

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate
Meeting of April 25, 2005, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall
Minutes

Members Attending

James Alexander
John Anderson
Hussein Assaf
Bo Carlsson
Randall Cebul
Sayan Chatterjee
Francis Curd
Sara Debanne
Robin Dubin
Jonathan Entin
Kathleen Farkas
Lynne Ford
Paul Gerhart
Katherine Hessler

Susan Hinze
Edward Hundert
Jaikrishnan Kadambi
Patrick Kennedy
Carolyn Kercksmar
Elisabeth Köll
Joseph Koonce
Kenneth Laurita
Kenneth Ledford
Elizabeth Madigan
Roger Marchant
David Matthiesen
Carol Musil
Georgia Narsavage

Spencer Neth
John Orlock
Theresa Pretlow
Martin Resnick
Gerald Saidel
Robert Salata
Paul Salipante
Laura Siminoff
David Singer
Philip Taylor
Aloen Townsend
E. Ronald Wright

Others Present

Antonio Candau
Mark Carlson
Douglas Detterman
Mark DeGuire
Pieter DeHaseth
Joanne Eustis

Donald Feke
Meredith Holmes
Kathryn Karipides
Tony Kinslow
Robin Kramer
Beth McGee

Raymond Muzic
Dean Patterson
Margaret Robinson
Charles Rozek
Virginia Saha
Lynn Singer

Professor Bo Carlsson, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 21, 2005, were approved as distributed.

President's Announcements

Dr. Edward Hundert offered thanks and praise for the hard work involved in preparation for the accreditation visit just completed, April 11-13, with special appreciation for Don Feke and the Steering Committee members. Dr. Hundert also noted the apparent successful work by our Undergraduate Admissions team; all indications are that we will have a record size and quality incoming class.

Provost's Announcements

John Anderson distributed and introduced the Case Compliance Program and Code of Conduct. He urged all to read the cover letter and the description of the program and follow the Code in its entirety. Details are available on the web site of the Office of Audit Services at www.case.edu/president/audit/hotline.htm. A key point is the confidential Case Integrity Hotline at 1-866-483-0367 or online at www.caseintegrityhotline.com. This is to be managed by a specialty firm.

Other topics noted were improved communications with students, parents, and faculty when deciding upon any tuition increases and the next steps in the academic planning process—May 3 is the deadline for submission of each school's plans. Then he will be writing up the university plan. The provost also mentioned the enrollment web site which we are monitoring closely for diversity and some small concern about too large an entering class; he had high praise for all involved in this success. And, the junior class again won the Hudson Relay race for the third successive year.

Chair's Announcements

Professor Bo Carlsson reported on a small change in wording in the new Partner Hiring Policy to clarify a question which had arisen. The change noted below was approved without questions:

Office of University Counsel and the Department of Human Resources modification to policy approved at the Faculty Senate meeting of March 1, 2005:

5. In the event that the partner of a final candidate or partner of a covered faculty member or administrator is pursuing an academic career, the appropriate dean and/or department chair in the initial hiring school, or appropriate supervising administrator may request, through the Office of the Provost where necessary, review of the partner for hiring by another department or school within the University. If the department or school considering the partner wishes to offer that person a position, the Provost and the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD) will work with the relevant dean, school, or administrator to facilitate the partner's hiring, if possible. The EOD Office will review the partner's qualifications, distinguishing characteristics, and potential contributions to the University, and if the final candidate or covered faculty member or administrator has received appropriate approval by the EOD Office, **the EOD Office generally will approve the department or school proceeding without an equal opportunity search for the position to be held by** the partner of the final candidate or partner of a covered faculty member or administrator ~~generally will be granted an exemption by the EOD Office from equal opportunity approval~~ if documented reasons exist for such an exemption in light of the pair's overall potential contribution to the diversity and/or the strength of the University.

