

Faculty Senate Minutes September 29, 1997

Senators present: K. Barhydt, B. Beardsley, N. Bristow, T. Cooney (ex-officio), C. Hale, W. Haltom, K. Hummel-Berry, G. Kirchner (chair), B. Lind, S. Sloane, R. Steiner, G. Tomlin, A. Wood

Visitors: D. Balaam, K. Bartanen, P. Huo, C. Kline, C. Mehlhaff

Meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

Minutes of 15 September 1997 were approved without emendation.

Announcement: Ballots for the senate seat left vacant by Marta Robertson have been mailed.

Chair's Report:

1. Academic Standards Committee discussed 1997-1998 charges at first meeting and found them satisfactory.
2. Curriculum Committee seeks clarification of its charge regarding accreditation.
3. Student Life Committee seeks clarification of charges regarding review of report that preceded deferred rush ten years ago.

8 October 1997 Faculty Meeting:

Kirchner noted that revisions of The Faculty Code and further considerations of core curriculum were potential business for the next faculty meeting. Balaam then presented two more topics on which he would like faculty to deliberate: subsidies for college education of children of faculty and staff and disparate teaching loads.

Balaam noted that the Faculty Salary Committee has been and will be considering policies and programs for college education for progeny of faculty. He stated that his research uncovered very few exchanges of faculty and staff children between schools outside the Northwest and UPS. He doubted that many faculty or staff wanted to limit their children's choices to this region. He also noted that some faculty have postponed procreation and so might qualify for early retirement before their children were college-age. He opined that a college-education benefit should not be lost due to early retirement.

Balaam also asked that faculty discuss disparate teaching loads to see if greater equity in numbers of students might be attained. He recounted the many semesters in which he has taught 100 or more students. As a member of two of the most burdened programs [Political Economy and Politics and Government], Balaam finds grading papers ever more onerous. He reported that his research, his family life, and his leisure must all be sacrificed to his grading.

Cooney reminded the assembled that the average load for faculty has been falling for some time and that the range of teaching loads across departments was limited although ranges of teaching loads within departments could be broader.

Bartanen suggested that departments might remedy some sources of uneven teaching loads.

Lind predicted wide-ranging debates about teaching loads if the matter came before the faculty because inequities were hardly limited to social sciences.

As the discussion turned to other items for the agenda of the next faculty meeting, Cooney reported that the Ad Hoc Code Revision Committee had issued its suggestions for amendments to The Faculty Code to remedy inconsistent and unclear language in the present code. He suggested that a first reading on 8

October would satisfy the requirements for revision of the code and provide faculty additional notice of proposals. This first step would then permit faculty discussion and consideration of changes.

Beardsley asked whether all faculty had received the report of proposed modifications. Bartanen responded that most faculty had been sent the report and even visiting faculty would soon receive a copy.

Cooney allowed that the faculty's settled practice has been to waive the actual public reading of amendments in favor of a presentation of the deletions, substitutions, and insertions offered by the ad hoc committee. He reiterated the committee's recommendation that faculty proceed chapter by chapter except for Chapter Three, which should be considered section by section.

Beardsley worried that chapter-by-chapter and even section-by-section deliberations would confuse the assembled faculty because some language has been moved to new places. He preferred to consider amendments change by change so that decision-makers might focus on precise proposals rather than prolix passages. He praised the side-by-side presentation created by the ad hoc committee but doubted that discussions could be orderly absent another guide.

Bristow and Hale asserted that the first reading on 8 October could lead to a discussion of processes for consideration of changes.

Haltom [M/S/F] moved that substantive proposals be considered in phase two of the core revision and only minor clarifications would be considered in the current phase. He cited the Senate's original authorization of the ad hoc committee [Senate Minutes 7 October 1996] and President Pierce's assurance that the ad hoc committee would propose procedural clarifications, not substantive changes.

Cooney feared that the Haltom motion would lead to endless deliberation that would result in nothing getting done. Beardsley opposed the motion because its distinction between stylistic clarifications and substantial modifications was not tenable. Cooney observed that the faculty need not pass any change, so changes--substantive or stylistic--were not a problem. Steiner agreed that faculty could be apprised that some changes were major, substantive departures. Sloane believed that going slow with what amounts to each faculty's contract with the university was imperative but found the motion too slow and too cumbersome. Beardsley reminded the Senate that the distinction between phase-one changes and phase-two changes was tenable if faculty were consistently reminded about what they were voting on and how the process had been originally set up. Cooney recalled that some of the more substantial changes proposed by the ad hoc committee had come from the Professional Standards Committee and from suggestions elicited by the ad hoc committee from faculty. Bristow wondered how many faculty had yet opened the envelope in which the report came; although she hoped the process would be orderly and predictable so that faculty would have effective notice, she, too, was underwhelmed by the proposed process.

After the Haltom motion expired miserably, Lind advocated a mode of presentation that would articulate each change and a process that would allow faculty to consider both discrete amendments in the package of proposals from the ad hoc committee and the changes as a whole. Tomlin asked if the ad hoc committee could issue an addendum that tracked text that had been moved around the code [as opposed to proposed insertions, substitutions, and deletions]. Cooney directed attention not only to the burden of creating such an addendum but also to the additional reading through which deliberators would then have to wade. Bristow agreed with Lind that deliberations must in any case proceed change by change with faculty explicitly notified about which changes will be in order at each meeting.

Lind [M/S/P] that "The Senate recommends that, at the 8 October 1997 meeting of the faculty, Professor Balaam lead off an informal discussion with each of his items [college-education benefits for faculty and staff offspring and teaching-loads], each discussion to be limited to fifteen minutes; that the revisions of the code then be introduced and given a first reading (with whatever procedural recommendation(s) the Senate may add at its 6 October meeting); and that, if time permits, some attention to the core curriculum follow as the fourth item on the agenda."

Kline and Mehlhaff asked that the Senate clarify its charge to the Curriculum Committee.

Tomlin [M/S/P] moved that "The first charge from the Senate to the Curriculum Committee be amended to direct the Curriculum Committee to assist in developing a process for systematic assessment of the core curriculum for the re-accreditation of the university."

The Senate then adjourned until Monday, 6 October 1997.

That's my story and I'm sticking to it,

Bill Haltom