

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

Members Present: Alan Johnson, Anthony Trozzolo, Barry Keating, Bernd Goehring, Carlos Jerez-Farran, Charlie Barber, Caitlyn Shea, Claudia Polini, Colin Jessop, Dale Nees, Dan Lapsley, David Klein, Debbi Desrochers, Kwan Kim, John Gaski, John Shafer, John Stamper, Judy Fox, Julian Velasco, Juan Rivera, Kristen Lewis, Lei Li, Liangyan (Leon) Ge, Meredith Chesson, Morten Eskildsen, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Salma Saddawi, Sarah McKibben, Seth Brown, Timothy Ovaert, Tom Gresik, Tom Noble, Vaughn McKim,

Members Excused: Jill Godmilow, Don Sporleder, Marker Dehmlow, Parker Ladwig, Susan Youens.

Members Absent: Al Miller, Collin Meissner, David Ladouceur, Richard Pierce, Robert Norton

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Colin Jessop who offered an opening prayer.

Elections – Colin Jessop

Several unfilled elections from the May meeting were conducted. Kristin Lewis and Morton Eskildsen were elected co-secretaries, Judy Fox was elected Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, Julian Velasco was elected to the Traffic Appeals Committee. Dan Lapsley was elected to serve as an alternate Student Senate Representative.

Senate organization – Colin Jessop

Colin Jessop reviewed Roberts Rules of Order and the structure and role of the Faculty Senate. Communication with members of the faculty will take place via email and the Faculty Senate website (www.nd.edu/~facsen), which will be upgraded by Mark Dehmlow. The Senate will also consider a Faculty Senate newsletter for quarterly communication, as well as new technologies such as Wikis, blogs, etc.

Minutes of the Senate meetings will be distributed and approved electronically by members of the Senate. Jessop stressed the importance of accurate minutes, and asked Senators to help by clearly stating their name before speaking.

Jessop requested that senators poll their constituents to establish the agenda of the Senate for the year. Suggestions should be emailed to Jessop (cjessop@nd.edu) and Rose Mitchell (Mitchell.63@nd.edu), and will be discussed during October meeting of the Senate.

Benefits Committee Report - Nasir Ghiaseddin

Meetings on health care continued over the summer and new premiums have been approved by Officers of University. If a faculty or staff member takes the (WebMD) health care survey, then changes in premiums costs will likely be moderate. Denise

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

Murphy (Human Resources) will attend the next meeting of the Faculty Senate to discuss changes in the faculty medical benefits.

Nasir Ghiaseddin also voiced concerns that Meritain may not be accurately recording and calculating payments to out-of-pocket expenses. Reports of this so far are anecdotal, so faculty members are asked carefully review their records for inaccuracies and report any problems to Ghiaseddin (ghiaseddin.1@nd.edu). The Benefits Committee will bring these issues to Human Resources. Claudia Polini commented that she has found that several faxes must be sent to be reimbursed through the Flexible Spending Account, and that these problems did not appear to occur when Notre Dame managed accounts directly. Ghiaseddin reminded members that medical travel expenses could be also reimbursed through a Flexible Spending Account.

Proposed Amendments to the revision of the Academic Articles – Seth Brown

The Academic Articles are reviewed every ten years, voted on by the Academic Council, and approved by the Trustees of the University. Potential revisions to the Articles were circulated in April 2007, and the Faculty Senate was asked to form an ad hoc committee (Seth Brown and Charlie Barber) to review and comment on the proposed revision. The Faculty Senate does not have direct voting powers on the Articles, but was asked to make recommendations to be considered by Academic Council.

The ad hoc committee has proposed a total of seven amendments to the revisions, four of which were discussed and voted on during this session of the Faculty Senate. The remaining amendments will be discussed at a future meeting of the Senate.

Amendment 1: Procedure for electing search and review committees for the Provost (*Article II, Section I*)

From the summary document circulated to the Senate by the ad hoc committee:

“The procedure for electing the selection or review committee from the whole of the tenured faculty seems unwieldy. We therefore prefer the *status quo ante* procedure of election from the elected faculty representatives in the Academic Council. This also restores the eligibility of certain classes of untenured faculty (e.g., library faculty) who might appropriately serve on the committee. Any lacunae of expertise or representation may be fixed through the presidents’ appointees to the committee. We propose reducing the number of appointees to two, removing one faculty member and one student, in order to decrease the size of the committee and to have it be more independent of the president (since the committee is advisory in any case, it is most helpful to have a more independent committee). Other minor changes in language are proposed for clarification or consistency.”

