Meeting of December 5, 2000

This was the last Senate meeting before the break, and there was a skimpy agenda. Hopes that we could leave early were dashed, though, as several important issues came up. Interim Provost Eddy solicited suggestions for Senate/Administrative cooperation (several were made), the changing role of the campus wide Promotion and Tenure Committee was discussed, as was the problem that new faculty starts teaching before they are paid or covered by insurance. Some Senators said that CIO Klimczak’s statement, made at the Nov. 21st Senate meeting, that computer choices were mandated by the unit ITs was inaccurate. They claimed he had mandated the choices. We agreed to check with our unit ITs before our next meeting. Finally we discussed the Blueprint planning process and closed the meeting by talking about procedures for emergency medical help. There were even some resolutions at this meeting -- we voted one down and passed another. For the exciting details, read on.

Call for cooperation from Interim Provost Eddy

Though Bill Eddy had visited with the Senate before, this was the first time he was officially here as Interim Provost. He asked the Senate how he could improve Senate participation in the decision-making process. Several suggestions were made:

- There should be regular briefings from the Vice Chancellors. The Senate would then be aware of upcoming issues and familiarity with the Vice Chancellors might help in times of crisis.

- The Chair of the Senate used to sit with the Council of Deans, but the practice had been discontinued under Interim Chancellor Lamb and Interim Provost Smelstor. Though the Chair would be bound by confidentiality in some areas, participation in the meetings allowed the him/her to guide the Senate towards emerging issues and to provide, sometimes, a different perspective at the dean’s meetings. Senators thought that the policy should be reinstated and Eddy’s initial response seemed favorable, though he clearly wanted to think about the issue.

- It seemed important to relate some of the Blueprint proposals to areas like curriculum. One problem was that there were many faculty committees and some coordination, probably through the Senate, was needed.

- Faculty didn’t have the time to examine detailed budget figures, but could usefully comment when decisions on programs and directions were being
made. We thought it would be useful if the Senate Budget Committee was brought into the process at those times. Bill Eddy seemed willing to do this.

- Several Senators said it would be useful if the Senate were alerted to issues that were coming down the pike, so that we could participate in decision making rather than merely reacting to decisions that were already made.

**Committee Reports**

- **Administrative Affairs:** This committee is working on the dean’s evaluations, and the process will be the same as in the past. New this year is the informal two-year evaluation. The results of these were to be turned back to the deans, and they were similar in many ways to the 3 year review of faculty on tenure track. There was some confusion about the process.

  The Senate decided that it would be best to offer the deans the option of a two-year review, though the deans could turn these down. The dean and the faculty executive committee of the unit would have access to the results. The deans that are eligible for a two-year evaluation are Powell (Law) and Reed (Dentistry).

  A special case was in the Education School where Dean Gallos was appointed without faculty input. At the time Interim Provost Smelstor promised a one-year review. Though Tony Manzo (Chair of the Education School faculty) had apparently not formally requested that a review be made, the Senate thought a promise to the faculty had the status of a contractual agreement, and that the evaluation should go forward.

- **Academic Issues:** The Academic Issues committee had not met, but a member of the committee generated a discussion about the campus wide Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Senate ultimately passed a modest resolution.

  Vice Provost Augie Mendoza chairs the Committee. Since this committee deals with central faculty issues, shouldn’t the chair be a faculty member with Mendoza as ex officio staff support? There are several present and past members of the Committee in the Senate, and that question led to a discussion of its role. The Committee was advisory to the Chancellor, and mostly acted when there were procedural errors. It reviewed split decisions, in which there was disagreement between the unit or department, the chair and the dean. Sometimes it acted if there was tenure without promotion, or promotion without tenure. Sometimes ad hoc committees were created. Sometimes the Committee acted if all parties agreed on the recommendations but there were split decisions along the way.

  There was some question about whether the responsibility for promotion and tenure decisions had slowly shifted from the units, departments and deans to the Campus P&T committee. To the degree that responsibility had changed, it was a slow shift that had not been adequately examined. A Blueprint committee was also examining promotion and tenure procedures. It is fair to say that there was confusion as to the actual role of the various committees. Finally the Senate passed a resolution directing the Academic Affairs Committee to investigate the role and composition of the Campus Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee and come up with a reasoned recommendation for the Senate at its February meeting.
Faculty Welfare: There was some discussion at the committee meeting of the Faculty Shares Program. Could that money be used to offset medical cost increases? The answer, apparently, is “no.” The money being used for the Faculty Shares awards is one-time money, generated by large gains from general fund investments in the stock market. In addition to the desire to use one-time funds for one-time projects there is an additional factor. The amount of money is relatively small, since there are about 1,300 faculty members and about $170,000 in the Faculty Share pot. On the other hand several Senators said that they thought the bonus program was poorly conceptualized and didn’t seem to have a clear purpose. It was also being applied poorly. One Senator finally summed it all up many of the statements by saying that he had never seen anything created with less likelihood of success.

The discussion with the Faculty Welfare concluded with a short discussion of the University’s contract procedure, especially in regard to new faculty. They begin teaching in August but don’t get paid until the end of September, and aren’t covered by insurance until the beginning of September. Senators thought the University ought to be able to change contract dates so new contracts would begin in August. The issue was referred to the IFC. We also agreed to ask the AAUP what other universities do.

Other issues: Hali Fieldman (Conservatory) was nominated for a one-year appointment to the Grievance Panel. She replaced Janet McClinney (Law Library). The Senate confirmed the nomination.... A Budget Committee has now been created. Gary Ebersole (Religious Studies), Michael Golden (Library), Andrew Holder (Chemistry) and Tony Manzo (Education) are members. A chair has not yet been selected. The Senate Budget Committee would need to coordinate with the Blueprint Budget Committee.... There was some confusion over the Blueprint committees, since they seemed to be open but faculty didn’t know which committees existed or how to volunteer.... There was a brief discussion of campus emergency procedures, and some confusion.Apparently the correct procedure in a medical emergency is to call the campus police at 1515. They will supply first aid and call 911 if necessary. If 911 is called directly ambulances will not know which building and room to go to. We didn’t know if this was the best procedure and wanted to find out. Also we thought the correct procedure ought to be publicized, since the initial response of many is to call 911 directly.... Several faculty members in the College had asked for the Senate to set up a direct faculty vote on the Post-Tenure Review procedures, and a resolution was proposed stating that the Senate ought to organize a campus wide vote on the procedure. Senators said that it was too late to organize a vote since the plan had been submitted. They also noted that the plan had been discussed and reported on often, and that no faculty showed up to the open meeting in which the plan was discussed. The Resolution was defeated with 2 abstentions.... Senators briefly discussed computer policies and agreed to ask their unit IT representatives about the reasons for the computer configurations offered to the campus.... The Senate Report of Nov. 21st was formally accepted.

Respectfully submitted

Harris Mirkin
Faculty Secretary