

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty Senators
FROM: Arthur Miller, President, Faculty Senate
DATE: 4 January 1979
RE: Agenda for special Senate meeting

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Monday, 8 January at 3:00 pm in room 303, University Center. The agenda is as follows:

1. President's report
2. University policy on selection of administrators (see enclosure)
3. Proposed MBA program

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Faculty Senate

From: Arthur Miller, President

Date: 21 December 1978

Re: Special Meeting of Faculty Senate

There will be a special meeting of the Faculty Senate at 3:00 pm on Monday 8 January 1979 in the University Center. A more detailed agenda will be distributed later, but a major item for discussion will be the proposed M.B.A. Program.

science 308
1. 12/21/78

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

January 8, 1979

Senators Present:	A. Miller	T. Cate
	J. Bushee	C. Mulligan-Nichols
	S. Neely	L. Sutherland
	M. Clark	S. Newman
	B. Dickens	J. McKenney
	J. Pounche'	J. Hopgood
	T. McNally	B. Goggin
	E. Oliver	J. Miller
	K. Beirne	J. Williams
	D. Kelm	B. Craig
	F. Rhynhart	B. Craig
	B. Lindsay	B. Gwynn

Others Present:	M. Adams	R. Yerkes
	T. Kearns	L. Noyd

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Miller, who introduced E. Goggin to discuss procedures to help keep the senate meetings within reasonable time limits. Goggin noted the need to curtail cross-conversation in this effort and stated that he would call people out of order in the future, if they engage in too much cross-conversations.

President Miller welcomed the several guests in attendance.

He then introduced Dr. Jim Fouche' who presented a statement on "Faculty Participation in Selection and Retention of Administrators" which had been developed and approved by the Professional Concerns Committee. This statement, after approval by the entire senate, will be presented to the Regents in order to get their approval. The statement read as follow:

"The University adheres to the policy promulgated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) that its faculty should participate in the selection and retention of members of the central administration.* This policy includes significant faculty membership on any committees established or convened for these occasions.

*Central Administration is here defined to include the President, Provost, and Academic Deans."

This statement, Dr. Fouche' explained was intended to be just a statement of policy which they hoped to get accepted, after which specific guidelines for implementation would be worked out. The statement follows AAUP guidelines, he noted.

F. Rhynhart asked how the committee meant to define "significant faculty membership"? Dr. Fouche' replied that they had not set any definite :

percentage and added that the AAUP guidelines did not mention a specific percentage. Rhynhart then asked if there would be any vote by the general faculty involved in the selection and retention process. Fouche' replied that specific procedures had not been discussed at this point. Don Kelm asked if any further modifications would be made after the statement was adopted. Dr. Fouche' replied that the intent at this point was to get the Regents on record regarding the policy, and then the committee would work on the specific guidelines. The Professional Concerns Committee felt that a more specific outline at this time would not get through the Regents. Further discussion focused on the evaluation of administrators, the definition of the term "central administrators," concern about stating the policy in such a way that it will not exclude other administrators who are significant to the educational environment, the vagueness of the statement, and the need to get a policy adopted at this time in order to move toward a more formalized procedure in the future. Fred Rhynhart moved to amend the statement by striking out the entire last sentence which reads "This policy includes significant faculty membership on any committees established or convened for these occasions." This was seconded by J. McKenney, who noted he did so because the final sentence seems to refer to only the selection of central administrators. This motion to amend the statement was defeated eleven to nine with two abstentions. J. Williams then suggested defining central administrators as academic administrators or those who influence academic affairs. B. Dickens suggested expanding the definition while B. Oliver suggested eliminating any specific definition of central administrators altogether. At this point K. Beirne asked if central administrators were specified because the committee wanted to limit the statement to those identified or if those named were to be considered as examples. Fouche' replied that the list was not to be considered an exhaustive and that it might help to insert the words "such as." Oliver asked if the AAUP statement includes any specific definition to which J. Fouche' replied that it did not. J. Bushee suggested that the Senate should either drop the definition or expand it. If it is included it should be clear that it is not limited to just those listed. K. Beirne moved to amend the definition to read "Central administration is here defined to include among others the president, provost, academic deans and such other officers of the university whose decisions have an impact on the academic areas." This was seconded by J. Bushee. B. Lindsay raised the question about whether the Senate wanted to become personnel agents. Beirne noted that if the sentence is included it should include such officers as the budget officer and others in areas which affect faculty. If it is broad at this time the Senate can later opt. out. If it is not broad enough it would imply an exclusion of many people. T. McNally suggested wording the statement to focus on those above the deans' level. J. McKinney questioned trying to define out part of the statement when all the other aspects of the statement were vague. This motion failed. B. Oliver moved to strike the footnote regarding the definition of central administrators. E. Goggin seconded the motion. Motion passed. A motion to terminate debate on the statement passed. The question was called on the statement as amended. The statement as amended was approved.

J. Hopgood reported that the Curriculum Committee met on the 14th of December to discuss the MBA proposal. The committee voted to recommend the acceptance of the MBA proposal with the amendment that the matter of all foundation courses will be brought back to the Senate before the initiation of the MBA program. Foundation courses are generally

600 level courses and the Curriculum Committee felt they should be referred back to the Senate for further review. J. Williams asked for clarification on where the foundation courses will be referred back to--the Senate or the Curriculum Committee. J. Hopgood replied it would mean that they would come back to the Senate, but also that Mike Adams might be able to help clarify the procedures. At this point F. Rhynhart called for a point of order and raised a question about outside speakers being given the floor without majority vote as detailed in Article VII, Section F of the constitution. E. Goggin pointed out that a vote was necessary only when someone other than a faculty wished to be granted floor privileges and in this particular case there was no problem as far as the constitution was concerned. Dr. Adams is clearly a faculty member. Dr. Adams explained the problem with foundation courses going back to the Senate in that any changes suggested by the Senate would have to go back through the entire curriculum approval process. In essence, the whole process would have to be re-done. The Senate cannot unilaterally change the program. In particular, the Graduate Council would have to look at any changes. T. Cate questioned whether there was a quorum in the Curriculum Committee when the vote was taken. Dr. Hopgood replied that there was a quorum for the vote in that there were seven people present and one proxy vote. The recommendation to accept the proposal along with the amendment passed by a vote of eight to zero. Responding to a question about proxy votes, Hopgood replied that proxy votes

were allowed at the committee meetings. J. McKinney discussed the concern of the curriculum regarding some of the unresolved issues surrounding foundation courses such as the math courses which the math department will be teaching. These must be resolved even though the committee wanted to approve the concept of the MBA program. Members of the committee felt that specific foundation courses needed to be looked at again before implementation. K. Beirne noted that there were a number of unresolved issues in the proposal which would have to go back to the graduate council so these would have to go through the Faculty Senate again anyway. F. Rhynhart and B. Oliver, speaking in favor of the proposal, noted the need to be sensitive to the concerns of the foundation courses areas. J. McKinney asked for clarification as to whether the Senate was voting for the entire package as it is or if they were approving more the concept of the MBA program. Russell Yerkes, Chair of the Business Programs, stated he believed the program stands pretty much on its own feet as a good program, although there may be areas where some changes would be good. At this time the Business Program wants to get approval of the package as probabilities, but some specifics points they expect to have to come back to the Senate. M. Adams noted that certain decisions involved in implementing the program such as salaries will be made by the president and provost anyway. J. McKinney again asked exactly what the Senate was voting on, and expressed concern about whether they were approving specifics of the concept. He believes the vote should be on the approval of the concept, but not the specific document. Dr. Yerkes agreed that in essence the Senate was being asked to approve the concept, yet he still believed it is balanced by a fairly specific outline of the proposal. B. Dickens stated he believed the Cluster Curriculum Committee viewed the original discussion of the proposal as pretty much a vote on the concept. Dr. Yerkes agreed that the Senate at this time could consider the vote as a vote on the concept

Program will keep... there will be no...
 ...there will be no...
 ...there will be no...

because the Business Program will keep working in the MBA program. When it is finally done there will, no doubt, have been changes in it. Rhynhart noted he believed it would protect specific departments more if the Senate did not approve the proposal as a concept, but voted approval of the proposal with specific reservations. T. McNally raised another concern about the proposal as a graduate program. He expressed the belief that the Business Program should be very careful to make sure that the new program is carried out by graduate faculty. He did not feel this was clearly evident in the proposal. E. Goggin called for the question on the report from the Curriculum Committee. The report was approved by the Senate.

J. Williams moved to adjourn. B. Dicken seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned.