

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, August 22, 2005
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Lane Crothers called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Present: Lane Crothers, Paul Borg, Marian Hampton, Nathalie op de Beeck, Dan Holland, Eileen Fowles, Josh Garrison, Ross Richards, Lynsey Wright, Provost Presley

Absent: Brett Schnepper, President Bowman

Oral Communications:

Senator Crothers: I just received Paul Borg's resignation as Senate Secretary and so, as a consequence, we will need to elect a replacement. He has kindly agreed to remain on the Senate, however.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of May 2, 2005

Motion XXXVII-1: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Garrison, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of May 2, 2005. The Senate Chairperson recommended revisions to a section of the minutes, which referred to document 04.20.0.01, recommendations from Brent Paterson concerning the Administrative Withdrawal and Involuntary Withdrawal Policies. The minutes were revised as follows:

~~The President's and Provost's concerns regarding some of the changes to the policies will be included in the Executive Committee memo, which prioritizes internal committee tasks, to the Academic Affairs Committee.~~ **The President and Provost expressed concerns about the proposed revisions, specifically, their removal from the withdrawal process.** Both policies and the memo **from Dr. Paterson** will be forwarded to the 2005-06 Academic Affairs Committee.

The minutes, as revised, were unanimously approved.

Distributed Communications:**06.10.06.01 From Tammy Carlson: Proposed Pension Legislation (Senate Communication Item 8/31/05)**

Proposed pension legislation will be discussed at the Senate meeting of August 31, 2005. Mr. Tom Fowles will be invited to the Senate meeting to expand on the information contained in the memo from Tammy Carlson.

07.01.05.01 From President Bowman: Advance Notice of Possibility of Surveillance Equipment Installation - 2005-06 (Senate Communication Item 8/31/05)

The President annually notifies the Senate of the possibility of the installation of surveillance equipment on campus. This notification of the possibility is all that is required; however, Senator Borg asked if the President (not in attendance) would be willing to say whether or not equipment had been installed last year. Senator Crothers responded that he would probably be happy to do so. The location of the installation(s), of course, would not be revealed. The notice will be communicated to the Senate on August 31, 2005.

07.12.05.01 From Steve Adams, Enrollment Management: Transfer Student Admission Proposal (Advisory to the Senate 8/31/05)

Senator Crothers: The question that is at play here is whether or not the Transfer Admission Student Proposal is a formal policy change or just an editorial change. If it is a policy change, it would need to go to the Academic Affairs Committee. If it is an editorial change, then it would not. I am in the position that the change from 12 hours to 15 hours as a full-course load is editorial.

Senator Borg: One of the justifications in the proposal is that many institutions, other state universities, do it. Would

that include the University of Illinois?

Senator Crothers: I don't know; I don't know if that matters; we could ask Mr. Adams to come to the Senate meeting.

Senator Borg: Not to come to the meeting, but I would want the question to be asked, since we are positioning ourselves more and more in alignment with the U of I. I would want to know the answer before we do anything that might compromise that.

Senator Crothers: I will follow up on that, but I think we should leave it on the agenda as an Advisory Item.

07.14.05.01 *From Laurel Retzer, Athletics: Sport Schedule Updates (Senate Communication Item 8/31/05)*

07.19.05.01 *From Priscilla Matthews: Panel of 10 Membership Eligibility (To Rules Committee)*

Senator Crothers: The issue that Professor Matthews raises is whether or not Panel of 10 members have to have tenure. I will need to redraft the Rules Committee memo to include this issue. The Blue Book language does not specify this requirement. The language for the Panel of 10 online (list of Panel of 10 members on the web) says yes. I happen to think that the Blue Book is dominant; therefore, we just need to clarify it that way—that you do not have to be tenured to serve on the Panel of 10.

Provost Presley: It would not be advisable for a person without tenure to serve on the Panel of 10.

Senator Crothers: As Priscilla's memo points out, Milner has done just that. My point is that that then leaves it to the President or the Provost to just not choose that particular person, if that is what they choose to do. Whether or not we believe that tenure is a requirement, it should be consistently stated in both places.

Senator Borg: It was never an issue when the Panel was created 35 years ago; these were done by recommendations of department chairs and forwarded to the Senate for election. People were very interested in serving on the Panel of 10. Now that that is less of an issue, it may be of use to clarify this.

