

Faculty Senate Working Meeting  
March 25, 2010 – 3-5 p.m.  
Newcomb Hall Commonwealth Room

Minutes

**Ann Hamric, the Faculty Senate chair**, called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

**SIS - James Hilton, the Vice President and Chief Information Officer**

James Hilton said the SIS program was introduced because ISIS, the previous system, was a very brittle system to begin with, based on a telephone registration system. It broke down every semester under the heavy registration load. Replacement had been discussed since the 1990s. SIS implementation began in 2008 and was completed in September 2009. Governance during the project included a number of informal advisory groups, including one from every college or school. Now the SIS Advisory Board is handling suggestions and complaints.

Rachel Most, an Associate Dean of A&S, reported that each school or department has a representative on the SIS Advisory Board; there are two from A&S, one grad, one undergrad. At first, there was a flurry of complaints and problems. Some of the original problems and complaints have been dealt with and fixed. In the College, several meetings have taken place where a variety of issues have come up, and working groups have been formed.

Faculty senators broke up into groups for discussion; they were asked to identify a couple of key questions for Mr. Hilton based on problems their constituents are having with SIS.

One group had a question about the differences between the wait list, the permission list, and the random list. Rachel Most said that the wait list works automatically; it kicks in when class fills. Students can't get on the wait list unless they meet the criteria of the class, and they get on in the order they're released to enroll in classes (4th year, then 3rd year, etc.). The permission list is the instructor's permission – the instructor has to invite those students, and they can be on that list even if their registration time hasn't come up. A one-page chart is being designed for students to show them how they can make changes: What the problem is, what they can do to fix it, and what are the consequences of that action.

It was asked what information the students will provide that teachers can see. Ms. Most said that their major will be there; a one-line reason why they want to be in the class; and the order in which they registered. Teachers will not have the ability to pose a question to them, but they will be able to email everyone on the permission list. Teachers can sort in a number of different ways to make their decision, which are invisible to students. On the wait list, students see what number they are. Now there is an upgrade to the permission list, so that teachers see a sequence number.

One discussion group thought that students ought to see a paragraph description of course, not just the name. Ms. Most said that that is still being worked on. For now, a teacher can paste the course description into Collab.

It was asked whether one can get a list of all the courses in a particular department for a particular semester. Ms. Most said yes, you can. You search by department – that gives the instructor, time, and class size for the department's courses.

One group said they would like notification that there are people waiting or people on the permission list, rather than just looking at icon.

Another group said that I-key is the biggest problem about graduate applications. Mr. Hilton said that no one had expected much highly secure material in graduate applications – but they do often come in with highly secure material, like Social Security numbers. Now a lot more people have to have I-keys than was first thought. Also, I-key, or any system to protect highly sensitive materials, is a moving target – when one of the providers upgrades, that causes problems.

One group suggested that if we could restrict materials to not containing sensitive materials, we wouldn't need an I-key. However, Mr. Hilton said that half the schools send transcripts with Social Security numbers.

Mr. Hilton was asked if there was a chance of getting this system working on UNIX, but he said that is not a high priority.

A question was asked about a problem some undergrad students are having with getting their financial aid worked out. Yvonne Hubbard, Director of Student Financial Services, responded that SIS has been a difficult implementation for financial aid, but it is working much better this year already. Anyone who still has undergrad students with issues can send directly to Ms. Hubbard at [yvonne@virginia.edu](mailto:yvonne@virginia.edu).

A problem was raised about the fact that in physics classes with lots of labs, students may want to sign up for one but be on the wait list for another. But as soon as they wait list for one lab, they get dropped from the other lab they've signed up for. Is there any way for them to be in one lab and wait-listed on another? Mr. Hilton said he is working to make sure that people with specific questions can be linked to the right person. He has put a comment link on the SIS website; also every unit has reps on the SIS Advisory Board, which are listed on the SIS page; and those who are passionate can join the Board.

Ann Witkower, the Faculty Senate administrative assistant, was asked to together a list of those on the SIS Advisory Board, indicating who would be the best linkage for what kind of questions. That list is to be sent out to all senators.

A demonstration is available that is helpful for students to learn about SIS. Information is continually being updated.

Any further questions can be posed to James Hilton at [jhilton@virginia.edu](mailto:jhilton@virginia.edu) or to Rachel Most at [rachel@virginia.edu](mailto:rachel@virginia.edu); or one can leave a comment on the SIS page.

Mr. Hilton requested an opportunity to return at a later date to talk to the Faculty Senate about SHANTI, which involves the use of information technology to support new initiatives.

### **Professor of Practice - Robert Kemp, Academic Affairs Committee Chair**

It is the responsibility of the Academic Affairs Committee to present any academic matter to the Senate. All information gleaned today will go back to the Committee, a final draft will be

produced, and the Faculty Senate will vote on it in April. John Teahan and Milton Adams of the Provost's Office have taken faculty suggestions and revised the proposal accordingly.

John Teahan said that Harry Harding contacted office about creating a Professor of Practice rank, and the Provost's Office looked into it and researched other universities' usage. The Provost met with the deans, and they were supportive of the concept. Revisions were made in response to suggestions by the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee and the Executive Council. He said that there is a need for this because it is a unique rank for practitioners who are coming from a particular field and will go back to that field. People come with experience but not academic background. This is proper title for such people.

It was asserted that this should be subset of the non-tenure track faculty (NTTF), and imbedded in that policy. Some faculty expressed concerns about the lack of standards of notice for these positions, and about the limited grievance procedure. Any faculty member here deserves adequate grievance process.

Ann Hamric said that these are individuals who would not be hired in a non-tenure-track position. They do not have academic credentials, but have distinguished themselves in some other field. This is not analogous to NTTF. Second, they are not seen as long-term faculty members. There is a real desire not to mix this up with NTTF procedures. These are only to remain one or two years. Exemptions were deliberately there so this would not be seen as a subset of visiting professor or NTTF. They have the ability to grieve through the Provost.

Bob Rood, chair of the Grievance Committee, said that those on the Committee have seen the importance of people having multiple ways to express their grievances. Grievance procedures in schools sometimes break down. It would be good to have more avenues for these people to bring grievances rather than just the Provost's Office.

Bob Kemp asked if it was the consensus of this group that we want the Provost's Office to put in more grievance procedures into this proposal when he takes this back to the Academic Affairs Committee.

A question was asked why this is needed. There was anxiety about lots of extra professorships that water down the basic meaning of our professor rank.

John Teahan replied that the Batten School would say these kinds of people are in demand, and that we are at a strategic disadvantage in relation to other schools if we do not have this rank.

Batten School's intention is to bring in policy-makers who have no aspirations to stay in academia; this creates a more porous boundary between the University and some of these practices and fields. These aren't people who are going to want to be lifelong academics.

Discussion ensued about other possible titles for this sort of individual, such as "fellow." John Teahan said that the Provost's Office thinks there is value to having the word "practice" in the title. Dr. Garson said that 22 of the AAU universities have this rank, including Harvard. We lose something if 22 have this and we do not. All 11 deans have looked at this and are satisfied with it.

Bob Kemp noted that the overall consensus seems to be that we do support the creation of this rank, and we support putting more grievance support in for these people if they so choose.

It was suggested to look at aspects of contracts at other universities, such as grievance procedures and offer dates.

It was concluded that the Academic Affairs Committee would look at John Teahan's revision, taking into account our discussion here. Specifically, they would consider the issue of the offer date (March 15), and at the grievance procedure.

### **Declaration against Discrimination – Chip Tucker**

Ellen Bass, who described herself as the only out gay faculty member in the School of Engineering and Applied Science, noted that in February when Governor McDonnell did not extend his executive order to include gender identity and gender expression, a group formed at U.Va. to call for the addition of those two items to our University non-discrimination policy.

Chip Tucker stated that he was presenting the document that had been decided upon by a Faculty Senate ad hoc committee. He expressed a sense of the momentum with this document as something presented for action today by this body, and did not propose adding new wording. He called for the Faculty Senate to affirm the wording we already have. He described it as a declaration, not a protest.

Ann Hamric said that we want to speak in favor of specifically mentioning students; the Governor spoke only about state employees.

Discussion followed about specific content of the declaration.

It was suggested to send the declaration to media outlets.

Ann asked if those present were in favor of a statement such as this? There was agreement on this. Second, Ann asked what we should do with this – send it to the Attorney General and the Governor? unite with other groups who want to make joint statement?

Ricky Patterson, Chair of the General Faculty Counsel, said he would like to come up with a statement that all three councils (including the Employee Communication Councils) can potentially endorse. It is important to get out a response very soon. He said that this statement is close to what needs to come out.

Ann Hamric suggested sending the declaration to our Board of Visitors and distributing it to media outlets. It will also be posted on the Faculty Senate website. This was agreed upon.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Submitted by Kevin Lee, Secretary of the Faculty Senate