~~**text to be deleted**~~

~~**generally will be granted an exemption by the EOD Office from equal opportunity approval **~~

~~^text to be added^~~

~~^ **the EOD Office generally will approve the department or school proceeding without an equal opportunity search for the position to be held by** ^~~

Chair Carlsson noted distribution of the Outcome Assessment Executive Committee's 2005 Report on Outcome Assessment at Case as required. He said that Don Feke is available to respond to any questions, and this report will be addressed more thoroughly in the fall.

Noting her plans to retire at the end of this academic year, Professor Carlsson had special words of appreciation for Dean Margi Robinson for her long service and many extraordinary accomplishments, especially in support of undergraduate students.

Report of the Executive Committee

Professor Carol Musil gave the report of the meeting of April 5. The minutes of the March 8 meeting were approved; the announcements were the same as presented at this Senate meeting; and the many committee reports and motions from By-Laws, Graduate Studies, University Libraries, Nominating, and Research which appear on this agenda were discussed and approved for forwarding. Finally, the agenda for the Senate meeting was approved; and adjournment was at 9:45 a.m.

Report of the By-Laws Committee

Chair Georgia Narsavage presented by-laws revisions from the Case School of Engineering, reviewed and approved by her committee, for vote by the Faculty Senate. The school has previously submitted and received approval for revisions to their guidelines for tenure and tenure-track faculty; this section is for a new non-tenure track. The school must still bring forward a standards and criteria document. There were several questions, one of which was why non-tenure track faculty are not permitted a vote at the school level even though those faculty can vote in university elections. Professor Mark DeGuire answered that his faculty wanted to retain certain items for tenure and tenure-track faculty alone. The MOTION to approve these latest revisions to the Case School of Engineering's by-laws was approved by a vote of 31 in

favor and 2 opposed.

Report of the Graduate Studies Committee

Chair Kenneth Laurita presented a proposal for a joint J.D./M.S. in Biochemistry program with the recommendation of the committee. He noted recently approved guidelines for joint degree programs which this proposal follows. Professor Jonathan Entin said that the Law School has several such programs and would be welcoming of other opportunities. This is not a new degree. The vote on the MOTION was approved by a vote of 33 to 0.

Report of the Committee on University Libraries

Chair Paul Salipante submitted a year-end summary report of activities for the past year. He said that the very complex Open Access publishing issues have been discussed previously. There are two ways of contributing - deposit materials in a digital archives, and make materials available free of any distribution restrictions. The attached resolution, supported by our Information Resources staff, is similar to those being discussed at other major universities; the language is not binding but is intended to stimulate dialogue within the community. Our librarians will be inviting speakers on the topic in the coming year.

Provost Anderson encouraged all to study this document and the information contained on the listed web sites, especially the NIH issues and concerns. A task force was formed in November with Kathryn Karipides representing the provost's office. There are great pressures on all universities to try to contain costs - journals have increased at three times the rate of books; digital access is greatly advanced.

- Senate members engaged in lengthy conversation on issues raised from
- concerns about monetary support to various professional organizations from traditional publishers;
 - timeliness of access to research information as some newer agreements allow free distribution after six months and also because of how long it takes to commercially publish;
 - less money being available to researchers and writers now having to bear more of the costs of publication;
 - suggestion to differentiate between the not-for-profit university presses and the for-profit publishers in our discussions and recommendations;
 - suggestion of a fund for authors from the savings; perhaps something that OhioLINK is doing;
 - encourage library to subscribe to journals whose costs are equitable with their impact.

The MOTION was supported by a vote of 26 in favor, 2 opposed and 3 abstaining.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate urges the University and its members to

Support Open Access publishing in their educational, research, editorial, and administrative roles by encouraging their professional societies to move toward Open Access publishing, aiding in forming and providing editorial assistance to peer-reviewed Open Access journals, and favoring such journals when submitting their own research;

Encourage the University's libraries to reallocate resources away from high-priced publishers;

Support the consideration of peer-reviewed Open Access material during the promotion and tenure process;

Post their work prior to publication in an open digital archive and seek to retain particular copyright rights enabling them to post their published work in a timely fashion and provide institutional support to those seeking to do so; and

Establish infrastructure to sustain digital Open Access publication.

