

Executive Council Meeting
March 19, 2010 – 8 – 10 a.m.
Newcomb Hall Board Room

Present: Bob Bloodgood, Marcia Childress, Ann Hamric, Bob Kemp, Ed Kitch, Kevin Lee, Marti Snell, Chip Tucker, Alf Weaver, Gweneth West, Dan Willingham

Guests: Arthur Garson, Jr., M.D.; Milton Adams; John Teahan; Daniel Bluestone;
Christina Hill

Ann Hamric called the meeting to order

Professors of Practice

The Council discussed the proposed Professors of Practice rank. Daniel Bluestone of the Academic Affairs Committee and his Architecture School colleague Christina Hill joined the meeting to discuss this issue. This discussion will be relayed back to the Academic Affairs Committee, which is charged with making a recommendation to the full faculty.

A question was asked why the person would be given notice as late as March 15. According to the Provost's Office, that date was pulled from AAUP guidelines.

Another question concerned excepting this rank from the grievance process: Could there be issues around the "leaving end" – the potential for more grievances filed, e.g., the school wanting them to stay, or their wanting to stay? The Provost would deal with grievances – would it be the same procedure as currently?

Milton Adams explained how the Provost's office currently deals with academic grievances from students, and promotion and tenure cases. Most Professors of Practice will come from the private sector or government between jobs, to teach for a year or two. We can't say if this will generate more grievances for us, but the Provost isn't worried about it.

There was extended discussion about the nature of this rank in regard to other faculty, especially non-tenure-track faculty and visiting faculty, and specifically the grievance process that would be available to them. A concern was expressed during the Academic Affairs meeting that these people may use this as a way to stay here without tenure. There was a desire for an explicit statement that this is a different sort of rank from non-tenure-track faculty.

The Council questioned whether the visiting professor policy needs to be revised to accommodate this sort of person as well, rather than create a new category.

Milton said that this new rank will strengthen the visiting professor rank and make it clearer – visiting professors are people coming from another institution; this is someone without traditional academic background. In practice, the visiting professor rank isn't following its original policy and intent. If this group recommended strongly that some with a Professor of Practice rank be eligible for Senate grievance, the Provost wouldn't have a problem with that.

Dr. Garson said that this is a well-known title. It is distinct; a Professor of Practice is someone with a great reputation but who doesn't fall into any other of our categories. Lots of institutions have this; the question is to limit the numbers of them.

Daniel Bluestone and Christina Hill expressed the Architecture School's concern that they want to have a new rank with a similar name (Professor in Practice) but a different meaning – it would be for those with academic credentials who have international practices, who would be on the faculty while continuing their practices.

The Council discussed the differences between Architecture's desired use of this title for the rank they envision, and that which is under discussion here. Milton said that the Provost will work with the Dean of Architecture to sort out this issue.

Dr. Garson stated that the idea of the proposed rank has been presented to all 11 deans, who are all in favor of this as a non-tenure-track position. We need to be able to get people here on a temporary basis who are not tenured, and the term in use seems to be Professor of Practice.

The Council discussed the grievance process for this rank. There was consensus for removing the Associate Professor rank, and for changing the document to read, "Annual reviews WILL be conducted." The revised policy will be presented to the Senate at the Working Meeting.

Other Matters

It was decided to have James Hilton, the Vice President and Chief Information Officer, address SIS issues in the Working Meeting, and to invite Lou Bloomfield also. At a later date, we would invite James to talk about his future plans. This time, we will have round table discussions and present him with questions and issues that arise in those.

Ed Kitch spoke briefly about the work of the Nominating Committee in identifying and recruiting candidates for vacancies on the Executive Council, plus nominating a chair-elect. He said the process is going on, and he asked for any suggestions. We need to engage and recruit younger members of the faculty. The slate will be presented at the final Faculty Senate meeting of the year. He would like to suggest that those he wants to recruit call members of the Executive Council to learn about the work involved.

Ann said that we have a good plan for new senator orientation. Issues continue to percolate about the Classified Research Policy, which will come back to the Executive Council for consideration eventually.

Nondiscrimination Statement

Ann has been contacted by both the General Faculty Council and Employee Communication Council to produce a nondiscrimination statement recommending that the University keep its current policies. The Governor's statement refers only to state employees, saying that we respect the federal guidelines; it doesn't have weight of an executive order, and doesn't speak to staff and students. ECC & GFC feel it isn't strong enough, that it doesn't carry legal weight.

Some advised keeping it under the radar. We really have no power; we are only saying we hope that our president will be sensitive to these issues. Others suggested waiting for GFC or ECC to write a statement.

Ann Witkower was asked to send out the Faculty Senate's current intolerance statement to the Executive Council.

Chip Tucker, Ed Kitch, and Marcia Childress volunteered to work as a small group to craft a resolution like the existing statement but not tied to a specific event. They would then send this statement to the other Councils to see if they want to endorse it.

Dr. Garson said we should not do anything without talking to the General Counsel's office first.

Dissertation Year Fellowships

We have a major problem with sustainability of the Dissertation Year Fellowships; we need help with this issue. The Graduate Funding group of the Planning & Development Committee needs to meet with Steve Macko, the Dissertation Year Fellowship Committee chair, to discuss this question. Other possibilities include all graduate research funds going into one pool to reward excellent research; housing this fellowship under a philanthropic group, with the Senate administering it; and the University taking it on as their task to get 100-200 of such fellowships, which is on list of priorities for new president.

The meeting was adjourned at 10 a.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate