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UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSEMBLY MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 24, 1992

The UFA met on September 24, 1992, at four o'clock in Massie Hall room #205. A quorum was present.

CALL TO ORDER
Hagop Pambookian, president, called the meeting to order at 4:08.

AGENDA APPROVAL
John Kelley made the motion that the agenda be approved and Mel Goetting seconded it. The members unanimously approved it.

APPROVAL OF MAY 28, 1992 MINUTES
Kathleen Simon made the motion that the minutes be approved and Nan Yun seconded it. The minutes were unanimously approved by the members.

INTRODUCTIONS
Hagop Pambookian introduced the executive board, and Jim Kadel introduced Carol Ward, a new faculty member in Allied Health. No other new faculty members were present.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
John Lorentz made the motion and John Valentine and Ed Miner both seconded it that a discussion of the constitution and bylaws for the University Senate be postponed until the next meeting on October 15th. The motion was carried. Dr. Lorentz explained that further work needed to be done to make the document complete and clear.

NEW BUSINESS
There was no new business.

ON-GOING BUSINESS

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Committee on Committees
Jim Flavin reported that committee appointments had been made, and committees have been asked to elect chairs as soon as possible.

2. Educational Policy and Curriculum (EPCC) — No report.
3. Faculty Affairs
Gail Massey will continue as chair. The first draft of the faculty handbook will be distributed to the faculty next week. One copy will be placed in each division. Open hearings will be held on October 9th at 2:00 p.m. in Library room #205.

4. Fiscal Affairs -- No report.

5. Student Affairs
Mary Dillard read Ginny Hamilton's report to the members. The committee will meet next week. Ginny was attending a conference.

6. Faculty Development/Research and Creative Activities
Robbie Burke and Kathleen Simon announced that the committee will meet next Friday.

7. Facilities Planning
Mel Goetting announced that this committee will meet next week.

8. Quarter Vs. Semester -- No report.

9. University Governance
John Lorentz reported that his committee is considering an escape clause to be included in the University Senate document. Larry Lonney has given him some ideas in writing. Anyone who wishes can go to the committee's next meeting to be held on October 1st.

10. Administrative Review
Ed Miner stated that the committee will meet and will report.

11. Plagiarism -- No report.

12. Campus-Wide Assessment
Mary Dillard read Ginny Hamilton's report. Ginny attended a national convention on assessment in June. Her committee will have two elements (1) an inventory of all assessment activities currently taking place on campus, and (2) an assessment plan of action for future academic assessment with suggestions of needed components. The committee has contributed assessment information to the North Central self study and
given regular reports during the summer to the dean/directors meetings.

B. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE
Hagop Pambookian made note of the August 7th letter to Robert Dever from the executive committee, copies attached to agenda. He announced that he sent color-coded forms to department secretaries to be used this year. He also stated that he sent a memo to the president, provost, deans, and chairs asking them to meet with the executive board about faculty input into the budget-cutting process. He also sent a memo August 20th to the UFA members giving the meeting dates for the board and general membership meetings for the academic year.

C. EXECUTIVE BOARD REPORTS
Hagop Pambookian told the members that the executive board had decided not to have a fall banquet and asked if they wanted one in the spring. After some discussion, the members voted not to have a fall 1992 or 1993, spring, or midwinter banquet. They also voted not to have an informal family outing. By show of hand, eight voted for a fall 1992 banquet, none for a spring one, ten for a midyear banquet, fourteen for a fall 1993 banquet, and twenty-four for a family outing. Since there was not a strong vote for any one option, none is planned at this time. Emily Gulker invited members to her home on October 31st for a Halloween party.

Hagop Pambookian reminded members that they should present items to the executive board and then the items will be sent to appropriate committees or be placed on the agenda.

Pambookian explained that no refreshments were served at the meeting because it would be inappropriate in the light of budget cuts.

