

Meeting of the Faculty Senate, Franklin College of Arts & Sciences – Feb. 23, 2006

1. Call to Order
 - a. Presiding Officer Mitch Rothstein [Mathematics] called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm in Room 2B of the Main Library.
2. Identification of Proxies and Visitors.
3. The minutes from January 19, 2006 were approved as amended (Mitch Rothstein's last name misspelled in previous minutes).
4. Comments by the Presiding Officer, Mitch Rothstein:
 - a. Dr. Rothstein indicated that at this session, the Faculty Senate will be discussing the revisions to the grade appeals policy, and discussed the process that went into those revisions.
5. Comments by Dean Garnett Stokes:
 - a. Report on Provost Mace's meeting with Faculty from 2/20/06
 - i. Applications for incoming class are up, and we expect 4,650 incoming freshman next year. Qualifications for entry will continue to rise, and the College is considering an enrollment management plan.
 - ii. Provost Mace indicated that the budget for current fiscal year (FY) was \$22M larger than the previous FY. Much of this increase was absorbed by increased costs of fringe benefits, graduate health insurance, an EPA fine, and increased energy costs (a \$6.1M increase from last year).
 - iii. For FY07, Provost Mace expects full formula funding, though the allocation is not known. There may be a tuition increase, and faculty salaries will be given consideration.
 - iv. Regarding the University Capital Campaign, the Franklin College is number one in fundraising and has surpassed its goal. A new goal of \$55M has been proposed, and the College is focusing on finding funds for named professorships and graduate student stipend endowments.
 - v. It is expected that the plus/minus grading system will be approved as a three-year pilot program.
 - vi. Provost Mace was concerned about the number of grad students and part time faculty providing instruction, as this is an accreditation issue. Mace believes that we are back to our 2002 faculty numbers, but Dean Stokes disagrees and has documented that in 2002 faculty count was 686, while in fall 2005 was 640.
 - b. The highest priority for next year is faculty salary adjustments, and the hope is for 4% raise. There probably will not be much allocation for new faculty lines.
 - c. Dean Stokes took questions from senators:
 - i. Our enrollment has increased from 14573 to 16279 from 2002 to 2005.

- ii. Based on the numbers given the Senate by Dean Stokes, it was calculated that to maintain the faculty:student ratio at the university in 2002 we would need 766 tenure-track faculty.

6. Committee Reports

- a. Committees: did not meet, nothing to report
- b. Academic Standards – 7 petitions, voted on grade appeals policy
- c. The Admissions Committee nothing.
- d. Curriculum – voted on items on CAPA system, all approved (course proposals for environmental literacy, women’s studies, math, deactivation of psychology minor is still to be voted on)
- e. Planning – no report
- f. Professional Concerns – no report
- g. Steering – no report.

7. New business

- a. Grade Appeals Policy discussion
 - i. There is still no timeframe discussed in this version (University Council Educational Affairs Committee is reviewing the revision of institutional policy); this will eventually be dictated by university policy, and a timeframe of six months is recommended.
 - ii. Presentation of proposed changes to policy
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. There is an implicit motion on the floor to approve the policy (Rothstein).
 - 2. Richard Morrison (Chemistry): There is still a problem with this version. Referencing the policy two revisions ago (1995), at that time Article 5 referenced the statutes, and assigned the authority solely to faculty, except for “specified appeals”. In the current language, that provision has been removed. In this revision, we are codifying the authority of a college administrator to change a faculty member’s grades. He is not in favor of this, because the Academic Standards committee has very little institutional memory due to turnover.
 - 3. Elham Izadi (Mathematics): Could Academic Standards overturn grades in the previous version? How was this done previously?
 - 4. Hugh Rupperson (Franklin College): Previously, the appeal would go to Academic Standards, and they would make a ruling. In 2-3 cases in 10 years, they found for the student.
 - 5. Mike Roden: In response to Dr. Morrison, the committee was worried about this issue of overturning faculty decision, but made it a 2/3 vote so that it is difficult to do so. The goal was to make it as simple as possible, giving as much power to departments as possible.
 - 6. Anne Summers (Microbiology): This should only be appellate – not a re-trial. There may be a contradiction

between leaving only the instructor in power, but a student should be able to appeal any grade for any reason – also in our bylaws.

7. Mitch Rothstein: There is an additional safety net because instructors can appeal to the Educational Affairs committee if the ruling goes against the instructor at the college level.
 8. Jim Coverdell (Sociology): Academic Standards should really be just appellate, why can't that stay that way?
 9. Art Leed (Legal Affairs): As it stands, it must go through 3 steps to overturn, and only on procedural grounds can it be returned to the departmental appeals level.
 10. Coverdell: The department's committee can rule in favor of student.
 11. Leed: However, they can ask the instructor to change it but they cannot overturn the grade.
 12. Coverdell: Why can't they instruct the instructor, who can then appeal?
 13. Chemistry (Jim de Haseth): The problem is that grades HAVE been overturned. Academic Affairs can ask for leniency due to many reasons. What we're asking here is to look at the curriculum and see whether the instructor dealt with things fairly. Academic Standards committee never lowers grades! They are only looking at exceptions – those who want a benefit over their peers.
 14. Anne Summers: To reiterate, this process should be appellate, not a re-trial. It should only be about procedures.
 15. Call to vote, motion is to approve the revision of the grade appeals policy to present to the faculty for full vote. 13 yes, 13 no. Tom McNulty voted absentee, yes. Motion carries 14-13.
- b. Deactivation of Psychology minor
- i. The department has reached a crisis point in that graduating seniors couldn't get required courses, due to an increase of about 30% in number of majors and a decline in faculty lines. Minors have similar laboratory requirements, so they would rather serve the majors and those from outside of department that need classes for their major.
 - ii. The savings will be about 120-140 seats per year in upper division labs, 35-60 in lower (4-5 lab sections). This won't solve problem entirely. The department is also rethinking how they are using faculty to cover the courses, going to larger lecture sections and graduate TAs.
 - iii. Amy Ross, Geography – Can this be temporary? Will it make the program suffer? Can we amend the provision to reflect the loss of faculty lines, something like: “Due to dearth of current faculty numbers...”

- iv. This would be approved for a 2-year period only.
 - v. Friendly amendment to amend motion to include discussion of the crisis of decreased numbers of faculty members, indicating that the department of Psychology is suspending the minor only under duress.
 - vi. Motion carries without amendment.
 - c. Institute of Bioinformatics M.S. and Ph.D.
 - i. Izadi (Mathematics): Does faculty come from different departments or do you recruit for yourself?
 - ii. IOB: They can recruit for themselves; there are about 35 members and 15 associate members.
 - iii. Dean Stokes: The faculty home is in a department, independent of the Institute.
 - iv. Both motions carried.
 - d. Agenda items for next meeting
8. Meeting Adjourned