

Senate Council  
September 22, 2008

The Senate Council met in regular session at 3 pm on Monday, September 22, 2008 in 103 Main Building. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

Chair Randall called the Senate Council (SC) meeting to order at 3:05 pm.

1. Minutes from September 15 and Announcements

There were no changes to the distributed minutes. There being no objections, the Chair stated the minutes from September 15 stood as approved.

The Chair explained that there was one announcement regarding proposed definitions for course categories. After brief discussion, it was determined that a group had put together such a list in the past. The Chair said that the Office of the Senate Council would look into a possible earlier list prior to using the recently created list of definitions and bring the matter back to the SC.

2. Proposed Ad Hoc Committee on a Reading Period

There was discussion on the best way to go about looking at the proposed reading period. After a short discussion, Wood **moved** that that the Senate Council charge three specific [but unnamed here] individuals with determining if a change to the university calendar to allow a reading period prior to finals can be accommodated. If so, those individuals will alert the Senate Council and request the addition of other members named below to create a proposal to enact a reading period prior to finals week for both semesters and both summer sessions: five to seven faculty members; one undergraduate student; one graduate student; representatives from Student Affairs; a representative from the Office of the Registrar; a representative from Auxiliary Services; and a representative from Campus Housing, with the understanding that the Committee may need to call on various other individuals for additional information (e.g. Parking and Transportation Services, Police Department, Athletics). Anderson **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken on the motion. The motion **passed** unanimously with eight in favor.

The Chair noted that the liaison for the Student Government Association, Joe Quinn, would be absent for the duration of the meeting.

3. Joint SC and Provost Group – Broad Look at Salary Adjustment Policies

The Chair referred SC members to the email he had received from Provost Subbaswamy regarding a possible joint Provost-SC group to take a broad look at salary adjustment policies. The Chair noted that the group would not be looking at individual cases, but rather the practices engaged in throughout the university as it pertained to salary adjustments. Upon request from Aken, the Chair asked Yanarella to share information about a faculty pay committee that was prepared in 2003; Yanarella did so.

There was some confusion about what the charge to the committee would be, along with some concerns about appropriateness. SC members decided on a list of eight names of possible faculty members for the committee. SC members offered a couple of additional suggestions for the committee and instructed such information to be transmitted to Provost Subbaswamy. The Chair requested that Provost's Liaison Greissman clarify certain aspects of the committee's scope with Provost Subbaswamy and report back to the SC.

#### 4. Academic Approval Process Work Group – Proposed Membership and Charge

The Chair reminded SC members that during the most recent meeting, the SC approved the concept of a work group to look at the academic approvals process. The current matter at hand would be to determine the work group's charge and membership. There was extensive discussion about both issues.

With the help of other SC members in wordsmithing, Chappell **moved** to approve the following charge to the ad hoc Academic Approval Process work group (AAP):

After gaining an understanding of the existing curricular approval process, the Academic Approval Process work group is charged with describing the manner by which course and program proposals might be processed in a more efficient manner by the University Senate.

Michael **seconded**. After additional discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously. After the vote, the Chair realized that the work group's membership was not explicitly part of the motion. There being no objections, he ruled that the membership, which included faculty, staff and administrators, as discussed by the SC was also approved.

#### 5. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.3.1.2.A.2 (Election of SC Members)

The Chair invited the chair of the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, Michael, to explain the proposal. Michael said that there was a complex two- or three-step process by which SC members were elected. After having given these rules a few years to operate, it was concluded that it would be best to simplify and clarify the process; the election was thus changed to a one-round process.

Piasek **moved** to approve the changes to *SR 1.3.1.2.A.2* and send them to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective immediately. Swanson **seconded**. There was some discussion about statistical probability of problems with the revised language.

After discussion ceased, the Chair called for a **vote** on the **motion**, which **passed** unanimously with eight in favor.

#### 6. Proposed Change to Senate Rules 1.5.2

Michael explained that second change pertained to the faculty trustee election – language in the *Senate Rules (SR)* specifically permitted a brief biosketch and photo in the second round of voting, but not the

first. Michael reported that he had received numerous complaints from voters about the lack of a photo and biosketch during the initial round of voting.

After some discussion about the stricken language in *SR 1.5.2.C*, Michael agreed to restore the language and add a phrase to indicate that a photo could be included on the ballot. This would make it explicitly clear that the biosketch was required in both rounds, and that a photo and statement, while optional, were also appropriate for both rounds.

Chappell **moved** to send the proposed revisions from the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee, including the revisions to the language to restore the stricken [by the Senate's Rules and Elections Committee] first sentence of *SR 1.5.2.C*, and the addition of language to that sentence to allow a photo be sent to the Senate with a positive recommendation, to be effective immediately. Anderson **seconded**. There being no further discussion, a **vote** was taken and the motion **passed** unanimously with eight in favor.

The Chair noted that there was sufficient time remaining in the meeting to hear an update from Greissman regarding recent changes to the *Administrative Regulations (AR)*. Greissman referred SC members to his handout and explained that the revised *AR II-1.0-1 Parts I – III* contained the following two substantive changes: 1. six (and not three) letters from outside reviewers, with at least four of the six from letter writers selected by the educational unit administrator selected independently of the candidate; and 2. academic area advisory committees will be asked by the Provost to submit letters of evaluation only in cases for which the unit/college-level opinions are clearly mixed. Area committees are permitted to submit letters - positive or negative - on cases not identified by the Provost. Greissman referred to this as "Version A." These two aspects were the only substantive changes made to the policy, although there were other changes made to reflect the provost organizational model and make the existing regulations more readable.

Greissman explained that certain aspects of the Top 20 Faculty Policies document that was circulated met with almost universal disagreement – those items (substitution of majority written statement instead of individually written letters and a change to a third- or fourth-year review instead of in the second year) were not pursued.

Greissman referred to a "Version B" – this contained all the aspects of Version A, but also included the following aspects: a tenure-eligible faculty employee is entitled to [only] one comprehensive tenure review, to be conducted no later than the next-to-last year of the probationary period; terms articulated for reconsideration in the terminal year of a negative tenure decision; the Dean of the Graduate School will no longer be required to write letters of evaluation on promotion and tenure cases; and educational unit faculties will be required to establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of activity assigned to the unit faculty. (Richard noted that the last two items would be accomplished only through a change to the *Governing Regulations*.)

Although there was some discussion on the merits of Versions A and B, the Chair and Greissman reiterated that the purpose of the discussion was to identify for Provost Subbaswamy the best method by which to vet Version B with faculty. Greissman noted that another consideration would be whether all faculty would fall under (if approved) Version B, or if only new faculty would come in under Version B and existing faculty employees would be governed by Version A until all faculty hired prior to institution of Version B had been released or become tenured. He noted that the Provost believe Version B to be superior and would not negatively affect junior faculty. However, Greissman was clear in stating that while offering an opinion, Provost Subbaswamy anticipated that the SC would identify a manner in which to proceed with vetting and how to deal with two versions of the same policy, if it came down to that.

SC members determined it would be most appropriate for the Senate's Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure to review the proposed changes and report back to the SC by November.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted by David C. Randall,  
Senate Council Chair

SC members present: Aken, Anderson, Chappell, Ford, Michael, Piascik, Randall, Swanson, Tagavi, Wood, and Yanarella.

Provost's Liaison present: Greissman.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on Wednesday, September 24, 2008.