Report of the Nominating Committee

Chair Kathleen Farkas announced that Jay Alexander was voted in as the chair-elect; and she thanked Randall Cebul as a most worthy candidate.

It was noted that the Nominating Committee was not included in the attachment: vacancies on this committee, one representing each constituent faculty, are selected by the faculty senators representing that faculty, the process to be administered by the dean of each constituent faculty. Those openings have been filled by Regina Nixon, MSASS; Robert Salata, Medicine; and Lee White, CSE.

The MOTION to approve the slate of candidates to fill openings on the standing committees, as presented, was approved: 31 in favor and 2 opposed.

Nominees for the following Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate for 2005-2006 are:

Executive Committee (7 openings)

Sara Debanne, Epidemiology & Biostatistics
Timothy Fogarty, Accountancy
Julia Grant, Accountancy
Sue Hinze, Sociology
Edith Lerner, Nutrition
David Matthiesen, Material Science & Engineering
Robert Salata, Infectious Diseases

Budget Committee (2 openings)

David Hutter, Physical Education and Athletics
Edith Lerner, Nutrition, School of Medicine

Committee on By-Laws (1 opening)

Stanton Cort, Marketing, Weatherhead School of Management

Faculty Compensation Committee (4 openings)

Roberto Ballarini, Civil Engineering, School of Engineering (replacement for D. Matthiesen)
Jonathan Entin, School of Law
Stanley Hirsch, School of Dentistry
Karen Potter, Theater and Dance, College of Arts and Sciences

Committee on Graduate Studies (3 openings)

John Clochesy, School of Nursing
Ica Manas-Zloczower, Macromolecular Science, School of Engineering
Rolfe Petschek, Physics, College of Arts and Sciences

Information Resources Committee (1 opening)

Mark Dunlap, Physiology and Biophysics, School of Medicine

Committee on Minority Affairs (6 openings)

Alice Bach, Religion, College of Arts and Sciences
Sana Loue, Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medicine
Ram Nagaraj, Ophthalmology, School of Medicine
Spencer Neth, School of Law
George Perry, Pathology, School of Medicine
Renee Sentilles, History, College of Arts and Sciences

Committee on Faculty Personnel (3 openings)

Hue-Lee Kaung, Anatomy, School of Medicine
Judith Lipton, School of Law
Judith Maloni, School of Nursing

Committee on Research (4 openings)

Janet McGrath (replacing Cynthia Beall), Anthropology, College of Arts and Sciences
Carol Musil, School of Nursing
Yiping Han, Biological Sciences, School of Dentistry
Lawrence Sayre, Chemistry, College of Arts and Sciences

Committee on University Libraries (3 openings)

Dario Gasparini, Civil Engineering, School of Engineering
Christine Hudak, School of Nursing
Marshall Leitman, Mathematics, College of Arts and Sciences

Committee on Women Faculty (5 openings)

Diana Bilimoria, Organizational Behavior, School of Management
Dale Dannefer, Sociology, College of Arts and Sciences
Faye Gary, School of Nursing
Angela Graves, Restorative Dentistry, School of Dentistry
Elizabeth Kaufman, Medicine, MetroHealth

Report of the Research Committee

Chair Carol Musil thanked her committee for their long and diligent work in updating the University Guidelines and Policy on Copyright to accommodate present day practices. The MOTION was approved, 33 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

(Changes in Bold)

Chapter 3, PART TWO, C. University **Guidelines on Authorship and Policy on Copyright**

2. University Guidelines on Authorship of Research **and Scholarly** Publications
Contributing to knowledge is a core activity of faculty, staff and students in a research university. Contributions to knowledge are evaluated by the publications produced, regardless of the medium or format. Recognizing that authorship can sometimes be a complex process, CASE offers these guidelines for helping faculty, staff and students navigate authorship issues. For the purposes of these guidelines, publications include any and all articles, abstracts, and/or manuscripts based on original work (research and scholarship) conducted at CASE. These guidelines describe what is expected of faculty, staff and students in authorship matters and are intended to encourage open communication about authorship issues.

a. Purpose of the Guidelines

1. Granting agency and public concerns are requiring **explicit** standards of accountability for all authors of research **and scholarly** publications.

