CAS Faculty Senate Meeting, March 21, 2011

Minutes

Excused: P. Sloane White, C. Skeen, J. Noble Harvey, L. Hoffman, A. Colman, F. Szabo


1. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of the agenda for the 3/21/2011 meeting – approved unanimously
   b. Approval of the minutes of the 2/21/2011 meeting - approved unanimously
   c. Other items from the Steering Committee

2. President's Remarks – Davis encouraged the senate to think about the issues that were raised in the strategic planning report – interdisciplinary work, writing, and research. He asked the senators to discuss these items with their departments. Two ad hoc committees – one working on the collaborative efforts and the second committee will work on writing across the curriculum will be created to continue the work of the committee.

3. Guest Speakers: Iain Crawford and John Pelesko (Co-Chairs of the CAS Strategic Planning Committee) (click here for presentation)

Iain Crawford – Between September and January the committee created a blue sky vision that will now become a plan from the Dean’s office. There were 21 focus group with over 250 people attending, and over 200 people complete the survey for the committee.

John Pelesko – First, the document represents a broad consensus of the thinking from the large group of faculty across campus. Second, the document is necessarily brief. All the debate and rationale do not appear in the document. They came to today’s meeting to answer any questions the senators had and share the discussions that led to the present document.
   a. UD’s Core for Interdisciplinary Activity
   b. Always a Leader in Undergraduate Education
   c. Advancing Scholarship through Graduate Education (research)
Question: Does “interdisciplinary” include multiple departments within a portfolio? Would like clarification.

Answer: Iain explained that they did not determine the exact meaning of interdisciplinary, but tried to capture overall sense of what was important.

4. Dean’s Remarks –

Strategic Planning – Dean Watson explained that he wanted a mechanism to provide feedback from as many faculty as possible and he welcomes the report as part of the project. Lots of other elements will add fuel to the final version. We need to be in alignment with the Path to Prominence. Another thing we’ve done to get input is have a chairs and directors retreat. Next step is to get feedback from additional sources, including the senate if they would like. Work is already being done by the dean and associate deans to form a draft of the final strategic plan. It is a 10 year plan for the college and it will drive a lot of the decision making in the dean’s office as far as budget, hiring, etc. The Dean’s office will activate the elements of the strategic plan as we can over the coming ten years.

Question: Should we expect goals and time tables in the final report?

Answer: No, there will not be yearly time tables. The Dean’s office is trying to come up with the essential points of the plan by April 15.

Question: Are any of the three points a higher priority than the others at this time?

Answer: His office is currently trying to determine what the priority of the three will be. Everything is integrated and interacts, so the Dean’s office is trying to make these determinations now.

Question: Rumors about budgets are going around. Any comments?

Answer: The budgets are definitely tight and we have to close this fiscal year in the best shape we can. We will not be able to implement a lot of things quickly. He struggles with the budget on a daily basis. We will know greater detail about the budgets but probably not until the end of April. Until he is able to responsibly give a clear answer on the budget he did not want to make any further comments.

Question: At the end of last year we thought we were looking good financially. What happened?

Answer: There has been a lot more fine tuning of the algorithms and the allocations of the state have gone down, special state funding is down, endowments are down. We are on a 12 month rolling payout so we’re still feeling the effects of the endowment drops.

Question: Can you envision a time in the future when RBB will be transparent enough that departments could use it for planning.

Answer: There are currently no deans that have departments running under RBB themselves.
There is always the chance that the numbers given to a department is driven by their enrollment. Portfolios aren’t set up that way either. He isn’t going to pit one department against another.

5. Unfinished Business - None
   a. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on University Senate representation. They’ve completed their work and have forwarded their report to him. Ted will distribute the report for senators to discuss with the department and report back at the next meeting. Lou Rossi explained to the senators how the apportionment is done for the UD Senate and explained the committees job was to find out how to apportion the allocated number of senators fairly among the college. The committee recommends separating the vote out by portfolios.
   There will need to be a transition from what we have now to the new plan. (click for presentation)

   Question: Concern about constitutional fairness since the art portfolio has only 3 department. How did we bring in all new units yet lose one senator?

   Answer: Showed the documentation on how many we have.

Watson: Immediate solution for this year will be department will not be represented.

6. Business Arising from Standing Committee
   a. COCAN
   b. Educational Affairs
      1. Non-consent item – 18 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
         a. FLLT New Arabic Studies Certificate
      2. Consent items19 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstention
         a. SPP Delete Concentration MA in UAPP
         b. SPP Revise Public Policy Major
   c. Promotion and Tenure
   d. Grade Grievances
   e. Advisement & Retention
   f. Faculty Diversity
g. Faculty Awards

7. New Business

   a. Creation of an ad hoc committee to make a recommendation regarding the establishment of a Graduate Education standing committee.

   Question: Do we really want to create another committee when we can’t staff the other?

   Answer: There has been no reports over the past several years that indicate how anyone is rewarded for service. AD hoc committee should report why they would be a vital committee.

   All those in favor – 17 approved, 0 opposed, 2 abstention

8. Announcements – None

   Respectfully submitted by Mary Cleveland, substituting for Danilo Yanich