

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate
Meeting of December 18, 2006, 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.
Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

Revised Agenda

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 1. | Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of November 21, 2006 | J. Alexander |
| 2. | President's Announcements | G. Eastwood |
| 3. | Provost's Announcements | J. Anderson |
| 4. | Report of the Secretary of the Corporation | J. Arden Ornt |
| 5. | Chair's Announcements | J. Alexander |
| 6. | Report of the Executive Committee | J. Alexander |
| 7. | MOTION from the Committee on Women Faculty | K. Adams |
| 8. | Old Business | |
| | a. Update on Partnership with Fisk University | K. Karipides |
| | b. Discussion of Budget Committee Organization | J. Alexander |
| 9. | Report on the Research Council | C. Musil |
| 10. | New Business | |
| 11. | Announcements | |

Attachments:

Minutes of the Meeting of November 21st

Recommendations Regarding On-Campus Childcare

Talking Points from Chair of Budget Committee

Attachments for the Agenda of December 18, 2006, Faculty Senate Meeting

Agenda Item 7.

MOTION from the Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty:

Transmittal of Senate Report

Title: **Endorsement of child care center**

Date presented to Senate: December 18, 2006

Presenter: Kathryn Adams, Chair, Senate Committee on Women Faculty

Subject of motion:

The Faculty of Case Western Reserve University has long expressed strong support for establishing a high quality, affordable childcare facility on campus. Such a facility would be a significant asset to the quality of life of faculty and staff. It would strengthen University efforts to maintain a supportive working environment and aid in recruiting and retaining excellent and diverse faculty.

The University area has too little of the highest quality childcare. Facilities which do exist have significant waiting lists, and do not address the need for year round facilities and infant daycare. During the summer University faculty and staff are often forced to spend much time patching together a series of different short period summer camps for their children.

A Women's Faculty Association survey of 2002 documents urgent demand for such a center, and NSF Advance-ACES program focus groups and surveys agree. Peer institutions, such as Brown, Cornell, Carnegie Mellon, Emory, Northwestern, and Vanderbilt offer childcare either on campus or affiliated with and close to campus.

Recent progress has advanced plans for a center to provide high quality, year round childcare providing more than 'babysitting', and offering flexible schedules and affordability. These plans raise the possibility of accommodating summer day camps for school age children which could offset operating costs. These have been detailed in the Recommendations regarding on-campus childcare of the University Advisory Council on Women (UACW). A version of these plans could feasibly be realized within the next year or two.

Voting (check one):

on resolutions or recommendations one by one _____

in a single vote _____

to endorse entire report _____

Committee work:

Committee on Women Faculty

Consultations (with other committees, legal office, administrators, etc.):

University Advisory Council on Women
Provost's Office
President's Office

Executive Committee approval: December 13, 2006

Alternatives: Take no position on the issue.

Risks: It is possible a center would be build, but there would not be sufficient clientele.

Financial implications: Significant. The initial capital budget is \$3M+. Placement and architectural plans have been developed. The University owns the land. The center is intended to be self-support.

Senate action:

Transmitted to:

Motion:

Resolved: The University should implement the recommendations of the UACW on child care and establish a child care center on the University campus with all possible expedition.

* * * * *

Agenda Item 8 b.

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee and the Constituent Faculties
Background for members of the Faculty Senate:
Prepared by Glenn Starkman

- 1) The faculty senate budget committee (FSBC) is charged with three principal tasks
 - (i) "participating with the Administration to assure that budgetary goals and priorities are responsive to academic plans" on the other hand:
 - (ii) "advis[ing] the Faculty Senate on the financial feasibility of the University's current and planned education programs, activities, and facilities, and their effect on the operating budget, capital requirements, and financial health of the University."
and "on budgetary questions as they affect current and planned educational programs, activities, and facilities."
 - (iii) "review[ing] and report[ing] to the Faculty Senate on the adherence to budgetary priorities and the attainment of budgetary goals."

Characterize this as:
partners with the university administration,
watchdogs for the faculty,
advisers to the faculty.

Each of these roles has had its time and place.

It is important to note that the FSBC makes no binding decisions, nor must the administration or the Senate obtain the approval of the FSBC for any actions.

2) In a decentralized university such as CWRU, most programs and activities, and thus most revenues and expenditures occur in the constituent faculties.

3) Traditionally, most constituent faculties have had no faculty committee of their own serving these three roles.

4) This means that:

(i) the FSBC cannot draw on a pool of faculty who are well informed about their own constituent faculties.

(ii) The FSBC often feels that its ability to probe the financial state of individual units is limited; and that this has hampered and is especially hampering its ability to advise the Senate on the financial health of the University.

(iii) Many schools have no clear avenue for providing faculty input into, creating faculty buy-in into, or sharing the reasoning behind financial decisions.

(iv) Many faculty feel absolved of responsibility for all collective financial matters.

These are negatives at any time, but particularly at times when the university or individual units face financial difficulties.

5) The FSBC is considering asking the Senate to alter its structure so as to include representatives of faculty budget committees of each of the constituent faculties.

For example, chapter 2, article VI, section C., paragraph 1 of the Constitution of the Faculty, might be amended to read:

The Budget Committee shall consist of one voting member elected by each constituent faculty Budget Committee, three members of the University Faculty at-large, at least one of whom must be an elected member of the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Committee on Faculty Compensation ex officio, and such additional members ex officio as shall be specified in the by-laws. The at-large members shall be elected to serve overlapping three-year terms. Should the terms of senatorial members of the Budget Committee extend beyond their terms as members of the Faculty Senate, they shall complete their committee terms as non-senatorial members.

6) This would necessitate that constituent faculties form such committees under their by-laws.

There are precedents for expecting constituent faculties to have committees to serve particular purposes. These are usually included in Chapter 3, Policies and Procedures. One could alternatively enunciate such expectations

in Chapter 2, Article VII (Structure of the University Faculty), Sec. A (Constituent Faculties). This article establishes the constituent faculties and their roles, lays down the requirement that each constituent faculty have a dean,... This section also requires that the constituent faculties have "essentially democratic" governments.

7) The Provost, who has been part of the discussions with the FSBC on this issue, has held discussions with the Deans and has requested that each form a budget committee including at least two elected faculty members. Such committees are in the process of formation. Their structure -- size, composition, how the members are selected, charge -- will vary considerably. Given the great diversity in size and culture of the constituent faculties a diversity of structure is probably appropriate.

8) The FSBC seeks the advice of the members of the Senate on two principle issues:

- * The restructuring of the FSBC

- * The establishment of committees within the constituent faculties:

- (i) their composition

- (ii) their charges

- (iii) how they are selected. and in particular how prescriptive the FSBC should be in its proposals to the Senate.

On this latter matter, the FSBC offers its own view for consideration by the members of the Senate. Deans will always be free to seek advice from whomever they please on matters under their purview. To the extent that the FSBC has been able to offer independent advice to the administration and reliable reports to the Senate, it has been in part because it is chosen by the faculty. The presence ex officio of senior members of the administration with appropriate expertise -- the Provost, the CFO and the VP and AVP for Budget and Planning -- is invaluable, but it is the independence of the faculty members of the committee that has allowed the FSBC to execute its charge.

To this end, the FSBC has considered (but puts forward only as a point of discussion) the following draft language:

Each constituent faculty shall have a Budget Committee. The regular members of the Budget Committee shall be selected from among the regular faculty of the constituent faculty by direct election or by appointment by a directly elected body established under the by-laws of that constituent faculty.

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate

Meeting of December 18, 2006, 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

Minutes

Members Attending

Daniel Akerib	Marion Good	Diana Morris
James Alexander	Julia Grant	Carol Musil
Jeffrey Alexander	Katherine Hessler	Ronald Occhionero
John Anderson	Kathleen Kash	John Orlock
Hossein Assaf	Elisabeth Koll	Martin Resnick
Cynthia Beall	Joseph Koonce	Sandra Russ
David Crampton	Uziel Landau	Robert Salata
Dominique Durand	Edith Lerner	Paul Salipante
Gregory Eastwood	Sana Loue	Glenn Starkman
Dustin Fisher	Charles Malemud	Philip Taylor
Paul Gerhart	Roger Marchant	Rhonda Williams
Anita Gilliam	Mehran Mehregany	

Others Present

Kathryn Adams	Jeanine Arden Ornt	Peter Whitehouse
Robert Friedland	Hossein Sadid	
Grover Gilmore	Mark Smith	

Professor Alexander, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He advised of a revision to the agenda and a delay, until the January meeting when Dean Pamela Davis of the School of Medicine can be present, for an interim report on the affiliation agreement.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous Faculty Senate meeting on November 21, 2006 were approved as distributed, with the request that a copy of the presentation made by Vice President Lara Kalafatis be appended to the posted minutes. A condensed version has been made available and approved by L. Kalafatis.

President's Announcements

President Eastwood is making the recommendation that business meetings be conducted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. as much as possible so as to be more family-friendly.

He announced that President-designate Barbara Snyder has asked him to chair the transition team for the next to six months or more, and he invited suggestions and comments.

The University Arts and Retail District project is moving forward and he has signed a memo of understanding with the developers, and the university has not acquired the "beach front" parking lot on the north side of Euclid Ave. From University Circle. He outlined some of the expectations and hopes; ground-breaking is expected in about one year.

A question was posed to Dr. Eastwood on whether Ms. Snyder will take part in an

interview process with new deans. Deans already named for Weatherhead School of Management, the College of Arts and Sciences, and, shortly, for the Case School of Engineering, are permanent deans; any process for the School of Medicine's next permanent dean has not yet been discussed with her.

Provost's Announcements

John Anderson announced the Holiday Open House Party for all the campus community at 3:30 on the following day.

On December 22nd the Adelbert Road bridge will be re-opened to pedestrian and vehicle traffic, and the Cornell Road bridge will be closed to vehicular traffic the following day but will remain open to pedestrians as work begins to re-build that bridge.

About the academic planning process, the provost said that there is a steering committee of faculty from each school, that they have a short planning document and one on how schools will proceed. He will visit each school with their representatives and senators. The new president will be involved and he expects to have public discussions in the next two months.

Report of the Secretary of the Corporation

This is a new regular agenda item each month, when Jeanine Ornt is available.

Ms. Ornt reported on actions taken at the December meeting of the Board of Trustees Executive Committee:

- faculty appointments, reappointments, and endowed professorships were approved in the ordinary course, and honorary degrees were approved following the recommendation of the committee charged with that responsibility;
- the change discussed at the prior Faculty Senate meeting regarding faculty eligibility for retirement Plan A benefits was approved;
- the Board authorized the conferring of the degrees in January;
- the Board approved the next year's tuition, room and board rates subject to final review of the Finance Committee;
- there was a finance report which focused on concerns relating to research recovery, philanthropy goals and financial concerns in three schools (CSE, WSOM, and SOM); as part of the finance report, it was reported that the university may benefit from lower than budgeted utility costs and from cost savings accrued through bond restructuring and refinancing;
- the resolution authorizing the Memo of Understanding for the University Arts and Retail District was passed;
- there was a development report which indicated progress in six of the ten management centers, problems in four, and progress in the annual fund; there is a likelihood that the university will fall short of its goal of \$77.9M by approximately \$10M;
- there was the annual report regarding Squire Valleevue Farm.

The Board then met in executive session, as is required for all meetings.

There was a question on our rate of return on investments, to which Hossein Sadid replied that this is public information posted on our web site and reported to rating agencies - 15.5% on an annual basis. He made special note of how well the portion managed by our staff has done, especially on a December 15th refinancing of debt to reduce the line of credit.

Chair's Announcements

Professor Jay Alexander reported on the presidential search - forums were held, the structure discussed, and the committee charged to present one name to the Board of Trustees. The Board chair was always conscious of the need for faculty input/approval. The committee interviewed nine candidates in December and found then that the timetable needed to be advanced because of competition for our candidates. There is a pool of strong candidates and he is confident in recommending Barbara Snyder. He assured all that the Faculty Advisory Committee did meet the candidate.

Report of the Executive Committee

This report also given by Chair Alexander. Much of the action was charges to various standing committees: University Libraries and the Information Resources committees to look at the allocation of resources for 2008 budget planning; Eric Cottington brought two items, and the Faculty Personnel Committee was charged to recommend on a possible Conflict of Commitment Policy and to give further study to a recommendation to revise the existing Conflict of Interest Policy; the Smoke-Free policy was sent to Faculty Personnel for their input, something which staff and students have already done. Discussion on the affiliation agreement will continue at the January Executive Committee meeting.

New Business

Professor Glenn Starkman asked consent to bring new business to the floor now and, after agreement, read a letter and distributed a MOTION on concerns about the affiliation agreement between University Hospitals and the university.

The Faculty Senate informs the University Faculty and the Board of Trustees that it has neither advised nor consulted with the President regarding the recent affiliation agreement between the University and University Hospitals nor its implementation, as would be expected under Article V of the Faculty Handbook, Section A, Paragraph 2. "Powers and Obligations of the Faculty Senate" subparagraphs d. and e.; nor has the Senate conducted any review which would be required under Chapter 3, Part One, Section E, for the termination of tenured faculty on the basis of financial exigency or educational considerations. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is directed to communicate this resolution to all members of the University Faculty and the Board of Trustees.

The local chapter of the AAUP has similar concerns. Based on this, Professor Kathleen Wells had raised this issue at the Executive Committee meeting and an effort was made to have Dean Pamela Davis present to discuss these concerns. The point being made was that established process as outlined in the Faculty Handbook has not been followed. Many senators spoke; some mention was made of efforts made recently in the School of Medicine to have the award of tenure also have a monetary commitment. President Eastwood introduced a friendly amendment (that the resolution should refer to both subparagraphs d and e, not just e) which was accepted by Professor Starkman. When the vote was called, the MOTION passed unanimously.

MOTION from the Committee on Women Faculty

Kathryn Adams, committee chair, read the motion and highlights from the rationale. The Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty recommends passage of this item from the

University Committee on Women.

Professor Starkman asked how the Senate decides on priorities and what it should direct administration to do? Professor Adams said that the committee hopes for Senate support for this motion, and Professor Sandra Russ noted that a child care center has been under discussion for a long time and it should now become a priority. Cost expectations were not discussed in any detail but, unlike the One-to-One facility which is run as an auxiliary operation, the child care center is not expected to cover its costs with fees. President Eastwood spoke in favor of the university supporting a child care center and proceeding with plans which will help to determine the costs.

The vote on the MOTION was approved unanimously.

Title: Endorsement of child care center

Subject of motion:

The Faculty of Case Western Reserve University has long expressed strong support for establishing a high quality, affordable childcare facility on campus. Such a facility would be a significant asset to the quality of life of faculty and staff. It would strengthen University efforts to maintain a supportive working environment and aid in recruiting and retaining excellent and diverse faculty.

The University area has too little of the highest quality childcare. Facilities which do exist have significant waiting lists, and do not address the need for year round facilities and infant daycare. During the summer University faculty and staff are often forced to spend much time patching together a series of different short period summer camps for their children.

A Women's Faculty Association survey of 2002 documents urgent demand for such a center, and NSF Advance-ACES program focus groups and surveys agree. Peer institutions, such as Brown, Cornell, Carnegie Mellon, Emory, Northwestern, and Vanderbilt offer childcare either on campus or affiliated with and close to campus.

Recent progress has advanced plans for a center to provide high quality, year round childcare providing more than 'babysitting', and offering flexible schedules and affordability. These plans raise the possibility of accommodating summer day camps for school age children which could offset operating costs. These have been detailed in the Recommendations regarding on-campus childcare of the University Advisory Council on Women (UACW). A version of these plans could feasibly be realized within the next year or two.

Old Business: Update on Partnership with Fisk University

Associate Provost and Professor Kathryn Kariptides thanked all for their interest in this faculty-driven request for an update. She urged all to carry the information back to their schools. She reported that the partnership is going well, with steady progress, and acknowledged that these things take time to mature. The legacy booklet with information about the partnership was made available for all. There is a generic memo of understanding on general education and three additional joint academic programs. These are Case School of Engineering Binary Program,

Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences Binary Program, and Weatherhead School of Management program in Accountancy. A few other such programs are under consideration. Our relationship with Fisk University goes back to the 1920s but the 2003 agreement gives it a formalized effort. The recent NSF award for the Science and Technology Center for Layered Polymer Systems (CLIPS) has energized the partnership (Fisk is a partner institution). Professor Karipides further noted that the recent visit by Fisk president Hazel O'Leary has sparked new interest. We must generate more faculty involvement and Professor Karipides urged faculty who are interested in exploring possibilities for exchanges and collaborations to please contact her. Professor Joseph Prahl expressed his interest and support of these programs.

Old Business - Budget Committee Organization

This was a discussion as a-committee-of-the-whole at which no minutes were taken. At the end of the discussion, it was agreed the Senate would welcome a motion from the Budget Committee at some future date concerning its structure and organization.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Lynne E. Ford
Secretary of the Faculty Senate