MEMORANDUM
TO: All Faculty
FROM: Glenn N. Cunningham, Chair of Faculty Senate
DATE: March 19, 1992
SUBJECT: FACULTY SENATE MEETING - March 26, 1992

This is a special final meeting of the 1991-1992 Faculty Senate:

DATE: March 26, 1992
TIME: 4:00 PM
ROOM: PH 115

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Minutes
4. Recognition of Guests
5. Unfinished business:
   - Acceptance, Appointment and Evaluation of Fully Endowed Chairs

6. Reports from Chairs of Faculty Senate Committees.
7. New Business

Please note that this resolution has been rewritten since the printed agenda of March 5, 1992.

RESOLUTION 1991-1992-12 (REVISION 1)
Acceptance, Appointment and Evaluation of Fully Endowed Chairs

WHEREAS, fully self-supporting endowed chairs affirm the university's commitment to excellence, be it resolved:

1) The establishment of a fully endowed chair shall be subject to approval by the university, college, affected department, and the major donor. By definition, fully endowed chairs provide a self-supporting scholarly activity without cost to the university.

2) The appointment of an individual to a fully endowed chair shall be made for a five to seven year term following agreement by the university, college, affected department, and the major donor. This appointment may be renewable for successive terms. When agreement has been reached to accept a major gift of a fully endowed chair, the president shall establish a committee to process each application and nomination. Committee membership should include leading authorities in the academic discipline from inside and outside the university. All other procedures as specified in Faculty Senate Resolution 1991-1992-8 (Revised) shall be followed regarding selection and performance review of fully endowed Chairs.
Administrative Review

Whereas the faculty handbook and previous senate resolutions address review of academic administrators, the level of administrator to be reviewed, is not specified; and whereas the unit/committee responsible for initiating and establishing the process or the dissemination of review results, has not been established, be it resolved that

a. All administrators at the level of Vice-President, Academic dean and Director-Resident Center shall be subject to a major review no later than five years after first appointment or five years after the last major review.

b. The primary purpose of such a review is to assist the administrator in improving his/her performance and effectiveness as well as establishing whether, and if so, for how long, the appointment of the administrator should be continued.

c. The responsibility for the initiation of the review should rest with the Personnel Committee of the Faculty Senate. The composition of the impartial review committee will be subject to the approval of the President of the University.

d. The composition of any review committee should reflect the constituency served by that office and the procedures of the review should insure the input of these constituencies in assessing the administrator/functioning of the office.

e. It is expected that the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will establish a sub-committee to determine the representation of the designated administrative review committee as well as monitor its progress.

f. A copy of the evaluation results should be provided to the administrator’s immediate superior, the administrator being reviewed and the Chair of the Faculty Senate. A brief summary of the review and recommendations should be included.

Proposed by the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee.

RESOLUTION 1991-1992-14

Whereas one week in each of fall and spring semesters is reserved for comprehensive final examinations, and whereas there appears to be a substantial majority of responding faculty who believe faculty should have the opportunity to give three hour comprehensive final examinations,

Be it resolved that future comprehensive examination periods be scheduled in three hour blocks.

Proposed by the Faculty Senate Instruction Committee.

Whereas one of the most important hallmarks of a university is a quality library, and

Whereas library quality depends almost entirely on a reliable (steady) source of funding that keeps pace with academic programs, limited enrollment, and

Whereas a severe cut in one year's allocation reduces the base and thus erodes future support,

Therefore, be it resolved that the library, like salaries, be protected from cuts and given priority for support from capital campaign funds.

RESOLUTION 1991-1992-16

No faculty member or administrative official shall participate directly in any recommendation or decision relating to appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or other condition of employment at the University of any parent, child, spouse, sibling, parent-in-law, sibling-in-law, child-in-law, or stepchild, except under such circumstances as the President of the University may determine as warranting waiver of this prohibition in the best interests of the University.

A faculty member or administrative official should withdraw from participation in any personnel recommendation or decision involving potential conflict of interest.

8. Announcements

9. Adjournment