

**HUMANITIES AND NATURAL SCIENCES COLLEGE ASSEMBLY**  
**Minutes of September 20, 2007**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order by Interim Dean Mary McCay at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 20, 2007 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Attended: Adams, B. Anderson, R. Anderson, Bell, Berendzen, Bernardi, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Blundell, Bourgeois, Brans, Brazier, Brisco, Brungardt, Butler, Chambers, Clark, Cook, Coolidge, Cotton, Dewell, Dittrich, Doll, Egejuru, Ewell, Fernandez, Gerlich, Gossiaux, Hauber, Hrebik, Janz, Lewis, Mabe, Matthews, McCay, McHugh, Moazami, Moore, Mui, Nicoll, Randall, Rowntree, Salmon, Saxton, Sebastian, Smith, Tucci, Underwood, Walkenhorst, Wessinger, Willems, Zucker, and Interim Associate Dean Hunt.

**II. INVOCATION**

Rev. Leo A. Nicoll, S.J., delivered the invocation.

**III. MINUTES**

The minutes of April 19, 2007 were accepted as written. The posted minutes of March 15, 2007 will be considered at the next meeting.

**IV. DEAN'S SEARCH COMMITTEE**

Dr. Edward Kvet, committee chair, provided an update to his recent letter to faculty and offered to answer any questions. He asked that committee members raise their hands to be recognized as the college's representatives on the search committee; he said it's key that faculty closely communicate with them. He described the usual search firm as providing a pool of candidates, contacts to recommend candidates, and targeted solicitation letters. He reported on the committee's mid-August meeting with three principles of Witt/Kieffer, the search firm hired by the Provost to identify candidates for the university's deanship searches. One of the three, a former dean of an arts and sciences college, had indicated that some preliminary contacts brought up the condition of the city and the issue of AAUP sanctions (full materials on the sanctions are provided). The position advertisement was approved to immediately appear in several on-line publications (traffic might indicate level of interest in 2-3 weeks) and in print in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Dr. Kvet will send the advertisement to faculty via e-mail, with a web connection at the bottom for their use in nominating candidates. Candidates' confidentiality is maintained until a scheduled visit. The committee is currently defining the job profile, a lengthy document to include pre- and post-Katrina issues. In response to questions, Dr. Kvet assured faculty that there will be no "sugar coating," and even during the airport interview phase, candidates will tour. The search firm is aware of desired characteristics and realities of the university and city, and will make certain that candidates understand and accept the "very candid" profile. He described the committee's timetable as: end of October – talk with the search firm, 2<sup>nd</sup> week of December – meet with candidates, 2<sup>nd</sup> week of classes – airport interviews to include the Provost, later followed by campus visits from 4-5 candidates, each for two full days. A member of the assembly commented that previous attitudes seem to have favored distant candidates, while local talent merits consideration.

**V. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT AND HuNS**

Dean McCay introduced Karen Anklam to brief the faculty concerning her office and institutional relationships. Karen said that those at the Council of Chairs meeting last week observed the office's large staff. She explained that the purpose of the staff is to advance the work of all faculty and share opportunities between the institution and potential donors. She said that although she anticipates working more closely with Dean McCay, she is open to faculty members and invites them to drop by her office to share opportunities they think might exist. She maintains office hours on Tuesdays.

**VI. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

Father Nicoll introduced the committee members in attendance. He reported that the committee is sending a survey to faculty members for their responses regarding the current evaluation instrument, and is also seeking DSAC input. He said the survey will provide options to retain, revise, substitute, or supplement the current form; also options as to how evaluations may be used (e.g., for salaries, teaching

improvements). He said that the committee, after gathering and reviewing the information, will discard it all and send a second survey to come up with a faculty instrument everyone can be happy with. (Laughter.)

## VII. HuNS STRATEGIC PLANNING DRAFT

Dean McCay asked faculty to give prompt attention to the draft plan previously distributed via e-mail. She called on sub-committee co-chairs Barbara Ewell and Bernard Cook. Dean McCay, Barbara and Bernard described the urgency for submitting a plan. Barbara summarized the committee's decision in presenting what they consider to be an unrefined document: "no paperwork, no money; better to have some paperwork to get some money." Bernard observed that the college was completely left out of the August Pathways report and funding. Both said they welcome additions and changes to the draft plan. In response to suggestions from the assembly, rather than waiting 5 days to vote, Dr. McCay agreed to have the assembly discuss the draft as projected on the screen and read aloud by Barbara or Bernard.

Motion I: "to accept the document in substance" was made by Denis Janz and seconded. Discussion: Part 1. a.

Revision to part 1.a. was accepted: delete "have begun to." A substitute for items 1-7 from Connie Mui and John Sebastian was projected and read. Suggestions included: reword item 7 to be an action rather than an outcome; indicate that the program will be expanded with internal as well as external recruitments. Comments included: common curriculum is in flux (proceed anyway); chronology of items 1 and 2 may need reversing (retained); the Honors co-directors first want to improve the program; the sense is the process must now move forward.

Part 1.b.

Among the points discussed were: aspects under the Provost, George Capowich's taking the lead up the line, faculty ownership of the proposal, academic nature of programs, specification of interdisciplinary minors or majors, definitions of linked courses within learning communities, running into FYE non-academic issues (e.g., "how to drink responsibly").

Part 1.c.

Dean McCay responded that the assembly should keep to the broad discussion and wait to specify (e.g., Computational Science minor, Computational Physics major). Concern was expressed regarding complications in drawing across colleges.

Part 1.d.

Source of the cited 45% was requested; it was identified as the Strategic Plan. Insert into part 1.d., item 4: "and students" was accepted.

Part 1.e.

Items 2 and 3: change "will be identified as a 'signature program' " to "will do the following" (both are already signature programs). Observations and concerns included: ability to get faculty positions for non-signature programs, need for hires prioritized with department chairs, possibility that a tenured departmental faculty member could be terminated along with a discontinued program, rationale for designating signature programs, criteria for designation, a program with endowed chairs becoming a signature program, funds attracted by signature programs possibly leading to development of other programs.

Remainder of draft

Dean McCay observed that the close of the assembly was nearing. Comments included: recognition of an immediate timetable for having a plan ahead of Capital Campaign's funding considerations and budget committee meetings, acknowledgement that other colleges have provided their plans, and suggestions that the sense of the house allow the committee to come up with a plan. Dean McCay recommended that the college get moving to provide a skeleton document, not a letter-perfect document, and if necessary, have a special meeting next week.

Motion II: "to empower the planning committee to finish as of (date), to be revisited in three months" was made by Kate Adams, accepted and seconded. Discussion: Suggestions from the floor included: 1) as an extraordinary measure in extraordinary circumstances, empower the committee to send a draft; 2) trust the committee to provide the Provost with a skeleton plan; 3) provide a draft plan as so far amended and with timely modifications as received. Move to call the question was unanimously accepted by voice vote. Point of order was raised. Motion I remained on the floor and was restated by Denis: "Approve the document as so far amended." Move to call the question was voted and accepted.

Dean McCay called for successive votes on motions I and II. Someone called out that the motions had differences. Motion was restated as the sense of the room: “empower the committee to go forward to provide skeleton plan to the Provost as a draft.” The ayes were a majority. Dean McCay directed the committee to get it done. Barbara Ewell and Bernard Cook said that they will provide faculty with a revised draft plan for their immediate responses. They invited timely suggestions from the faculty.

**VIII: ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.