

Minutes
College Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, October 25, 2007

Members present: Johanna Cleary, Julie Dodd, Ferguson Ferguson, Bridget Grogan, Juan-Carlos Molleda, Cynthia Morton, Henri Pensis, and Marilyn Roberts. Senior Associate Dean Linda Hon and Constitution Committee Chair Robyn Goodman also attended. Absent: Dave Carlson

The meeting was called to order by Dodd at 8:35 a.m.

Pensis moved and Grogan seconded a motion to approve the minutes. Approval unanimous.

Dodd announced that she had asked Robyn Goodman, Chair of the Constitution Committee, to attend the meeting.

Discussion followed about the list of meetings for the rest of the year, including the meetings with the candidates for the dean position. Similarly, discussion followed about the meeting with the first candidate, Dr. Ruth Walden, and how to proceed with the rest of the candidates in terms of the written questions and the best way to take advantage of the time allotted to the Faculty Senate during the on-campus visit of the candidates. Concerning the meeting with Dr. Walden, Pensis said it went well and the Senate has plenty of time to cover the established questions and ask follow up questions. Ferguson asked if notes were taken during this meeting, and the senators in attendance said that they took personal notes. A conscious decision was taken not to write minutes of the meeting with the candidate. Morton suggested shortening the background information and context provided to the candidate at the beginning of the meeting. Molleda also suggested to first asking the candidate about his or her definition and understanding of shared governance.

Discussion moved on to the draft proposal of policy change introduced by the Tenure and Promotion Committee concerning the packet for external reviewers. Dodd explained the context of such policy change, including the consultation already conducted with deans and chairs. Ferguson moved a motion, which Roberts seconded, to discuss the draft proposal. Before leaving the meeting, Cleary said that makes sense to give external reviewers more time to evaluate the T&P candidate's file (Cleary and Grogan left the meeting at 8:55 a.m. to attend a Telecomm Department meeting with a dean candidate.) Hon explained that the draft proposal was attending the need for better timing and for being in sink with the procedures used by peer institutions. Molleda, as a member of the T&P committee, added that besides the draft proposal the T&P committee will evaluate the consistency of the letters and procedures to seek external reviews written and carried out by department's chairs and other units on campus. Ferguson introduced a motion, seconded by Roberts discussed and unanimously approved by the senators in attendance. The final motion reads: The Faculty Senate (1) approves, in principle, the Draft Proposal from the Tenure & Promotion Committee concerning the content and timing of the packet for external reviewers, (2) to take the draft proposal to the faculty as a whole in the next faculty meeting, and (3) to recommend the T&P Committee to encourage Department's chairs to seek feedback from their faculty on the draft proposal.

After a brief discussion, Dodd announced that tentatively the next faculty meeting would be called on Thursday, November 15 from 12 noon to 1 p.m.

Discussion moved on to the Committees Election Process recommendations for discussion and submission to the Constitution Committee. Goodman updated the Senate on the progress of the Constitution Committee. Concerning the Committees Election Process, Ferguson pointed out that the Process didn't include a provision to protect new faculty to expend too much time in committees during his or her first years as tenure-track faculty. Some senators warned about the need for new faculty members to socialize with their new colleagues, and that committees may be a good way to facilitate such socialization. Goodman explained that in addition to the Committees Election Process, the Constitutional Committee has sent a letter to each Committee chair to request information about the present and future (expected) structure, roles, and activities of their committees. A form developed to request information about the status of committees will be sent to department chairs, committee chairs, the FC and cc the entire faculty of the College.

Goodman said that the Constitution Committee was waiting for the Process and the working flow chart to continue their work, which was stalled because of these documents. Ferguson suggested continuing to work on the sabbatical and T&P components of the constitution, which don't depend on the awaited documents but mainly on the University Constitution. Hon suggested that the Constitution Committee should consult the University's rules and regulations.

Ferguson moved and Roberts seconded a motion on the Committees Election Process developed by the Faculty Senate, which was approved unanimously. The motion states: The Faculty Senate in principle approves the Committees Election Process to be sent to the Constitution Committee, and recommended that jointly the Faculty Senate and Constitution Committee send the Process to the Deans and Chairs and the department chairs to encourage them to seek further input from their faculty. Roberts advised that the Senate does not want to become partners with every committee's initiatives. Ferguson suggested the Senate write a policy on the process of interacting with committees. For example, when the Faculty Senate works on specific policies or processes, the Faculty Senate would joint the action of a given committee in terms of sending the document or encouraging further actions by the Deans and Chairs or the Department Chairs.

Roberts moved to adjourn and Pensis seconded, meeting was adjourned at 9:41 a.m.

Minutes prepared by Juan-Carlos Molleda