

Arts & Sciences Senate

Minutes from Senate Meeting

March 13, 2000

Secretary: Robert Bloomer

The Meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Agenda. The tentative Agenda was approved.

II. Minutes of the Senate Meeting on February 21st, 2000. These Minutes were approved.

III. Report of the A&S Senate President (Hugh J. Silverman). In his brief report, the President gave an overview of today's business and then reminded those present that Senate elections will take place this Spring. He suggested that anyone interested in serving on Arts and Sciences Standing Committees should let him know. He also asked that we encourage other people to express their interest in serving on Committees. Also, if our terms are coming to an end as Senators, either Departmental or At-Large, he encouraged us to run again for our positions.

IV. Report of the College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Operations (Eugene Katz). Dean Paul Armstrong asked Eugene Katz to focus on his function as Associate Dean for Operations. He was also asked to comment on the current structure of the College of Arts and Sciences versus its previous structure when there were four academic area Divisional Deans rather than a single College Dean with three functional Associate Deans. Dr. Katz described the old structure as vertical, where each of the four Deans had the full range of responsibilities (curriculum, budget, operations, personnel) in their areas. The new structure is horizontally integrated, with a Dean of Arts and Sciences and Associate Deans who have responsibilities that go across all of the Departments of the College of Arts and Sciences. This is also true for the Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Associate Dean for Personnel as well as the Associate Dean for Operations. Dean Armstrong has chosen Associate Deans from each of

the traditional academic divisional areas.

Operations covers equipment and space. Space is horrible because to find it they have to take it away from somebody else, and currently there is no way to expand the space we now have. A number of rehab projects over the past year have involved cutting up offices into smaller ones in order to accommodate new faculty. The situation with equipment is a little better since some new money is available so that it is not necessary to take funds away from somebody to provide money for somebody else. Every year a certain amount of money comes to the College for equipment. The main source is AER (Academic Equipment Replacement) monies, which is specifically given by the state to provide replacement equipment for departments. A certain amount is allocated to the Campus. The Provost receives his share, and then the Provost allocates certain amounts to each of the units within his area (Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Marine Sciences). He does this proportionate to faculty FTEs, but he also reserves a certain amount called the "Central Pool" which each college has to compete for. Meetings are held to split up those funds. The problem is that the amounts of money are grossly insufficient relative to needs. For the College of Arts and Sciences this year, the basic allocation is \$160,000, which comes to Eugene Katz to be allocated within the College. But he had to immediately return \$75,000 to the Provost in order to balance the College budget this year. Of the remaining \$85,000, they are planning projects along the order of \$20,000 to \$30,000. So now they are down to some \$40,000 to \$50,000 to be distributed to all of the 32 units within the College of Arts and Sciences. This is done by asking the Chairs to provide a list of requests for the use of funds. The requests that they got this year totaled over \$400,000, which is typical, and now they are down to \$50,000. But this is not completely available because there are certain initiatives that take place each year. This year, the President provided some money for faculty computers. But this has to be done on a matching basis of 50%. If they filled all of the requests that they have for computers, the \$50,000 would not be enough for a match. But not all of this money can be used for this purpose because there are departmental needs, such as xerox machines, that simply have to be met. So relative to the needs in the College, the amount of funds available is unfortunately very small. The situation for rehab projects is about the same, as some 30 projects this year will remain unfunded. Overall, it has been frustrating because, relative to the needs, the resources available are inadequate.

V. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rights,

Responsibilities, and Retirements (Sarah Fuller, Committee Member). Sarah Fuller noted that many departments already have by-laws, and one of the striking things about them is how much they differ. In order to establish more consistency in by-laws throughout the College, the CFRRR recommends that departments planning to create new by-laws or to review and revise existing by-laws consider several areas in establishing operating policies and procedures for the department or program. In general, the committee recommends that guidelines address questions of departmental membership, departmental governance, operations of the department, and other areas such as workloads, allocation of resources, and retirements as well as formal procedures for amending by-laws. She drew our attention to a written outline of these areas, which is preceded by a preamble that includes a paragraph on the advantages of by-laws.

Some of these advantages are: 1. Protection of faculty against arbitrary decision-making; 2. Clarification of faculty rights and responsibilities within the department or program; 3. Specification of standard procedures for a variety of practices, such as selection of a chair; 4. Determination of the status of members with "combined" (i.e. divided budget line), "joint" (single budget line with shared academic responsibilities), "affiliated" (delimited responsibilities to another department), or "adjunct" (temporary term or per course) appointments; 5. Articulation of procedures for promotion, tenure, and contract renewal review, for hiring new faculty, for discretionary fund recommendations, for grievances, etc.

Following some discussion, the question was taken that departments consider establishing by-laws as outlined in Item #5 of the Agenda. The question was called without objection. The vote was nearly unanimous in favor of the recommendation, with one opposed and one abstention. The President added that this information will be sent to departmental Chairs and will be posted on the Arts and Sciences Senate Webpage.

VI. Report of the University Senate Committee on Administrative Review: Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences (Paul Wortman, Committee Chair). This Committee has been trying to determine how the change from the previous structures of four deans compares to the new so-called "superdean" office headed by Paul Armstrong. They are in the process of developing a survey instrument that contains a number of questions, e.g. how effective has the new Dean's office been in conducting department business?, and a list of people who should

answer them. The survey will be conducted by phone, though the questionnaire and the organizational charts will be sent to departmental Chairs, who will be asked to name a second administrative person, e.g. the undergraduate director, to participate in the survey. Paul Wortman estimates that there will be some 30 to 35 closed questions along with three or four open-ended ones to provide qualitative data on issues.

Following a lengthy discussion, a motion was proposed that A & S Senators be considered as a resource and that they also be surveyed in this process. The motion was seconded without further discussion. 10 senators were in favor, four were opposed, and there were three abstentions. Therefore, the motion passed.

VII. Discussion of the Formation of an Arts and Sciences Senate Academic Planning Committee [for discussion only]. This was the second discussion of a Committee on Academic Planning. Committee would focus on academic planning in the Arts & Sciences Senate Constituencies and would make recommendations to the three Senate Constituency Deans and to the Provost. Among others, its tasks would be to: 1. Encourage cross-disciplinary and extra-disciplinary initiatives and development; 2. Respond to changing needs and profiles in the CAS, MSRC, and PE&A; 3. Recommend new programs and initiatives; 4. Review proposals for new ideas in programmatic development and configuration, research institutes, centers, and constellations.

Some reservation was expressed during the discussion, in part because it was thought that it might be difficult to find people to serve on this Committee, but Hugh Silverman commented that this would be a committee that might be attractive to a number of colleagues. He also pointed out that there are only five A&S Senate standing committees currently and that none of them cover the general area of academic program planning.

VIII. Old Business. None

IX. New Business. None

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.