Senator Crothers: Do you want the task priority memo from the Executive Committee to the Rules Committee to indicate a preference regarding tenure or non-tenure?

Senator Borg: We could add to the memo that 'the Executive Committee observes that, over the history, people on the Panel of 10 have not been non-tenured.'

Senator Holland: I would suggest that we say that tenure is a good idea.

Provost Presley: I know that there are requirements that certain things be shared with Panel of 10 members; I view them as people who have volunteered for serious administrative kinds of functions. I have gone to the Panel of 10 to chair dean evaluation committees, for example. Obviously, I could ignore someone on the list who is non-tenured, but they would just be taking up a slot as far as I am concerned. I would never ask an untenured faculty member to chair a dean's evaluation; I wouldn't even ask them to be on one.

Senator Crothers: That's fine; when we talk about that memo, I will insert the appropriate language.

08.02.05.01 *From Roslyn Wylie, 2004-05 Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson: AFEGC Policy – Revised*

08.02.05.02 *From Roslyn Wylie: Update on 2004-05 Faculty Affairs Committee Tasks (To Faculty Affairs Committee)*

Senator Crothers: We next have a revised AFEGC Policy from the 2004-05 Faculty Affairs Committee. In the memo from Roslyn Wylie, the 2004-05 Chairperson of that committee, she says that the revised policy is ready to come to the Senate for consideration. First, of course, the policy would go to the Caucus and not to the full Senate and, two, I don't think that the policy is quite there yet. There are a couple of gaps in the language; there are a couple of issues that are unresolved. Before presenting this to the Faculty Caucus, would the Executive Committee mind if the Provost

and I, with Paul's help, revised the policy as we did the Administrator Selection Policy and then brought it back to this committee for its consideration.

Provost Presley: I would suggest that while the group may not include Ira Schoenwald, we call upon him to clarify some aspects of the NTT contract.

Senator Crothers: That's fine. What I am asking is that before we put this on the Faculty Caucus Agenda, that John and I, and anyone else who wants to join in, have a meeting and determine what kind of tweaks might need to be made and then come back to Exec.

Senator Borg: Would it be appropriate for the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee to at least listen in on the conversations? The Faculty Affairs Committee has at least some notion of what is going on.

Senator Crothers: I don't think so anymore because this now belongs to the Faculty Caucus and I am the Chair of the Faculty Caucus. I think we, as the Executive Committee, are exercising our authority. Roslyn has retired; there is virtually no one left from Faculty Affairs from last semester.

Provost Presley: They consider themselves (Faculty Affairs Committee) to have acted on it.

Senator Crothers: Correct.

Senator Hammel: I don't remember having this on Faculty Affairs last year.

Senator Crothers: My guess is that Roslyn sent it to Brian Clark; Brian tweaked some things and returned it to her and it came late to the committee, which is another reason that I am suggesting that we ought to do it centrally right now.

Senator Borg: I have no issue with doing it centrally, but I do think it might look better if we had someone from Faculty Affairs involved.

Senator Crothers: I am not disagreeing with that, but right now, of course, we don't have a Chair of Faculty Affairs. I would more than happy to have participation from anyone interested.

Roslyn's memo also describes other activities that Faculty Affairs has been addressing. We will forward this update to the 05-06 Faculty Affairs Committee.

08.15.05.01 From John Presley: Summative Evaluations for Administrators Schedule

Senator Crothers: The Summative Evaluations Schedule is the standard schedule by which senior administrators are evaluated. We see this year that there are six administrators who are going through evaluation.

08.15.05.02 From Lane Crothers: Senate Committee Activities and Issues Pending List - Memo to Executive Committee

08.15.05.03 From Senate Office: Matrix of Internal Committee Issues

Senator Crothers: All matters pending before the Senate are included in the matrix entitled *Committee Activities and Issues Pending 2005-06*. The memo that I wrote to the Senate Executive Committee makes a number of specific recommendations about what to take off this list of issues pending. Then, there are separate memos in your packets to each of the committees prioritizing the remaining issues. We may or may not agree on the priorities. Therefore, the first order of business is whether or not you agree with my recommendations about what to remove or otherwise change in the matrix, because the memos that I wrote are contingent upon those changes. In my memo to the Executive Committee, I first ask that we suspend the notion of a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Committee.

Senator Fowles: How does the function of the subcommittee differ from the function of the full committee?

Senator Crothers: As of now, no subcommittee for the APC has ever met.