2. In multiple investigator research **and scholarly** projects, standards are needed so that contributors can anticipate and understand their rights **and responsibilities related to authorship or acknowledgment. However, in very large, multidisciplinary, or multi-institutional projects, following these precise guidelines may not be feasible; nevertheless, scholars are expected to adhere to the spirit of the guidelines.**

3. Not all contributors in any research or scholarship endeavors have the same role, power or seniority in relationships; it is necessary to clarify the roles of all those involved and to understand each person's rights and obligations in authorship. The potential scholarly contributions of all collaborators, including students, need to be considered in the decisions of authorship.

b. Responsibilities and Criteria for Authorship

1. Authorship is attributed to persons responsible for the intellectual content of the publication. Only those who have contributed substantially to the **conception, execution, or interpretation of the work such that they are willing and able to take public responsibility for the publication** should be included as authors. **Honorary authorship that is listing someone as a coauthor in the absence of substantial intellectual contribution, is discouraged.**

2. All authors must have contributed to developing the manuscript and have read and understood the entire contents of the publication.

3. All authors must be sufficiently familiar with the conduct and at least the general interpretation of the research to accept responsibility for its integrity and credibility.

4. It is the responsibility of the author corresponding with the journal or conference, **or his/her proxy, to ensure that authorship decisions conform to CASE guidelines and ensure** that all authors approve the final **submission** before publication.

5. All investigators accepting authorship **should** also accept the responsibility of avoiding unnecessary duplicate journal publication of similar material. Previous publication should be cited in any repeated use of data or theory, and a new publication should meet the criterion of making a new intellectual contribution to the field.

6. In the absence of meeting the above criteria, limited contributions such as provision of standard materials (**for example, plasmids, cell lines, tissue, antibodies**), performance of incidental assays or measurements, use of facilities, routine patient care, critical review of the manuscript, **providing access to subjects** or providing an environment and/or financial support for the research, **collecting or analyzing data in a routine format, chairing or advising a dissertation or thesis committee, having an administrative relationship to the research, or contributing to the general intellectual development of one or more authors are insufficient to** justify authorship unless the above criteria have also been met, but **may** be recognized by acknowledgment.

For large group projects, it is important at the outset that all members of the research team understand and agree to principles of authorship. It is also important that procedures for resolving more detailed concerns, such as the timing of presentations or publications, order of authorship, and privilege of presenting results at meetings, be **discussed** to the extent feasible at the beginning **and throughout** the work **as needed**.

7. If disputes or questions concerning authorship have not been successfully

resolved among members of a collaboration, these disputes or concerns should be brought, by the individual having a concern, for assistance in resolution to the following administrative officials, in this order: a) the department chair, division head, or similar first line of academic management, b) the Dean, and c) the Provost.

However, if these matters involve allegations or evidence of scholarly misconduct or threats of retribution, they must immediately be brought to the attention of the **appropriate university official, as per Chapter 3, Part 2, II, Policy for responding to allegations of scientific misconduct, in the Faculty Handbook Journals, societies, and conferences may have different authorship policies that are more stringent or more lenient than these guidelines. In such cases, the guidelines expressed in the present document are to be considered as the minimum standards to which all CASE faculty, staff and students should adhere.**

Report of the Budget Committee

The final report of the year was given by Professor Paul Gerhart for chair Glenn Starkman.

The Budget Committee has continued to meet on a monthly basis to review the finances of the University and their impact on its academic programs. This report focuses on the University administration's progress toward an FY06 budget.

The University currently faces certain financial pressures. As reported to the Senate by the budget committee in the recent past, anticipated growth in fund raising over the past several years has not materialized, indeed attainment is significantly less than a few years ago. Any future growth, starts from a baseline that is 30-40% below the previously anticipated baseline.

In the meantime, growth in funded research appears unlikely to continue at the rate projected in earlier years. This reflects primarily the apparent end of a period of rapid growth in the budget of some federal granting agencies, especially the NIH. Plans to grow the total funding base of the University, especially outside the health-related schools, must include increased levels of support from other granting agencies. University-wide, they must focus less on capturing a fraction of a growing pool than on increasing the University's share of a stagnant (or perhaps contracting) overall pool. While the average level of proposal activity across the University remains healthy, the short-term impact of approximately static NIH budgets and rumored declines in the fraction of NIH proposals that are funded is as yet unclear but is likely to be considerable.

There have been challenges in some units in increasing or even maintaining the flow of tuition dollars. Earlier plans and projections for a decreased undergraduate tuition discount rate appear, in the short term, not to have been realistic. Similarly, earlier plans for significant year-after-year tuition rate hikes, based on a projected willingness of future Case students to pay higher tuition for a significantly differentiated educational product, no longer appear viable in the short term. The looming success in recruiting a markedly larger incoming freshman class therefore represents an important piece of positive financial news for the University in general and the undergraduate colleges in particular. Many people will have contributed to this success, assuming that current trends persist; but the Vice-Provost for Enrollment Management, Chris Munoz, and his staff merit particular recognition. The increased levels of participation by faculty in recruiting also deserve acknowledgment.

Another important piece of positive financial news has been the performance of the University's endowment, which has exceeded that of its comparison group.

Overall, the budget committee has persistent concerns that seem to be shared by the responsible administration authorities. The current difficulties in finalizing a budget reflect these financial challenges as well as process issues possibly arising from personnel transitions and past practices in the Budget Office.

Nevertheless, the administration has expressed to the committee its confidence that a budget acceptable to the board of trustees will be presented as mandated in early June and that the current financial issues are resolvable in the long run. A revived five-year planning should help to avert similar situations in the future. The committee has suggested to the administration that it is at times when hard choices need to be made that the advisory role of the University Budget Committee may be most valuable.

The committee thanks Provost Anderson, Vice President Ash, and Associate Vice President Leitch for their consistent cooperation during the past academic year.

Professor Gerhart noted that the committee has persistent concerns that seem to be shared by the responsible administration authorities, and they hope that progress will continue next year. Several senators commented that they would have liked to also get the quarterly forecasts with comparison figures and to see the numbers as they unfold. Chair Carlsson feels that the administration has been most transparent this year.

Report of the Faculty Compensation Committee

Chair Theresa Pretlow reported as follows:

Our committee has met nearly monthly since our report in November '04 to continue discussions on the same 4 items then enumerated as follows:

- (1) long-term health insurance;
- (2) with the Fringe Benefits Committee, to develop an equitable and competitive fringe benefits plan for faculty and staff;
- (3) performance reward supplement in the schools of Medicine and Engineering; and
- (4) salaries in relation to the Senate resolution passed in April, 2003.

These meetings have been attended by one or more of the following administrators: Houssein Sadid, Chief Financial Officer; John Anderson, Provost; and Tony Kinslow, Vice President for Human Resources.

1. Long-term Health-care Insurance: We are pleased to announce that a new plan is under discussion with Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife) that would include a guaranteed issue for employees who enroll during the initial offering period and guaranteed issue for new employees who enroll within 90 days of their date of hire. It is hoped that a contract can be completed by July 1 with initial enrollment to take place September 1 through October 31 and a start date of December 1, 2005. We want to publicly thank Tony Kinslow and Carolyn Gregory from Human Resources and Houssein Sadid for supporting our concerns on this issue.

2. Fringe Benefits: The whole benefits package is under continual review and discussion. Mercer, who is under contract with Human Resources (HR) to advise on our benefits program, will provide a detailed analysis of Case's benefits at the May Fringe Benefits Committee meeting. Our (Compensation) committee met with representatives of the Staff Advisory Council to discuss their concerns especially around health coverage for retirees. While no immediate solutions were forthcoming, Human Resources will do more to inform employees about the availability and benefits of Retirement Plan C that can be used at retirement for any purpose including medical expenses. Our committee expressed concern to HR for the need to provide recognition to staff, especially those who have served Case for many years.

3. Performance Reward Supplement in the Schools of Medicine and Engineering: As noted in our November report, the faculty had concerns about these programs that were shared by our Provost, Dr. Anderson. We are pleased that the Dean of the School of Engineering announced in December, 2004, that the current "performance reward" system would no longer be used in that school. We have not heard anything from the School of Medicine.

4. Faculty Salaries: In 2002-03, the administration shared with our Committee the results of a very detailed

study based on 2001-02 salaries of 10 peer institutions. The following resolution, submitted by our committee and passed by the Faculty Senate April, 2003, reads as follows:

"*Whereas*, the university administration has completed a study showing that faculty salaries at Case Western Reserve University are below the levels at peer institutions, specifically that 'CWRU's rate of salary increase over the past five years is 8th highest of 11 schools for Professors, the lowest of 11 schools for Associate Professors, and the 2nd lowest of 11 schools for Assistant Professors" and that "CWRU's salaries for 2001-02 are ranked 11th for Professors, 11th for Associate Professors, and 9th for Assistant Professors'; and

Whereas achieving the goal of 'be[ing] the most powerful learning environment in the world' requires that Case Western Reserve University recruit and retain a faculty of the highest quality; and

Whereas the university administration has begun the process of responding to the results of the faculty salary analysis;

Be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate encourages the university administration and the deans to develop and implement plans that give urgent priority to raising faculty compensation at least to the median of peer institutions, beginning in the next fiscal year's budget process, in order to assist in fulfilling the university's institutional vision." [my underlining]

As noted in my November report, while Provost Anderson provided our committee with some figures on faculty salaries at our October meeting, it was impossible to tell if we were improving or getting farther behind since the current data were gathered on a different, larger number of institutions and data from several schools, i.e., Medicine, Dentistry, and Law, were not included. For our December meeting, we were sent additional data that were included in the self-study. This showed the 2003-04 faculty salaries were at 89% of a set of nine benchmark institutions, compared with 88% in 2002-03 and 87% in 2001-02 with a footnote stating the salaries for medical school faculty and deans were not included in these calculations.

In April, we received an update that compared the 2003-04 figures with 2004-05 figures for 10 disciplines using data from the American Association of Universities (AAU). As previously shown, the largest discrepancies are at the Professor level where only Nursing and Social Work are at or above the mean salary of 41 AAU schools. Currently Humanities, Social Sciences, and Math, and Natural Sciences are between 80 and 89% of the mean at the Professor level and between 93 and 98% at the Assistant Professor level where four disciplines (Social Work, Law, Management, and the Visual and Performing Arts) are at or above the mean. Most disciplines showed a 1-2% gain at the various ranks or remained the same over this one-year period with 3 of 30 categories showing a loss. While the modest gains are encouraging, the committee expressed concern that on our current course we would not reach our goal within 5 years. Another major concern is that we still have not received any data on the largest component of our University, the Medical School, after specifically requesting this in October and again in several emails in March '05. Dr. Anderson assured us this would be forthcoming, but we have not received it in time to include it in this report.

There was a question as to whether the university is competitive in various disciplines, and a suggestion that an even further breakdown would be of interest. Professor Cebul said that the MGMA report for Medicine is standard and by discipline. Another comment was to look at success in current hiring for determining competitiveness. Provost Anderson also reminded all of the costs and time involved in researching this data.

Faculty Diversity Report

Professor Beth McGee, the Faculty Diversity Officer, made her annual report (distributed with the agenda) for the period of 2003-2004. Her more detailed presentation at the meeting covered data on faculty composition; comparisons to other urban universities for women, African Americans, and Hispanics; a three-year comparison by race/gender by school/college; faculty composition by rank/race, by gender/tenure status; endowed chairs; and administrative positions.

