**OVERFLOW MEETING**

**MINUTES**

***December 10, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

John Bardo, Mary Kay Bauer, Richard Beam, Wayne Billon, Heidi Buchanan, Kyle Carter, David Claxton , Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Jamie Davis, Terre Folger, Steven Ha, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Elizabeth McRae, Jane Perlmutter, Phillip Sanger, Barbara St. John, Jack Summers, Michael Thomas, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Eleanor Hilty, Christopher Hoyt, Sean O’Connell, Chuck Tucker

Members absent:

John Hodges,Jack Sholder

Recorder:

Ann Green

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Report from Chancellor John Bardo:

Dr. Bardo reported that 11,200 applications had been received. Applications were sent to about 35,000 prospective students and it is anticipated about 15,000 prospective students will apply. Admissions standards have been raised.

A class size of about 1550 is expected next year unless something dramatic happens at the state level that will fund enrollment growth. WCU had estimated enrollment growth, but we over enrolled which meant we caught up with some deficits we’ve had for several years and now we’re above where we anticipated being. We are asking the UNC system to allow us to modify our request for additional funding.

The retention rate has now been officially published at 76.2%. Dr. Bardo feels we can do better and we will continue to work on that. Retention is expected to increase as admissions standards go up.

The numbers of problems with students; police reports etc. is lower per capita which is attributed to higher admissions standards.

The Board of Governors is not meeting until January. They have proposed a tuition increase. The state put an increase in, but Erskine Bowles has convinced the leadership of the House and Senate to at least allow us to present an alternative tuition to the one they had. That is being proposed by other campuses as well. The use of this money for faculty salaries is not on the table although, this additional money can be used if a faculty member gets an offer from another university to try to keep the faculty member. Using this money for general salary increases is prohibited.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Richard Beam reported that the General Assembly has called for an 8% or $200 tuition increase for all students at all UNC campus. If adopted, they would retain that increase as part of the general fund and the money would not come back to any of the campuses. Our proposed tuition increase which is public knowledge would run about 6.5% and what GA is proposing is that campuses would retain those funds and target them for QEP and other specific projects. If GA gets their way at least 50% of the funds would be used for local campus need based aid for students.

Richard asked if anyone has contacts within the legislature, please use them. Our students and our campus are the only ones that will benefit if they will do this. If the legislative proposal goes through, it will cost the students more and the students and our campus will get nothing from it.

Chancellor Bardo clarified that the current law is that there will be an 8% increase and the money will go to the State. It is not a proposal; it is current law. Erskine Bowles asked for and got permission to propose an alternative to the 8% from the House and Senate.

The other issue that will be raised before the legislature is that the E&T fee is treated as tuition. Our position with the Board of Governors is that it should not. All other fees are left alone. There is no rationale for it being treated differently than all the other fees, but it was approved that way 20-25 years ago. We’re going to try to get that changed.

Chancellor Bardo remarked that when we set up the Senate in this way, the intent was to have one space for either him or his designee. When Kyle is here, Kyle is the ongoing person who is most informed about the topics at hand. If the Senate should ever need Chancellor Bardo to stay for a meeting he is glad to do so, but he is consciously trying to stay with the original intent.

Chancellor Bardo next commented that we are under obligation from GA to minimize the number of administrators on campus offering direct service to students. Though we are going through that process, it is a hard process and is no fun. Because Kyle Carter has the largest operation he has had the largest changes to make. Chuck Wooten and Clifton Metcalf’s areas are already through this process. Almost everybody in Student Affairs is not paid out of state money so there’s not much to do there. Dr. Bardo reiterated that we are under obligation. Every institution in the system is going through this and it is not pleasant; it is not fun, but it is the end of the budget cutting process that was instituted last Spring. We’re trying to do it as rational and reasoned as we can.

Richard Beam recognized that an endowed distinguished professorship at WCU has been named for Chancellor Bardo: “Before Chancellor Bardo leaves, I hope that all of you have seen the announcements and are as pleased as I am at the announcement and creation of the Chancellor John Bardo and Deborah Bardo Endowed Professorship in Educational Leadership. Something that was not in the letter that I believe you all got is that this is the first time a sitting Chancellor has been honored at least within the UNC system...”

**COUNCIL REPORTS**

Reappointment Process

Discussion relating to simplifying the reappointment process was picked back up from the December 3, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting.

There were some questions left from the earlier discussion for Provost Carter:

The question was that the current handbook it says reappointments go to the Provost, but it is not certain if it says annual reappointments. In the years where a faculty member is not reviewed, does the Provost still have to make a decision?

Response from Kyle Carter: I hate to, and I’m sure anyone in the provost position, hates to sign anything that he or she knows nothing about. Frankly, in the first year and second year appointments, I don’t know how many letters I sign, but there’s probably 150 -200 letters and it seems kind of silly for me to be signing something where really the review has taken place at the college level where there’s a thoughtful review. And, I don’t have time to give thoughtful review to 200 faculty every year and I don’t think that that’s something that any provost would like to do. I really like these proposals and if there are changes that we need to make in the Faculty Handbook we can do that but I wouldn’t be constrained by what is now. I would look at what is a good process, what gives the faculty good feedback so that they can be successful, what gives the departments and deans the ability to make good decisions and where are the safeguards.