Senator Fowles: What was the intended function of that subcommittee?

Senator Crothers: It was intended to provide a much broader look at these issues, but we have run out of bodies and time.

Senator Fowles: So, the Academic Planning Committee, as a whole, is also carrying out the functions of the subcommittee?

Senator Crothers: We are trying to embed into the academic planning process a more sophisticated approach to these questions, making the subcommittee moot. I am asking for a declaration to suspend it. I believe that the next permutation of Rules will recommend its elimination since it has never met.

Senator Fowles: The point is, it needs to be clear that whatever function was there is carried out by the full committee.

Senator Crothers: It is certainly intended to be embedded in the regular Academic Planning Committee procedures. Is there any objection about suspending the subcommittee?

Senator Borg: As long as we make it clear about the completion of functions of the subcommittee by the full committee.

Senator Crothers: I will take that then that as a 'yes' to suspend that and then we may decide to eliminate it or reconfigure it. Next, in my memo I address the annual colloquium issue. I believe that this committee asked last year that the establishment of an annual colloquium be removed from the Academic Affairs Committee's agenda, the establishment of which was recommended many years ago and nothing has ever happened with it.

Senator Fowles: What the colloquium for?

Senator Borg: It was to be a faculty forum, modeling for students, activities that a good university tends to do and the recommendation was to establish it on an annual basis.

Senator Crothers: On the other hand, we have lots of speaker series and lots of other kinds of things.

Senator Hampton: The colleges generally tend to deal with this kind of thing.

Senator Crothers: So, I would say that we can remove it from the Academic Affairs Committee's agenda. Next, the Program Proposal Financial Implications Form was sent to the committees for discussion. It was discussed, but there was nothing to act on. I think we should just remove it from the list.

Next in my recommendations for removal of issues pending is the Academic Standards Enrollment Management memo. The question is, is it realistic to expect this Senate with this level of experience to undertake a sophisticated analysis of such a complex issue. The issue is if one college or department increases its standards, does that affect the rest of the University. I know that the Provost's Office has talked about working on this question. As a practical matter, I don't see that this Senate is going to do it. The problems with academic standards are less what happens if my department raises the GPA entry requirement; it is more of what happens to the education majors who get dumped after their student teaching.

Ms. James: This may not be relevant to that, but I don't have a committee membership for Academic Standards yet.

Senator op de Beeck: If it gets removed entirely would it never come back to the committee? Could it not be tabled to be reassessed in the future?

Provost Presley: We are going to come to the Senate committees with several proposals related to this.

Senator Borg: The question is about the Academic Standards Committee itself; we vote on the membership of that committee. Rules proposes people and so the membership should be there somewhere.

Ms. James: Actually, Academic Standards has been on “hiatus” since Undergraduate Studies was eliminated and replaced by Enrollment Management and Academic Services.

Senator Crothers: The first step would be to contact Steve Adams.

Ms. James: I have been doing that for about a year with no response.

Provost Presley: I would feel better if I knew what this committee was about.

Senator Crothers: The committee has not done anything for quite awhile now and if it needs to be eliminated, that’s fine.

Provost Presley: What were they supposed to do?

Senator Crothers: Just in general, when we had the discussion about going to pluses and minuses (grades), the Academic Standards Committee was the first place to discuss it.

Senator Borg: Admission standards came through the Academic Standards Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Crothers: Right now, since we don’t have specific standards for admission, the committee got undermined because we have a holistic analysis.

Provost Presley: I placed Steve Adams on the Academic Affairs Committee as my designee.

Senator Crothers: The Provost and I will try to remember to talk about it. It’s a real issue and to address your concern, Nathalie, about removing the academic standards memo from the list of issues pending, I would just encourage you to continue to ask when are these proposals coming to the Senate and if they don’t, we can reinsert it later on the list of issues pending for the Academic Affairs Committee.

Provost Presley: We are dealing with the General Student question right now and we will have proposals to Academic Affairs I would assume before the end of the semester. The General Student issue is a larger version of exactly that question, because if you raise your standards, it may affect the rest of the University indirectly, but it affects the General Students directly.

Senator Borg: The Academic Standards Committee is where that process would have its contact with governance; to the extent of having worked that way, there is a problem.

Provost Presley: Last year, the Academic Affairs Committee was doing this; they were helping us deal with the General Student issue. So, not to be rude, but that’s the committee.

Senator Crothers: The only item on the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee’s list that is likely to be controversial is my request that we remove the Administrator Selection Policy from the committee’s responsibility and take it over by the Executive Committee. The policy has been sitting in that committee for over four years with no action and with the committee regularly refusing to follow the expressed will of the rest of the Senate. It seems to me that it is never going to work there.

Senator Fowles: So this would come to the Senate after we, as the Executive Committee, hashed it out? It would come to the Senate from the Executive Committee?

Senator Crothers: Yes.

Senator Hampton: I don't think you can quite say that there has been no action by the Administrative Affairs Committee. There has been action, but it has not followed along the lines of exactly what was recommended.

Senator Crothers: It's more than that; it never gets anywhere. It comes, we discuss, it stops. I think that it is too big and complicated an issue for the committee to handle in the timeframe available. It requires more central direction and management.

Senator Borg: I just wanted to remind everyone of how sensitive this issue is; this was the exact issue about which the controversy and conclusion of no confidence in a former Provost arose.

Provost Presley: I think that given that one can assume that this group will have a discussion of it and there is a discussion in the Senate, that's the way to go. I don't see political issues that won't be addressed by this process.

Senator Crothers: So, we agree, in principal, that this can now come to the Executive Committee; we will talk about the actual policy later.

I am hearing no concerns about the length of Senate terms. Senate meeting times is something that the Executive Committee properly controls and something that we need to talk about. I have done a little research this summer and that is something that I would bring to you for discussion, but I don't think that that is appropriately in the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee's domain. I can't imagine the committee objecting to the removal of those to issues.

The Planning and Finance Committee's list of issues to remove is pretty simple because it only entails suspending the Academic Planning Subcommittee, to which we have already agreed, and removing the Program Proposal Financial Implications Form. It was a consultative matter and the question has been answered.

For Rules, the bottom item in my memo is the Financial Implications Form, which we already agreed on. The top two have to do with whether or not we are doing anything with the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Senate Representation issue. As a purely practical matter, I am persuaded by the Provost that unionization has made these issues moot. They are part of the negotiating contract and, therefore, they are no longer within the Senate's purview to discuss.

Senator Fowles: Not knowing what the contract is, do they address these issues?

Senator Crothers: In my opinion, they are not, but that is not point; you negotiate for what you want and if you don't negotiate for it, you don't get it. That's what unionization means.

Ms. James: But doesn't the Civil Service have a union?

Senator Crothers: Right, but those rules existed prior to the unionization, though. They got grandfathered in. I am just personally very reluctant to have the Academic Senate mess with Illinois Labor Law. It is a very dangerous, complicated thing.

Ms. James: It's a scary thing, but I don't think you should decide this issue based on the NTT issues that kind of scared everybody when the union was first formed, because I think that these rights belong to all employees.

Senator Crothers: The first of the memos asks that the NTT membership on the Senate be expanded from one to six or seven or eight. That's not going anywhere anyway. The second one is about whether or not they should be represented on Chair/Director and Dean Five-Year Review Committees. That, to me, is much more about the law because that is then a unionized faculty member participating in the evaluation of the administrator that hires them. That is at least a challenging and difficult kind of question. That seems to be more negotiation.

Provost Presley: I think that there are really two issues here. One is if a group unionizes and enters collective bargaining and is using governance to enhance their situation, frankly, then you are getting two bites at the apple,

which tenure and tenure-track faculty don't get. The other issue is that I disagree; I don't think that we need to be scared, but I think that we need to be cognizant that Illinois Labor Law allows for many, many different kinds of grievances and cases to be filed. One of the most recent ones had to do with a report that the Senate was dealing with that tried to make life better for the NTT that was aggrieved.

Senator Crothers: The argument was that by attempting to give benefits to non-tenure track faculty during the unionization process that that constituted unfair interference in the election. Essentially, we got sued for being nice.

Provost Hampton: The timing was all in that case, was it not?

Senator Crothers: The NTT Report, however, predated the union. I think we are getting off track. The first question is removal of the request for additional NTTF Senate representatives. We are saying that they are not going to get seven or eight reps.

Senator Hammel: Can you go ahead and send that question to Rules?

Senator Crothers: Rules has had it for years and it just gets ignored because no one takes it seriously. Second, the question is should they then be on chair/director evaluation committees. I say that the unionization question makes it moot; if you don't agree, then we will not take it off Rules' agenda.

Senator Hammel: Are chairs allowed to have NTTs on it?

Senator Crothers: Currently, it varies by rules by college.

Provost Presley: For chairs and directors, but not for deans.

Senator Crothers: And this was a request to make that systematically across all units.

Senator Hammel: That does sound like a union issue.

Provost Presley: For example, when the Dean of University Libraries was being evaluated, they asked for civil service to be on the evaluation committee, which makes perfect sense given their structure, but I said no because the evaluation of the dean is a personnel matter and I wasn't going to say yes, let's just ad hoc it. I follow the rules to the nth degree on personnel matters. I made sure that the NTTs over there who are not unionized and the civil service people, including through focus groups, be included in the review.

Senator Crothers: Last year's Rules Committee did ask that this item be removed; we just haven't had time to do it. They did discuss it and decide it wasn't appropriate.

Senator op de Beeck: Is the NTT union informed of the removal so that they can maybe negotiate?

Senator Crothers: Not formally; if you, however, want to tell someone, you are more than welcome to.

Senator op de Beeck: If we change the way that we deal with them and they think that it's still pending...

Senator Crothers: The last expressed preference I heard is that they don't care and that was from last year's NTT rep. There is no formal notification as there isn't for the rest of this.

Senator Borg: Are we clear that we are removing both points or do you need a motion?

Motion XXXVII-2: By Senator Borg, seconded by Senator Hampton, to remove both issues regarding NTT faculty from the Rules Committee's agenda. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Crothers: The items that we have just agreed to delete will be deleted from this matrix and only the active

items will be submitted to each committee. Each committee will only get the part of this matrix relevant to its agenda

08.15.05.04 03.17.05.03 From 2004-05 Administrative Affairs Committee: Administrator Selection Policy

Note: The document numbered 08.15.05.04 was included in the Executive Committee Packets of 8/22/05 as a reference document only. As this draft of the policy is actually the original March 2005 draft, *without revision*, it should retain its original number of 03.17.05.03.

08.15.05.05 FORWARDED BY E-MAIL: Administrator Selection Policy-Revised Draft from Crothers/Presley (August 2005)

Senator Crothers: For now, there is the question of whether or not you believe the revised Executive Committee Search Committee Policy is on track with what the Senate ought to be doing. The President has already made one brief request for a change, which we have just distributed around the table, which I think can easily be accommodated. The revisions to the policy by the Provost and I include the insertion of language governing internal searches and for the first time language talking about “targeted searches”, which means that if you believe that there is an individual that we really want, authorizing that, but then requiring that the person who pursues that targeted search get permission or at least discuss the question with other constituents. This language actually requires a process now for the first time. The other is that it does provide more flexibility to the administrators in selecting the composition of committee than the current language does. The current language has people directly electing; the revised language has administrators selecting from lists of those that were elected. Those to me are the two crucial differences. The revised policy organizationally gets rid of a lot of the repetitiveness; it lays out responsibilities of all committees. It then lays out the composition of specific committees. Is this the direction that you think we ought to be going?

Senator Borg: I am comfortable working from a new draft, as long as there is someone who will pay attention to issues from the March 2005 draft, because I am not sure that everyone is going to understand why this was changed. I would like to suggest that since this is now in the Executive Committee, we work with the March draft as a basis, taking some time to look at the wording and to do that kind of comparison.

Senator Crothers: I agree completely. I would like to suggest that this be done in a relatively short timeframe. If you read this in the next week and half and have concerns, please e-mail the entire committee and we will schedule this for discussion at the next Executive Committee meeting. I want this passed fast and the reason is last year, we initiated a search process for the Vice President for University Advancement because the President agreed to accept the draft policy for that search. We initiated a search process and we elected people to the committee, but the rules did not formally exist. I then got a phone call from the President saying that he had cancelled the search and picked somebody. I did not like it, but I can’t enforce rules that don’t exist. So I want these rules passed fast so that as new administrators change, we have these rules in place. I want to have them in place by the middle of October.

Ms. James: Did everyone get a copy of the President’s memo, which was distributed at the beginning of this meeting? His recommendations are in regard to representatives from the Alumni and Foundation Boards: “There is probably some wisdom in letting these groups follow their own procedures for determining committee representation.”

Senator Crothers: His point is that these are national and statewide, even international, people in some cases and an election might be a silly thing. We might revise the policy to say that such a representative is chosen by the President.

