

Numbered items correspond to agenda items

1. *Presidential courtesy:* N/A
2. *Report for GFS* N/A
3. *Report from Executive Secretary*
 - a. *Approval of Minutes*
 - i. *Meeting of 4/27/09*
 - (1) Abstain. I was not present
 - ii. *Meeting of 6/23/09*
 - (1) Minutes seem ok.
 - iii. *Meeting of 7/29/09*
 - (1) Pp. 22-23 of packet: who is speaking here? If a council member, he or she needs to be identified. If the recording secretary, this shouldn't be in the minutes.
 - (2) P. 24, my statements
 - (a) I said attorney drafted a "statement." He didn't draft a letter.
 - (b) Didn't say no difference between the LOE and the attorney's statement; rather, said the attorney said the LOE essentially accomplished the same thing as his letter.
 - (3) Pp. 24-25: Dawn Massey's comments—is this a track changes version? Should be corrected
 - (4) P. 26,
 - (a) Chris Bernhardt's question: specifically asked about job security for non tenured faculty
 - (b) My bit, bottom: what I said was that, in response to Chris Bernhardt's question about whether untenured faculty need

be worried about renewal, it is worth emphasizing that untenured faculty do have protection....

b. *Correspondence*

i. For all items here:

(1) p. 29 of packet:

- (a) read quote from BOT at top
- (b) compare with "RD to IM June 08" , and quote from the actual motion

(2) p. 30 of packet:

- (a) read quote from BOT at top
- (b) point out relevant section of handbook, and that this quote applies to educational policies
- (c) changes to the handbook are covered by section 8 of that same major section

(3) The BOT need to be made aware of these misunderstandings of the subcommittee's charge, and the relevant sections of the handbook. So, I propose the following motion:

- (a) **Motion: that the AC direct the Executive Committee to write a cordial letter to the members of the BOT and cc'ing the GF, pointing out the misunderstandings related to the charges given to the ACSG, and the misunderstandings related to the provisions for amendment to the Handbook.**
- (b) Rationale: I would hate to think the BOT would go into meeting this fall with misunderstandings of this sort. This is the cleanest way to be sure this information gets to the Board, and to the GF as well.

4. *Council Subcommittee Reports*

a. *AC Subcommittee on Governance*

- i. Recommendation 1: HB amendment to give GFS and SVPAA voting rights on the AC
 - (1) Neither the GFS nor the SVPAA should have voting rights. Neither are elected representatives to the Council.
 - (2) Second, this does not fit with any widely recognized model of shared governance I'm aware of. E.g. the AAUP Statement on Government
 - (3) Note letter from Paul Huston: read section on shared governance does not imply shared decision making
 - (4) The proposal here is really a candy-bar model of shared governance (share that candy bar! Share those votes!). It is not in keeping with shared governance means, as articulated by the country's leading experts on shared governance
 - (a) speaking of the experts, did the ACSG consult them? E.g. the AAUP, or individuals such as Bob Krieser, Greg Scholtz?
- ii. Recommendation 2: Expanding the ACEC to include the SVPAA and GFS
 - (1) The general idea of facilitating communication is good. But this implementation of that idea is a terrible one. Assuming it does not pass, I'll propose an alternative motion that meets most of the point made in the rationale, but without the drawbacks
 - (2) Here are some problems:
 - (a) The ACEC receives a lot of communication from faculty that is not intended to be sent to the AC, but is, e.g., by way of inquiry. Here are two of many examples I've seen in my earlier stints as Executive Secretary
 - (i) a faculty member describing details of a complaint about merit increases, including possible grounds

for a lawsuit against the administration. This was an inquiry, along the lines of whether there is a role for the AC to play in the dispute

- (ii) A similar situation involving alleged age discrimination. Again this was an inquiry directed to the officers of the AC, not intended for general distribution.
- (iii) Now, the SVPAA reports to the President, and presumably would also report to the EVP. The SVPAA would have an obligation to pass on such information to those he reports to.
- (iv) so: if the SVPAA is a member of the ACEC, the ACEC faculty members would have an obligation to share correspondence such as that above. And the SVPAA would in turn have an obligation to share such information with those to whom he reports.
- (v) do we want such a situation? I take it as obvious that we do not. Yet this proposed HB amendment would mandate just such a situation

(3) so, here is an alternative motion

MOTION:

That the Academic Council Chair and Executive Secretary, together with the General Faculty Secretary, meet with the SVPAA at least once a month. The meetings should take place before the agenda is prepared for upcoming Academic Council meetings. Topics for discussion should include but not be limited to possible Academic Council agenda items, as well as how best to address issues that arise within the governance structure of the university

- (a) Rationale: this accomplishes the main goals the ACSG wanted to accomplish in terms of better communication, without the serious drawbacks outlined above.

iii. Recommendation 3: HB amendment on Public Lectures and Events committee

- (1) This should come from the PL&E committee.

