

Faculty Senate Minutes

December 13, 2004

Senatores: Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley [Chair], Ryan Cunningham, Alyce DeMarais, Julian Edgoose, Robin Foster, Bill Haltom, Keith Maxwell, Eric Orlin, David Tinsley
Hospites: Dave Balaam

Call to Order

Senate Chair Beardsley called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

Chair's Report

The Chair announced that Senate meetings for Spring 2005 would be held on the following dates:

Jan 31
Feb 14
Feb 28
Mar 21
Apr 4
Apr 18
May 2

The chair also announced that the PSC has forwarded an interpretation to the Senate for inclusion in the minutes. The PSC interpretation can be found at the bottom of these minutes.

Special Orders

There were no special orders.

Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure

Senator Beardsley opened the floor discussion of the composition of the committee. He suggested that Senate use approval voting, wherein the names of all nominees are included, and Senators vote for all the nominees of whom they approve. The leading vote-getters would thereby be elected to the committee. This suggestion was approved by the Senate, and after discussion of the number of people to serve on the committee, the election was held and the following people were chosen to serve on the Ad-Hoc committee:

Alexa Tullis
Nancy Bristow

Hans Ostrom
Robin Foster

Following the election, several additional suggestions were made of issues for the Ad-Hoc committee to examine. Senator Edgoose suggested that the Ad-Hoc committee might look at the diversity of ways in which departments conduct their evaluations; for instance that some departments told evaluatees not ever to use closed files, except when mandated in tenure cases. Senator Foster noted that the PSC might be of use there, while Senator Haltom noted that such an injunction would be a violation of the Code, which leaves such decisions up to the evaluatee. Senator Beardsley suggested that an overall issue might be to examine how far the actual practice of each department deviates from the stated procedures. Along these lines, Dave Balaam requested that the committee look at departmental standards as a whole.

Other Business

Senator Beardsley exhorted Senators and non-Senators alike to encourage junior faculty members to attend the Feb. 7 faculty meeting, at which the issue of the code change allowing open files in tenure cases would come up for a vote.

Senator Bartanen expressed appreciation to Senator DeMarais for going through the minutes of the other standing committees and distributing excerpts noting actions taken for the Senators' perusal.

There being no other business, the Senate adjourned at 4:45 so the Senators could avail themselves of the hospitality offered by the President at his house.

Scripsi,

Eric Orlin

Professional Standards Committee

18 November 2004

Interpretation of Chapter III, Section 2. Delaying a Scheduled Evaluation (Report to Faculty Senate 18 November 2004):

In this section, the Code describes the normal intervals for scheduled evaluations and provides for the possibility of early evaluations. There may also be circumstances in which a faculty member requests a delayed evaluation. Over the years, practice has evolved to allow the Academic Vice President discretionary authority to permit the postponement of a scheduled evaluation. This informal arrangement has received formal expression with reference to the particular circumstances covered by the University's "Faculty Medical and Family Leave Policy and Faculty Disability Policy." That document states, "The request for the delay in evaluation will be submitted in writing to the department chair. The chair will make a recommendation to the Academic Vice President, who will review the request and approve the delay when circumstances warrant."

To maintain consistency in the handling of requests for delayed evaluations, the procedures quoted above should be followed in all cases. Whenever possible, faculty members should anticipate the need for a delayed evaluation, take steps to insure that student evaluations are administered as required, and seek the recommendation of the department chair and the approval of the Academic Vice President well in advance of the time for the normally scheduled evaluation.