

NAU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes Monday, December 5, 2005

Please email corrections to Julie.Hammond@nau.edu

Call to order:

Senate President Marcus Ford called the meeting of the NAU Faculty Senate to order at 3:05 p.m. in the Student Union/Kaibab room.

Members Present: David Allen, Syl Allred, T.S. Amer, Nancy Barron, Virginia Blankenship, Kathy Bohan, Chuck Connell, Bill Culbertson, Jim Davis, Mary Dereshiwsy, Sally Doshier, Jack Dustman, Marcus Ford, Bill Gibson, Tara Green, Liz Grobsmith, John Haeger, Kelley Hays-Gilpin, Emily Hill, Glenn Hookstra, Chris Lanterman, Chunhye Lee, Rich Lei, Dave McKell, Helaine McLain, Janet McShane, Larry Mohrweis, Sheila Nair, Cecilia Ojeda, Michael Ort, Lon Owen, Nancy Paxton, Jon Reyhner, Blase Scarnati, Nando Schellen, Karen Sealander, Astrid Sheil, David Sherry, Marty Sommerness, Ric Wiggall and Marsha Yowell.

Members Excused: Minnie Andrews, Gae Johnson and Sally Doshier

Others Present: Marge Conger, Susanna Maxwell, Karen Pugliesi, Bill Stone and Sharon Young

Acceptance of Agenda/Minutes: Senate President Marcus Ford asked for an approval of the agenda. **A motion made and seconded to approve the agenda. Motion Passed.** Senate President Marcus Ford asked for an approval of the minutes from the November meeting. **A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Motion Passed.**

Opening Comments - Senate President: President Ford said he had no opening comments except to say that he attended the ABOR meeting on December 1st and 2nd. He felt it was a very standard ABOR meeting and he met with the Arizona Faculties Council.

COFS Rewrite Update: Four documents summarizing proposed changes were distributed to Senators for review prior to this meeting

1. [COFS - summary of changes](#)
2. [COFS – nontenure track](#)
3. [COFS – ombuds/informal resolution](#)
4. [COFS – sabbatical leave](#)

Senator Janet McShane reviewed the proposed changes. Position definitions are clarified to provide greater distinction across titles while still incorporating the ABOR languages. Responsibilities, terms of appointment, and qualifications are indicated for each type of classification. Instructor title is clarified as a non-ranked appointment, temporary in nature. Ranked titles include lecturer, clinical, research, practice, and visiting. A third category of lecturer has been added – Principal lecturer – to allow for advancement of our most outstanding senior lecturers. The classification of Professor of Practice has been added, consistent with ABOR definitions. All non-tenure eligible appointments have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period. The classifications of lecturer, clinical, research, and practice may have appointments from 1-3 years which may be renewed. Proposed changes

Sabbatical: Reorganization of material

- Clarification of requirement for “sufficient resources to maintain the department or area program during the faculty member’s leave”
- Addition of requirement for a Statement of Expectation incorporating the sabbatical goals and effort distribution, for the purpose of subsequent evaluation.

Senator Chuck Connell has been working on the informal resolution portion of the COFS document. Since the Ombuds office was eliminated, there is no informal resolution process in place. The COFS Rewrite Committee strongly recommends the establishment of an Ombuds Program similar to that currently found at the University of Arizona.

Resources Needed:

- One full-time Ombuds Program Coordinator and access to a full-time administrative assistant; the Coordinator must be a trained ombudsperson and/or trained mediator and be responsible for coordination of the work of the Ombuds Committee and other ombuds services for staff and students, as well as record keeping, file maintenance and reporting as needed.
- A Volunteer Ombuds Committee. Approximately twenty full-time faculty volunteers would be nominated or self-nominated, appointed by the President for a term of three years (subject to annual performance review and renewable after three years), and trained and provided ongoing professional development as needed. Faculty would be awarded “extra” service credit in the annual review. Given the desire to avoid the expense of a fully staffed University Ombuds Office, institutional needs can be met by substituting with a volunteer Ombuds Committee with a single compensated position that combines professional expertise and organization, oversight, and ongoing professional development.
- Regular workshops and training for the Committee Members. These might include a summer or post-spring three-hour introduction to “ombudsing” with access to legal counsel; a full-day training workshop for all ombuds volunteers (trainer should be brought in from off campus); a spring semester half-day workshop on new techniques and/or best practices shared. Also, there should be other workshops or brown bag lunches for review of issues and best practices among the ombudspersons.

2. Resultant Informal Dispute Resolution Process

Individuals seeking ombuds services could initiate contact either through the Ombuds Program Coordinator or by directly contacting any member of the Ombuds Committee. The membership list of the Ombuds Committee would be published and publicized to facilitate decentralized access. If an individual approached a member of the Committee first, and did not find that individual to be available or willing to work with them for whatever reason, the individual could contact the Ombuds Program Coordinator to try to find an alternative ombudsperson to work with.

All work with any of the ombudspersons would be confidential. The Ombuds Program Coordinator would only be informed of the number of individuals using the services and the nature of issues undertaken by individual ombudspersons or the Coordinator so that records of activity and issues resolved could be maintained. Names of individuals

and/or their specific issues would not be maintained for any purpose whatsoever in order to build trust and confidence in the process.

Issues not resolved through the informal dispute resolution process could still be referred to the grievance a process as appropriate.

3. Location of Program: Office of the President

Rationale: No campus office now addresses informal conflict resolution issues that specifically involve faculty, or exist within and between employee groups. A gap exists in providing a safe place for faculty and staff employees to voice concerns and receive help in defining options for conflict resolution. Effective informal conflict resolution requires that facilitators maintain a neutral stance and promote the interests of all parties involved in a given conflict. Therefore the University Ombuds Program should be located in the Office of the President. The program needs both the obvious support from the executive level and independence to maintain its neutral stance and its promise of confidentiality. Informal conflict resolution facilitators cannot be advocates for any particular group (faculty, staff, students, administration) or individual, but must look to try to resolve issues for the mutual benefit of the individuals and the University.

In sum, this recommendation meets the President's expressed desire to see more effective informal resolution of personnel issues prior to formal stages of grievance. This proposal appropriately places the primary responsibility for resolving faculty conflict on the body of the faculty itself, in parallel with the more formal grievance procedure.

Janet and Chuck asked the group to look over the proposed changes and provide feedback. The goal is to take action and vote on the proposed changes at the January Senate meeting.

Budget Council: Senator Chuck Connell said that after the last full Senate meeting the council met to discuss some of the recommendations made by Karen Appleby about what to focus on next. The council is recommending that they focus on two items around salaries. 1) Maintaining the 85% level. Currently, there are some instances where individuals are grouped into a classification which does not reflect salaries in their specialty. 2) When a person is promoted, they may not meet the 85% level even with the promotion. The compression issue needs to be addressed between ranks. Years of service and credentials need to also be considered. Chuck asked the Senate for its recommendation. Should the Senate make this recommendation? Chuck asked for input and feedback from Senators about this important issue.

Liberal Studies Review Committee: Chair Virginia Blankenship and Senator Blase Scarnati said that they have received a lot of input from faculty. They are currently working on their formal recommendations. They are meeting with Vice Provost Karen Pugliesi on Wednesday. Beginning in the spring semester they will be working with the Liberal Studies and Undergraduate committees and hope to bring the final recommendations to the Senate at the February or March meeting. The committee is also planning a spring faculty forum to generate feedback.

Comments from the Provost: Provost Grobsmith said President Haeger could not attend today's meeting as he is attending a meeting in Phoenix.

- At the ABOR meeting last week, one study session that took place was about tuition and fee setting. As you may recall, last year's proposed fees were rejected. In fact, no fees were approved. This year the board will entertain fee proposals, so we will bring the course proposals that were not approved last year back. The board is now receptive to receiving undergraduate program fees, in the past, they have not been. Tuition classifications, for example, differential and base tuitions were another topic that was discussed.
- The board approved the Proposition 301 Technology and Research Innovation Fund [TRIF] proposal plans.
- We have 2 delegations from China coming this weekend. The plan to sign a broader MAO that promotes faculty and scholarly exchange, graduate student exchange, masters programs as well as the 1-2-1 undergraduate program.
- Senate Secretary Rich Lei asked about the distribution of summer 2005 revenue. The Provost said she did not have the answer at this time but said she would find out. Rich asked if there has been discussion about summer 2006 compensation plans. The Provost said she has been discussing this with Karen Pugliesi. She is reluctant to change the compensation without first looking at the entire formula. She feels the formula needs to be reexamined. If we raise the compensation, it will automatically be assumed that it comes out of the colleges share. She wants the colleges allocation revisited before any changes are made because we have a huge amount of revenue that the institution is accustomed to receiving for the summer. A small portion of this money goes to the academic unit.

Adjournment: Meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m. The next meeting will be from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Monday, January 23, 2006 in the Student Union/Kaibab room.