



## UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE RECORD

### **Minutes of the Faculty Meeting**

**April 1, 2002**

The meeting was called to order at 5PM by Prof. Michael Payne. The group agreed to reorder the agenda. Prof. Payne said that requests to reorder the agenda were always welcome. If a vote on reordering is requested, a 2/3 majority is required for passage.

#### Nominations for University and Faculty Committees

The slate of nominees to committees prepared by the Faculty Council was presented, and several nominations from the floor were added. Prof. Leslie Patrick thanked the members of the CAFT nominating committee for their hard work.

#### Report from the Committee on Instruction: George Exner

Prof. Exner gratefully presented the COI report on Assessment, held over from the February, 2002 meeting (see that Agenda for the report). The report includes statements of principle on matters of assessment and two proposals, although the proposal for an ad hoc committee to help with assessment start-up was now moot, as we are past the start-up period. The statement of principles derive from a request to have the governance structure weigh in on something imposed from the outside. Prof. Exner hoped that the main goal of assessment would be reflection on what we do, and also hoped that the administration would support this effort. Provost Steve Bowen responded that \$20,000 would be available to support assessment plans during this coming summer and fall. COI and departments should identify needs; requests for funds should be sent to the Provost's office. Prof. Exner also requested that the University consider how to reward the outcomes of assessment efforts so that improvements identified via an assessment procedure can be effected.

Prof. Exner addressed the need for a permanent Assessment Committee as a subcommittee of COI, particularly to attend to matters of service courses, general education goals, and nondepartmental student advising; the charge to this committee would be publicized. A brief discussion followed about the membership of the committee, and the difficulty of assessing service courses as the audience for those courses is sometimes largely outside the department offering them. Prof. Exner then moved adoption of the whole report (minus the moot proposal). The motion was seconded and passed without objection.

#### Report from the Personnel Committee: Kim Daubman

The motion on tenure "dead years" is a response to a recommendation from AAUP that provisional faculty often need to establish a record of scholarship at the same time as they are establishing families.

A provisional faculty member, regardless of years of service, is entitled to stop the tenure clock or extend the probationary period, with or without taking a full or partial leave of absence, if the faculty member (whether male or female) is a primary or coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children. Thus, faculty members are entitled to stop the tenure clock while continuing to perform faculty duties at full salary. The tenure clock can be stopped for up to one year for each child, but faculty may take no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period (for child-bearing/child-rearing or for any other reason, such as a full-time untenured faculty leave).

Professor Payne noted that this had been discussed in the University Review Committee, and that this reason for stopping the tenure clock should not be confused with stopping the clock for medical reasons. Interim Dean Mark Padilla added that pregnant faculty members automatically receive a dead year, and have to apply to not take such a year (so that the candidate assumes any risk associated with that decision); he added that a dead year is preferable to a leave of absence without salary. Prof. Daubman emphasized that a maximum of 2 years would be granted for any faculty member, including any dead years negotiated at hiring.

The motion was moved, seconded, and passed without objection.

Report from the Committee on Staff Planning: Tony Massoud

CSP was asked to review the implications of a 3-2 teaching load. The current report summarizes a survey asking all 37 departments and programs about the feasibility and specific impact of a 3-2 load, and how many new positions would be needed. Prof. Massoud noted that the committee did have to interpret some unclear responses. The report (published in the April 2002 agenda) found that most departments/programs thought a 3-2 was feasible and that it would have a negative impact on electives but not core courses. Opinion was mixed on whether there would be a negative impact on the CLA or class size. A total of 18.67 new positions were reported as being necessary, although CSP thinks that is a conservative figure, with 20 being more realistic.

The following discussion covered a number of implications of a reduced load, including whether larger departments would need more positions, the problem that larger class sizes (an assumption made by the Deans under a 3-2 load) might not easily be accommodated by the currently available classrooms, and the problem of finding office and lab space for faculty hired to partially make up for reduced course offerings. It was also unclear whether increased class size would exceed current caps, or rather fill currently unfilled courses.

Several people wondered what the next step should be. Prof. Ben Marsh proposed a motion asking *CSP, working with other committees and offices, to bring a plan to the faculty by February 2003 for implementing a 5-course-per-year teaching load*, which was seconded. Provost Bowen noted that the academic task force will be considering this as well as part of Vision 2010. Prof. John Peeler reinforced the urgency of this matter due to recruitment and retention problems.

The wording of the motion prompted Dean Padilla to ask whether we wanted to limit consideration of other possible ways of reducing student contact, for example, having more frequent sabbaticals or decreased class size. Prof. Andrea Halpern wanted the CSP to consider what expectations will be increased if teaching contact is decreased. Several faculty asked about comparisons with other universities. Dean Padilla said that a 3-3 load is now an exception among comparison schools; most now are at 3-2. However, he warned, a course load reduction can have some cost, a thought echoed by Provost Bowen. For instance, at Smith College, a course reduction was accompanied by "recovery" of all previously negotiated released time, which meant some people taught more after the reduction than before. Other possible scenarios also have costs: more frequent sabbaticals results in more disruptions to curricula, committees,

etc. Scholarship requirements at places with 3-2 loads varies, depending on the type of institution. Prof. Gary Sojka added that counting courses may be a too simplistic way of tallying load, which ignores the type of course and total students taught.

Prof. Marsh then substituted the following motion, incorporating suggestions from several faculty members: *The faculty directs the CSP, in consultation with other relevant committees, to present in the fall of 2002 a set of options on methods to reduce courseload and to move to implementation of the chosen method in the spring.* Prof. Marsh was aware that a strict deadline may be impossible to meet, and so it is understood that the fall deadline is flexible.

Although several faculty preferred the original motion, Prof. Exner reminded the group that a fuller discussion should take place when a set of options is before us. Dean Padilla emphasized that a vote for a 3-2 load would mean a large change in culture and that we need to be aware of all the implications. The vote was then taken and the substitute motion passed.

#### Announcement by the Chair of the Faculty

Prof. Payne announced the appointment of Jim Orbison as Dean of Engineering, who was warmly congratulated by all those assembled. He announced that there will be an open forum on the developing Mission Statement, as well as a questionnaire sent to all faculty. Finally, he reported ongoing efforts to explore means of increasing efficiency of communication between campus and Trustee committees.

#### Announcements by the President

President Rogers announced a BSG faculty reception on April 10 from 5 - 7PM. He also announced that the new residence hall would be named McDonnell Hall in recognition of a substantial contribution to the capital campaign James and Elizabeth (Libby) McDonnell. President Rogers ended his remarks by thanking the faculty for all their efforts this year.

VP of Enrollment Management Kurt Thiede reported that 2630 acceptances and 900 financial aid offers have gone out. April 13 is accepted student day and asked the faculty to join the prospective students for lunch. He reminded us that the best students look for relationships with faculty, which this year is being facilitated by email contacts.

Director of Physical Plant Dennis Hawley presented an update on the Campus Master Plan. When the O'Leary Center opens, parking areas near Engineering and O'Leary will be a quad. New parking behind Phi Psi will result in a net gain of spaces (plus spaces recovered after current construction is completed). Funds are being raised for a new Engineering building connected to the current one. Under consideration is closing 7<sup>th</sup> St. on the upper campus and landscaping it for a pedestrian mall. A new, safer. entrance to the University from Route 15, is also under consideration, although that is not funded yet.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Halpern  
Secretary of the Faculty