

November 30 1999

Holloway Hall Room 119

Present: Carolyn Bowden Elizabeth Curtin Tom Erskine Greg Ference Joel Jenne Peter Lade Dave Parker Kathleen Shannon Cal Thomas Marvin Tossey Don Whaley E.J. Crane Jim McCallops Jerome DeRidder David Rieck Kashi Khazeh Kathy Fox (until 4:00).

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Lade at 3:35 p.m.

Dr. Lade reread the motion passed on 11/16 regarding the meeting for Educ 200. After broad discussion concerning the relationship between the motion to discuss the particular course and the role of different schools in General Education the motion stood that the Senate would dedicate the meeting of Dec 14 to a discussion of the concerns that were brought about by the UCC's acceptance of Educ 200 as a general education course and the decision's wider implications for general education. The motion was passed by a vote of 13 to 4.

Provost's Remarks

Dr. Cathcart addressed the collaboration efforts that we have with UMES. He is working very closely with Dr. Nadi Vice President of Academic Affairs on this effort. They are discussing several topics in order to have a successful collaboration between the two universities by fine-tuning the ongoing dialogue. There are some differences in rules between the two schools even though we are in collaboration. We try to make sure that things go smoothly. For example UMES is helping us with the Masters of Social Work. There are areas that both institutions want to grow in.

Old Business

I. Minutes: A motion was made to approve the minutes of the 12 and 19 of October. The motion was seconded and all voted in favor of the motion.

II. Grade Policy Change: Dr. McCallops read the results of the grade change poll of faculty taken by the Academic Policies Committee:

Total votes: 149 full-time faculty

For change to a system using A- B+ B- and C+ 82

Against the change 67

Members of the Academic Policies Committee mentioned that the Bylaws said nothing about the meaning of such a vote. Nevertheless the committee believed and had told the faculty that if a majority of faculty voted the vote should be binding. Consequently members of the committee proposed that the Senate accept the committee's report and send forward a recommendation to the Provost to change the grading policy. The motion was seconded

Several members of the Senate opposed the view that the vote should be binding largely because the difference of 15 faculty members seemed too small for such a major change. It was noted that Bylaw changes require a 2/3 majority. Academic Policies Committee members argued that the clear preference of a majority of faculty should not be ignored. The motion was brought to a vote.

After discussion about the appropriateness of the Senate President's voting the motion failed 6-7 with two abstentions. (If the Senate President's vote had been counted the vote would have been 7-7 so the motion would still have failed.)

III. Faculty Evaluation Form

Dr. Lade opened the floor for discussion of the Faculty Welfare Committee's proposed revision of the Faculty Handbook's language related to the new faculty evaluation form the committee had recommended. The committee's charge had been to replace the existing evaluation form to the simplified form that was presented on Nov 11 and Nov 18. Although the committee had expected their proposed form would be accompanied by the chair's narrative many senators suggested the narrative should not be required if faculty members were receiving merit year after year.

A motion was made to remove the old form entirely from the Faculty Handbook and change the line in the handbook that department chairs should evaluate faculty by using the evaluation form provided to read that department chairs should use 1)the form provided 2 one approved by a department or 3) one approved by the department and dean. Some senators and other faculty members suggested we should have at least threeand up to five categories for evaluating merit instead of the two categories that the committee recommended. The motion was seconded and passed with 12 in favor and 2 opposed.

New Business

Dr. Erskine read the minutes from the CUSF meeting of November 17 as follows:

A greeting from President Habowski of UMBC in which he commented that at UMBC faculty has considerable input into the allocation of resources.

A report from Chair Steve Havas on the Governor's Conference of Higher Education which highlighted the following: accountability technological proficiency teacher education and entrepreneurial initiatives.

Comments by BOR Chair Nathan Chapman discussing several matters including the eminent scholar program and the poor retirement benefits for faculty in the "new" system.

The Council's endorsement in principle of the concept that librarians be considered faculty.

Discussion of the new faculty awards with this year's them being Non-Academic Partnerships Collaborations with Business.

Announcement of a conference for departmental chairs which will be held at Bowie in late spring 2000.

Announcement that Regents awards nominations from campus presidents are due December 10 1999

Discussion of faculty workload policy during which SSU's formula for relating contact hours to credit hours was held up as a model policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m. by a motion and it was seconded.

Motions considered

1.The Senate would dedicate the meeting of Dec 14 to a discussion of the concerns that were brought about by the UCC's acceptance of Educ 200 as a general education course and the decision's wider implications for general education. (Second vote: Passed 13-4)

2.Acceptance of minutes of October 12 and 19. (Passed unanimously)

3. The Senate accept and send forward to the Provost the Academic Policies Committee's recommendation to change the grading policy to include A- B+ B- C+. (Failed 6=7 with two abstentions.)

4. That the evaluation form in the Faculty Handbook be replaced and that the language there be changed from-- department chairs should evaluate faculty by using the evaluation form provided-- to--department chairs should use 1)the form provided 2 approved by a department or 3) one approved by the department and dean. (Passed 12-2)

Comments and questions about this page can be directed to the [Senate Webmaster](#).