Provost Presley: I think that it is important to note that one of the reasons that this March 2005 draft from the 04-05 Faculty Affairs Committee stuck around as long as it did is because the President and I had difficulties agreeing on it. I couldn’t agree to it as long they kept refusing to incorporate the fact that department chairs should have a voice in picking a dean. That’s just one piece of it. As Lane and I worked on this draft during the summer, we kept the President informed of what was going on. So with that one tweak, he is ok with this. Obviously, I am ok with it as it stands, but I am also interested in the way the discussion goes. It is important to note that the President, who will do almost all of the hiring, is ok with it.

Senator Crothers: Please do look at the revisions and let’s schedule this for a formal discussion. I would love to have this moved to the Senate as an Information Item in the middle of September and hopefully voted on by early October. If there are serious, substantive concerns and it takes longer, then so be it.

08.15.05.06 *From Lane Crothers: Internal Committee Issues Pending – Memo to Academic Affairs Committee*

Senator Crothers: I would like to talk very briefly about the various assignment memos for the internal committees, obviously with the proviso that the Rules memo will have to have one change, the addition of the memo from Professor Matthews concerning the Panel of 10 tenured membership question. Does anyone see anything in the Academic Affairs memo that jumped out at them as wrong? This memo would be paired with the matrix of issues pending before that committee, as we have revised it.

Provost Presley: On the last page of the memo, the sentence may technically be correct, but my office has not yet done the audit regarding program hour limitations.

Senator Crothers: Could we revise it to say that you will continue to work on this audit?

Provost Presley: Yes, I am going to ask Deborah Curtis to put this issue on the agenda of the CTE, because I think that that is the group that can get this done.

Senator Crothers: Are there any objections to the memo with that revision?

Senator Borg: The date should be Fall 2005.

There were no further revisions to the memo.

08.15.05.07 *From Lane Crothers: Internal Committee Issues Pending – Memo to Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee*

Senator Crothers: I have one small change for this memo in the last paragraph on the first page, the part that starts with “Note that if...” This is the threat part of this thing: “Note that if the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee has not delivered this policy (Administrator Evaluation Policy) to the Senate Executive Committee by October 31st...” I would like that to read “October 15” instead of “October 31st”.

Senator Fowles: I have a question about the “threats”. There are so many. What are going to be the consequences if they don’t do it?

Senator Crothers: There are only two things referred to in the memo that are going to come off their agenda if they are not completed—the Solicitation Policy and Administrator Evaluation Policy. If they don’t do it, then we’ll do it; it will come out of Exec. What that means is that I will do it. While I am not happy about that, the truth is that this stuff has been sitting there for four years.

Senator Fowles: I can only say that I can see people dumping stuff on your doorstep.

Senator Crothers: As it happens, both of these items are so simple that I can do them in 20 minutes. They can do them in three meetings. I think what happened last year with the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee is that it is a big committee with a lot of responsibilities and it wasn’t very experienced. By refining and refocusing, I am hoping that we will be able to get the work done.

Senator Fowles: I would couch your memo to them and say that this is really simple to do.

Senator Borg: Perhaps you could say at the Senate meeting that this is meant to be the “spur”, which expresses some measure of how seriously the Executive Committee takes these issues.

There were no other objections to the memo.

08.15.05.08 *From Lane Crothers: Internal Committee Issues Pending – Memo to Faculty Affairs Committee*

Senator Crothers: The last paragraph of my memo to Faculty Affairs was written before I had carefully looked at

what Roslyn did regarding the AFEGC Policy, so I am going suggest that I will just delete that entire paragraph concerning the Faculty Affairs Committee's revisions to that policy. Based on our prior discussion, John and I will talk about it, perhaps with Ira and some others.

Provost Presley: In the second paragraph concerning recruitment and retention, you might suggest that Faculty Affairs work with ODAA, which is also doing a faculty and staff retention survey.

Senator Hammel: We did talk to them at one point.

Provost Presley: I think that I would like it if the language in the first paragraph made it perfectly clear that Dr. Schoenwald in his role of Faculty Ombudsman reports to the Provost's Office, not to the Faculty Affairs Committee. You are sort of inviting them to do this rather ineffectively with Dr. Sabine Loew because she just started today.

Senator Crothers: I thought that she had started earlier.

Ms. James: Was it stipulated by the Senate that the Ombudsperson report to the Provost. I know that it is a pilot program that reports back to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Crothers: The nature of the services during the pilot is the kind of things I am asking Ira to report to the committee.