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

Proposed changes (Art. II, Sect. 1):

When such an appointment is to be made, the president so advises the University through the Academic Council. The council then elects five members from ~~all tenured faculty of the university, its elected faculty representatives~~ and one member from ~~the Academic Council's~~ its student representatives to constitute a committee chaired by the president. The president may also appoint to the committee up to ~~three~~ two members from among the ~~tenured regular~~ tenured regular faculty ~~and one student~~ in order to insure that a broad range of views and perspectives is represented on the committee. This committee receives and considers nominations from all sources After ~~completing its due diligence on consideration of~~ each candidate and deliberation among all committee members, the members of the committee other than the president make a recommendation to the president. The president reports the complete results of the committee's deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Trustees, along with a personal recommendation.

For the five-year review of the provost, a committee is constituted ~~in the same way. The president does not chair the committee, but appoints similarly, except that the president is not a member of the committee, but names~~ a member of the committee to serve as chair, and may appoint another person to join the committee and assist as a non-voting member. The five-year review of the provost shall include an overall review of the provost's performance as well as the provost's responsibility for the performance of the associate provosts. After receiving the report of the committee, the president ~~makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees on reappointment forwards the recommendation of the committee to the Board of Trustees, along with a personal recommendation.~~

Tom Noble questioned why one wouldn't want to draw from the full faculty rather than a small group of faculty on the Academic Council. Charlie Barber reiterated the difficulty of running an election from such a broad group. Seth Brown noted that the Articles still call for two faculty members to be chosen by the President from among the whole faculty. Tom Gresik inquired as to the intention of the initial revision to broaden the group. Barber explained that the revision was proposed in response to a sense that the committee had been too secretive in the past. Brown noted that restricting the committee membership to the Academic Council added more weight to the authority of that body. Salma Saddawi spoke in favor of the current amendment because it provided the possibility for non-tenured faculty such as Special Professional, Research and Library faculty as well as young Teaching and Research faculty to participate.

Tom Gresik expressed concerns that several seats on the Academic Council may be held by Department Chairs who might be more connected to the views of the Administration. Gresik proposed an amendment that the election to the committee be open to all Regular Faculty. In Gresik's proposal the wording would read "the Council then elects five

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

members from all Regular Faculty of the University”. Judy Fox commented that although Chairs might be among the members of Academic Council, these individuals were still elected by their peers and presumably would represent their constituency on a search committee. Opening the election to all Regular Faculty would not address the infeasibility of electing from such a broad group. Tom Noble inquired about use of the term “Regular Faculty” throughout the Articles and whether it was used consistently. Seth Brown responded that the definition of Regular Faculty is clear and will not change. (Regular Faculty includes Teaching and Research, Special Professional, Research and Library Faculties.) Dale Nees expressed concern that the amendment proposed by Gresik would reverse the attempt to simplify the process of electing members. Tom Gresik questioned why the Faculty Senate would propose a more restrictive limitation when the Administration was trying to increase faculty representation. Gresik’s amendment was rejected by majority vote.

Kwan Kim expressed support for the revision as initially proposed by the Provost’s Office to open the committee to all tenured faculties. Kim then proposed to divide question, separating the clause on faculty eligible for election to the committee from the rest of the amendment. This was approved by majority vote resulting in a division into Part a) and b)

Amendment 1a) was then approved by majority vote. Amendment 1b) was also approved by majority vote.

Amendment 2: Appointment and review processes for the deans (*Article II, Section 4,5,6*)

From the ad hoc committee:

“Two important amendments are suggested for the process to select and review Deans of the colleges: First, it is clarified that each College Council should establish its own procedure for electing a committee, in advance. This allows each college to adopt distinctive procedures of its own choosing, but minimizes confusion by making these known before an election is imminent. Second, in cases of review, the committee is given the option of transmitting a copy of its report directly to the dean (for purposes of constructive feedback). In the cases of the Deans of the Law School and the School of Architecture, we propose that formation of a faculty committee, currently optional, be made obligatory.”

Proposed Changes:

Art. II, Sect. 4:

The dean of a college is appointed by the President, with the concurrence of the committee provided for in this section. The appointment is subject to formal review every five years. When such an appointment is to be made, the provost advises the college of the pending appointment through the College Council. The council then elects five members from among the tenured faculty of the college and

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

one student from among the student members of the college council according to procedures determined in advance by the College Council.~~to constitute a committee chaired by the provost.~~ The provost ~~The committee is chaired by the provost, who~~ may appoint up to two additional members from among the regular faculty of the University to the committee in order to ensure that a broad range of views and perspectives is represented on the committee. The committee receives and considers nominations, including those from the faculty of the college. The provost then reports the recommendations of the committee to the president, along with a personal recommendation.

For the five-year review, a similar committee is constituted, except that the provost does not ~~chair~~ serve on it and committee concurrence in action taken pursuant to the review is not required. The provost will ~~appoint~~ name the chair of the review committee from among the elected members and may assign a vice president and associate provost to assist the committee as a non-voting member. The committee will transmit its assessment and recommendation to the provost, and may at its discretion share its report with the dean.

Art. II, Sect. 5:

The dean of the Law School is appointed by the president; the appointment is subject to formal review every five years. When such an appointment is to be made ~~or a review conducted, the provost consults formally with all regular faculty of the school.~~ A committee comprised of three tenured faculty elected by the regular faculty and one student elected by the Student Bar Association ~~may be is~~ established ~~to facilitate either a search or a review.~~ The provost chairs the committee and may appoint up to ~~two~~ one additional members from among the regular faculty of the University to the committee in order to ensure that a broad range of views and perspectives is represented on the committee. The provost ~~may assign a vice president and associate provost to assist the committee as a non-voting member.~~ ~~In appointment cases, the provost~~ will consult with the faculty of the Law School concerning the candidates recommended by the committee. No offer, formal or informal, is extended to any candidate for the deanship until the provost has provided the faculty with that candidate's credentials and a full opportunity to react to that candidacy.

For the five-year review, a similar committee is constituted, except that the provost does not serve on it. The provost will name the chair of the review committee from among the elected members and may assign a vice president and associate provost to assist the committee as a non-voting member. In both appointment and review cases, the provost ~~gives the president both a forwards the~~ recommendations of the committee to the president along with a personal recommendation and a full account of all consultations with the faculty.

Art. II, Sect. 6:

The Dean of the School of Architecture is appointed by the president; the appointment is subject to formal review every five years. When such an appointment is to be made ~~or a review conducted, the provost consults formally with all regular faculty of the school.~~ A committee comprised of regular faculty

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

and a student ~~may be established to facilitate either a search or a review is elected by the regular faculty of the School.~~ The provost chairs the committee and may appoint up to ~~two~~ one additional members from among the regular faculty of the University to the committee in order to ensure that a broad range of views and perspectives is represented on the committee. ~~The provost may assign a vice president and associate provost to assist the committee as a non-voting member.~~ ~~In appointment cases,~~ The provost consults with the faculty of the School of Architecture concerning the candidates recommended by the committee. No offer, formal or informal, is extended to any candidate for the deanship until the provost has provided the faculty with that candidate's credentials and a full opportunity to react to that candidacy.

For the five-year review, a similar committee is constituted, except that the provost does not serve on it. The provost will name the chair of the review committee from among the elected members and may assign a vice president and associate provost to assist the committee as a non-voting member. In both appointment and review cases, the provost gives the president both a forwards the recommendations of the committee to the president along with a personal recommendation and a full account of all consultations with the faculty.

Section 5 and 6:

Julian Velasco proposed to divide the question and consider the recommendations for the Schools of Law and Architecture (Section 5 and 6) separately. The motion to divide the question was passed unanimously. Velasco commented that members of the Law School had not been sufficiently consulted in drafting the amendment. John Stamper concurred that he would like the proposal to be made available to members of the School of Architecture before voting. Seth Brown agreed that the matter needed more consultation with the faculty of Law and Architecture. Velasco moved to commit the matter back to the ad hoc committee, pending further consultation with the appropriate faculty members. The motion to commit passed unanimously.

Section 4

Vaughn McKim noted some surprise that the language specified that a Dean would be appointed by the President with "concurrence of the Committee". Seth Brown agreed that the Article as stated did provide significant power to the Committee.

John Griffin noted that if the Provost appoints one additional member to the committee, this results in a committee of eight members that could come to a tie decision, whereas if two additional members are appointed there is a nine member committee. Griffin proposed a motion that the language be changed to "will appoint two additional members".

Vaughn McKim asked if the intention of the additional members was to allow faculty from outside the college to serve on the search committee. Seth Brown indicated that this

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

was the case. John Stamper commented that if change were made here, then it should apply to similar cases throughout the Articles. John Shafer suggested that the language be changed to “will appoint zero or two additional members” so that appointment of additional members would not be mandatory.

Griffin’s amendment was rejected by majority vote.

Judy Fox inquired if there were any provisions made for a search for the Dean of the Graduate School. Seth Brown replied that this would be done at a later date since the position was just created. Don Sporleder asked whether the Articles should be changed so that the recommendations from the committee go directly to the President rather than communicated through the Provost. Brown presumed that in practice the written recommendations of the committee are provided to the Provost and then to the President. Tom Noble commented that since the Provost chairs the committee, the Provost may not in fact vote, since the Articles allow the Provost to provide a separate recommendation.

Amendment 2 (*Section 4*) was approved by majority vote.

Amendment 3: Termination notice for instructors and one-year appointees as assistant professor (*Article III, Section 3, Subsection (a) Teaching and Research Faculty*)

From the ad hoc committee:

“Because of the academic hiring cycle, termination with less than six months’ notice can constitute a significant hardship. Even in a one-year appointment, six months from the conventional start date of July 1 allows one full semester for assessment of the performance of the faculty member, and thus does not impose an unreasonable burden on the University.”

(3) Termination notice for instructors and one-year appointees as assistant professor

Because of the academic hiring cycle, termination with less than six months’ notice can constitute a significant hardship. Even in a one-year appointment, six months from the conventional start date of July 1 allows one full semester for assessment of the performance of the faculty member, and thus does not impose an unreasonable burden on the University.

Proposed changes (Art. III, Sect. 3, Subsection (a), “Teaching and Research Faculty”):

The requirements for the rank of instructor are the same as those for assistant professor except that the instructor may not yet possess the terminal

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

degree. The appointment is ordinarily for a one-year period, and may be renewed twice. If the University chooses to terminate the services of an instructor at the end of a contract period, the University will give ~~three~~ six months' notice of such termination. If the instructor elects to terminate services, the University should be given three months' notice of such termination. Time spent at this rank does not count toward tenure.

The assistant professor should ordinarily possess the doctoral degree or its equivalent, or, in certain fields, the appropriate professional degree or license. The assistant professor should have demonstrated teaching ability, promise as a scholar, interest in students, and a genuine spirit of study necessary to keep courses continually revised and to assure growth in knowledge and maturity. The initial appointment is ordinarily for a three-year period, but salary is reviewed each year. If the University chooses to terminate the services of an assistant professor at the end of a contract period, the University will give 12 months' notice of such termination. If an assistant professor elects to terminate services, the University should be given three months' notice of such termination, and the end of the notice period should coincide with the end of an academic year. An appointment as assistant professor may be made for a period of one academic year. In this case, if the University chooses to terminate the services of the assistant professor at the end of the contract period, the University will give ~~three~~ six months notice of such termination; if the assistant professor elects to terminate services, the University should be given three months' notice of such termination.

Seth Brown clarified the amendment would return the Article to the *status quo ante*. The proposed revisions to Articles had reduced the termination notice to three months, with the thought that this would provide more time for assessment before a final decision was to be made on the faculty member's reappointment.

John Shafer inquired why the termination notice for Research Faculty remained three months. Seth Brown noted that the short notice was necessary because such faculty positions were funded by soft money. Vaughn McKim asked if TCE results were available by the deadline for six months notice. Seth Brown noted that the numeric TCE results were available promptly, along with other teaching assessments carried out by the Department during the semester.

Amendment 3 was approved by majority vote.

Amendment 4: Improvements in procedures for reporting negative tenure and promotion decisions (*Article III, Section 4*)

From the ad hoc committee:

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

“Two changes to the procedures for reporting negative tenure and promotion decisions to the faculty member are proposed. First, the current system requires the faculty member to request the information. Since it is difficult to envision a situation where the faculty member would not want the information (and she is free to discard it if so), we propose making this communication automatic. Second, the information is usually relayed through an intermediary (e.g., the department chairperson), who may not have firsthand knowledge about the reasons for the negative decision (and indeed may disagree with it). This can lead to garbled or uninformative descriptions. We therefore propose that the written communication be made by the person ultimately responsible for the decision (president for T & R faculty, provost for other regular faculty).

