

Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, March 25, 2002
4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Mark Albrecht, Curt White, Scott Kording, Jack Howard, la'Rufus Mitchell, Marian Hampton, Lane Crothers, Susan Winchip, Carolyn Bathauer, Eileen Fowles, Al Goldfarb

Excused Absences: Vic Boschini

Guest: Ruth Townsend, Interim Director of Diversity and Affirmative Action

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of 03/08/02

Motion XXXIII-111: By Senator Crothers, second by Senator Hampton, to approve the March 8, 2002 Executive Committee minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Oral Communications:

- 03.14.02.01 From Betty Chapman: Request to Place Academic Plan on Senate Agenda of April 17, 2002
- 03.20.02.01 From President Boschini: Approval of Senate Actions of 2/20/02 (Approval of Student Elections Code) and 3/6/02 (Approval of Revised Graduate School Bylaws)
- 03.20.02.02 From Pat Peterson: Request for Volunteers for GLT Fund Drive of April 19-27, 2002
- 03.22.02.01 From Jude Boyer: NCAA Certification Self-Study Report (On CD - Available in Senate Office)
Dr. Boyer will make a presentation to the Senate on April 17, 2002 regarding the NCAA Report.
- 03.22.02.02 Announcement of India Cultural Dinner: April 8, 2002, 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., Shawnee Conference Room

Communications (distributed):

(See Discussion Section)

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting 04/03/02 at 7:00 P.M.

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of March 6 and March 20, 2002

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Committee Reports

Information Items:

Distribution of Vita for Review for Panel of 10, Academic Freedom Committee and Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee Elections on April 17, 2002 (Rules Committee)

**03.07.02.02 Recommendations Regarding the Following Information and Advisory Items
(Academic Affairs Committee):**

Information Item:

02.12.02.01 College Level Examination Program Policy Revisions

Advisory Items:

11.16.01.03A Dean's List Policy

11.16.01.07A Final Exam Policy

11.16.01.08 Grading Practice Policy

Communications:

**01.23.02.01 KNR Athletic Training Education Major Proposal
Approved by the Senate on the Consent Agenda March 28, 2002**

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-112: By Senator Kording, second by Senator Albrecht, to add the Student Code of Conduct to the Senate Agenda of April 3, 2002 as an information item. The motion was unanimously approved and the agenda was so revised.

Motion XXXIII-113: By Senator Crothers, second by Senator Mitchell, to approve the Senate agenda. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Discussion:

Free Speech Policy

Senator Crothers: The administrative group working on the Free Speech/Student Protests Policy has developed a document that I find deeply disturbing. They forwarded a draft to the Administrative Affairs Committee but not the Executive Committee of the Senate. It also appears that they are attempting to enforce the document although it has not been passed by the Senate. It came out of a "Chatters Group". Brent Paterson of that group needs to be contacted and asked to send the document here so that we can assign it to the Administrative Affairs Committee.

List Serve Policy:

12.04.01.01 Request to Review Policy (In Exec Packets of 2/6/02)

12.04.01.01A Request to Review Policy (In Exec Packets of 2/6/02)

Senator White: We still have not received a response about the list serve policy concerns.

Senator Goldfarb: That policy has been forwarded to the Provost Advisory Council for review at the next meeting. We hope to get this done before the next end of the semester.

02.19.02.01 Diversity and Affirmative Action: Guidelines for Selection and Review of Faculty and Staff Applicant Pools (Previously In Packets of 2/25/02) (Ruth Townsend)

02.26.02.01 Concerns re: Above Guidelines

Dr. Ruth Townsend: I wanted to give some clarification about the search committee process. We receive many requests to bring only two candidates to the University to fill vacant positions. In reviewing applicant pools, we need to review the diversity of the pools. If you only want to bring two people to campus for interviews, then we need to look at the phone interview list. Your phone lists would contain more than two individuals and if the list is not diverse, we need to check advertising, check outreach and see if there is anything more than we can do.

Senator Crothers: In the guidelines in the memo that you distributed (dated February 12, 2002), you continue to use the word "can only" and I find this deeply troubling. Our department had very little money for our last search process and I don't know how we could have been expected to bring in more than two candidates for interviews. Is someone going to determine whether my department can only bring in two candidates? If not, can that be specified better? I

don't see how this solves the problem of nefarious departments. The only check I could see would be a clear vote, which then slows the process down for those departments that are not nefarious.

