

The Executive Council of the Faculty Senate  
December 17, 2009 – 1 p.m.-5 p.m.  
Hotel E, Room E-2

## Meeting Minutes

Present: Marcia Childress, Ann Hamric, Chris Holstege, Bob Kemp, Susan Kirk, Ed Kitch, Kevin Lee, Pam Norris, Marti Snell, Chip Tucker, Alf Weaver, Gweneth West, Dan Willingham

Guest: Arthur Garson, Jr., M.D., Provost

**Ann Hamric, Chair of the Faculty Senate**, called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. and welcomed Chris Holstege, the representative of the Faculty Recruitment, Retention, and Welfare Committee, to the Council.

### **Plans for President Casteen's Last Faculty Senate Meeting**

Ann said that Craig Littlepage, the Director of Athletics, has offered Bryant Hall next to Scott Stadium for our last Senate meeting with President John Casteen, for minimum set-up and clean-up fees. Free parking would be available. Craig is interested in coming to an Executive Council meeting before the next Faculty Senate meeting in February. Ann asked if the Faculty Senate should host a reception for JTC rather than him hosting a reception at Carr's Hill. Also, do we want to give him a gift?

The idea to hold the last meeting in Bryant Hall was discussed and approved. Regarding the idea of a gift, it was pointed out that the Development Office plans to give one gift that anyone at the University could contribute to.

One suggestion was to present the President with a framed proclamation of appreciation from the Faculty Senate. Perhaps the text could be modeled after the type of resolution like the Virginia legislature creates.

The idea was approved, and Susan Kirk agreed to adapt a Virginia legislature resolution for the President, then circulate it to the group for their approval.

### **Discussion of All-University Event**

An all-University event to mark President Casteen's tenure has been proposed by Bob Sweeney and the Office of Development and Public Affairs for the spring semester Reading Day on May 5. The Council disapproved of this use of a Reading Day. Many students likely would not come. Those students involved with providing entertainment would not be able to use the time for studying. The idea of holding this event on Founders Day was suggested, as well as on the Saturday before graduation, after the Valedictory Exercises.

### **Executive Council Spring Meetings**

The Executive Council is working to find a recurring day and time that works for Spring Semester meetings. All Executive Council members were urged to weigh in on their availability.

## Honor Case

A professor has asked the Executive Council to consider alleged violations of the Honor Code. The Honor Committee was approached but stated that the Committee doesn't consider general issues, only specific cases. Without evidential data, the Honor Committee could do nothing.

The Council discussed what recourse faculty have in raising what they believe to be serious concerns. It is not something for the Faculty Senate to deal with. The best forum would be the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Honor Committee, according to Pat Lampkin.

The professor wants discussion about whether the honor system needs to be revised. The Faculty Senate undertook a thorough examination of the system four years ago, without much tangible result. At the time there was a real student push to get rid of the single-sanction, yet the referendum on the issue didn't pass.

A contributing problem may be classes too large to form community rapport. One suggestion is to offer guidelines for faculty about how to create an atmosphere where students are less likely to cheat.

## Faculty Recruitment, Retention and Welfare Committee Report

Chris Holstege introduced the topic of Governor Tim Kaine's initiative to amend section 1VAC 55 320(E) found at <http://www.townhall.state.va.us/L/ViewXML.cfm?textid=3978>. In short, this "Other Qualified Adult" (OQA) program would enable a state employee who does not already enroll a spouse in one of the state's available health plans to enroll one adult individual for benefit coverage if specific criteria are met. Such adults could include a parent, a sibling, an adult child, or an unmarried partner. **The FRRW Committee unanimously supported the proposed amendment at their December meeting and recommend that the Faculty Senate add a statement of support on the public comment website devoted to this proposal.** President Casteen has already posted support for this proposed amendment, as have other Virginia university presidents. A discussion ensued regarding the appropriate manner in which to post a statement of support from the Faculty Senate, and the decision was made that the FRRW Committee would be the appropriate vehicle to post the statement. The public comment period closes on Jan. 3. Chris Holstege and Susan McKinnon were tasked with drafting a statement for public comments and sending it to Ann for review. All agreed on this course of action.

