

**SEC/VPAA JOINT CONFERENCE  
MINUTES**

September 12, 2006  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Senate Conference Room  
140 McFall Center

Present: Barnes, Bernhard, Currie, Hebein, Folkins, Lee, Orel, Pinto, Vatan Woodhouse, Williams

Absent:

Faculty Senate Vice Chair Barnes called the joint conference to order at 2:30.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Recall of the Chair of a Department**

A handout was provided showing the proposed Charter Amendment regarding the Recall of the Chair of a Department. (Article XI, Section E) The proposed modification would change lines 2 & 3 of paragraph 1 from **“upon the initiative of the Dean or by petition of two-fifths (2/5) of the eligible faculty of the Department.”** to **“upon the initiative of the Dean or by petition of at least two-fifths (2/5) of the eligible faculty of the Department.”**

Additional changes included the addition of the following sentence on line 4 of paragraph 2. **“Efforts at negotiation and reconciliation must begin within one week of the initiation of the procedure and must be completed no later than one calendar month from the initiation of the procedure.”**

The third modification called for the insertion of the word **“eligible”** in the following sentence in paragraph 2: **“If the petitioners’ desire for recall persists, and also in those cases where recall has been initiated by the Dean, the Dean shall call and chair a meeting of the eligible tenured and probationary faculty members of the department.”**

The fourth modification called for the addition of the following sentence to be added as the next to last sentence in paragraph 2. **“The Chair of the Department shall not be eligible to vote in this matter.”**

The fifth modification would change the wording on the last sentence of paragraph 2 from **“Recall shall be recommended to the VPAA when at least two-thirds of the eligible departmental faculty vote in favor of recall.”** to **“Recall shall be recommended to the VPAA when at least three-fifths (3/5) of the eligible departmental faculty vote in favor of a recall.”**

The following discussion ensued relative to the proposed modifications regarding the “Recall of the Chair of a Department.”

**Woodhouse:** What is the purpose of adding the word “eligible” to define which faculty would be involved?

**Pinto:** The recall of a chair is a serious issue. Is there more behind the recommended modifications than we are being told?

**Woodhouse:** What happens if the process doesn’t occur according to the specified timelines? **Folkins:** The language is intended to be followed, but nothing negative typically happens if timelines aren’t followed...there is just encouragement to follow the suggested timelines.

**Folkins:** The Dean’s Council questioned whether or not the Chair should be allowed to/kept from voting. The Deans also felt that the current recommendation for recall based on two-thirds vote of eligible faculty gave the Deans more discretion in the matter. John also noted that prior to recommending recall of the Chair to the VPAA, the recall should be recommended to the Dean of the College.

**Barnes:** Because there are a number of unanswered questions regarding these proposed modifications, this issue will be reviewed again at the next SEC to determine if it is ready to go forward to Faculty Senate. Bernhard was asked to address some of the unresolved issues.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Planning for Infectious Disease: Academic Issues**

SEC was given a copy of a letter from Provost Folkins sent to the Faculty Senate Leadership (July 24, 2006) regarding academic issues relative to an outbreak of infectious disease. The letter identified the following academic issues that might need to be addressed:

If classes were to be suspended to deter the infectious disease, would faculty be able/expected to/ prepared to continue class work with students by distance education? (Pros & Cons?)

If classes were to be suspended, what impact might it have on grading issues? (Incompletes, grade at the time of suspension, grades of Pass/Fail instead of conventional grading?)

The following discussion occurred regarding the Plan for Infectious Disease.

**Folkins:** What sorts of faculty discussions of these issues/options would be most helpful in order to prepare the academic community for the potential of dealing with an infectious disease outbreak on campus? **Hebein:** Suggested that it might go to Undergraduate Council and CAA to discuss and develop a policy.

**Lee:** Noted the importance of developing a policy in advance to cover the grading procedures.

**Currie:** Should Firelands develop a separate policy? **Lee:** Suggested that there be only one policy and that Firelands could implement/modify the policy per Firelands special needs.

## **Development of a Check List/ Routing Sheet for Faculty Senate Approval**

A sample check sheet was given to members of SEC. This check sheet is being developed to assist in the routing of items that would eventually need Faculty Senate approval. Examples of items that might go through this routing procedure would include: the creation of new degree programs; major policy and program changes impacting on academics; reconfiguration of colleges and departments; etc. The check sheet /routing slip would identify the succession of approval steps needed prior to sending the item to Faculty Senate. In addition, there would be a signature required at each step of the approval process, along with dates of approval along the way. This should make it easier to track the status of any proposals that need Faculty Senate approval.

Discussion on the Check List followed:

**Williams:** The purpose of having such a check list or routing sheet is to make it easier for faculty to follow the procedural guidelines outlined in the charter for having proposals approved by Faculty Senate.

**Folkins:** The Provost's office already has a similar type of check list to use for items coming through the Provost's office. John noted that the college Deans should be included in the list of signatures needed for approval. John requested that a copy of the check list be sent to his office so his staff could review it.

**Hebein:** Suggested that Mark Gromko would be the ideal person to work on this check list to ensure that no step in the approval process is left out.

**Barnes:** Suggested that this check list be reviewed by the Provost's office for any suggested changes and returned to SEC for further discussion.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

### **Adequate Seating for Faculty Senate in the Gallery (McFall Center)**

**Williams:** Noted that there were insufficient chairs at the Faculty Senate reception, held in the Gallery. **Barnes:** Noted that extra chairs were found subsequent to the reception.

**Folkins:** Noted that he had appointed an ad hoc committee to look at updating the environment in the Gallery. He suggested that Faculty Senate write a letter to him requesting that there be some renovations made to the Gallery, such as painting, adequate chairs, etc. He would activate his ad hoc committee to implement some of these changes to update and improve the appearance of the Gallery.

**Bernhard:** Are there other places where Faculty Senate could meet? **Hebein:** Yes, Faculty Senate might meet in 4 different rooms in Olscamp Hall (including 117 Olscamp). **Barnes:** Wherever Faculty Senate meets, there needs to be seating that makes it easy for the Faculty Senate Secretary to see name plates so they can be recorded properly in the Faculty Senate minutes.

**Faculty Sanctions**

**Folkins:** Announced that he and Barbara Waddell are currently working on a policy regarding faculty sanctions related to faculty misconduct. This will be discussed at a future VPAA/SEC meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:****SEC/ VPAA Meeting at Firelands**

**Hebein:** Reminded SEC that the next SEC/VPAA meeting will be held at Firelands campus on October 17, 2006.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Williams  
Faculty Senate Secretary  
September 19, 2006