What we are trying to do is tie the reappointment process to promotion and tenure. I know a lot of people are eager to see that; the reappointment process, to become more accumulative so that promotion and tenure isn’t seen as something that is separate. I think these ideas have a lot of merit.

Another question is whether the Task Force wanted a vote or just feedback from the Senate.

The outcome was that it is understood that the Task Force asked for action from the Senate if the Senate feels in a position to give it. Also discussed, was the fact that there are other things on the table in terms of Collegial Review streamlining. These are just the first steps.

Kyle Carter: One other comment and I don’t know if you will agree with me or not, what I think is a tendency when you have an annual reappointment as opposed to a 3rd year, or 2 or 4th year is that they are not taken as seriously in general. I think if you have a single point where people are looking carefully at you or two points, that those are taken more seriously, you get better feedback, better results.

David McCord: To my memory, nobody spoke in favor of keeping the annual reviews on the Task Force. The question is, is the 2 point review enough (3rd & 6th) or 2, 4, 6.

Kyle Carter: I think there’s still the intent to have the annual review by the department head and the faculty.

Comment: The AFE. This doesn’t address the AFE.

Comment: If there was a no vote, does that stop at the college during the 2nd year? And then, is there something in place to challenge it?

Kyle Carter: There would have to be. I think that’s one piece that would have to go through the entire system. If somebody were not to be reappointed there would have to be an appeal process through the Provost and essentially to the Chancellor.

Comment: Isn’t that already in place? I’m not sure this would necessarily change.

Comment: From what I understand, all we’re voting on is to choose the #1 or #2 proposal.

Comment: The process so far couldn’t reach a strong resolution of #1 or #2. The Task Force went back and forth; the CRC and really those two bodies reached a different recommendation.

Comment: Right, that’s why there’s two of them.

Comment: The consensus of the Task Force was a 3rd and 6th year. The strong consensus of the CRC was the 2, 4, 6. So that’s how; at least we’ve reduced it somewhat for the full Senate to consider; Proposal 1 or Proposal 2. I think whichever one of those the Senate wants, there won’t be strong objection to it. We just couldn’t settle on a consensus.

Comment: What if there is a clause that had some kind of a hybrid between 1 and 2 and said that the minimum number of TPR reviews would be 3 and 6. However, if a department chooses to go with the 2, 4, 6 that’s the department head’s headache?

Comment(DM): the idea of leaving some of this; leaving a looser structure and leaving it up to the departments was discussed and we were discouraged from pursuing that because of the complexity of the calendar and the processes; it affects so many levels.

Comment: But, since this doesn’t affect the AFE and faculty who need help or mentoring to publish more or to teach better or whatever it is that they are not doing, can’t we up the ante of the AFE?

Comment: I think that is already there. Wth the TPR, I don’t think you’re able to give that much feedback during the AFE. That’s what I was told. You gave the feedback during the AFE and it’s…

Comment: That’s now what is happening in our department. In the TPR were giving feedback.

Kyle Carter: I don’t think there would be anything to prohibit what you are talking about. I would suggest that we not make it a university policy. For sake of argument, let’s say you adopted proposal #1 and the music faculty decided that in addition to that you were going to review people in year 4, you can do that, it’s just a departmental decision. It’s not part of the university official review and then I think there’s another fail safe, if a faculty member doesn’t do well in that 3rd year, then they could be on a continuous review until they get off it. I think what you’re suggesting could be done without making it a university policy.

Comment: I don’t know 3rd year review means, does it mean after year 3?

Comment: That’s a universally confusing language, but it means the year that you are in. So, the 3rd year review means you have gone through one year, the 2nd year and now it’s the fall of your 3rd year.

Comment: the 2, 4 was supposed to be the same after 2 years you were reviewed and after 4 years you were reviewed.

Comment: We were talking a 3rd year review and a 5th year if you use the terminology in the first.

Comment: I didn’t hear it that way, I heard that in the 2nd and 4th year review, you would be reviewed in the Fall of your 2nd year and the Fall of your 4th year.

Comment: You can take the time table backwards from the mandatory 6th year review. That reviewed is conducted during the 6th year and in order to meet legal requirements for timely notice, it must be done in the Fall. The logic would be whether we are talking the 2nd, 4th or the 3rd option that it would be the Fall of the year that it would take place. At the beginning of the 3rd year, for instance.

Comment: The way I look at this; I’m just completing mine. I thought somewhere in the middle, it would be nice to know whether I’m going down the right path with some option that you have enough years to change. And then I really got value out of a 5th year feedback, because that’s really like a practice for the next year. Did anybody consider a 3, 5 year?

Comment: That’s what this was meant to be.

Comment: No, (several no’s).

Comment: It comes at the 4th year which is 2 years away. I look at it the 5th year; that’s a draft, but the 6th year, it’s all in the pot. That feedback at 5 was really a draft for the 6th.

Comment: It was all considered. It got down to these 2 with the broadest consensus.

Comment: On the flip side, if you have a faculty member who is horrific, is this 1st proposal mean that the university commits to that person for 3 years?

Comment: No …the department head and dean can have an administratively initiated review at any point.

Comment: And that could be triggered by an AFE. The question is whether or not, for reappointment there needs to be the full TPR like-dossier prepared how many times and that sort of review how many times before the full 6th year review.

Comment: Is it possible for us to merge the TPR and AFE processes.

Comment: DM That is the longer term project. It’s not just AFE and TPR, it’s program review, its Delaware 2; it’s a lot of review processes. So, the overall goal here is to change the paradigm of how faculty maintain their portfolios for these unending review processes.

Comment: The BOG has mandated the annual faculty evaluation, but that does not necessarily, immediately trigger questions of reappointment and that sort of thing can. They’ve set it up as a separate process and it’s usually conducted at the end of the year which does not allow for timely notice if someone is not reappointed.

Comment DM: “What the Task Force is working toward is a somewhat longer term vision; that all faculty members will keep all of their stuff in an electronic portfolio and that you do it on a contemporaneous basis. When you submit an article, you log in and say this article is now submitted. When you get the first rejection you say now it’s under revise and re-submit. When you get elected to the Senate you say I’m on the Senate from 2009-2012. You do it all along. You make these entries that take 30 seconds to a minute so that the electronic portfolio is always at any point in time, a reflection of your record. For AFE processes in April, the data could be extracted with a time parameter of one year…The department head could send out an email saying that they will extract the AFE report on April 15; make sure yours is up to date. If it is up to date, you don’t have to do anything. In the Fall, when we go through a reappointment tenure promotion is a different dossier format, but the faculty doesn’t have to do anything. It’s formatted differently in the electronic portfolio…That’s the goal. If you try to combine AFE and TPR Spring event and Fall event and then you run into snags and then you’ve got Delaware II which looks like it is going to be a December event and then anytime your program goes under review that is another event. So, it is a losing battle if you try to think in the old paradigm if you shift so your portfolio is always up to date and the format is extracted according to the necessary format for that type of review it may not involve any particular attention on the faculty member’s part…:

A motion was made and seconded to vote on the second proposal.

Comment: How does it work, in the TPR document you have a four page summary and various addendums.

Comment: All of that gets rewritten. That’s why we can’t get it done this year.

Comment: How would that work in the electronic version. So you keep your document as a set of facts?

Comment: No, you keep your narrative; there is place for those. Leroy Kauffman has proposed…in this kind of a working model now; you have something called a case statement in that you write it. You can write one for your AFE, there might be another one for your TPR, but you are making your case. It’s a narrative…all of the facts stay in there. You don’t need to say how many things you published; there are right there. Or you don’t need to say anything much about what courses you’ve taught, about the variety of teaching, about the enrollment, about the grade distribution. None of that do you need to address; it is already there. You do have the right to prepare a narrative that makes the case for the action at hand. “This year I deserve the most merit raise in the department because of all the great things I did”…

Discussion continued…

Comment: Have you ever considered no reappointment until the 6th year? When I was here seven years ago, I was shocked that I should be reappointed every year and I was on tenure track. What’s the point of being tenure track? Do I have actually five years to show my performance? That was not the case. I have to show my performance every year even though they are extremely generous for the first and second year. It makes more sense to give tenure track faculty member five full years than it would be tenured or not five years later. Did you consider that?

Comment: …Nobody proposed that (in the Task Force)...

Comment: And the safeguard is you’ve got the administrative review with the AFE.

Comment: I’m talking about why tenure track faculty members should worry about annual reappointment.

David McCord: That specific statement was a widely shared point of the Task Force. Every single year is excessive. I don’t think anybody was comfortable with that. But, Proposal 1, doing it the 3rd year, that is just one time before; that was the leanest proposal.

Comment: The question is do people need to practice? Again, since we haven’t gone to the electronic thing, do they need more of a chance to get some substantive feedback in the 2nd and 4th years.

Comment: Can we put some text in there saying that faculty members that would like additional reviews may request them? Do they have a right to demand additional reviews? If somebody gets an unfavorable review, they would like to see how things they have done addressed those points are viewed by the various reviewing bodies.

Comment: Seems reasonable. I would also like to add to X, it’s not just the practice, you would also like to have people outside your discipline in your college and then outside your college reflect because people in your department are going to be aware of what is expected of you. But outside of that you really need to know how you need to tailor and explain things. For instance some of my colleagues in computer science journal articles are low ranked; it’s presentations and publications and meetings that are high ranked. But to somebody who meeting presentations and proceedings is not a big deal you might be judging it based on your own, but you want to get the feedback before your 6th (year). People at a level outside don’t understand what you are saying.

Comment: And that’s at the university level committee?

Comment: I’m saying …since my department has multiple disciplines and we had to be instructed from one discipline to the next and then you have to go to the college. You find out how to write to best explain the things that you thought were obvious.

Comment: You are saying something that really bothers me; you’re saying that somebody who is not in your department is going to evaluate you, when they ought not to do that.

Comment: That is the case.

Comment: The process I thought at the university committee was to make sure that the college did their job to follow the procedures. It’s not. They get to review everything?

Comment: That’s the charge of the university committee has been to conduct an independent review and that’s why it’s so important to get the CRD documents. …David Claxton was on the university committee almost as long as me, maybe longer….and I think he will verify that people on that committee spend hours and hours reviewing those files and looking very, very carefully at those CRD documents. That’s why the CRD document is so important.

Comment: We have a motion on the floor.

Comment: I think it needs to be more specific; it doesn’t require that a review be conducted once the faculty member makes that request. I would like it to say for clarity that faculty members who request additional reviews can have them.

Comment: Is that not a decision for the college to make as opposed to the entire university-that you request a review of your department head, dean.

Comment: Let’s take the example, all of your research is boiler plated stuff. You better test the water all the way up…

Comment: None of these go all the way up to the University Committee.

Comment: Yes it does it goes to the Provost.

Comment: If the University Committee is an independent body and they made a decision of what counts and what doesn’t count then they need to go all the way down to the department. Otherwise why do all this stuff in the department.

Comment: But, your CRD makes the case of what does and doesn’t count, doesn’t it?

Comment: Yes, but if the CRC committee says I don’t agree with what they are saying or that publication record is not good enough so I’m not going to vote for that person, how do you stop that?

Kyle Carter: …I started a reporting mechanism either last year or the year before and I think you’ll see that the university committee rarely disagrees with the college or the department. It happens, but it is rare.

The point I wanted to make is the reason I thought this was more for information than for action, is I thought there was a full blown proposal that has much more detail than this summary here, because I believe what X is talking about is actually in that proposal. That if a faculty member gets a negative review then they must be reviewed again the following year. Is that not right?

David McCord: I don’t remember that specific one. There is a much longer proposal; it was working toward that broader goal of consolidating AFE and TPR processes…in terms of what could be achieved potentially to go into effect next fall, Gibbs trimmed it down, but a lot of it was nuts and bolts that had to do with implementing, but it was more than this.

Comment: Is it possible we just vote on time period as opposed to maybe the technicality of it all. If there’s a longer document that we can see, can we just vote on the 2, 3, 4 and get that out of the way?

David McCord: That would be a great idea. If the Senate can decide on should it be a 3rd and a 6th or should it be a 2, 4, 6 and then let us take that back to the Task Force to flesh that out. That would be very helpful.

Richard Beam: If I am interpreting what I am hearing correctly, what the Task Force is requesting from the Senate is a sense of the Senate as to which of these 2 proposals is preferable as opposed to the Senate formally adopting either.

David McCord: Right.

Richard Beam: Then may I… X, I think you were the one that made the first proposal is that…

Comment: I would change that to candidate who would initiate the additional review and not faculty member.

Comment: RB I think if I am interpreting all of this correctly, I am choosing to interpret, if it is agreeable. That the motion that was put on the floor was is it is the sense of the Senate there should be two reviews probably in the 2nd and 4th year.

Discussion continued before coming to a vote on Proposal #2 (for 2, 4 & 6 year reviews):

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON PROPOSAL 2 (for 2, 4 & 6 year reviews):**

**YES: 25**

**NO: 2**

**The Vote passed.**

The motion has been adopted. David McCord will notify the Task Force.

David McCord: My understanding is what the task force will do is send back a more articulated and thorough resolution for action…we need to reconcile this with 4.0 and any other existing policies, documents….

Comment: Does legal have to be involved?

Kyle Carter: If we find some inconsistencies with 4.0 we can work with you in our office and be a liasion with Legal.

Comment: If I get a negative review, normally the only action I can take is to appeal. Why would someone have a second chance in asking for a second review?

Discussion continued around timely notice if not reappointed and Kyle Carter advised that timely notice differs depending on how long you have been here.

Comment: Legal provisions differ.

If you get your review back in April, don’t you have a job the next year because of timely notice?

Kyle Carter: The issue we have run into now and the reason we have asked you to evaluate people even before you have the data in the first year remember you have to have their reappointments in by December something because they are given 90 days to be able to terminate their contract at the end of the current year. And those reviews have always been a little silly in my mind because you don’t have much information...

Faculty Affairs Council /Frank Lockwood, Chair:

Frank asked David McCord to talk about the forms with Student Assessment and David reported that there is a lot of talk on campus about SAI (Student Assessment Instructions) and that it seemed like a good time to have a couple of academic forums to let people ask questions and to debate. Two forums are being planned, one with more focus on technical issues, i.e. statistics and a second forum would focus more on pragmatic use of the instrument, i.e. how would we use it to evaluate somebody’s teaching to go up for reappointment, distributions of scores, what they mean, etc.

The forums are planned for January 25 and February 11th at the UC Theater. A campus wide email will be sent and alternative views will also be presented at the January 25th forum.

Frank Lockwood reported that the Council is still working on childcare, and is looking into support for grants and the process for emeritus professors. They have decided not to look at the Bookstore advisory request.

OTHER

Old Business:

None.

Other New Business:

Richard Beam: This was initially brought up in the November meeting. The Rules Committee has proposed some changes to the By-Laws of the General Faculty as well as the General Faculty Constitution that we need to have a first reading, then will have to vote on at the next meeting in order to follow through on the remainder of the process. I think in terms of the By-Laws other than a couple of grammatical changes the only substantive change, personally, I don’t consider it terribly substantive, was the statement relating to the election of delegates to the faculty assembly that the terms should be arranged to be staggered so that the delegates are not all elected in the same year. ….

Comment: I think there was another change that was substantive for the Constitution. In the By-Laws you started first off deleted the rules relating Liberal Studies Committee, UCC and all these committees from the By-Laws.

Comment: They weren’t there to begin, with that was the problem.

Comment: The By-Laws of the Faculty Senate or the By-Laws…

Comment: We are talking about By-Laws of the Faculty right now. Faculty Senate passed back in November.

Richard Beam: Changes to the By-Laws of the Senate were adopted; that’s a done deal.

In terms of the Constitution, the bulk of the changes were in Article II, Section 10 which dealt with formally revising the Curriculum review process along the lines that we’ve essentially adopted already, making that legal in terms of the language of the Constitution.

Comment: I think there are some fundamental changes that occurred in this draft that is bothersome.

Comment: Now would be the time to start addressing those.

Comment: …I thought in the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate where we define what the role of the Faculty Senate is and what the functional role of the councils are, i.e. create policy and to really guide the governance of the Faculty. These recommendations of the changes to the Constitution fundamentally alter that. It basically puts the all four of the committees looking at the curriculum outside of the council structure and creates a separate structure for these committees. I think the original concept for these committees was implementation; they were not policy generating bodies.

The policy generating bodies were the councils of the Senate. The fundamental question is what is the basis for that direction?

Comment: It has not been the case as far as I understand and when you look at the Handbook when you look at the flow of the curriculum is has never been the case that I’m aware of that the Professional Ed Council is part of the APRC or the Graduate Council isn’t under the APRC. The four groups that are looking at curriculum and it depends on if it is Graduate, or Liberal Studies or if it is neither of those then it is going to the University Council, but excuse me, I left off Education.

So depending on which of those four as to which group it goes to but they still all go up to Senate. Last year or 2 years ago, the Senate voted to not have the University Curriculum Committees go through APRC but directly to Senate.

Comment: That was 2 years ago.

Comment: So, nothing has changed about that. I know Sean can’t be here today because he is in a department head’s meeting but he did ask to respond that if you mentioned things about policy, if I can recall his comment was is not talking about the Liberal Studies Committee creating policy, his comment was the university and the faculty created that policy about Liberal Studies. The policy being to have the Liberal Studies program what if there is the one that Senate just voted on that they are in support of a single Liberal Studies program not that there had to be only one, but they are in support of that. That went through back in October. His point was it’s not a creation of policy.

Comment: It looks like a creation of policy.

Comment: It sure looks like it and it says it. It says when you start giving the Liberal Studies Oversight what is was formally called before, the option to review and revise the Liberal Studies Program you are giving that body policy.

Comment: It’s not created until it goes through this group. It’s recommendations. If you wanted to go to your department and want to propose something.

You didn’t create policy in your department; it doesn’t become policy until it goes through the Senate.

Comment: I’m obviously not communicating very well. The APRC and the Councils of Faculty Affairs etc are the policy making bodies of the Faculty Senate…

Comment: Well, the Senate is the policy making body.

Comment: Yes, but under the Constitution and our By-Laws that responsibility is given as the working elements of the Faculty Senate is pushed down to the councils who then bring recommendations back to the Faculty Senate which makes the final disposition and that’s where the final authority comes. What this does is create curriculum as an extension basically in parallel with your councils and instead of making them bodies that officially implement the policies and the structure that the Faculty Senate has approved it gives them the policy making responsibilities which I think is incorrect.

Comment: Well, we will disagree on interpretation.

Comment: Well, when you…

Comment: I still see it going through Faculty Senate and nothing is being created…

Comment: It would appear to me that what is being proposed is Article II Section 10.6, it clearly says the Faculty Senate will receive all recommendations from the councils and committees and has the final Faculty vote on new programs just as we do now. So, the Senate is ultimately the policy making decision.

Comment: But, what it did is by-pass the councils in all matters of curriculum.

Comment: That’s what is going on now, so it’s not a change from anything. What was voted two years ago is the by-pass the council so…you are arguing something that was two years not what is up for a vote now.

Comment: I am arguing about this particular structure that formalizes that structure by passing the APRC in terms of the matter of curriculum.

Comment: Would you explain the color scheme on this?

Comment: The purple is what is in the amendment to the Constitution (generated from Sean O’Connell).

……………………….

Comment: I added where green is; what I substituted back into this. In some places replacing statements that were in purple. I didn’t delete anything in purple. Where I suggest deletion in capital letters it says DELETE.

Comment: What’s black is still there.

Comment: Yes, there is a lot of black before this and a lot after. This is the only section that is modified.

Comment: No, It’s not the only section, is it?

Comment: Well, major (substantive), yes.

Further discussion was had…

Comment: What I am suggesting in these modifications is this Faculty Senate restore the role of its councils to generate policy in matters of the faculty and we also have other bodies that implement it and we have…

Comment: Point of order, councils cannot establish policy.

Comment: They recommend policy to the Faculty Senate.

Comment: But your statement here on the second page, that the APRC has the responsibility for establishing and modifying academic policies is simply not correct. They cannot. They can bring a recommendation to bring changes to policies to the Senate, but they cannot establish policy.

Comment: There’s not a statement in here as far as I can see that anybody other than LS committee would be able to suggest a revision. If the LS committee is the only body that is able to consider and initiate revisions that makes them pretty much responsible for starting policy and we are the people that say yes or no and I think that’s ….

Comment: The Senate can recommend; the last meeting we did the Senate recommended a revision and a policy. The Senate can do that. The Senate can do that through a council that makes that recommendation to the Senate and the Senate can do that. That’s still in the Constitution as to abilities of the Senate to make recommendations on policy.

Comment: I think bad policy recommendations; that’s my opinion.

Comment: …I think you are correct in that the councils don’t create policy; they recommend policy, but they’re working bodies that the Senate has appointed and created in its Constitution to look at these policies and recommend modifications to the Faculty Senate. That’s, I think, an accurate statement…

Comment: I believe so.

Comment: Ok, this particular change to the Constitution changes that relative to the role of the APRC and the councils, these are the curriculum changes. What it says is now the bodies of the UCC, LS Committee, the Graduate Council and the PEC go directly to the Faculty Senate and make recommendations, I presume recommendations of policy instead of the APRC.

Comment: That’s the way it is now.

Comment: But right now it’s a bit of a mess. Liberal Studies - Right now the only way you can get the Senate to look at something that’s been rejected by Liberal Studies is to make an appeal. Nothing comes up directly to the Senate. This was trying to fix all that.

Comment: No, it all goes to the Senate. It’s in the little folder that says Faculty Senate and we’re not required to make a vote.

Comment: The last time Sean was here, he was very clear. I appreciated that. The only way, if one of your proposals in the LSOC was rejected is if you make a deliberate appeal to higher authority, no one reviews their statements…

Comment: I thought you were talking about what goes through Liberal Studies no one reviews it again. I’m just saying everything that got through if you’re talking about rejected that’s a different thing but everything that’s approved is up for Senate to look at, it’s in the Senate folder. You can choose to argue against it, but it’s not a required…

Comment: But what about those that get rejected in Liberal Studies?

Comment: But those that get rejected yes, I was talking about those that go through…

Comment: So we are giving a subset; a non-Faculty Senate group the authority to veto something we are giving up that authority; that right.

Comment: Well, that’s the way it is now, but the only thing they reject is they have a list of things they watch for, it comes from Beth. If those objects are not there; they reject it or send it back to be corrected.

Comment: You’re rejecting on technical terms is different than what we are talking about here.

……………………………Discussion continued…………………….

Comment from Beth Lofquist: Actually on the spreadsheet that’s given to the Senate every month it has what action. If something was rejected, it is noted on that spreadsheet. It is the Senate’s prerogative to bring anything to action regardless of what has gone on before. It’s just like any other curriculum item that has been passed by those bodies. If you want to bring it to action because you disagree with it being passed, you can or if you want to bring it to action because you disagree that it wasn’t passed, you can. So, it’s not really necessarily a formal appeal, but that you bring it to action before this body.

Comment: If I can just take a step back and ask the Senate what we want in terms of the structure and how we want to structure the fundamental policies which govern the faculty. One of the reasons that Sean sent it to us when we voted on UCC going directly to the Faculty Senate basically was they’re implementing stuff it’s basically a rubber stamp and it was another bottleneck. They were just implementing, looking at and implementing the policies they had in place. Which I fundamentally agree with, what I’m trying to suggest is we want to retain in our council structures the responsibility for generating recommendations for policies at the council level as opposed to pushing it into the UCC, LS and the other bodies which this proposal does. When it says specifically LS has including total revision of this program; to me that’s policy. A total revision of LS program is fundamental policy. If we got a raise, leave it to higher level that’s what I’m suggesting.

Comment: Especially since currently the LS committee is not an elected body and really is not representative of Faculty in terms of people who are on that committee.

Comment: The proposal in front of us that we are engaging in the first reading of changes that.

Comment: Why don’t we wait three years until…

Comment: Article II Section 10.2.a clearly established the LS Committee as an elected body.

Comment: It will be an elected body in three years when the appointed people are shuffled off.

Currently, it’s not. Right?

Comment: I believe at this point the LSOC is the members are appointed by deans.

Comment: Right so, deans are appointing and so 3/8 of that committee is appointed by Wendy Ford. Is that correct?

Comment: At the moment, I believe that’s correct.

Comment: Has Wendy appointed anybody from Math or Science.

Comment: No.

Comment: No, well there’s nobody in there now from Math or Science. There’s one representative from Kimmel School, one representative from Health & Human Sciences, one representative from Education College. It certainly doesn’t represent the number of graduates. The…

Comment: Didn’t we vote on a revision last Weds that would address some of this? A resolution.

Comment: Last Weds resolution was a Task Force which was a totally separate resolution

Comment: To review Liberal Studies, is that right?

Comment: Right.

Comment: But this discussion is about not just Liberal Studies, but those four councils. Liberal Studies seems to be the hot spot.

Comment: I started the discussion by saying structurally what do we want? Do we want to retain the councils that had the responsibility to review and generate recommendations to the Senate and basically all matters or do we want a separate group to recommend things relative to curriculum and treat that differently? Some other things here are changes to the words there and one of the changes to the words in green replaces the “full time equivalent undergraduate students in each unit” as the basis for membership on the LS Committee so the formalization that we used and accepted for the Task Force on the portion of faculty from each college on the number o f degrees granted by each college. Just cut and paste it out of the previous (resolution). That’s specifically to the Liberal Studies, but I started the conversation by asking, structurally, what do you want to do?

Comment: And we are back to the question of electing versus appointing. It says membership in the University Committee will include a representative appointed from each college’s curriculum committee and appointed member from each of the Library, LS Committee, PEC and Graduate Council so those are all appointed people and this is we had this meeting where Provost Carter said what is it that Faculty want to have ownership of and everybody there who voiced an opinion said we should own curriculum. And if we are saying oh, we’ll just have a bunch of appointed people, we don’t own it.

Comment: If you read the next sentence it says there will be elected members.

Comment: Ok, there will be six out of how many?

Comment: What, X, is saying is it is fundamentally to the suggestion to this body. If they are in fact implementing what we as a body and as a council have generated policies to be implemented then there’s much less issue about elected, appointed. We are setting the policies, APRC is reviewing curriculum policy and they just have a responsibility and a very useful responsibility of implementing it. Ok? But when you muck around with allowing them to review and revise and then that’s when you get into that second level that we are not in control of; that process.

Comment: One thing is I see there would be a disjuncture if you don’t have anything from Liberal Studies being aware what’s going on in the colleges’ individual curriculum and unfortunately the way the college’s curriculum committees are made it’s by appointment and so how can you elect from a group when you don’t know who it’s going to be. I think that’s more of a practicality….

Comment: Huh?

Comment: How can you hold an election for which part of the Business College’s Curriculum Committee is going to be elected to the LS Committee if you don’t know who the Business College’s Curriculum Committee is? If it weren’t appointed, but elected from the other curriculum committees…

Comment: Why would it be restricted to the Curriculum Committees?

Comment: I think part of it was to have someone from each college’s curriculum committee being aware and participating in Liberal Studies and again equal representation.

Comment: That’s not what we voted on the Task Force.

Comment: No, I’m just talking about what was stated in here. It’s just hard to elect someone from the group that the body, the numbers from that group is not yet in existence ...

Discussion continued…

Comment: Is there some reason we have to elect them prior to knowledge of who is on these? Well, ok, so on the Liberal Studies Committee it doesn’t say that they are from the Curriculum Committee does it?

Comment: No, it says they’re elected completely. There’s no appointment listed there.

Comment: Well, X, was reading appointment stuff out so that’s what I referring to.

Comment: That’s on the UCC is the appointment.

Comment: Oh, I thought we were talking Liberal Studies, sorry. The UCC there is nothing anywhere that will be handled now about how it is created so this year we got into a bit of a mess. There was none because everybody who we believed had an appointment, their appointment was over. So it turned out there was no UCC, therefore no….nothing could go through the chain as it was required.

So, this was an attempt to get something to happen. Part of the reason to have representatives from each college curriculum was so that person if no one else showed up would hopefully have discussed this proposal once before so they could be a person speaking in favor of that curriculum when it came to the University level.

Comment: So, what are you suggesting, X, what are we supposed to do with this today?

Comment: I would like to make amendments…I would like to….

Comment: We’re not voting on it now, it’s a work in progress, I understand. It will come to us next year.

Comment: It has to be open for reading, then it becomes a viewing and then we have vote and then we have a full vote of the Faculty Senate.

Comment: So, we should be instructing Sean then to consider these points of view?

Comment: What we have been doing is proposing changes to text and voting them up or down. I don’t see why this would be different than that. At the end of the day you have to vote the entire document up or down.

Comment: We’ll discuss this when it comes to it, it’s not coming to a vote today. Is it?

Comment: And to consider X’s recommendation, we need to read them, before we modify them, not modify them as we read them, right? I mean…we had your resolution ahead of time…

Comment: Honestly, I don’t know what the process is……….how this gets into our Constitution…

Comment from Richard Beam: The Senate has an initial reading and a discussion, then after at the subsequent meeting there is a formal vote taken; proposal by the Senate, at which point then it gets sent to an open forum of the general faculty among the entire faculty and there is an open forum held subsequent to that there is a vote of the entire faculty whether or not to adopt the change.

Comment: So in terms of process in answer to your question that you corrected this is what Sean has, the purple is what Sean has recommended that we modify the Constitution with and next session we will then vote whether we accept that or at which such time we could then entertain amendments to that…before it goes out.

Comment: It could be amended.

…………….

Comment from Richard Beam: If I could quasi step out of the chair, for a moment, to insert a personal comment here. Before you…I would encourage you to take a careful look at the proposal that you have circulated at Article II Section 10.6, be deleted. I think that’s the real safety valve there that specifically mandates that whatever, even if we adopt this proposal as come forth from the Rules Committee that the Senate must take action on all of these items. That none of these bodies are policy making, they are simply making recommendations to the Senate. I personally would find it very dangerous to delete that paragraph because it seems to be me that’s where the danger lies in removing the Senate from which is the ultimate decision making body…

Comment: I would go back to my first statement, if in fact these committees are implementation only committees which I strongly recommend, then they don’t have anything. They are not adopting resolutions or adopting policy. If you retain at the APRC level, policy, that is the only body that can make policy and they only recommend to the Senate.

Comment: Therefore they are not making policy, they are making recommendations to policy.

Comment: Question: I think in the very first paragraph the key words in here, suggestion is…The APRC will establish and modify the other four committees will do implementing. Right now, I’m on the College Curriculum Committee. What we do every month is we have a bunch of AA-4s, AA-5s, AA-6s and we discuss and we have to vote yes or no. Is it implementing or establishing? It is not clear to me we on the UCC cannot simply implement or review instead of making a decision. Do we just have to review and make recommendations. Is that what you are saying? I don’t know what you mean by just implement and review. For example, can we still vote?

Comment: Of course. You can still vote because…

Comment: But each vote, each decision will affect policy, right. Either we change a number of credit hours in such and such minor….if it go through then we are not supposed to vote. I’m not arguing, I need help to…correct me…

Comment from Kyle Carter: I would suggest that you try to clarify what you mean by policy because I don’t see the approval of a course or even the increasing of credits in a program as a policy. I can see the Senate saying they would have one general education program for the entire student body as being policy. So, as you debate this, I would suggest you be real careful in what you’re changing in your document. I don’t think you want to give up the right…to make curricular decisions. The approval of programs, courses, etc. I’m a little confused by this discussion because it sounds like you are using policy in a much broader term than what I would expect to find. If I had a policy manual for the institution, I don’t think I would find curriculum in it. I might find the total number of credit hours required for graduation as a policy, attendance as a policy, other kinds of things, but I wouldn’t find a single program of study in it….I think you have a framework of policy that guides curriculum.

Discussion continued. This discussion is the first reading with the issues to be continued further. There may be additional proposals by our next meeting.

Comments from Richard Beam:

I was somewhat disappointed in lack of Faculty Senate response in taking advantage of attending the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees and it’s committees. I was able to go to two of those committee meetings and I believe Dr. Sanger went to a third one. In light of the expressed desire of some faculty to develop a closer relationship with the members of the board, you should be aware that the program prior to the actual formal meeting of the board was sponsored by the Academic Affairs Division and took the form of having 11-12 faculty groups (Interjection by Kyle Carter: I think there were actually 13 scheduled but it was a poster session). A number of faculty simulating a conference poster session so it was a very informal thing; members of the faculty encouraged to meet in small groups with a variety of faculty and talk about the research they are doing with their students which I think was very successful. I also mentioned in the formal Board meeting my desire as a faculty to meet or to have additional opportunities to meet with the Board on a less formal basis and expressed my willingness to work with the Board Chair to develop further opportunities of faculty and board interaction and that appeared to be accepted very graciously by Mr. Warren, the Chair of the Board. I will keep you informed as to what happens with that as it develops.

The meeting was adjourned.

1. This clarifies and corrects comments in the Faculty Assembly External Report of the Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes of December 3, 2009 regarding the use of tuition increase money for faculty salaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)