Changes in U.Va.'s health plan were discussed involving mental health and prescription drugs. A question was raised to Anne and subsequently forwarded to the FRRW Committee regarding an insurance change requiring the need for authorization of approval following every 5 psychiatric care visits. Susan Carkeek was also involved in the discussions and Bankole Johnson, chair of psychiatry, was asked to review and give an opinion if this would be a significant additional burden to faculty and psychiatric services. Dr. Garson suggested directly contacting the insurance carrier to determine the specific reason for this change. **The FRRW Committee will follow-up with Susan Carkeek, Professor Johnson, and the insurance carrier.**

## Creating a FAQs Page on Faculty Senate Website, Collab Discussions

Ann Hamric asked how various issues that arise could be assigned to the different committees. Where do we gather data, and who should respond? With a new administration and a new president, we'll have even more of these things. Questions will arise about the role of the Senate and what they should deal with. We could create links on left side of Senate page – “if you are dealing with issues related to . . . , you need to talk to FRRW.” Ann Witkower could devise a way to automatically direct a question to the appropriate chair. It will be good for her to field questions and point people in the right direction.

There could be a link to, for instance, the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Honor System, with a description of what issues might go to them. People don't know whom to ask when they have a problem.

How do we make it more the role of the Senate to respond to questions, not just the Senate chair? Any restructuring of our Senate organization needs to be in touch with the restructuring of the University administration. Do we wait until a new president comes on board and start with a blank sheet of paper? A comment was that we can't wait. Significant change takes three years. Let's think now about how we want to restructure ourselves rather than wait and see how the central administration gets restructured. A change in the top administration won't change the path for problem solving. It's an unfair burden for the chair alone to be the clearing house for these things.

FAQs could be developed with headings such as Benefits to address common themes. How can the office of the chair work more efficiently? Ideally, a question should go to the Senate rep in a department, and only if they can't deal with it should it go on to the chair.

There are two issues: traffic control, and sharing the burden of the office of chair.

Beyond the issue of who to send people to, there's a deeper systemic issue: too many faculty senators are placeholders. Often new senators aren't involved because they don't know what they're supposed to be doing. There has been talk of an orientation session for all new senators.

It was suggested that to assist the chair, the Executive Council could meet more often – maybe every two weeks, even if not everyone can be there.

To tackle the issue of all the queries coming in to Ann Hamric, past chairs of the Faculty Senate could make recommendations for improved organization. If we're missing some key committees, those could be added.

Tim Garson suggested that the Executive Council have a weekly internal blog, perhaps once a week. The Council doesn't need more meetings, but a way to get questions answered. Based on the questions received, a decision could be made about what other committees might be needed. The Council could even pick an hour for a live chat, which could also solve the problem of so many meetings. This wouldn't replace face-to-face communication, but just supplement.

Ann Hamric and Tim Garson have talked about linking committees to respective administrative leadership roles, enabling ongoing dialogue between faculty and administration leaders. How can we be more nimble and representative?

To properly utilize committees, perhaps voice the expectation at election time that each senator will serve on a committee or two, then define how those committees support the chair. This

could be a role for the orientation of new senators: present them with the committees and ask what their interests are.

The Executive Council serves as the chair's cabinet; another model might be that the Executive Council is the body, and the chair is basically the clerk of that body. One model is of an executive with a set of advisers; the other is an executive council. Could it be made to work in the University climate? Maybe step by step.

Our Collab site will augment our ability to keep each other apprised. Ann Hamric can tell what her needs are and solicit help on particular problems from particular people.

### **Discussion of New Senator Orientation**

In the past, there was an orientation for new senators. Ken Schwartz met in small groups with new senators to give them notice that they were expected to do certain things. It is suggested that late this spring, the Executive Council or a subset could devise an outline of expectations and what should be communicated – then someone could meet with new senators in small groups or several sessions. There is a need to get people lined up, thinking, ready to go in the spring, not wait until the fall. New senators should come to the last full Senate meeting. Frances made sure elections were made by then; she called deans and chairs to follow up.

