

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes
Monday, January 11, 2010, 4:00 P.M.
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of November 9, 2009

Motion XXXXI-53: By Senator Stewart, seconded by Senator Fazel, to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of November 9, 2009. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Distributed Communications:

12.17.09.01/02 ***From Susan Kalter/Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Academic Impact Fund Recommendations (Information Item 01/20/10)***

Senator Kalter: The main thing I think we are all concerned about is Milner Library and its number of faculty. There was a zero hiring, though I think at times they had up to 33 tenure-track faculty and now I think they are at 23. So our first recommendation was to try to figure out a tweaked model, because for the rest of the colleges we use instructional capacity to figure out how many non-tenure track lines to fill in. Milner, this year, because of the formulas, did not get any tenure-track hires or non-tenure track money. The second recommendation was to infuse the fund with a little more money to continue to try to correct the salary inversion issues. The third recommendation is to call attention to departments and schools that seem to be hurting. You can see on the back of the table the rationales for highlighting certain departments. It was things like ratio of tenure-track to overall faculty and how many positions people are down percentage-wise.

Number 4 was to acknowledge that the Provost's Office can't work with every single department on what the optimum number there is, so doing it gradually over the next seven or eight years while we are doing performance reviews would be fine with the committee. The reason we have the AIF was originally because of sick leave payouts, so number 5 is saying 'is this the most expeditious way to reauthorize hires?' In number 6, we are saying thank you for tracking this for us. The committee and Mardell are still trying to work out the best way to track all of these numbers such as 'what do we really need to pay attention to?' Since there is no one on the committee who is really good with statistics, number 7 was a request on the part of the committee to receive trend analysis data, not just raw numbers.

There are two important paragraphs at the end. The faculty on the committee observed that the data in the table does not capture crucial productivity components, workload distribution needs and instructor-to-student ratios within departments and schools. Finally, we felt, since the move away from the old AIF model, that chairs and directors need to have better direction on how to make the best case for tenure-track faculty hires. It apparently has not trickled down from the Provost's Office to the deans to the chairs what you really need to say in order to validate your case and that may have to do with the complexity of the data, but I also think that it is a communication issue.

Senator Bonnell: Dean Elzy was flattered and grateful that you included Milner. Would it be helpful for Milner to create a model? Would that be useful?

Senator Kalter: I would think so. Milner seemed to be the most pressing issue and we say earlier that the Provost's Office, the dean's office and the Vice President of Finance and Planning Office will need to put their heads together, so, of course, that will include input from other people in Milner. The faculty at Milner support the General Education program, so we mentioned here 'what is needed at the library, in terms of both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, to make sure that there is enough support for that mission?' There has got to be some kind of ratio that those three offices can get to say this is what we need to adequately support the campus.

12.17.09.03 ***From Senate Chairperson Dan Holland: Administrator Evaluation Policy (Dist. Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Holland: For everybody on campus, except for a couple of VPs, there is some mechanism for faculty input

for administrative evaluation.

Senator Kalter: I want to make sure whatever the committee comes up with doesn't step on the toes of the President's Office, but actually aids the President's Office in doing these evaluations and also to get a sense of whether this is best to be an annual thing or something done periodically. The Presidential Commentary Survey went out this morning without a glitch. Now that we have something like that in place, it would be fairly easy for our committee to come up with a similar survey. So, it would be a question of how often and to whom do we send out for these various offices, because everyone has a different kind of constituency.

President Bowman: I think that you are thinking along the right path because identifying the right audience is critical. For the VP of Advancement, the students really have no interaction with that office, so they would not have an informed opinion. They would about Student Affairs and the Provost, so I think your committee should engage in a dialogue with each VP and find out who they think their stakeholders are and then run this down the similar path as the Presidential Commentary.

Senator Holland: Is it something that we should be doing annually?

President Bowman: If you are going to do it, I think you should do it annually. I would certainly welcome the input and I'm surprised that we are not doing it.

12.17.09.04 *From Dan Liechty/Faculty Affairs Committee: Honorary Degree Recipients Selection Policy (Information Item 01/20/10)*

Senator Wedwick: This is one of the policies that we were asked to review. Even though we changed only one word in the entire document, we did have a lot of discussion about it. Rod Custer, who is in charge of this and getting nominees, is on the Faculty Affairs Committee. He said one of the most troublesome parts of this is getting nominees and having people that can be available on Founders Day. We talked about creating a separate nominating committee that could go out and get people who are worthy of receiving that. He took that back to Jay Groves and asked him some things, and maybe even the President. Rod came back and said that the nominating committee wouldn't work and having a day other than Founders Day wouldn't work. It would be best to just leave it the way it was, and that is what we did except for number 2. We felt like it was unclear having a student elected from the Student Association Assembly. It did not differentiate that from number 5. We wanted to make it clear that the person in number 2 does not have to be a member of the Student Association Assembly and number 5 is actually a student senator.

Senator Holland: How do they decide which one of these degrees to offer?

Senator Wedwick: Basically, Rod said that the committee talks about that and thought about should we be adding more things. The more that we talked about it, the longer the list. Rod said that they felt that the ones that are listed here encompass everything that could possibly be relevant to the person they selected, so they just slide someone into one of those.

12.18.09.01 *From Susan Kalter, Academic Senate Secretary: Faculty Code of Ethics – 2006 (Dist. Rules Committee)*

12.18.09.02 *From Susan Kalter, Academic Senate Secretary: Faculty Code of Ethics – 1970 (Dist. Rules Committee)*

Senator Kalter: An issue has arisen in which the language of the 1970 Code...

Senator Holland: It could be that what you are looking for may have been shifted off to one of the attached policies.

Senator Kalter: That was one question I had. Is this all there is to the 2006 Code or is there a supporting document?

Senator Holland: We have things like the Consensual Relations Policy, the Faculty Responsibility to Students Policy; it's all based on the AAUP standards.

Senator Fazel: The policies are referenced here so they are in a way attachments to this.

Senator Kalter: I could not find, and this might not be the only issue, something equivalent to IV. There is some fairly important language in IV in the 1970 document about administrator-faculty relations. For example, in IV.D., on page 2, it says in cases where faculty members are accused of unprofessional or amoral conduct, the accused should be given a hearing. That is something that I don't think is captured by this. No administrator should accept hearsay comments. Anonymous letters should have no status whatsoever. B basically says that the faculty have the right to expect competent, frank, scholarly administration that is able to give dynamic and purposeful direction. That one is a little more of a feeling kind of thing, but I am concerned that faculty may lay unprotected with the new, or about four years since we passed, shortened version of the Code. Does the shortened version supersede the 1970 version?

Senator Holland: Yes, the 1970 version should be gone.

Senator Kalter: I guess I would register my concern as while it takes what's in here and consolidates it in a general way, it can have the effect of not giving enough guidance and not giving enough protection to the various people in the relationships that are mentioned in the larger document.

Senator Fazel: I was on the Rules Committee when it was changed and here we are just saying what is expected ethically. Here, (in the 1970 Code) it talks about procedure and what if you violated it and it really doesn't belong in the ethics document. Procedural discussions about how we deal with unethical behavior is not here (in the 2006 Code). But, for example, there is 'treating colleagues and students with respect and civility' and policy 1.1.1. I don't know if you have had a chance to check this policy because I don't recall what that policy is. My guess is that it deals with this issue in more detail.

Senator Holland: I think we put in policy 1.1.1. as what are the protected classes. Are there particular parts of this that you would like included?

Senator Kalter: All of number IV, but I also haven't examined the whole document so there may be other things that are missing. My guess is that the relationship with colleagues is also not captured completely.

Senator Holland: A lot of those things you can read into what's in the 2006 Code. Potentially, a separate policy could be written.

Senator Kalter: That is what I was thinking of asking Rules to consider. I understand your intent four years ago to lift out of that document sort of the nitty gritty, but perhaps they can go back and see can we write policy on the nitty gritty that can go some other place so faculty, students, administrators are specifically protected about specific things that were mentioned for over 30 years.

President Bowman: Faculty's due process rights are codified and what you are saying is show me the documents that guarantee that hearsay will not be used against you. So someone needs to go through and attach those documents.

Senator Bonnell: So the suggestions are add IV or taking that and placing it in a separate policy.

Senator Wedwick: Or cross referencing the existing documents with this short one if they already exist.

NOTE: Policies attached to the Faculty Code of Ethics:

3.3.14 Consensual Relations Policy

3.3.15 Relationship with Students Policy

3.3.16 Involvement in Political Activities Policy

Proposed Agenda for Academic Senate on January 20, 2010:

Academic Senate Meeting Agenda
Date: Wednesday, January 20, 2010
Time: 7:00 P.M.
Location: Old Main Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of November 18, 2009 and December 9, 2009

Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- *President Al Bowman*
- *Provost Sheri Everts*
- *Vice President of Student Affairs Steve Adams*
- *Vice President of Finance and Planning Daniel Layzell*

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee: Chairperson ~~Gudding~~ Stewart

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Chairperson Kalter

Faculty Affairs Committee: Chairperson Liechty

Planning and Finance Committee: Chairperson Fazel

Rules Committee: Chairperson Solberg

Information Items:

12.17.09.01/02 Academic Impact Fund Recommendations (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

12.17.09.04 Honorary Degree Recipients Selection Policy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Communications

Adjournment

Motion XXXXI-54: By Senator Hochhauser, seconded by Senator Stewart, to approve the Academic Senate Agenda for January 20, 2010.

Senator Stewart: Senator Gudding is on sabbatical, so I will be taking over as Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Holland: I have received a request to have a short presentation to the Senate about the new Urban Teacher Preparation Grant. Would this be acceptable to add to the agenda? Nerida Ellerton and Judith Briggs made the request.

There were no objections to adding the item to the Senate Agenda and the agenda was unanimously approved as amended.

Adjournment