

Notes on Senate Council Meeting on April 7, 2008

1. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm. Members present: Anderson (DA), Finkel (RF), Piascik (PP), Randall (DR), Swanson (HS), Tagavi (KT, chair), Wood (CW), Yanarella (EY), and Richard Greissman (RG). Associate Provost Heidi Anderson also attended on behalf of the Provost. All votes were conducted by show of hands and are recorded as "for/against/abstained."
2. The minutes of the SC meeting of March 31, 2008 were approved. There were no announcements.
3. Guest, Heidi Anderson, joined the Senate Council (SC) members in continuing discussion of the Faculty Policy Issues.

Policy 2 (assigned to HS): Discussion revealed that SC members agreed that published, carefully-worded policies for any given college would be useful stating those conditions under which a seventh year reconsideration of tenure and promotion could be conducted, particularly given that present practice seemingly relies upon uncertain and unstated criteria that has the potential to be capriciously applied. The role played by the dean of a college vs. the recommendation of the college's faculty evoked considerable discussion. It was moved (RF) and seconded (PP) and carried (6/0/0) to "Report to the Provost that SC generally favors Policy 2, but that such policy requires very careful wording to clarify all issues, especially including the role of the dean."

Policy 3 (assigned to DA): PP noted that the issues addressed by this policy were those that originally lead to the Special Title Series (STS) line. This policy, therefore, requires particularly careful attention. She further opined that the expectations for promotion are not found in a person's DOE, but in the expectations of the department and college for promotion. Only careful development of Policy 2 will dispel the concerns in many quarters of the University about any changes in the STS.

It was moved (DA) and seconded (CW) that SC "Inform the Provost that we are generally in agreement with Policy 3. We suggest, however, that the next-to-last sentence be changed to read as follows (revised wording in italics): "Where the scholarly activity of a newly hired faculty person is deemed to be highly interdisciplinary, the chair, in consultation with the unit faculty, should prepare a statement of *expectations* and procedures for soliciting the opinions of scholars external to the department and beyond the disciplinary boundaries typically applied by the department." The motion carried (6/0/0).

In addition, with respect to the second sentence of Policy 3 as formulated by the Provost it was moved (CW) and seconded (HS) and carried (6/0/0) that the SC "would like clarification of the phrase 'in consultation with the dean' to clarify whether the opinion of the faculty of the respective college or of the dean holds final approval."

Policy 5 (assigned to RF): RF noted that, in his opinion, the Area Committees needed to see all dossiers, if only so that they could see a range of applications for tenure and promotion and thereby be "calibrated" as to their expectations for support or denial of tenure and/or promotion. They could, in his opinion, conduct an expedited review of cases that received unanimous agreement by "lower" review groups. RF submitted proposed re-wording of the text of this policy (see page 16 of the March 31,

2008 agenda). CW expressed concern over the use of the word "unanimous" in RF's rewording since "unanimous" may imply that only a single faculty member, by a negative recommendation, could, by a possible interpretation of this wording, halt expedited review of a candidate's dossier. Time constraints interrupted further consideration of Policy 5 by the SC members.

4. It was moved (CW) and seconded (PP) to forward the [revised language for appointment to full graduate faculty](#) to the Senate. Recommendation of SC was not required in this instance because the [Senate had previously directed](#) that the Dean of the Graduate School forward the revised language. Motion carried (6/0/0) with no recommendation.

5. It was moved (DR) and seconded (PP) and carried (6/0/0) that the [request to waive the retroactive withdrawal two-year rule](#) (item 2 on SC Agenda for April 7, 2008) "be referred to the Reinstatement Committee and that the student be invited to provide written support for the request to this committee."

6. With respect to the agenda for the April 14 meeting of the University Senate, members of SC directed the Chair to move all "action items" listed on the [tentative agenda](#) (last page, SC agenda for April 7) for the April 14 meeting to the top. He is also directed to consider scheduling a University Senate meeting for the first Monday in May (May 5) at which time all reports previously tentatively scheduled for April 14, are to be given. The Chair was given discretion to arrange matters as he deemed most appropriate upon consultation with those individuals, including the Provost, who were scheduled to give reports.

5. SC adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted

David C. Randall