Gwen, Alf, Marcia, and Marti agreed to consider this issue and constitute an orientations committee.

Question: Should the Planning & Development Committee still work with three subcommittees, or does it need to be reorganized?

### **Provost's Report**

We need to take a good look at the new school template so that we can make sure any ideas for new schools are thoroughly vetted. It doesn't matter as much for institutes, which are not degree granting. We only have jurisdiction over the degree-granting entities.

The relationship between the Faculty Senate and the General Faculty Council (GFC) was discussed. The GFC is self-constituted, created for non-tenure-track and administrative and professional faculty. It wants to be closely aligned with us. In the past, a joint meeting between GFC and FS has accomplished little. Ann was invited to address the group; the group was eager to hear how we were going to increase interaction between the two groups and asked why she hadn't constituted a joint council. She suggested making task forces when we have joint issues. She said she would bring the issue back to the Executive Council. Question: do we try to reconstitute this joint committee?

There was support for the idea of working on things issue by issue, maybe issuing joint statements. It was suggested that it might be good to have GFC members on certain Faculty Senate committees, for ad hoc issues and for select committees. The Council approved the idea of addressing issues cooperatively in an ad hoc way.

Recommendations were to swap minutes of full Faculty Senate meetings with the GFC on a regular basis; point out that general faculty are members/leaders of a number of committees; and emphasize that we would welcome members of the general faculty as senators. This would send the message, "We've taken your thoughts into consideration, and this is what we're proposing." Ann Hamric will draft a letter, then send it to Marti and Chip for review.

One of GFC's big concerns was with the School of Engineering. Peter Norton stated that he had talked to the SEAS dean, and he had declined to send the non-tenure-track report to department chairs. Ann Hamric sees this as a school issue, not a GFC issue. She urged Peter to get in touch with senators to discuss what they want to do about it. The STS department is a humanities department within SEAS; its chair has a very different world view from other departments. Ann further urged Peter to deal with the issue within the department. Alf Weaver agreed to discuss the issue with Dean Aylor.

Reg Garrett called Ann with concerns about classified research. SEAS is looking at classified, defense-related research, which would set a precedent at University. The University could have exemptions that could be jeopardized if we engage in classified research. Funding streams could be jeopardized that were made on the basis of the University doing no classified research.

Alf Weaver said that a year and a half ago, SEAS began working on an applied research institute. It has an office in UVA research park, with a staff of three and Alf as director. They are working to open up a new market for classified work. Any participation in this is entirely voluntary. Participants would need security clearance; the building, which is not on the Grounds, is working to get security clearance. No junior faculty, or students whose academic process is likely to be impaired, would be encouraged to work on classified projects.

Pam Norris said that DIA is a huge enterprise that is moving employees here, with a lot of money that U.Va. wants to tap. The Senate was asked to approve any requests for classified research through the Research & Scholarship Committee (R&S). It is unclear what happens when R&S disapproves a request.

The Council discussed the larger issue of classified research and what is involved to be approved for such work. If individual faculty want to do classified work, their group must provide a place for the research. The University is providing money for this entrepreneurial research in the hope that it would increase – we haven't done any since 1984. When the federal government has work to be done, it finds someone with the appropriate classified status to do the work, then provides funding for this individual and a place for it. The problem is that we can't get a classified project until we have the place, the people, and the need. The need will come from the government. Only a few faculty have security clearances. There are many obstacles to overcome before we make a request for approval to the Faculty Senate.

From administration's point of view, there needs to be dissemination of information and discussion, so faculty don't overreact. Ann asked how we begin to inform; or do we begin a thinking group as part of R&S to consider these matters?

Alf Weaver volunteered to talk to Reg. If Reg wants to be involved, he could be invited to serve on R&S; otherwise, he could be directed to talk to Alf or to Pam Norris as Committee chair.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate