

Minutes of the Executive Meeting of the Academic Senate August 28, 2003

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Penny Washbourn at 9:00 a.m. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Chair Penny Washbourn, Vice-Chair Jim Sauerberg, Past-Chair Charles Hamaker, Theo Carlile, Richard Courtney, James Hawley, Rye Huber, Sam Lind, Claude-Rheal Malary, Susan Marston, Keith Ogawa, and Mindy Thomas. Absent were: Robert Gorsch, Wayne Harter, Yung Jae Lee, Patrizia Longo, and James Temple.

Chair Washbourn welcomed the new Senators. She announced that Michael Barram will act as the Senate Parliamentarian, however he was unable to attend the first meeting.

2. Chairperson's Report - Chair Washbourn reported that it will be a challenging year for the Senate. One of the major tasks ahead is to revise the *Faculty Handbook* to reflect the change to the provost model and its implication on the governance of the school. She explained that two specific areas of the *Handbook* need to be addressed this year: the rank and tenure process and the reporting relationship of the Senate to the new governance system. She proposed that a task force be formed to research each of those *Handbook* sections independently. She asked the Senators to think about their areas of interest, each Senator will serve on one of the committees.

Chair Washbourn stated that there will be issues related to the WASC visit that the Senate will be consulted and involved in.

The Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC) will conduct four evaluations this year; the President and three deans. Members of the AAEC are: Chair Nancy Struthers, Hugh McAllister, Joan Peterson, Don Snyder, and Br. Charles Hilken. The evaluation form for the President will be distributed in mid-September. The evaluation of the Deans of the schools of Science and Economics and Business Administration will be distributed in early October and the evaluation of the dean of the School of Education will be conducted in the spring.

Chair Washbourn reviewed a few items still pending from last year: 1) Shared governance, how the concept is understood and expressed. The subject was raised last year with the President, but a broad conversation is needed. 2) Retirement health benefits, the college is discussing a Melan Foundation College Retirement project. It would require a contribution from the individual and the college, and the establishment of an individual account, which would eventually provide for a retirement health plan. It would provide a cap for out of pocket expenditures on the part of the individual in conjunction with the medicare supplement. Various institutions are being recruited to sign letters of interest. It is hoped that institutions will sign letters of commitment this year. The Faculty

Welfare Committee will be reviewing this. Chair Washbourn will contact the FWC regarding the status. 3) Faculty Petition re: scholarly leaves (tabled). 4) *Faculty Handbook* language re: R&T Promotion (tabled). 5) Senate actions, several actions are still outstanding. 6) Procedures for a vote of no confidence.

Chair Washbourn announced that a joint meeting with the Senate Chair, Br. Craig, AVP Stamp, and the Vice-Provost Frances Sweeney will be held monthly.

The President has followed up on a Senate Action and invited Bishop Vigneron to visit SMC campus to have a discussion with faculty. The Bishop has accepted the invitation for November 17, 2003. A reception will be held from 4:15 - 5:15 p.m.

A reception for new faculty will be held at the September 11, 2003 General Meeting.

The Academic Vice President's yearly report to faculty will be made at the October General Meeting.

Chair Washbourn announced that a faculty representative is needed to serve on the Campus Planning Committee. The committee meets on Friday mornings. She asked Senators to talk to their colleagues and to make recommendations to her.

Chair Washbourn said the Provost Transition Committee (formed by the Senate last spring) has met over the summer. She distributed the provost job description, which was drafted by the transition committee. She said the job description would be discussed at the strategic planning meeting, immediately following the Senate meeting. Sally Stamp will retain the title of Academic Vice President/Provost during the transition, which is scheduled to take place over the next two years. Feedback will be required from the faculty. She added that the provost model will also affect the President's responsibilities.

NEW BUSINESS

3. Senate Self-assessment - Chair Washbourn reported that the Senate has been asked to make a self-assessment regarding the structure of faculty governance. It is part of the WASC discussion on institutional effectiveness. A subcommittee will need to be formed to begin the self-assessment process. How well does the structure work? What do faculty think about the Senate's effectiveness as a mechanism within the institution? How would an assessment be conducted by the Senate, EPB, or R&T Committees? She suggested that the Senate think about the design of such an assessment. She asked if anyone was interested in drafting an outline to be reviewed at the next meeting. Vice-Chair Sauerberg asked how far back in time the assessment is needed, 2 years, 5 years? Senator Hawley mentioned that it is impossible to look at a self-assessment of a specific committee without considering how it fits in within the governance structure as a whole. She suggested that the Senate and EPB should agree on a system for assessment. Chair Washbourn added that this would be discussed at the strategic planning meeting with AVP Stamp.

4. Rank and Tenure Procedures - Chair Washbourn said that the R&T section of the *Handbook* (Section 2.6) will be one of the most important decisions made by the Senate. The Senate must consider whether the Provost, AVP or Vice-Provost will sit on the R&T committee. How will the recommendation process work?

Senator Ogawa said that the transition committee, which met over the summer, did not make a final decision about how many vice-provost positions will be needed, but currently one vice-provost position has been created. This could make a difference to the R&T structure. Should the provost have any direct involvement in the R&T process? Senator Hawley commented that when the R&T committee gets top heavy with administrators, even with ex-officio members, it changes the discussion. There is also controversy about when the President or administration should exercise their prerogative and go against a R&T decision. What is the basis for dismissing a R&T decision?

5. Senate Governance Structure - Who does the Senate report to? Where do the Senate recommendations go, to the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, the Provost? If the creation of a provost model splits the responsibilities of the reporting system, how will the Senate deal with campus-wide issues? How does the Senate function? These are practical questions the Senate subcommittee will need to address.

Senator Hawley suggested that the Senate consider how the college sees itself down the road, in order to differentiate itself from other schools.

The subcommittees were formed as follows:

Senate Governance	R&T Committee	Self Assessment
Charlie Hamaker	Theo Carlile	Keith Ogawa
Dick Courtney	Susan Marston	Jim Hawley
Patrizia Longo	Robert Gorsch	Mindy Thomas
Wayne Harter	Jim Sauerberg	Rye Huber
Yung Jae Lee	Claude-Rheal Malary	Sam Lind
	James Temple	

OLD BUSINESS

6. Report on the School of Extended Education - A special meeting with Dean Elias was held last spring. Senators Malary and Carlile each drafted a motion for consideration as an action item. A MOTION was made by Senator Carlile and SECONDED by Past-Chair Hamaker to place the following motion on the agenda for the General Meeting:

PREAMBLE: The Academic Senate received the "Report of the Senate Task Force Re: The School of Extended Education." The Report is authored by Robert Gorsch, John Thompson and Mary True and dated February 26, 2003. Its findings are two-fold:

a) Dean Elias of the School of Extended Education took actions and made decisions in violation of the "procedures mandated by the Faculty Handbook and the culture of shared governance"

b) said violations "did not occur in a vacuum" inasmuch as "Dean Elias had a mandate to increase revenues substantially"

The Senate's deliberations pursuant to the Report included a special meeting held in May 2003, wherein Dean Elias contextualized and provided an apology for his problematic actions.

MOTION: that the Senate write a letter of censure addressed to Dean Elias, whose actions, according to the Report, violated procedures of shared governance; and to Academic Vice President Sally Stampp, whose "mandate to increase revenues substantially," again according to the Report, propitiated Dean Elias's violations.

The Senators discussed the following issues related to the motion: Should a letter be sent to all academic administrators advising them in their mentor-ship and supervisory roles with regard to other academic administrators, "to make clear the primacy of the *Faculty Handbook* and the core values attached at all levels to Shared Governance?" Should Dean Elias be penalized alone for this action? Should the February 26th report by the Senate subcommittee be attached? Should the motion include a reference to the verbal statement of the AVP that mistakes were made and a broader statement sent to academic administrators that this was not handled in a correct manner?

There was discussion about whether the Senate should ask AVP Stampp to censure the Dean. Senator Malary said that if AVP Stampp is accepting responsibility she should not censure another for her actions. It was agreed that Senators Malary, Hawley and Carlile would amend the motion and send it to all Senators for review and comments prior to the General Meeting. The motion passed by a hand vote of 10-0-1.

7. The meeting was adjourned to the Soda Center for the strategic planning luncheon and meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Academic Senate Secretary