

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 1, 1996

Senators present: Beardsley, Bristow, Butcher, Chandler, Goleeke, Holm, Kay, Kirchner, Mace, Matthews, Potts, Rocchi, Smith, Stirling.

Visitors: Ariessohn, Curley, Haltom, Rex, Riegsecker, Taranovski, Veseth, Wood.

Kirchner called the meeting to order at: 4:00 p.m. The minutes of March 18, 1996 were approved with the following corrections to Page 2: First line should attribute the suggestion to Beardsley. Last sentence of paragraph 2, the suggestion should be attributed to Kirchner.

Announcements:

Kirchner inquired about the form of the Standing Committee year-end-reports. Senators felt that they can be disseminated by electronic mail.

Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Rex and Veseth led the discussion on the review of the Faculty Advancement Committee. The discussion centered on the five (5) concerns raised by the report:

1. open/closed files for tenure reviews
2. ways to lessen the evaluation workload
3. professional growth
4. evaluation of instructors
5. election of the Faculty Advancement members

A lengthy discussion followed whose salient points were about: the most effective use of faculty time, the history of the existing Faculty Code and previous efforts at changes, the role of the Board of Trustees in the Faculty Code changes, the wisdom of undertaking editorial changes or starting from scratch, scheduling Faculty Code changes before or after the current work on the By-Laws proposed changes.

The point discussed most was the way to inform and pool the Faculty on the options listed in the committee report. Holm and Potts volunteered to devise a Faculty survey to accomplish this task.

Continued Discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee Report on the Professional Standards Committee (PSC).

The discussion returned to the various roles of the PSC of policy making and adjudicating with an emphasis on the issue of grievances. Some felt that the PSC is charged with too many responsibilities; others asserted that the PSC would be more effective than a Hearing Board to handle grievances as PSC members are involved with Code issues on a regular basis. Several voices spoke to the question of how to insure consistency for legal matters and still protect individual rights as well.

As no consensus was being reached on the issue, the Senate Executive Committee volunteered to identify places in The Faculty Code chapter VI on grievances where changes could be made to use the Hearing Board procedures for general grievances.

The Senate adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Michel Rocchi