

Minutes
Faculty Forum Meeting
February 15, 2006
2:00-3:30 P.M.
Dolan Auditorium

1. Ernie called the meeting to order at 2:00 P.M.
2. Announcements
 - a. To make use of the new common meeting times, the Forum has posted its schedule of meetings for the semester on the website. Specifically, we will have a meeting on March 1, 2006 in order to ask David LaGuardia questions about his Town Hall presentation.
 - b. The Faculty Forum Executive Committee voted to have Ernie draft a letter requesting that a few members of the Executive Committee be invited to the University Planning retreat.
 - c. The Student Union has asked to have a faculty representative to help revitalize Homecoming. Ernie asked anyone interested to contact him.
 - d. Marcy Milota made an announcement from the floor to encourage all members of the Forum to fill out their library surveys and to encourage their students to do the same.
3. New Business
 - a. Karen Gygli and Tamba Nlandu announced the number of faculty eligible to vote (229) and the slate of nominations for the upcoming elections. Some nominations were taken from the floor, but it was also announced that February 22 is the close of nominations. The current list will be posted on the Forum website. Carl Spitznagel asked for clarification on the procedure for At-Large seats, and it was announced that there is one large pool of At-Large candidates from which the top 2 vote-getters would be awarded the seats.
 - b. Duane Dukes and Jackie Schmidt talked about the proposal for a new Masters Program in Non-Profit Management. Jackie explained that the Committee on Academic Policies received the proposal in November after it had already been endorsed by the member departments and the Deans. The Committee on Academic Policies voted to approve the proposal and would like to send it out to a paper ballot of the faculty. Carl Spitznagel asked a question about the discount rate of 40% listed in the proposal. Mary Beadle clarified that this discount rate is based on the “cohort model” which rewards programs with 10 or more students making their way through. Some questions were fielded about the housing of the program, distinction between the proposed program and the Weatherhead School, and the effects that the program will have on the staffing of courses in the participating departments. Carl Spitznagel expressed some concern that the program would dilute the quality of undergraduate education. Ernie announced that the proposal will be sent out to the faculty for a vote and that we will have 10 days to return the ballots.
 - c. Ernie asked a faculty representative from the Budget Committee to give a report. Instead, Ed Peck gave an overview of some of the processes and

issues facing the committee. He announced there are 5 elected members of the faculty and 4 administrative appointments on the University Budget Committee. They have had 18 meetings over the last 4 ½ months, with a majority of this time being spent in order to understand the complexities of the budget. Specifically they have been looking at things to recommend cutting from the budget, both long and short term but more immediately the short term goal of 2.7 million dollars in cuts. They have already submitted several recommendations but do not yet know which of the recommendations will be followed. Ed also announced that despite hopes to the contrary there are no additional savings for spring 2006. It was explained why the recommendations would not be made available for faculty to debate, though many members of the faculty expressed a desire to have a more transparent budgetary process. Faculty members on the Budget Committee defended their decision to not share more specific information. A long discussion around the issue of transparency and budgetary secrecy ensued.

- d. Paul Shick gave some background to the Faculty Governance Assembly proposal and explained why he was facilitating the discussion of the draft proposal (he wrote the current incarnation). He explained his position on what element of the FGA proposal that concerns the ability of the FGA to vote on non-substantive issues when a quorum of faculty are in attendance at the FGA meeting (instead of sending it out for a vote of the full faculty), but also conceded that this issue was perhaps the most controversial in the document and would require consensus. Under Paul's recommendation the only decisions that would require a full vote of the faculty would be handbook issues. David LaGuardia pointed out that some of the expectation of meetings might need to be amended because the common meeting time is on a trial basis only. We had some discussion about the problem of scheduling labs during the common meeting time and perhaps choosing a new common meeting time that would be more convenient. It was announced that in order to have a vote on the new FGA structure the Handbook Committee would have to recommend a series of Amendments to the Handbook. If voted in, the new FGA would mean that the Forum would cease to exist and the current elections would yield seats that would soon be outdated and require new elections. Val Flechtner commended the faculty that have been working on the FGA proposal and thanked them for the clarity of the document. Ernie announced that we will continue the process of evaluating the FGA on March 15 at the Forum meeting since the March 1 meeting will be a conversation with David LaGuardia about his Town Hall presentation.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.

Minutes submitted by Mindy Peden