Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting

Minutes #15

September 25, 2014

1. The meeting was called to order at 8:08 AM on Thursday, September 25, 2014 in Library Conference Room A, Chairperson Nassersharif presiding. Senators Cerbo, Rollo Koster, Sullivan, and Welthers were present. Senator Rarick was absent.

2. Minutes of FSEC Committee Meeting #9, August 25, 2014 were approved. Minutes of FSEC Committee Meeting #11, Sept. 4, 2014 were approved as amended.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE/REPORTS

   a. Chairperson Nassersharif reminded the committee that the Provost and Vice Provost Beauvais would be joining the meeting at 9:00 AM.

   b. Chairperson Nassersharif reported that he had attended a meeting of the Strategic Budget and Planning Council (SBPC). He noted that the focus of the Council overlaps to some degree with the areas of concern of the Faculty Senate. He also expressed concern about the small number of faculty (4) relative to the number of administrators (15) comprising the committee. Chairperson Nassersharif reported on the recent activities of the SBPC including the request for an appropriation of funds to hire 55 faculty (40 tenure track, 15 lecturers) over the next 5 years. He commented that new academic initiatives would determine areas of growth in curriculum and, consequently, the likely distribution of the new faculty hires. Chairperson Nassersharif also reported that the SBPC is reviewing the overhead policy (indirect cost recovery), adjustments to which are to be made in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Council for Research.

   b. Ms. Neff was asked to contact the Professor Webb, Chair of the Council for Research, and ask her to attend the next FSEC meeting.

4. ONGOING BUSINESS

   a. Regarding the letter issued by the President as a means of faculty feedback on the evaluation of the Provost, Chairperson Nassersharif reported that he had been asked by faculty if the evaluation survey data were available. The FSEC discussed the fact that the new language describing the Administrator Evaluation process does not include public distribution of survey data. The FSEC agreed that the President's letter had been an effective means of faculty feedback on the evaluation of the Provost. The committee decided to consider proposing a change to Manual section 10.90.15 to allow for verbal or written reporting to the constituency by the supervisor.

5. Provost DeHayes and Vice Provost Beauvais joined the meeting at 9:15 AM. The following matters were discussed:

   a. The Provost asked the committee for an update on the implementation of the revised general education program, noting that it has now been 6 months since the faculty senate voted to support the new general education program. Chairperson Nassersharif told the Provost that the implementation effort rested with the General Education Implementation Steering Team (GEIST), chaired by Professor Swift. The Provost indicated that the community is eager for an update and suggested that the FSEC provide an update perhaps through use of an informational page on the
Faculty Senate website. A discussion ensued about the development and use of rubrics as tools for assessment of courses not as a means of approving courses for the general education program. Ms. Neff reported that Professor Swift had called a meeting of the chairs and heads of gen ed groups (UCGE, SAGE, SLOAA, LOOC, ITS, Enrollment Management, the Key Stakeholders group), and it was scheduled to take place on October 7th.

b. The Provost and the FSEC discussed the Provost's evaluation report to the constituencies of Dean Zawia, Vice Provost Libutti, and Chief Information Officer Bozylinsky planned for the October Faculty Senate meeting. The Provost said that his reports would be brief but he considered faculty feedback an important part of the process that reinforces the value of faculty participation in administrator evaluation. He also stated that he considers the survey-based process a significant improvement over the former letter-writing process.

c. Chairperson Nassersharif asked the Provost to discuss his understanding of shared governance at the institution. The Provost expressed his view that committee turnover and a lack of continuity across terms can handicap progress and delay the development and implementation of institutional initiatives. He suggested that better lines of communication across executive committees be developed so that institutional memory is preserved. He would like to develop a means of accomplishing work with greater agility, but without compromising shared governance, which includes getting the individuals with the appropriate expertise and commitment to work on the important tasks at hand. He believes that some work should continue during the summer months. He noted that compensation for summer committee work has been and will continue to be available through his office. The Provost indicated that shared governance implies a shared responsibility for the health and vitality of the institution and not individual agendas. He said that effective communication and effective, up-to-date processes would improve our ability to accomplish substantive in a work in a timely manner. He asked the FSEC to consider changes that would enhance continuity, agility, and responsiveness, and suggested exploring what other institutions have done in this regard.

d. The Provost was asked about the status of the Health Reorganization proposal. He reported that he had met with the Phase II faculty planning group on Sept. 24. The group had produced a 50-page report that was in the process of being summarized. One recommendation of the group had been to meet with external constituents. At the recommendation of the committee, the Provost has arranged a breakfast meeting that included invitations to 25-30 health care-related individuals, college advisory group members, donors, and alumni to be held on October 10. The committee planned to present the constituents with a one-page summary of the proposed reorganization plan. A report is planned to be released to the community shortly thereafter. A forum and opportunity for comment and questions will follow. Members of the Phase II group will be available to meet with the Curricular Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

e. The Provost was asked about the status of the searches for the deans of the College of Business Administration (CBA) and the Library. He said that the CBA search committee was almost complete. He also indicated that an interim dean would be appointed. Senator Cerbo, a member of the Library Dean search committee, said that that committee had met once.

f. Chairperson Nassersharif asked the Provost about summer J-term courses, courses of 2-3 week duration offered in the summer. The Provost said that he was not aware of summer J-term courses, but that he would inquire and report back to the FSEC.

g. The Provost asked the FSEC to assist in educating the community about the College of Engineering building bond referendum question on the upcoming, Nov. 4 election ballot. Chairperson Nassersharif said that the Dean of the College of Engineering had been invited to make a presentation at the October 16 Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 AM.
Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Neff