Jim Flavin gave a report of the executive board's September 17th meeting with administrators. He stated that discussion focused on academic issues alone. Preliminary indications are that forty-nine classes were cancelled. On canceling classes, Dr. Veri told the board that input was achieved through a budget advisory committee which submitted more than one hundred suggestions and that the document was shown to UFA members. Chairs, who now have faculty status, represented the faculty in defending some classes with fewer than twelve students. Dr. Jahnke indicated that she worked closely with the faculty in her area to defend
some classes. Dr. Addington stated that he attempted to follow Stylianos Hadjiyannis's suggestion at a UFA meeting last spring that it was better to cancel classes early than late. He began cancelling classes with enrollment of five and then later cancelled classes with ten students. Some classes with fewer than twelve students are running in all divisions.

On the issue of raising course caps, the administrators said that it has occurred in a variety of courses within disciplines and within the core. Larger classes often make it more difficult to achieve course goals and objectives. The core commitment to critical thinking, reading, and writing is threatened by larger classes.

The link between the new governance proposal and faculty input in summer raised the issue of administrators who teach. Quality control was the UFA board's major concern. The board was told that chairs are asked to review the resumes of those administrators who teach and that student evaluations are given in those classes and reviewed. The executive committee supports the practice of having administrators teach.

Dr. Flavin's report contained the following questions that the board's discussion with the administrators raised. He suggested that we might want to discuss, not as a faculty aligned against an administration, but as a university community. The questions are in random order.
1. What constitutes viable faculty input into decisions such as the cancelling of classes or the lifting of caps?
2. Where do faculty rights end in such decisions and administrative prerogatives take over?
3. Do we as a faculty believe there is such a thing as an administrative prerogative?
4. How much money has the university saved through cancelling these courses?
5. How much money has been lost in revenues that would have been generated from student FTEs in those cancelled courses?
6. Is there a relationship between cancelled classes and the lack of enrollment increase this year?
7. Is there any thing inherently wrong with the practice of having administrators teach?
8. Are other options available for saving money that have not been proposed?
9. Does raising caps on courses within disciplines make it easier or more difficult to achieve course goals?
10. Do decisions to increase enrollment caps within the Core take us closer or further away from our commitments to critical thinking, to speaking and to writing across the Core?
11. Is it possible for faculty and administration to work together in response to this budget crisis?

Responses to Jim Flavin's report included Ed Miner's statement that the budget committee did not have input into cuts. Bill Hanlon stated that SEA was not notified. Shirley Crothers asked how much jurisdiction faculty members have over their own programs. Tom Stead asked how administrators arrived at the 10/12 limit. Dr. Addington responded that the 10/12 number was a generalized number. He told the members that he had cut 24.3% contact hours for summer quarter but the budget increased $40,000 because regular faculty taught many courses rather than adjuncts. He stated that the 10/12 number for cut-off is supposed to save $50,000. He tried to avoid course duplication and worked with the deans on the fall quarter cuts. They were sensitive to sequential courses or courses required in majors. He also stated that there are different funding levels for different levels. We have been cut in supplementary funding to 3.7 million dollars.

Other UFA member responses included the following: Scott Oliver expressed his concern for upper level courses and building the four-year programs. Carlson Yost stated that upper division students register late and some lost classes because classes were cancelled too early. Tom Carnevale expressed his concern over class size and having to produce a winter schedule by tomorrow with no direction. Robbie Burke said that one of her classrooms didn't have enough seats for her students. Tom Stead suggested that we consider what Ohio University does. It pays a percentage of salary for teaching smaller classes. John Lorentz expressed his concern for the arbitrary setting of figures and the large numbers in the Core classes. Ken Warfield asked who looked at quality control of administrators who were teaching for departments with no chairs. Ray Irwin pointed out that our students always register late. Dr. Addington responded to Ken Warfield by stating that deans would review administrators in departments that had no chair. If they were teaching, they would review themselves. Bill Penn stated that there is some confusion over who represents SEA/UFA at different times. Bill Hanlon
stated that we were approaching a no confidence situation for the university.

The next item of business was a report from Anita Gilmer who asked members to read the Managing for the Future Report; a copy is in the library on reserve. She would like responses to it and has serious concerns about some material in it. She will be secretary of the Faculty Advisory Committee this year.

Tony Dzik reported that the North Central Report is almost complete. It will be in university offices and the library on September 30th. He needs comments and responses by Friday, October 9th.

