. Standing Committees.

A. The Academic Standards Committee

a. Membership on the committee:

Considerations for Change of the Faculty Bylaws	Current Faculty Bylaws
The Committee shall consist of no fewer than ten appointed members of the Faculty, the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Dean of the Students (ex-officio), the Director of Academic Advising (ex-officio), the Registrar (ex-officio), two undergraduate students and one graduate student members.	a. The Committee shall consist of the Dean of the University (ex-officio), the Registrar (ex-officio), no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two student members.

Suggested changes in the bylaw and rational for changes.

Seven faculty to ten. The ASC has two substantive roles, petitions and policy making. With ten faculty it will be possible to assign four faculty to the petitions committee and six to the policy board. The chair of the committee calls a meeting of the whole if that is advisable.

Adding the Dean of Students (ex-officio) and the Director of Academic Advising (ex-officio) acknowledges the important contribution of those administrators who are currently active members of the committee.

Adding a graduate student acknowledges the importance of the graduate perspective on this campus.

Faculty have been listed first to acknowledge that this is a faculty committee. This was done to invite discussion and was not a committee decision,

Special thanks to Ron Van Enkevort, John Finney, and Melissa Weinman for their time and insights.

b. The duties of the Committee:

Considerations for Change of the Faculty Bylaws	Current Faculty Bylaws
1. To study, formulate, and recommend academic goals and priorities of the university.	1. To study, formulate, and recommend the educational policies, practices, goals, structure of the academic year, and priorities of the University.
2. To study, formulate, and recommend academic policies and practices within the context of the academic goals of the University.	(See 1 above)
3. To formulate standards of admission, rules for probation and dismissal for unsatisfactory work, grading procedures and student evaluation policies, and policies that ensure eligibility for a degree is consistent with the University's educational philosophy and ideals.	2. To apply the educational philosophy and ideals in undergraduate and graduate programs of the University to the formulation of policies which determine the composition of the student body through standards of admission, rules for probation and dismissal for unsatisfactory work, grading procedures and student evaluation policies, and eligibility for a degree.
4. To assist the Deans in the interpretation and the administration of academic policies.	3. To assist the Deans in the administration of adopted policies.
5. To establish and interpret policies for advising.	4. To establish policies for advising, and to interpret those policies.
6. To hear student petitions for waivers of academic policies.	6. To hear petitions of students in regard to University decisions and policies.
7. To recommend University and Departmental standards for Honors at graduation.	5. To recommend the standards for Honors at graduation, both University and Departmental, and to nominate students who should receive such Honors.
8. To study, formulate and recommend the structure of the academic year.	(See 1 above)
9. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.	7. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.

Rationale for changing the language of the "duties" of the ASC.

b. 1. , b. 2. , and b. 8. have been derived from b1.

Editorial changes. "to formulate policies" replaces "to ensure the formulation of" Reads cleaner and locates authority more precisely.

b.3. Renumbered; was 2. "policies which determine the composition of the student body through" has been take out as redundant.

b. 4. Renumbered; was 3. Adding "the interpretation" acknowledges what goes on in both the petition and policy committees of the ASC.

b. 5. Renumbered; was 4. Editorial changes.

b. 6. Editorial changes. Petitions are a request for "waivers" of academic policies.

b. 7. The ASC does not nominate students to receive Honors and therefore we recommend deleting "and to nominate students who should receive such Honors". Remaining changes are editorial.

b. 8. See b.1.

b. 9. Renumbered; was 7. No changes made.