

Faculty Senate Minutes

March 19, 2007

Present: Barry Anton (chair), Rich Anderson-Connolly, Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Hart Edmonson, Robin Foster, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Priti Joshi, Juli McGruder, Hans Ostrom, Amy Ryken, Ross Singleton.

Anton called meeting to order at 4:32pm

Announcements

1. Anton welcomed to new member, Hart Edmonson, President of ASUPS

2. Anton noted that the Professional Standards Committee has requested the Senate to call a faculty meeting for Tues, May 1st to discuss revisions to Chapter 3, sect 6 & 7 of the *Faculty Code*. No objections were raised and Anton will announce the meeting.

2. Anton noted that a call for nominations will go out on facultycoms for several positions:

- One position on the FAC (Sue Hannaford is going off)
- Two positions on the Faculty Senate (Sousa vacancy & Haltom sabbatical)
- Election of Faculty Senate chair
- Three (3) positions on the Faculty Salary Committee

Nominations shall run for one week and last year's method of using a combination of paper, the Senate suggestion box, and email for nominations was very successful and will be continued. Voting itself occurred via electronic envelop and a brief conversation indicated that all present felt that should be followed again this year. Anderson-Connolly suggested that as the language in the *Bylaws* actually says "paper ballot," we ought to change it. A committee consisting of Anderson-Connolly and Anton was formed to revise the language to reflect our electronic ways.

3. Anton reported that he had, as per the Senate's request, sent out a "framing statement" to explain the issue to be discussed at the March 20 Faculty meeting regarding the proposed amendments to the *Faculty Bylaws* (membership on the FAC and section on "Responsibilities of the Faculty").

4. Foster reported that efforts to provide child care at the Faculty meeting had proved more intractable and "multi-layered" than simply finding a room. Consequently, there will not be child care at the March 20 meeting.

5. Bartanen reported on the Senate request that the university attorney be available to speak about the inclusion of "personal and professional characteristics" in evaluation letters: the attorney is available to speak at the April 17th Faculty Meeting on this topic, as well as internal and external recommendation letters generally.

6. Anton announced that members of the PSC will attend our next meeting.

Haltom's minutes of March 5, 2007 were approved as amended.

New Business

Anton read statement from a colleague who wished the Senate to discuss review procedures for Faculty Awards (Nelson & Lantz)

As these procedures are not under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Senate, what followed was a discussion in which senators shared their ideas and thoughts about how the process may be revised with Senator/Dean Bartanen.

Bartanen read brief excerpts from the proposal and application process, contained in the University Resources for Faculty Development document and mentioned that each award specifies the composition of the selection committee: four dept chairs from non-applicant departments and the three academic deans. She noted that this year there were more applications (14 for Nelson, with 6 awards granted; 10 for Lantz, with 4 awards). This year the committee gave one extra Nelson with funds coming from the one less Lantz awarded. Bartanen also alerted the group to an issue that came up for the first time this year but that she believes will occur again in the years to come: that there were some applicants for a Lantz who had already received Lantz twice before. The awards committee discussed whether such applicants should be given lower preference, but ultimately decided that to do so would be to be making a “decision after the fact,” without first alerting applicants. Hence, the committee considered all applications equally. Finally, Bartanen mentioned that she had just come from a meeting with Ron Thomas, Dave Beers and Jane Kenyon that was focused on writing a grant proposal for funding junior sabbaticals.

The wide-ranging discussion followed. It has been loosely thematically organized by this amanuensis for purposes of clarity.

- Ostrom noted that the first time he applied for a Lantz, an outside reader from another institution was asked to evaluate his proposal.
- Singleton emphasized that there ought to be clarity about whether folks who’ve had two Lantz will be considered for a third. He suggested not that such applicants be barred from applying but that perhaps the language could suggest that those who had already received two Lantz would be given lower preference than those who have never had one.
- Haltom agreed with Singleton, reasoning that if you’re in a “cohort” you’re getting locked out time after time. He also approved of the idea of giving more Nelsons because those are more pressing. “A prudent investment in our junior faculty,” he said
- Bartanen mentioned that this year there were three “third-timers” applications.
- Foster wondered if there was some flexibility in terms of one applying in a different year from one’s (highly competitive) cohort or of allocating awards in accordance with the number of individuals in that cohort.
- McGruder noted that one can self-select out of one’s cohort by delaying sabbatical.
- Bartanen pointed out that for Nelsons, there is a two year window; faculty can apply in the 2nd or 3rd year, generally for leave in the 3rd or 4th year.