- (2) This recommendation should be forwarded by the ACSG to the PL&E cmt for consideration, and have them return to the AC with a recommendation. No need for the AC to do this: the ACSG can do it.
- iv. Recommendation 4: HB amendment to have school governance documents be approved by President rather than by BOT
 - (1) No real comments on this. Not sure what the rationale is for this, or whether it is a good idea.
- v. Recommendation 5: forming AC subcmt to recommend HB changes to formalize role of faculty reps on BOT subcmts
 - (1) This should be sent to the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees.
 - (2) In fact, the Cmt on Conference was already given a similar charge at an earlier AC meeting.
- vi. Recommendation 6: forming AC subcmt to look into folding work of University Council into Student Life committee (former is a university wide cmt, latter is a HB cmt)
 - (1) The recommendation of “folding the work of the University Council into the Student Life subcommittee” is way screwy.
 - (a) The University Council is a non faculty committee, dealing with non academic issues, i.e., issues that are not under the faculty purview
 - (b) Folding that committees work into a Handbook committee is not appropriate—the faculty have no business telling such a committee what their work should be
 - (c) If some other type of restructuring is in mind, send it to the Student Life committee. Have them consider these issues, and report recommendations back to the AC. No need to have the AC direct the committee to do this.

vii. Recommendation 7: expanding members of Budget Committee

- (1) This should be coming from the budget committee.
- (2) I'd suggest the ACSG forward this to the Budget Committee (no need for AC approval of this), and have the Budget Committee consider it and return it to the AC with their recommendation.

5. *Petitions for Immediate Hearing* N/A

6. *Old Business*

a. *Athletic Events and final exam conflicts* N/A

b. *Integrating grad ed more fully* N/A

c. *Cmt on Conference with the BOT*

- i. Has the committee heard back from the BOT regarding the June meeting and the votes the BOT passed at that meeting?
- ii. For next meeting, only item to discuss is the ongoing fiscal and governance issues

- (1) I would encourage the cmt to make this point. We have heard rumors that some people think some faculty are trying to obstruct proposals from being voted on. I know of no such faculty. And as one of the people most vocally opposed to many of the proposed changes, I suspect I've been suspected of being obstructionist.

Not so. What I want to assure is that the faculty representatives do their due diligence in hearing the arguments pro and con, and deliberating the issues, but not in a rushed manner. That encourages mistakes.

7. *New Business*

a. *Report from the FSC*

i. General list of problems with report

- (1) Motion is not stated correctly. Unless the FSC is recommending the AC approve removing key faculty benefits and benefit protections, with nothing in return, the motion itself must include all contingencies
 - (a) we cannot cook up contingencies off the top of our heads. These are difficult to word properly.
- (2) No BPO with tracked changes, or even a list summarizing the differences between the proposed BPO and our current BPO ???
- (3) Note Betsy's email: the BPO we have is the most current the ACEC has available. Didn't the FSC include the BPO, and a current one at that, to the ACEC? How are we supposed to compare the proposed BPO with the existing BPO, without having the latter?
- (4) No motion for the merit plan. This is not a simple motion. Some options:
 - (a) Divide the motion in to the portion that is not contingent on any other matters, and the portion (the CPI clause) that is contingent. They are separate, and so no reason to vote on them as one.
 - (b) If for some reason the FSC wants to include the CPI clause in the vote on the overall merit plan, then craft the needed motion. Then write a second motion to cover the quite likely situation that the CPI clause will not be accepted by

the administration. This can be conditional on the clause being rejected, and would say that the faculty approves the remainder of the merit plan, i.e., the plan minus the CPI clauses.

- (c) What we *don't* want is to have this same motion come back to the AC and back to the GF a third time. It should have been done differently last spring, and certainly should be done correctly this fall.

(5) —

(6) —

(7) —

(8) —

ii. Miscellaneous items

- (1) note quote from Al Kelley's letter about benefits not in handbook being at the good will of those involved

- (2) **Note my memo to FSC and AC, pointing out that CPI language does not do what most faculty think it does**

(3) —

(4) —

(5) —

- b. *Elect Faculty reps to honorary degree subcmt* N/A
- c. *Academic Calendar/final exam issues*
 - i. Is the attached schedule final?
 - ii. I'd suggest we approve if for fall, and figure out how faculty can work with the SVPAA's office to try to avoid such problems in the future
- d. *AC Subcmt to clarify policy on grade changes*
 - i. This is from our subcmt's report from last spring.