Dr. Townsend: Actually many departments want to have a clear vote. In many cases, departments don't know if they have a diverse pool because they do not have the background information. In those cases, they contact our office and we check that for them. We are not really looking for nefarious departments; we are looking for the adequacy of the pool. The one judgment I will make is that when I get a finalist of, for example, five people, all of one ethnicity, and someone on the next level adds diversity to the pool, I will ask that you at least consider that individual so that you can diversify your pool. When you get down to your finalists, all of those people are qualified for the job. We are not telling you whom you can or cannot hire. Backing this up to the phone list of five to six people is so that we don't have to make those phone calls asking why you are only bringing in two people.

Senator Crothers: The way to avoid that is to require everyone to provide their phone lists regardless of how many candidates they intend to bring in.

Dr. Townsend: No, because sometimes departments are calling 15 people and only bringing in five for interviews. As soon as you provide the phone interview list, then they become finalists and that is not really fair to the nine to ten people that you don't plan to interview because you begin to check all of those individuals' references. This is actually a short-term solution to the difficulty. We can revisit this issue next year when the new director comes in.

Senator Howard: I think you can do phone interviews before calling it your finalist list and then narrow it down and do subsequent telephone interviews. What happens if one of three candidates backs out at the last minute and you are left with only two candidates to interview? You do not have time at that point to bring in another person.

Dr. Townsend: That is when you contact the Diversity Office and explain that you had an approved list of three people and one has dropped out. If you have already interviewed and have a viable candidate, then I would say go ahead. If you haven't interviewed, then we would need to discuss it further. It is all going to be on a case-by-case basis based on the search, the size of the pool, as well as your ability to bring candidates to campus.

Senator Howard: I am glad to hear that because that was not what was implied by the President at the last Executive Committee meeting. If you take too much time to bring in another candidate, you may lose your top candidates, who may have other job offers.

Senator Crothers: Are we going to assign this to an internal committee to review?

Senator White: It is up to this committee. This is an internal procedural document that has consequences for the academic area.

Senator Crothers: I am happy to let the chairs and deans straighten it out.

Senator Fowles: For nursing, to have an ongoing process has been successful in getting qualified candidates instead of setting a deadline after which you can begin the interviews.

Dr. Townsend: That is actually a lock-in right now because of the policy on our web site. When can you say as a committee that you are done receiving applications if they keep coming in? That is the purpose of that date. It gives you the flexibility to keep going, but also gives you a target date.

External Committee Elections

Senator White: We still don't have a very good process in place for nominations to the external committees because of the change in the seating date of the Senate. Last year, Cynthia put together the slate of nominees so that we could get them approved at the last meeting of the Senate before the new Senate started. As I recall now, we stated last year would be the only year in which one Senate elected two slates of nominees. This year's Senate has not had that task yet and will be appointing next year's external committee members. However, I don't see any way around that because we won't even have the new Rules Committee formed by the end of the spring semester. The only option would be to elect

members to the committees during the fall. I think we need a slate ready by the meeting of April 17 so we can elect the external committee members before the end of the semester.

Student Election Concerns

Senate Crothers: This relates to an employee of the Vidette participating as a candidate in a Student Government Association election. I sent an e-mail to the Publishing Board of the Vidette, as well as to the faculty advisor for the Vidette about my concerns. I reported at the last meeting that I received a response from the faculty advisor. However, I did not even receive an acknowledge of my e-mail to the Publishing Board. I am very troubled by this. I am, therefore, requesting a response from the member of the Board to whom I sent the e-mail or that that individual be invited to a future Executive Committee meeting to explain the situation. I feel that this is fully in the Senate's prerogative to make a request for this information.

Senator White: If you would send a copy of your e-mail to the Senate office, we will resend it and ask for a response, as well as offer the option of joining us for an Executive Committee meeting.

Senator Kording: Are we wrong in our assertion that we should get an answer?

Senator Goldfarb: I don't understand why you wouldn't get a response to any e-mail. Why would this case be different?

Senator Kording: I don't think that I really got a response to my question. In this particular case, are we under the assertion that we should receive a response?

Senator Goldfarb: I don't understand the issue.

Senator Crothers: I think what he is asking is that, on principle, do you believe that administrators need to answer questions posed by the Academic Senate?

Senator Goldfarb: Yes, they should respond to anyone that asks questions of them. The response may be "I can't answer it", but there should be a response.

Adjournment

Motion XXXIII-114: To adjourn. The motion was approved by standing vote.