

Faculty senate and provost executive meeting

Tuesday, September 12, 2006 – 10:00 AM

Attendance

Brad Creed,
Mark Bateman,
Don Sandley
Robin Snyder
Brian Toone

Summary

Don passed out the following **agenda items**:

1. Convo. Definition – Matt Kurlin
2. Emeritus Faculty status waiting period
3. Final Exam Policy
4. Pedagogy assessment and improvement
5. The “W” designation and the writing committee
6. Evaluation and definition of the Dean’s
7. The general nature of faculty involvement

Topics discussed:

- The above agenda items
- Academic freedom statement

Detail

Here is a summary / paraphrased / transcript of the meeting. I have placed a bold heading to categorize each comment or series of comments. There are some places marked in brackets where I have tried to interpret what was being referenced by the speaker.

Agenda Item #1

Don – Let’s hold off on agenda item #1 until next time.

Agenda Item #2

Don – Currently, there is a five year waiting period for emeritus faculty [and this needs to be addressed.]

Brad – The promotion & tenure committee deals with this. I’ll check on this. Is [the five year waiting period] too long?

Don – Yes, especially if it is not applied consistently. Let’s create a uniform policy.

Brad – I’ll check and see what the faculty handbook says.

Agenda Item #3

Don – I’ve handed out a draft of a revision to the final exam policy.

Brad – Perhaps the faculty handbook committee could continue this year and look at this issue. We’ll take this up with [the faculty handbook committee].

Agenda Items #4 and #5

Don – Lots of discussion has been going on about [pedagogy assessment and improvement]. I have a radical suggestion – let’s do away with the writing committee and replace it with a separate “assessment” committee.

Brad – [What we have now is...] a “W” designation for courses, “W” for the core, “W” emphasized in TLA. An assessment learning plan will be produced each year. I would like an assessment contact person in each of the academic units.

Don – I originally thought this should be part of the UCC, but they are doing so much already.

Brad – Let’s think this through.

Mark – What are we assessing?

Don – Currently it has been the faculty member. It needs to be an assessment of the learning taking place in the university.

Mark – We need to have very detailed language for the purpose of a committee like this. People are going to have many different ideas of what assessment means.

Don – I’ll report to the senate that the Administration is taking action on #4. I’ll send an email to Charlotte indicating that they should keep up the good work they are doing now, but that we are working on [the process].

Agenda Item #6

Don – The current definition of an academic dean is vague. The definition of an associate provost is not in the handbook.

Mark – We need to know “what decisions are allowed” for that position.

Don – I would ask you (Brad and Mark) to take this up in the handbook committee and come up with a definition. In some circles, the dean has the final say. In others, the chairs have the final say.

Brad – I would be curious about what other schools put in their handbook about this issue. [There are currently the following 3 components of assessment for deans:]

1. Foundational / conceptual – About every 5 years all the deans and vp’s are assessed using assessment tools
2. Strategic plans / goals for the year – Deans are evaluated based on these goals
3. 360 feedback (SkillScope) – Every 3-5 years starting in the fall this tool will be used.

Don – Could you address this at the senate meeting?

Brad – Every month I’m tracking projects with the deans.

Agenda Item #7

Don – I met with Sarah Latham to discuss what used to be the Quality Council.

Brad – The president has formed a “president’s cabinet” (formerly the QC) which will hold a tactical meeting once a week. He has also formed a university council with broader representation that will meet once a month.

Don – What is the composition?

Brad – Mainly those that directly report to the president with a couple of additions.

Don – My proposal – if we hire the best/brightest faculty, it doesn’t make sense not to use the faculty.

Robin – I’ve sent 1,000,000 emails about the renovation (to BBS)... noise, vapors, dust

Brad – I talked to Bill about this ... they’re supposed to have it sealed off.

Robin – What do we do now?

Brad – Find the building coordinator for each building and see if there is an open classroom.

Mark – It’s to your [the faculty] benefit to begin to look at the leadership selection process. It’s been good for the past few years, but we’ve been lucky. We need to have a leadership program in the senate. How do we get the right people for the position? I commend you for selecting Don Clemenson.

Robin – Don’s been good about driving home “serve because you want to serve.”

Brad – You’ve got to find the people who can make contributions. Others can focus on scholarship.

Don – Part of the problem is the tenure / promotion system service requirement to be in a leadership type position.

Academic Freedom Statement

Don - The last item is to get a really working fair academic freedom statement in the handbook. There was a very strong statement that Mark sent out [from the AANCU]. It would send strong signals if you [Brad and Mark] could draft something to bring to the senate.

Brad – The faculty handbook has the disclaimers in it in response to the Baptist statement of faith. We are working with the faculty handbook committee and we came up with something, but I feel like we’re not finished yet. The president needs to see this. The president needs to gauge the trustees’ on this.

Don – Can you update us on this process?

Brad – In the October meeting, unless the president has some grave concerns, we ought to have something to present [on academic freedom]. If we had a refined, edited statement, we need to do a better job in faculty development for new faculty in this area. We can use the AANCU statement as a backdrop even if we don't adopt it officially.

Brian Toone
September 22, 2006