We also propose clarifying the communication process between departmental CAPs and the higher administration in cases where disagreements arise, to ensure that CAPs are given an adequate hearing by the dean, and in cases where their recommendations are not followed, that they are informed of the reasons by the ultimately responsible party (usually provost or president).”

Proposed changes (Art. III, Sect. 4):

Subsection (a), Teaching and Research Faculty

. . . . Reappointments, promotion, and tenure for the teaching and research faculty are made by the president. A faculty member under consideration for reappointment, promotion or tenure must be notified by the chairperson in advance of the evaluation process and must submit a statement and evidence on the faculty member’s own behalf for use in the evaluation process. The chairperson of the department submits written recommendations, along with a written report, approved by the CAP, of its deliberations and recommendations, to the dean of the college, who then submits these recommendations to the provost, along with a written personal recommendation. If the dean anticipates ~~disagreement disagreeing~~ with the recommendation of either a CAP or a departmental chairperson, the dean ~~consults formally meets~~ with the chairperson and the CAP jointly ~~to discuss the case~~ before submitting the written personal recommendation to the provost. The results of any such ~~consultations meetings~~ are forwarded to the provost along with the recommendations. The provost, after consultation with such advisers as the provost may choose, submits all recommendations, both positive and negative, and including a personal recommendation, to the President for final action. For reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, the provost ordinarily will consult with the Provost’s Advisory Committee before making a recommendation to the president.

Whenever the ultimate decision concerning reappointment, promotion, or tenure is negative, the ~~dean, upon request of the faculty member concerned,~~ ~~president~~ conveys in writing the reasons for this negative decision to the faculty member.

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

Whenever a recommendation made by a CAP is not accepted ~~by the provost or the President, the CAP may request that the president conveys the~~ reasons for such nonacceptance ~~be conveyed~~ in writing to the committee through the dean.

Subsection (b), Endowed Chairs

. . . . The departmental Full Professor CAP shall evaluate each candidate for appointment to an endowed chair at the full professor level and provide the Endowed Chair Review Committee with a written report of its deliberations and recommendation. The Endowed Chair Review Committee shall then assess the candidate evaluated by the departmental Full Professor CAP and advise the dean as to the candidate's quality. The Endowed Chair Review Committee advises the dean as to the candidate's quality by submitting a written report of its deliberations and recommendation to the dean. The Endowed Chair Review Committee also shall forward to the dean the written report of the departmental Full Professor CAP. If the dean approves of appointing the candidate to the endowed chair, the dean shall provide the Provost with a written personal recommendation along with the written reports of the departmental Full Professor CAP and the Endowed Chair Review Committee. If the dean disapproves of appointing the candidate to the endowed chair, the dean is not required to forward any written materials to the Provost but instead shall terminate the candidacy by informing the Provost and the committees of the decision and his reason for it. If the Provost, after receiving a positive recommendation from the dean and after consultation with such advisers as the Provost may choose, approves of appointing the candidate to the endowed chair, the Provost shall submit a personal recommendation and all other reports and recommendations to the President for final action. If the Provost disapproves of appointing the candidate to the endowed chair, the Provost is not required to forward any written materials to the President but instead shall terminate the candidacy by informing the President ~~and the~~ the dean, and the committees of the decision and his reason for it.

. . . . Whenever a recommendation made by a departmental committee is not accepted by the ~~Dean, the~~ Provost, or the President, the reasons for such nonacceptance are conveyed to the committee in writing through the dean.

Subsection (c) Research Faculty

. . . . Reappointments and promotions of the research faculty are made by the provost. The formal procedure for determining recommendations is initiated by the chairperson of the approving department {see section 1, subsection (b)}, acting with the departmental CAP. The formal procedure for reappointment and promotion may also be initiated ~~also~~ by the director of a University institute. In such case, the director refers further consideration to the department involved in the particular appointment. A faculty member under consideration for reappointment or promotion must be notified in advance of the evaluation process and must submit a statement and evidence on the faculty member's own behalf

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

that might be used in the evaluation process. The appropriate chairperson or director submits written recommendations, along with a written report, approved by the appropriate CAP, of its deliberations and recommendations, to the dean of the college or school, who then submits these recommendations to the provost, along with a written personal recommendation. If the dean anticipates ~~disagreement~~ disagreeing with the recommendations of the appropriate departmental chairperson (or institute director), or with the committee, the dean ~~consults formally~~ meets with the chairperson (or the director) and the committee jointly to discuss the case before submitting the written personal recommendation to the provost. The results of any such ~~consultations~~ meetings are forwarded to the provost along with the recommendations.

