

October 6, 2004 Minutes of the General Faculty Committee Meeting

Members In attendance: Eva Redei, Thomas Bauman, Caroline Bledsoe, David Buchholz, Sonny Cytrynbaum, Sudhakar Deshmukh, Charles Geyer, Abraham Haddad, Ilya Kutik, Deborah Lucas, Allen Taflove, Bruce Wessels

1. Welcome and Introductions

GFC chair, Eva Redei, began the meeting by welcoming all members.

2. Approval of June Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the June GFC meeting were approved by all GFC members present. The minutes will be posted to the GFC website.

3. Issues/ Reports for 2004-2005

a. *Subcommittee Chairs-Continuing and New Issues*

Educational Affairs: Sub-committee chair Bruce Wessels gave a brief explanation of the committee and briefly spoke about the COIA initiative that will continue in the upcoming year. New issues for this committee are the problems with engaging international students and faculty in the light of the current immigration policies and the Patriot Act, and the recognition and implementation of plans for increasing interdisciplinary teaching.

Research Affairs: Sub-committee chair David Buchholz spoke about the Research Affairs issues and gave an update on how the administration has responded to the issues sent to them from the Research Affairs initiative, which began last year. The administration is in many cases slow to respond or does not respond at all. The sub-committee hopes to successfully tackle this issue. David Buchholz will meet with Brad Moore VPR and identify who in the VPR office is to receive the specific comments of the faculty to solve. Once the currently unsolved comments will be resolved, the committee will solicit further participation, comments from the faculty using the initiative.

Budget and Policy: Sub-committee chair Debbie Lucas would like to alter the charge of the sub-committee making it more clear and concise. The sub-committee remains proactive in trying to

meet with the administration and in participating in the University budgetary meetings. The process of involving the GFC is very beneficial. Many of the budgetary topics have a direct impact on GFC issues. The controversy regarding the wording of the policy regulating consented relationships between faculty and students and faculty and faculty has not been resolved yet. The university is in the process of changing the CUFS system. The budget subcommittee is represented in this process, but the whole GFC would benefit from a discussion with Jake Julia associate VP for change. It is suggested that he would be invited to a GFC meeting.

Benefits: Sub-committee chair Abraham Haddad remains proactive in addressing current and upcoming benefits issues. He plans on meeting with Tom Evans and Guy Miller every six weeks to discuss what is being done to address issues and improve benefits. Examples of issues include improving tuition benefits, improving mental health benefits, optional and voluntary insurance, and graduated parking fees. The health savings account is being discussed as offering many possibilities.

Charles Geyer and Ilya Kutik agreed to join as members of the benefits sub-committee.

Faculty development: In the absence of Martin Mueller, the chair of the sub-committee, Eva Redei has discussed upcoming issues previously identified at the sub-committee chair's meeting. The question of who defines the term of faculty (university, schools, departments) and what are the rights and responsibilities of the faculty on the different tracks is an important one as the number of non-tenure track faculty has increased at the University significantly. The other important issue is related to the conflict between IRB requirements for non-federally funded research, specifically in schools other than the Medical School, and academic freedom of conducting research using publicly available databases and materials.

GFC sub-committee chairs were asked to forward the names of all the sub-committee members to Eva Redei and to Diana Snyder before the November GFC meeting to be posted on the web.

4. Charter of GFC from 1939 and Faculty Senate Minutes from 1975

The GFC reviewed the two documents, and Eva Redei pointed out items that need to be revisited. First, there is no clear statement in the charter or in the faculty handbook regarding who GFC should be representing in this changing higher education organization. Currently, the faculty handbook states that faculty includes full time faculty, not just tenure track only, without

adjuncts, absent tenure and/or visiting faculty. But this statement is in conflict with current practices. The university has grown significantly, but the number of GFC representatives is the same as they were in 1975. Eva Redei proposed to form a temporary GFC sub-committee that would reevaluate the charter of the faculty senate and the GFC and would evaluate the significance of increasing and broadening the membership. The mission of this subcommittee on faculty governance is to draft a new charter that can be approved by the faculty senate at the last faculty senate meeting of the year and subsequently brought in front of the Board of Trustees. If approved, elections can be done as soon as next year.

Eva Redei will head the Governance sub-committee. Bruce Wessels and Thomas Bauman have agreed to serve as members of this newly appointed sub-committee.

One concern raised is the question of who will listen to the GFC if the membership grows in number. GFC needs to address the central issue of how we are going to be respected. It is a complete waste of time for the GFC to meet if we continue to be disregarded. Eva Redei addressed the concern by stating that increasing in number could result in the increase of faculty involvement. Often times, controversy brings in participation. The burden rests with the GFC to engage faculty with issues of interest.

5. New Business

a. Faculty Senate Meeting: As a whole, the GFC needs to find a way to increase attendance at the next faculty senate meeting. The faculty senate is the only conduit to having a say in faculty governance.

Summary of topics to address:

1. IRB issues: a) problems with the current procedures; b) requirement for IRB approval for non-federally funded research using publicly available information/databases.
2. Status of research compliance issues at the university: a) did we solve the previous major issues, animal care, IRB and effort reporting; b) do we know what will be the next problems
3. International affairs- the contradiction between having and wanting an internationally known university and the visa problems.
4. The changing faculty profile: the University grew not by increasing the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty but increasing the numbers of adjunct faculty, instructors,

research and clinical faculty. They have no representation in the Faculty Senate or do they?
Conflict of faculty handbook, the charter of the faculty senate and “common belief”.

b. Questions for the Board of Trustees Meeting in December:

Summary of proposed theme and topics:

Theme: University in the 21st century

Topics: Faculty governance vs. university management

What makes a university relevant, or what makes a great university

Compliance vs. productivity

c. Communication Issue – resistance to GFC coverage in the observer paper or any other publicity avenues. The GFC needs help from faculty to publicize our goals.

Conclusion of meeting:

Eva Redei asked for volunteers to attend the Board of Accreditation meeting on October 11th and represent the General Faculty Committee.

Everyone is reminded to send Eva Redei and Diana Snyder the names of current sub-committee members.

A reminder will be sent out to all GFC sub-committee chairs for the upcoming Executive Committee Meeting with NU Administration to be held on October 28th.

The next GFC meeting will be held on November 3, 2004 at 7:00 pm in Scott Hall room 201 (the Ripton Room)

Minutes Submitted by:

Diana Snyder