Provost Presley: Exactly, as Ombudsman, he reports to me.

Senator Crothers: I am not sure that we actually explicitly discussed that part of the equation.

Provost Presley: I remember a very explicit discussion about it.

Senator Crothers: I am not saying that we think that the Faculty Ombudsman works for us.

Senator Hampton: So, what you are saying is that in his position, he reports to you, but that he needs to make a report to the committee.

Provost Presley: Yes, as a pilot.

Senator Crothers: I can try to work on some language there to address those concerns.

Provost Presley: It's a point almost not making because the work that he does is very confidential so it is not as though I direct it but more that he comes back and tells me everything that he has done.

Senator Crothers: The only organizational issue is that technically he works for Dr. Bragg. But you are right, in this particular role, he has assigned the reporting authority to you.

Provost Presley: That was part of the argument. We had a pretty long discussion about it at the Senate meeting.

Senator Crothers: I remember several discussions, but not that one; I will take a look at the minutes.

There were no further revisions to the memo.

08.15.05.09 ***From Lane Crothers: Internal Committee Issues Pending – Memo to Planning and Finance Committee***

Senator Crothers: The Planning and Finance Committee memo is an easy one. The President has already signed off on a note and is coming up with a salary plan. Dr. Bragg is on board, so there is no issue there. I understand that the BOT has placed it on its agenda as a point of concern. The Campus Communication Committee forwarded a memo to the BOT at their July meeting in which indirectly it was made clear with the President taking a nearly 9% pay raise

and the rest of us taking around 3%, we thought that everybody's salaries ought to be on the agenda. So, this is what this is following up on.

There were no revisions to the memo.

08.15.05.10 From Lane Crothers: Internal Committee Issues Pending – Memo to Rules Committee

Senator Crothers: For Rules, we do need to add that language about the Panel of 10 question of tenure and the sense of the Executive Committee is that it ought to be tenured.

Provost Presley: Regarding the next to the last sentence, "...appropriate experts both on and off campus..." I would remind the Rules Committee that we have a couple of lawyers on retainer with practice in educational law.

Senator Crothers: My expectation was that they would contact the Provost's Office and ask who might be the appropriate person for them to talk to.

Provost Presley: The last time, with the Consensual Relations Policy, the committee wanted legal advice, which I thought was entirely appropriate and may be appropriate for the Ethics Code, too. I would be happy to arrange for that.

There were no other recommendations for revisions to the memo.

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate Meeting of August 31, 2005:

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of May 11, 2005

~~Presentation: Green Team Report (Chuck Scott) (Unavailable to attend)~~

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

IBHE-FAC Report

Honorary Degree Selection Process (President Bowman)

Advisory Item:

07.12.05.01 *Transfer Student Admission Proposal From Academic Services and Enrollment Management*

Communications:

06.10.06.01 *Proposed Pension Legislation*

07.01.05.01 *Advance Notice of Possibility of Surveillance Equipment Installation – 2005-06*

07.14.05.02 *Sports Schedules - Hard copies available upon request; schedules can be viewed on line at: <http://goredbirds.collegesports.com> (Select "Women's Sports" or "Men's Sports" to view schedules.)*

Adjournment

Motion XXXVII-3: By Senator Fowles, seconded by Senator Hampton, to approve the Senate Agenda of August 31,

2005. The agenda was unanimously approved.

Discussion:

Approval of Student and Faculty Internal Committee Nominees

Senator Crothers: I had forgotten that Dr. Naidu from COB is going to be joining the Senate and I haven't yet thought about which internal committee to assign him. You do see on the list that Professor Gamage just resigned recently. We will be getting a memo soon from the Provost's Office about the administrators available for each committee, as we did last year. (**Note:** Dr. Naidu will not join the Senate.)

Provost Presley: Once again, my approach would be to try to put someone on a committee for the run of the academic year, as expertise can be used, rather than to juggle people around. That would be important to make clear to the committee chairs that they should keep us informed of the issues.

Senator Crothers: We certainly tried last year. We appreciate that being done again.

Provost Presley: I agreed with Helen Mamarchev last year that, depending on the problem, my designee list would even extend into Student Affairs.

Senator Crothers: We have had no problem with that.

The Executive Committee unanimously accepted the Internal Committee Membership Assignments.

Adjournment