. . . . Whenever the ultimate decision concerning reappointment or promotion is negative, the ~~chairperson or director, upon request of the faculty member concerned,~~ provost conveys the reasons for this negative decision in writing to the faculty member.

Whenever a recommendation made by a ~~departmental committee~~ CAP is not accepted ~~by the provost,~~ the provost conveys the reasons for such nonacceptance ~~are conveyed~~ in writing to the committee through the appropriate dean ~~or director~~.

Subsection (d) Library Faculty

Appointments to the library faculty are made by the provost or the provost's designate. The formal procedure for appointment is initiated by the director of University Libraries in consultation with the University Libraries Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP). The director of University Libraries submits written recommendations to the provost. ~~The provost, after consultation with such advisers as the provost may choose, submits all recommendations, both positive and negative, and including a personal recommendation, to the president for final action.~~ Faculty of the Law Library follow appointment procedures set forth by the Hoynes Code of the School of Law.

Reappointments and promotions of the library faculty are made by the provost. A faculty member under consideration for reappointment or promotion must be notified in advance of the evaluation process and must submit a statement and evidence on the faculty member's own behalf for use in the evaluation process by the University Libraries CAP. The director of University Libraries submits written recommendations to the provost. ~~The provost, after consultation with such advisers as the provost may choose, submits all recommendations, both positive and negative, and including a personal recommendation, to the President for final action.~~ Faculty of the Law Library follow reappointment and promotion procedures set forth by the Hoynes Code of the School of Law.

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

Whenever the ultimate decision concerning reappointment or promotion is negative, the ~~director of libraries, upon request of the faculty member concerned,~~ provost conveys the reasons for this negative decision in writing to the faculty member through the director of University Libraries.

Whenever a recommendation made by the library CAP is not accepted ~~by the provost or the President, the CAP may request that~~ the provost conveys the reasons for such nonacceptance ~~be conveyed~~ to the committee in writing.

Subsection (e) Special Professional Faculty

Reappointments and promotions to the special professional faculty are made by the provost ~~or the provost's designate~~. A faculty member under consideration for reappointment or promotion must be notified in advance of the evaluation process and must submit a statement and evidence on the faculty member's own behalf to be used in the evaluation process. The chairperson, institute director or academic unit head consults with the relevant CAP, and submits a written recommendation to the dean, who submits this recommendation to the provost, along with a written personal recommendation.

Whenever the ultimate decision concerning reappointment or promotion is negative, the ~~chairperson or director, upon request of the faculty member concerned,~~ provost conveys in writing the reasons for this negative decision to the faculty member.

Whenever a recommendation made by a CAP is not accepted, the provost conveys the reasons for such nonacceptance are conveyed in writing to the committee through the appropriate dean.

Meredith Chesson requested that the proposed language in *Article III, Sect. 4, Subsection (b), Endowed Chairs* be altered to be gender inclusive. Seth Brown modified the language to meet this request.

John Stamper questioned whether the current recommendation would open the University to appeal in every negative decision, and had the ad hoc committee considered the possible consequences. Seth Brown responded that a faculty member currently has right to ask for reasons for a negative tenure decision, and the proposed amendment simply makes this notification required and in writing. Charlie Barber commented that such a change might be welcome by the General Councils office, because it would resolve the current ambiguous situation. Judy Fox noted letters would most likely be written by the General Council not the President or Provost. It is legally more problematic to have Deans and Chairs inform faculty members without any control or structure. Julian Velasco noted that the proposed amendment does not specify the level of detail to be

Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 5, 2007
MINUTES

provided in the letter. John Stamper agreed that if in fact some Deans are providing this information to their faculty, then this amendment is an improvement over the status quo.

Amendment 4 was approved by majority vote.

Colin Jessop adjourned the meeting at 9pm.