Recommendations are for there to be diversity plans for all schools/colleges with evaluation in chair and dean performance reviews; recruitment of under-represented minority faculty for candidate pools and retention for hired faculty of color; emphasize recruitment, retention, and promotion of women to senior positions and administration; specialist in search preparation and training in candidate evaluation made available for all faculty searches; and emphasize and utilize the Case/Fisk partnership.

Senators asked for additional information on the Fisk partnership and the numbers participating: 10 undergraduates over the last two summers from Fisk and some Case students who traded places for several days with Fisk students as ambassadors; some faculty visits from Fisk for special projects and one simultaneously-taught class. It was noted that we might take advantage of future partnerships with Meharry Medical and Dental College, which is on a nearby campus.

Faculty-Government Relations

Mark Carlson, Associate Vice President for Government Relations, spoke about his office's staffing - Director Adrienne Dziak with many years of experience in this field, two assistants, and two outside firms employed to work for us in Washington and Columbus. The activities include monitoring of legislation and policy (State and Federal), advocacy for university interests in higher education and specific disciplines, sponsoring events and visits, and developing/strengthening legislative and executive branch relationships. He further outlined specific accomplishments and a lengthy list of current activities. Dr. Carlson looks forward to developing a stronger relationship with the Faculty Senate through the Governments Relations Advisory Group and a variety of liaisons.

Senate Chair Bo Carlsson said he has been eager to start this conversation so that all may be better informed. He urged everyone to think of further avenues, perhaps ad hoc committees, for future collaborations and continuing discussions. There was much interest expressed and questions on such topics as international government affairs - current financial resources are too limited though this would fit with the Vision statement. Our Law School has a special interest in being a government resource in hearings and service. On the current practice of earmarking rather than peer reviews, President Hundert noted agreed to guidelines of the Association of American Universities.

Report of the UUF Executive Committee

Chair Antonio Candau's written report was included with the agenda. The major issues for the past year were review of the UUF bylaws and preparing for a smooth transition to a full implementation of SAGES for all entering students next fall. Details have been proposed and accepted for approval of the various SAGES seminars and Capstone courses; professional schools without an undergraduate curriculum will bring course proposals to UUFCC. The UUFXC will continue to discuss its role in assessing SAGES' institutional impact; a student initiative for midterm evaluations; and take up some possible collaborative work on service learning with the Office of Student Community Service. The next General Faculty Meeting of May 5 will vote on revisions to the bylaws and revisions to Academic Standing regulations.

Report of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Surveys

Professor Douglas Detterman chaired this committee and gave a brief status report.

The Faculty Survey Committee was appointed in January of 2005 to develop plans for a survey that would allow faculty to provide information to the University administration to improve the functioning of Case. The committee consists of Doug Detterman, CAS, Chair; Dale Dannefer, CAS; Jean Gubbins, Center for Institutional Research; Caryl Hess, President's Office; George Kikano, Medical School; Shirley Moore, School of Nursing; and Mohan Reddy, Business.

We have decided to begin simply. We have developed a 10-item questionnaire. The faculty will be divided into 12ths and a portion of the faculty will be emailed a questionnaire each month until we develop an adequate methodology. Feedback from the faculty and administration will be used to revise each iteration. A test questionnaire has been sent to undergraduate psychology majors to determine if the method of soliciting

responses will be effective.

Professor Detterman responded to questions. He could not estimate at this time when a final report would be available as that would depend on the response rate. President Hundert and Provost Anderson have both provided a question for the initial survey and indicated their interest. Part of the charge to the ad hoc committee is to develop a process for use now and in the future. We will expect another report in the fall.

Role of the Senate

Senate Chair Bo Carlsson handed over the gavel to Chair-elect E. Ronald Wright as a symbol of the transfer of leadership for the 2005-2006 academic year. Professor acknowledged the accomplishments of the past year and committed to continuing the efforts at better communications among the faculty and to moving business items forward.

Professor Wright plans to start earlier and to dramatically improve communications with deans, schools, and among faculty members. He invited any suggestions and ideas and stated that the Faculty Senate will become a factor in governance - with action rather than reaction.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m. to a reception and further conversation.

Lynne E. Ford
Secretary of the Faculty Senate