

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, March 28, 2002, 3:30 P.M.
Yankee Meadows Room, Hunter Conference Center

I. Call to order (including introductions and acknowledgements) at 3:32 p.m. (quorum of senators arrived) by President Steve Evans. Those attending: Senators Steve Evans (Pres.), Brian Heuett (Pres. Elect), Joe Baker (Treasurer), David Lund (Secretary), Darin Wadley for himself and as proxy for Virginia Stitt (Parliamentarian), Rick Lambson, Robert Eves, Ben Davidson, Steve Barney, Eric Brown, Idir Azouz, Ron Martin, Steve Heath, Rea Gubler, Deborah Hill, Greg Colf, Tom Cunningham, Jim Mills, Julie Simon as proxy for James Aton, Roy Johnson, and Kay Anderson; Visitors: Provost Carl Templin, Assoc. Provost Mike Richards. Absent: Curt Bostick (excused), Boyd Fife (excused), Eric Brown

II. Review and approval of minutes from meeting of February 28, 2002. No corrections were recommended by the senate. Joe Baker moved that the minutes be approved; the motion was seconded by Ben Davidson; the motion then carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the Faculty Senate.

III. Priority Items:

A. Faculty Development and Evaluation (Tom Cunningham): Steve Evans reminded us that there is a great deal of pressure to get this evaluation in place—mostly from accreditation bodies. Tom Cunningham also indicated that in a meeting with the provost, it was determined some policy changes needed to be made to align ourselves with accreditation bodies. It is clear that student evaluations are no longer sufficient as a tool to evaluate faculty. To address all of these concerns, the committee is recommending that the portfolio review form be used for 3rd year review, rank, tenure, and post tenure review (every 5 years)—these reviews need to be comprehensive and should review everyone who teaches on campus, including adjuncts (although the evaluation of adjuncts would not be as rigorous, and weighted very heavily by student evaluations). These recommendations by the committee are in line with the accreditation demands of Northwest Accreditation. The committee also thought it would be appropriate to have only one department evaluation committee; and evaluation would be conducted by students, department chairs, department evaluation committees, and would also include a self-evaluation.

These policies will be integrated into the current policy and appropriate changes in the current policy will be recommended to create a consistent policy document for faculty evaluation. In addition to teaching effectiveness, scholarly/creative activity and service need to be appropriately evaluated. The committee feels that teaching effectiveness should be evaluated in a similar manner across the campus; but scholarly activity and service evaluations should be dictated by individual departments. Brian Heuett wanted to know if teaching should be the most important item in evaluation, and Tom Cunningham indicated that a survey of departments across campus indicated that the majority of the faculty felt this should be the case. The committee came up with a weighting system—50-70% teaching, 10-30% service, and 10-30% scholarly activity. Ron Martin was concerned that weighting

things could possibly devalue one or more of the categories. Tom asked if we were a teaching institution or not? Robert Eves indicated that the weighting of the forms also came from department feedback, and that most department feedback indicated a strong desire to retain our identity as a teaching institution. Deb Hill was concerned that we need to value scholarly/creative work more highly than we have in the past in order to keep up with current research and trends among universities. Brian Heuett reminded us that we could adjust the forms to reflect what we thought was important. He also reminded us that it was important that all three categories must be represented; but he said it is not time spent on the various activities that counts in the evaluations, rather it is quality of the activities that counts. Robert Eves indicated that this type of evaluation document was a contract with the department chair created at the beginning of the evaluation period. Ron Martin wanted to know if it would be possible to adjust the weighting differently than the proposed documents indicated; could they be more flexible? Tom indicated that this could be done, but again reminded us that the current weighting system was a result of department feedback. Idir wanted to know if there was a minimum amount of the contract that was to be applied to any category of activities. Tom said there is—10% for service and scholarly/creative work and 30% for teaching effectiveness.

Tom wanted to know if the senate thought the leave, rank, and tenure policy should also be rewritten to conform with this document. Deb wanted to know if adjuncts must be subjected to the same evaluation procedures. Tom indicated that this was not the case—they are not required to do service and scholarship. This is dealt with in policy 8.3.1 8.3.1. There was some talk of putting this process on-line, but we do not have the software capability and it would take over 1.3 millions dollars to obtain the tools necessary to do so.

It was decided that the two committees, the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee and the Leave, Rank, and Tenure Rewrite Committee need to get together to create a consistent, campus-wide policy. The committees will get together to accomplish this goal.

B. Curriculum Policy: Steve Evans said that the most important piece of this policy was getting the membership of the committee established. Brian Heuett reminded us of the reason for this policy change--at present, the Deans make curriculum decisions for all major changes that occur. The 6.8.1 policy is designed to create a representative faculty committee to review curriculum and get it ready for the Deans to review when it is appropriate—when it must be sent on to the Board of Regents. The policy change would increase committee membership to one appointed member and one elected member per department, with a chair appointed by the Deans Council from among their members. The Deans have accepted the policy, we need to pass the structure portion of the committee, so the Deans can get committee members appointed/elected and the committee can move forward next year. The purpose is to help curriculum move through channels more quickly. The impetus for this change is primarily to provide the faculty with more responsibility regarding curriculum in accordance with Northwest Accreditation.

Robert Eves has some philosophical questions regarding the curriculum policy. First, the name of the committee needs to be consistent. Next, who is the Deans Council

representative on the committee, and are they elected or appointed to the committee? Robert Eves moved that the name be “The University Committee on Curriculum Planning,” seconded by Jim Mills. In discussion, Rick Lambson suggested that we use “University Curriculum Committee,” and the motion was so amended. With no further discussion, the motion was carried in the affirmative by unanimous vote of the senate.

Returning to the question regarding the Deans Council representative, Deb Hill and Robert Eves felt the Deans representative should be an academic dean. Ben Davidson wondered why the chair even had to be a Dean or a member of the Deans Council. Carl Templin said that pragmatically, a Dean was the chair to utilize the Dean’s secretary to support the committee. The chair is non-voting currently. Greg Colf moved that we amend 6.8.1.A.1 to read that the Dean be specifically an academic dean who does not vote. Steve Heath seconded the motion. In discussion, the reasons for a dean were reiterated—secretary, direct communication with the deans council. A vote was called and the motion carried in the affirmative by vote of 19 in favor and one abstention. Robert Eves moved that the provost office representative in 6.8.1.A.3 should be an ex-officio member; this motion seconded by Rea Gubler approved in the affirmative by unanimous senate vote.

Robert Eves then suggested that 6.8.1.A.8 should be amended to say that all faculty committee members be required to be tenured. In the ensuing discussion it was noted that the original wording Robert proposed was that they should be tenured, not required to be tenured. Joe Baker moved that the wording should be changed to say “should be tenured;” the motion was seconded by Rick Lambson; the motion was then passed in the affirmative by a vote of 18 senators in favor and 2 abstentions.

Steve Heath moved to change 6.1.b.3 to reflect that the chair is a non-voting committee member; this motion was seconded by Steve Barney; the vote of the faculty senate was unanimous in the affirmative.

Robert Eves moved to amend the entire document to say College/School Curriculum Committee and Department Curriculum Committee, seconded by Ben Davidson, carried in affirmative by unanimous vote.

The semantics in the first sentence of section 6.8.ii.b can’t be changed to be more specific, so it was decided to leave it. The second sentence was questioned, since the idea was to empower the faculty over the Deans Council--why send any curriculum to the Deans Council? We are trying to avoid this level of management. According to Provost Templin, the intention in this sentence is to have the Deans Council review any curriculum that uses resources beyond that of the department or school. Robert Eves thought it ought to be changed by striking the Deans Council and inserting provost since he ultimately decides funding matters anyway; the motion was seconded by Greg Colf; in the subsequent vote the motion carried in the affirmative with 19 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

In C & D there is concern with wording, and Julie Simons wanted to know how this is going to happen—that is how the committee would “In concert with deans and department chairs effect curriculum improvements and changes . . .”, and

accordingly, the word effect was discussed—what does the word effect really mean, is there a better word or a better way to say this?

At this time (approximately 4:50 p.m., it should be noted that Faculty Senate Secretary, David Lund, had to leave the meeting; and Faculty Senate Treasurer Joe Baker took over the note-keeping responsibilities.)

Robert Eves suggested that the term “effect” in II.C needed to be defined. Discussion ensued, with several different terms suggested. Greg Colf made a motion to combine sections C and E into the following:

“Review curriculum, independent study, study abroad, exchange programs, internships, and interdisciplinary courses, and facilitate curriculum improvements and changes as appropriate, in concert with deans and department chairs.”

Ron Martin seconded this motion; the motion was carried in the affirmative by a vote of 18 in favor with 1 abstention.

Robert Eves suggested that the term “arbitrate consistency” in II.F needed to be defined. Discussion ensued, and it was decided that no action was necessary on II.F

Robert Eves suggested that the term “monitor the policy” in II.G needed to be defined. Discussion ensued. Robert Eves then made a motion to strike II.G from policy 6.8.1; Rea Gubler seconded this motion, and the motion passed in the affirmative by senate vote with no opposition.

Ron Martin posed the following question: Should the faculty have the means to override the dean’s decisions on curriculum? Robert Eves stated that the faculty already had input by being a part of the curriculum committee; and only the Provost can “yea-nea” a curriculum decision and the Provost is an academic. Ron Martin stated that even with these policies in place, faculty input was weak. No action was taken.

Rick Lambson indicated that the policy (I.B.C.1) was ambiguous on how the department curriculum committee members were chosen. Robert Eves stated that the department chair would decide; they could be appointed or elected. Ben Davidson pointed out that the department chair could control the committee through appointments. Robert Eves motioned that I.B.C.1 be changed as follows:

“At least two elected representatives of the faculty; and”

The motion was seconded by Ben Davidson and then carried in the affirmative by vote of the senate with no opposition.

Deb Hill then motioned that policy 6.8.1 be approved as amended; Greg Colf seconded this motion and the motion carried by unanimous senate vote with no opposition.

Ben Davidson made a motion for executive session, second by Deb Hill, motion carried without opposition.

IV. Officers' Reports

A. President

1. Election of Faculty Senators for 2002-2003: President Steve Evans then discussed upcoming faculty senate elections. Policy and procedure for these elections will be sent out via email. Six senators will need to be replaced: Jim Aton, Jim Mills, Idir Azouz, Greg Colf, Ben Davidson, and Rick Lambson. The senior retiring senator in the college is responsible for conducting elections.

B. President-elect

1. SUU Board of Trustees—no report given

C. Treasurer

1. General Report on Provost Search—no report given

2. Report on Finances—no report given

V. Organizational Reports

A. Annual Awards by Faculty, Staff, and Students—no report given

VI. Other Business—none brought up.

VII. Motion for Executive Session was made by Ben Davidson, the motion was seconded by Deb Hill and carried in the affirmative by vote of the senate with no opposition.

VIII. Adjournment at 5:30