Hagop Pambookian reminded the members that agenda items must be turned in seven working days before the general meeting.

Pambookian asked for a response to the letter to Mr. Dever. Ed Miner stated that it was well done.

John Lorentz made a motion that the meeting be adjourned and Ed Miner seconded it. The members voted unanimously to adjourn.
FINAL GRADE GRIEVANCE POLICY
DRAFT 3

Goals:

The goals of the grade grievance policy are:
1. to provide a viable procedure for students to appeal a grade;
2. to effect a reconciliation at the lowest level possible;
3. to provide written notification to all parties of the intent to file an appeal;
4. to notify the faculty member in question as soon as the appeal is filed;
and
5. to handle the appeal in a timely manner.

Procedure:

1. The first appeal made by a student should be directly to the faculty member issuing the grade.

2. If the appeal is not satisfied at the faculty-student meeting, the student may file an appeal in writing to the appropriate chairperson.

3. If the response of the chairperson does not satisfy the appeal, the student may file an appeal in writing to the Dean.

4. If the Dean's response does not satisfy the student, the student may file an appeal in writing to the Grade Grievance Committee.

5. Both the student and the faculty member will meet with the Grade Grievance Committee to state their cases.

6. The Grade Grievance Committee will recommend a course of action to the faculty member and the Provost. If the Grade Grievance Committee disagrees with the faculty member, they will recommend a change in the grade. The Provost will be so informed. If the faculty member is not employed in the quarter the grievance is filed, the committee will inform the Provost and the Registrar if a grade change is necessary.
7. Documentation of the appeal action at the previous level will be submitted to the next level and the faculty member and student notified of the appeal status.

Time Frame

1. A student wishing to appeal a course grade must appeal the grade to the faculty member issuing the grade no later than the second class day of the next quarter of student enrollment.

2. The faculty member must respond to the appeal within two class days of the initial appeal filed by the student.

3. The student may appeal the grade to the chairperson and/or Dean within two(2) class days after receiving the faculty response.

4. The Chairperson and/or Dean must respond within two class days of receiving the appeal.

5. The student may appeal the grade to the Grade Grievance Committee within two(2) class days after receiving the response(s) from the Chairperson and/or Dean.

6. The Grade Grievance Committee will convene between the eleventh and fifteenth class days of the quarter to interview the student and the faculty member involved.

7. The committee must make a decision within two class days after meeting with the faculty member and student.

8. If an appeal proceeds beyond the Chairperson/Dean level, the student may be required to enroll in a class, pay fees and attend class pending the outcome of the Committee appeal. Approval of these measures will be by the Chair of Grade Grievance Committee. It is understood that appropriate fees will be refunded if the student loses the appeal.

This time frame may be altered, if extenuating circumstances warrant, by the Chair of the Grade Grievance Committee. Students and/or faculty may appeal the time frame to the Chair of the Grade Grievance Committee.
Grade Grievance Committee

A pool of fourteen (14) faculty members shall be selected at the beginning of each academic year. There shall be two (2) faculty members selected from each of the following: College of Business, College of Allied Health, College of Engineering Technology, Arts and Humanities Division, Math/Science Division, Social Science Division, and Education Department. A call for volunteers will be made at the beginning of the academic year. Each Chair/Dean of the above units will appoint the needed two members. Chairs or Deans will appoint alternates if needed.

Two students will be selected by Student Senate at the beginning of the academic year. One of the two will be selected to serve as a voting member of each committee.

Each time a grade appeal is filed at the committee level, a committee of seven (7) faculty members and one (1) student shall be seated. The eight members shall consist of the two faculty pool members from the academic area of the faculty member involved plus five additional pool members selected randomly, and one student.

The committee will be convened by the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs. The person who convenes the committee shall chair, but not be a voting member. If a vote results in a tie, the chair will cast the tie-breaking vote.

The 8-member committee shall convene between the eleventh and fifteenth class days of the quarter to interview the student and the faculty member involved. The committee will hear all parties and then communicate their decision to the faculty member and the Provost within two class days following the hearing.

All parties involved will be notified of the committee decision.