- Bristow noted that one thing she had been hearing is that there was some confusion as to what the selection criteria are. Is it scholarship, teaching, service?
 - Ostrom wondered if the awards are developmental or rewarding those who have demonstrated scholarly achievement.
 - Joshi was surprised to hear that excellence in teaching was a criteria for the Nelsons and wondered how this was assessed as teaching evaluations were not included by the candidate with her proposal.
 - Bartanen responded that recommendation letters speak to teaching excellence.
 - McGruder underscored that evaluations should not be included but that a CV should be required. She also argued for outside evaluators, but felt that there was no need to offer a stipend, that such evaluations were a “professional courtesy” rendered regularly in the profession.
 - Ryken argued that as we do not require outside letters in tenure, a far bigger decision, we should not on award applications.
-
- Haltom raised the question of “outcome” or product at the end of the leave. For purposes of highlighting product, he argued that a CV should be included with the proposal. He also suggested that award recipients be required to offer a public presentation on the work accomplished upon returning from the leave.
 - Ostrom noted that some folks use the language of having a year “off” and that this is counterproductive and bad for morale.
 - Foster noted that a public presentation is a good idea, no more than we ask of summer stipend students.
 - Bristow noted that there currently exist “outlets” for such presentations, such as the Thompson Hall series or Humanities Colloquium.
 - Anderson-Connolly wondered if second- time applicants should not be asked to speak in subsequent applications to their accomplishments during the previous leave year.
-
- McGruder argued that the part that requires applicants to connect research to teaching is difficult for those who seldom get to teach courses in their immediate research area.
 - Joshi noted that she was not suggesting that teaching be used as a criteria, but that given it is she did not believe that internal departmental letters are the best indicators of merit in teaching
-
- Bartanen indicated that she would work on revising and clarifying the Nelson and Lantz guidelines over the summer.

Old Business

Ostrom presented a draft of “crafted language” to reflect proposals made in the Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Standards’ Report for items 1, a & b (p. 4). (Ostrom had volunteered at the Feb 19th meeting to draft language). Ostrom’s proposed language is below:

Faculty Code, Chapter III, Section 4 **Revised after the Senate Meeting of 3/19/07**
 Proposed **new part f**:

If, during an evaluation, a member of the faculty explicitly raises a question or a concern regarding the professional ethical behavior of an evaluatee and is unwilling or unable to resolve the matter with the evaluatee, the faculty-member shall initiate a grievance-process, and the department, program, school, or Faculty Advancement Committee shall suspend the evaluation until the grievance-process concludes. The faculty-member may ask the Dean of the Faculty to initiate the grievance-process instead. Concerning grievances not related to the circumstance described above, please consult Chapter I, Part E, Section 3 and Chapter VI of the *Faculty Code*.

If, during an evaluation, a member of the faculty explicitly raises a question or a concern regarding the professional ethical behavior of an evaluator (related to the this person's role as an evaluator) and is unwilling or unable to resolve the matter with the evaluator, the faculty-member shall initiate a grievance-process, and the department, program, school, or Faculty Advancement Committee shall suspend the evaluation until the grievance-process concludes. The faculty-member may ask the Dean of the Faculty to initiate the grievance-process instead. Concerning grievances not related to an evaluator, in his or her role as an evaluator, please consult Chapter I, Part E, Section 3 and Chapter VI of the *Faculty Code*.

–Bristow underscored that the intent of the proposal was to make a distinction and separation between the evaluation and grievance process.

– Ryken questioned the necessity of “criteria for evaluation” in the parenthesis in both paragraphs.

A discussion followed about how in certain cases matters such a “sexual harassment” may not be related to the “evaluation” but may be necessary to discuss.

–Foster noted that there is not equivalence between an evaluator's and evaluatee's positions, that issues that may have bearing on consideration of evaluatee's case, may not be relevant to dismissing an evaluator from a case.

– Haltom argued that the material in the parenthesis served to protect those about whom questions came up. He deemed it best to keep the parenthesis.

– Anderson-Connolly suggested fleshing out the language in the parenthesis

– Ostrom argued for taking out the parenthetical altogether.

– Bartanen pointed out that Chapter I already discusses ethical conduct, so this parenthetical could read “related to role of faculty as described in Chapter 1.”

– Foster pointed out that the parallelism between two paragraphs in the Ostrom draft was troubling and she noted that in the AHCP's report the parenthetical on evaluator read specifically related to ethical misconduct related to the evaluator's “role as evaluator.”

M/S/P to adjourn: 5:54pm.

Submitted by Priti Joshi