

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY  
Faculty Senate  
Meeting of March 23, 2006, 3:30 - 5:00 p.m.  
Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

AGENDA

- |           |   |                 |
|-----------|---|-----------------|
| 3:30 p.m. | 1. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of February 27, 2006 (attached)   | R. Wright       |
| 3:35      | 2. President's Announcements  | E. Hundert      |
| 3:45      | 3. Provost's Announcements  | J. Anderson     |
| 3:55      | 4. Chair's Announcements  | R. Wright       |
| 4:05      | 5. Report from the UUF Executive Committee (attached)   | L. Parker       |
| 4:15      | 6. Report of the Executive Committee  | J. Alexander    |
| 4:20      | 7. Report of the By-Laws Committee (attached) (Action Item)<br>MOTION to Approve<br>A. Revised Bylaws for the College of Arts and Sciences<br>B. Revision to the Membership of the Honorary Degree Committee  | M. Resnick      |
| 4:30      | 8. Report of the Faculty Personnel Committee (Action Item)<br>MOTION to Approve<br>- Revisions to Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, Part One,<br>I. Appointments, Reappointments, etc., J. Review and Decision; and<br>IV. Professional Responsibilities, D. Hearing Procedures, 4. Conduct of Hearing<br>(attached) | A. Huckelbridge |
| 4:40      | 9. Report of the Nominating Committee (attached) (Action Item)<br>- Election of Chair-elect and the Executive Committee   | R. Dubin        |
| 4:45      | 10. Report of the Graduate Studies Committee (Action Item)<br>MOTION to Approve<br>- Proposal for Joint Degree M.D./M.S. in Engineering (attached)  | K. Laurita      |
| 4:55      | 11. Report of the Research Committee (attached)   | C. Musil        |
| 5:00      | 12. New Business<br><br>MOTION to Adjourn   |                 |

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

**Faculty Senate**

Meeting of February 27, 2006, 3:30 - 5 p.m.

Toepfer Room, Adelbert Hall

Minutes

Members Attending

James Alexander  
John Anderson  
Roberto Ballarini  
Nicholas Bonazza  
Bo Carlsson  
Stanton Cort  
David Crampton  
Barbara Daly  
Sara Debanne  
Robin Dubin  
Timothy Fogarty  
Lynne Ford  
Anita Gilliam  
Marion Good  
Julia Grant

Katherine Hessler  
Susan Hinze  
Edward Hundert  
Patrick Kennedy  
Elisabeth Koll  
Joseph Koonce  
Uziel Landau  
Kenneth Laurita  
Wilbur Leatherberry  
Kenneth Ledford  
Edith Lerner  
David Matthiesen  
Vincent Monnier  
Diana Morris  
Carol Musil

Spencer Neth  
Elizabeth Olson  
John Orlock  
Martin Resnick  
Alan Rocke  
Sandra Russ  
Paul Salipante  
Cyrus Taylor  
Philip Taylor  
Aloen Townsend  
Kristin Victoroff  
E. Ronald Wright

Others Present

Daniel Anker  
Paula Baughn  
Nabil Bissada  
Christine Cano  
Kathleen Carrick  
Martha Cathcart  
Eric Cottingham  
Dale Dannefer  
Mark DeGuire  
Paul DiCorleto  
Joanne Eustis

Donald Feke  
C. Cleveland Gilmore  
Jeremiah Heilman  
Stanley Hirsch  
Eva Kahana  
Lara Kalafatis  
Tony Kinslow  
Jamie Knue  
Virginia Leitch  
Marshall Leitman  
Beth McGee

Raymond Muzic  
Judith Olson-Fallon  
Jeanine Ornt  
Larry Parker  
Dean Patterson  
Joseph Prahl  
Charles Rozek  
Hossein Sadid  
Virginia Saha  
David Singer  
Elizabeth Woyczynski

Professor Ronald Wright, Chair of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and stated that he would allow some flexibility with the times noted for each agenda item.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the previous Faculty Senate meetings on January 31<sup>st</sup> were approved with the addition of Elizabeth Damato's name as attending.

President's Announcements

Dr. Edward Hundert referred to his memo on budget issues saying that since last fall and

continuing into this week he has been discussing the status of the Vision Investment Plan and the steps needed to get the budget back into balance by next year. He believes there has been too much focus on the difference between Vision and non-Vision dollars. He acknowledged that income from research and philanthropy have not met projections. Though the Board of Trustees are very supportive and the deficit is precisely at the level that was planned, we cannot continue the plan a further year without the income anticipated. Dr. Hundert will be talking about all this in forums across the university and expressed his regret that some of the targets have not been met. He emphasized that the NIH funding climate is unlikely to change soon, and that philanthropy will also take time to continue building. He noted that budget information has now been put on the Budget Office website and encouraged faculty to help generate ideas. He said that now is the time to pull together and identify our real priorities.

In the discussion which followed, it was agreed that we need to get a balance between expenses and revenue, determine what is core to students and faculty, and pare down central administration except where it serves the schools. Dr. Hundert said he will be listening and setting priorities, with the help of the faculty, to ensure financial stability. It was noted that our projections on net tuition are where we expected, but not in the areas of indirect cost recovery nor in unrestricted philanthropy.

One question was asked about the use of a line of credit - this is because the return on the endowment is much greater than the cost of credit and most of the endowment is restricted. Emphasis was placed on the importance of balancing revenues and expenses, and not running the last year of planned deficit, given the current environment. It is important to keep the positive momentum with undergraduate student enrollment and to invite dialogue, with the Faculty Senate playing a role. Dr. Hundert suggested that the Senate's standing committees form a liaison with various faculty committees of the eight schools. He invited everyone to get involved in the priority setting at each of the schools, so that we continue to invest in the student and faculty experience even through expense reductions.

### **Provost's Announcements**

Provost John Anderson had no announcements.

### **Chair's Announcements**

Professor Ron Wright announced the date and time for a special Faculty Senate meeting to talk about the strategic plan - Friday, March 31<sup>st</sup> from 2 - 3:30 p.m. in the Toepfer Room.

### **Report from Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education**

Donald Feke explained the background on the proposed motion to rescind actions of the Faculty Senate and the Case Assembly in 1970 on the Academic Status of ROTC at Case. Each year we have five or six students with ROTC scholarships and they take required military leadership courses at Kent State University. We have been asked by the Air Force to give academic credit, where appropriate, for these courses. The UUF and the departments of History and Management have reviewed the course syllabi and determined that eight of 24 credits would be eligible for academic credit and transfer as generic credit. Dr. Feke is requesting that the Senate rescind the action of May 5, 1970.

There was lengthy discussion and various alternative solutions suggested. After a reading of the old resolutions, Provost Anderson spoke in favor of the present proposed action to allow

for inclusiveness. Professor David Singer, the Senate Parliamentarian, raised a point of order on whether the Senate could act relative to an action of the Case Assembly in 1970. Chair Wright clarified that the present motion is only to rescind actions of the Senate. The vote on the MOTION to Rescind Actions of the Faculty Senate and the Case Assembly in 1970 on Academic Status of ROTC at Case passed by majority.

### **Annual Report from the Office of Faculty Diversity**

Professor Beth McGee reviewed statistics which were distributed with the agenda and suggested that there are ways the university could do more to recruit and retain minority and women faculty. She urged all search committee to seek assistance from Amanda Shaffer to find ways to mentor faculty and utilize the various initiatives which are available. Steps which would make a difference are for this consultation to be required for all search committees, developing the Fisk Partnership, etc.; simply deciding that this is a priority for Case would have positive affects. Many suggestions were made such as mentoring, a welcoming environment, getting information from those we are not successful in hiring, support diversity and a diverse applicant pool. We are not, by law, permitted to set goals or percentages.

### **Report of the Executive Committee**

Chair-elect Jay Alexander will give this report each month. Professor Alexander reported on two announcements which were not made at this meeting regarding the status of searches for two deans: final candidates for the Law School search have been to campus for interviews, and that process is beginning for candidates for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. A second item to report is that he has asked for feedback from the Executive Committee on his planning initiative for next year. A special meeting of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate Budget Committee was held last Friday. All other actions are on today's agenda.

### **Report of the By-Laws Committee**

Chair Dr. Martin Resnick reported that the committee has completed the review of changes to the bylaws of the School of Medicine and the Case School of Engineering. A summary of those changes was included with the agenda, and he noted that the major change for the School of Medicine is the definition of the tenure and the non-tenure track. The Executive Committee supports approval of these changes which bring these two sets of bylaws into compliance with the last changes to the Faculty Handbook.. The MOTION to Approve Revised Bylaws for School of Medicine and the Case School of Engineering passed.

### **Report of the Graduate Studies Committee**

Chair Kenneth Laurita said that the motion is to approve the M.S. and Ph.D. Program in Molecular Medicine as distributed. The focus of this academic program is on translational research, which is consistent with new NIH Roadmap Directives. Moreover, the curriculum is multidisciplinary and novel as evidenced by the participation of faculty from many departments and disciplines and by several new yet unique courses. The Graduate Studies Committee reviewed the original proposal in the fall semester and several concerns were raised. A revised proposal was submitted and all concerns were satisfactorily addressed. The Executive Committee approved this proposal as an agenda item at today's meeting; however, some concern was raised regarding the flow of tuition revenue. Those details are still being negotiated, but it is

expected that a model similar to that used by other departments in the School of Medicine will be used. It is also important to point out that a Howard Hughes grant to fund the program was just received. If there are any questions, I or a faculty member representing the program would be happy to address them. The MOTION to Approve M.S. and Ph.D. in Molecular Medicine passed.

#### **Report of the Minority Affairs Committee**

Professor Spencer Neth, committee chair, thanked Beth McGee for all the assistance she has offered. He said that the committee can coordinate various efforts and help to set priorities. He suggested a change in the charge to this committee to add the interests of the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender (LGBT) organization and various religious groups on campus. He will bring resolutions forward in April. He noted the problem of a welcoming atmosphere, and invited input.

#### **Report of the Research Committee**

Professor Carol Musil, committee chair, noted that this is the third policy change from the committee this year as they review and update established policies. These revisions more clearly state the responsibilities of a faculty member serving as the responsible investigator on student-conducted human subjects research, propose that students who are not PIs may accept custodial responsibility of their original data when they leave the University, and specify the necessary written agreements about the custody of research data when students or faculty leave the University. It was acknowledged that much work and thought has been going into this review.

There were several questions on: security of data and on storage and those costs, and on what to do with data in offices when faculty members retire.

The MOTION to Approve Data Custody Policy in the Faculty Handbook passed.

#### **Report from the UUF Executive Committee**

Deferred to next agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

Lynne E. Ford  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

## Agenda Item 5. Report from the UUF Executive Committee Chair

### Introduction

This is the first report of the University Undergraduate Faculty Executive Committee (UUFXC) under the new UUF bylaws. Changes in the new bylaws include

- The UUFXC now has responsibility to report the activities of the UUF Curriculum Committee (UUFCC), and decide if the UUFCC decisions should go directly to the Faculty Senate, or the general meeting of the UUF, or rejected. (The requirement to report a summary of the UUFCC activities remains the same.)
- The UUFXC now has responsibility to provide evaluation of SAGES.

### Summary of UUF Committee Activities

Executive Committee: Chair, Larry Parker

The XC

- is engaged as a committee of the whole for this year to provide an evaluation of SAGES (attachments provided). The committee is in the process of selecting a subcommittee to evaluate SAGES in future years. Received monthly updates from Peter Whiting on SAGES.
- examined issues related to Air Force ROTC transfer credits, and has recommended related action by the Faculty Senate.
- provided guidance to each UUF committee, providing both tactical and strategic recommendations.
- examined the issue of class size, and accepted an admission goal of about 1050 freshmen.
- assigned discussion of the topic of composition of the freshman class and examination of the Arts & Science Group report to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.
- assigned the issue of late admission of transfer students to the admissions committee.
- informally recommended that the undergraduate faculty consider utilizing the Undergraduate Student Government's proposal for mid-term evaluations.
- is continuing discussions of service learning.

Academic Computing: Chair, Richard Boland

Academic Computing

- met several times to review results of a survey done in Spring 2005 on student and faculty dissatisfaction with computer labs and facilities.
- is planning an open forum this spring on academic computing topics.
- is considering an examination of use of technology in SAGES seminars.

Academic Standing: Acting Chair, Julie Amon

Academic Standing

- met to review status of students for academic probation, loss of scholarships, separation from the university, etc.
- determined that retention of freshman is about 98% as of the end of the first (Fall 2005) semester.

Curriculum Committee: Chair – initially John Blackwell; then acting Chair Sandy Piderit; now Gary Chottiner.

Summary is provided at the end of the report.

Student Life, Services and Environment: Chair, Christine Cano.  
Will have its first meeting in Spring 2006.

Undergraduate Admissions: Chair, Jerrold Scott

Undergraduate Admissions

- assisted the admissions administration with freshman admissions.
- presented a program on standards and preparation for admission for children of Case faculty and staff.
- began study of the composition of future freshman classes.

### Summary of UUF Curriculum Committee Activities

September 1

- proposal from Bioethics to drop cross-listings from BETH 271 due to financial considerations of tuition revenues following students – solution accepted to limit registration under Religion and Philosophy to majors and require others interested to register as BETH
- new course proposal MPHP 306
- approval of changes to Biochemistry program to accommodate SAGES
- approval of WSOM university seminar

October 6

- additional proposed changes to Biochemistry B.A., B.S. and minor program
- various course action form approvals from Case School of Engineering (EECS 370, 399L and M, and USSO 228), and WSOM (USSO 232, ORBH 370 and ECON 120 (discussion on giving credit for “guidance” course)
- modifications to the minor in Childhood Studies and the major in Public Health Studies. Also, began discussion on the charge from the XC to each standing committee to define strategic priorities for this year.

November 3

- approvals of a variety of course action forms: Biochemistry, BIOC 393 SAGES senior capstone; CAS, University seminars USSY 227, 228, 229 and USNA 217; Nursing, USSO 220, 231 and NURS 201; School of Law, USSY 226; WSOM, ECON 386; CSE ECHE 395 and USNA 213
- approval of College of Arts and Science new major in Cognitive Science. NOTE: Approved by consent agenda of the Faculty Senate in December
- continued discussion on defining strategic priorities and on SAGES oversight

December 1

- USSO 215 from CAS, and final approval for new public health course MPHP 303
- more discussion on strategic priorities

January 12

- affirmed the UUFCC would only explicitly consider actions that might affect more than one school in the university
- approved USSY 270, USSO 216 and UCAP 395
- contact department chairs directly for SAGES oversight

Prepared and Submitted by Larry Parker  
Chair, UUFXC

UUFXC OVERSIGHT OF SAGES, ACADEMIC YEAR 2005 – 2006  
Proposal for the UUFXC, November 10, 2005

A major responsibility for the UUFXC is to provide oversight of SAGES for the undergraduate faculty and provide an oversight report to that faculty near the end of each academic year. This is the first year in which this requirement is in full effect.

1. The UUFXC will request an overview of SAGES from each of the following groups, from the perspective of each respective group, to be provided to the UUFXC by the March 23, 2005 meeting.

- SAGES administration (Dr. Whiting)
- All UUF committees, to include the views of relevant participant groups in that committee. (For example, the Committee on Admissions should include the view of the Admissions Office; the Committee on Student Life, Services and Environment should include the views of the Career Center, etc. The Admissions Office and Career Center, among other groups, may provide individual reports if the relevant UUF committee believes that is appropriate.)
- The constituent schools involved in undergraduate education. This would be led by the representative(s) of that school on the UUFXC. (For example, Larry Parker would be responsible for the report from the Weatherhead School of Management.)
- Undergraduate Student Government
- SAGES Advisory Board
- Office of the Provost (Budget, Space, Faculty hiring, etc.)
- Office of Undergraduate Studies
- SOURCE

The requested general form of the report would be

- Positive effects of SAGES
- Major Concerns about SAGES
- Suggestions for improvement

Very specific questions in the context of the above general format should be developed that are most relevant to the responsibilities and interests of the reporting groups or committees.

2. The UUFXC will compile the reports and develop a summary report. The compilation and the summary will be provided to the UUF at the spring meeting of the UUF. A report will also be provided to the University Senate, as required in the By Laws of the UUF.

3. The UUFXC will also consider developing an Ad Hoc committee with a very broad constituency in the future for study and reporting of SAGES.

./ from the SAGES Phase II Task Force Report of March 15, 2004

We stress that the Director of SAGES will have authority over and be responsible for the implementation and operation of SAGES. The assessment of impact is a separate function. What is needed is a role normally played by a visiting committee. In this case the impact of SAGES will be monitored by an “internal visiting committee”.

When considering the impact of SAGES on the University, some of the questions that need to be asked are:

1. How will the student population change? This includes the total number of applications, but also includes student demographics such as distribution between majors, geographic origin, socioeconomic status, ethnicity and gender.
2. Who teaches SAGES? It is desirable that the teaching faculty be distributed among the various colleges and schools and faculty ranks. Moreover, neither the untenured faculty, nor any other identifiable subgroup of faculty, should be forced to assume a disproportionate load. Unwavering commitment from all of the schools in the University is expected. The staffing must be tracked so that deviations from expectations are quickly identified and addressed.
3. What resources are devoted to SAGES upon implementation? Although SAGES is derived from pedagogical desires of faculty and is designed to achieve academic goals, it is staff intensive and, therefore, expensive. Fiscal models project enhanced revenues that will be more than enough to offset increased expenses, but the revenues and costs must be monitored to insure that SAGES does not threaten the financial health of the schools or University.
4. What is the effect of SAGES on institutional reputation? The profile not only of the University but also the individual schools and colleges will be affected by SAGES. Citations in college guides, popular press, and rankings need to be tracked and analyzed to determine how the program affects how we are perceived by prospective students, their parents, our peers in the academic world, and the public at large.
5. What is the effect on morale? SAGES offers the possibility for raising the level of student and faculty engagement in scholarship in a manner that results in vastly improved intellectual and personal satisfaction. Measures of student engagement and measures of morale need to be made to determine the nature (positive or negative) and intensity of the change on morale. It is important, also, to determine the range of responses, i.e., whether different identifiable subgroups are experiencing different consequences.
6. What is the effect on the rest of the undergraduate curriculum? A successful program will extend the SAGES style into other parts of the university. Evidence that can demonstrate such a trend needs to be tabulated.

The above represents only some of the ways SAGES will have impact, but it serves to indicate the required breadth of continued study of SAGES efficacy. The question is how to make such measurement and how to disseminate the information.

### **Agenda Item 7. Report of the By-Laws Committee**

B. On a recommendation from the Chair of the Nominating Committee and University Marshal, Robin Dubin, the Senate By-Laws Committee discussed adding to the membership of the Honorary Degree Committee the University Marshal, ex officio. This is being recommended by the By-Laws Committee.

### **Agenda Item 8. Report of the Faculty Personnel Committee**

[deletions ~~struck out~~, additions in *italics*, both in red]

#### Chapter 3 Policies and Procedures for the Members of the Faculty

##### PART ONE

##### I. Appointments, Reappointments, Resignations, Promotions, and Tenure

##### J. Review and Decision

1. The faculty in a particular field has a responsibility to render favorable or unfavorable judgments on the work of its colleagues in an objective manner. All recommendations from departments or constituent faculties regarding mandatory tenure review or regarding promotion ~~to full professor~~, if initiated by the faculty member according to Section I, I, 5, and any affirmative recommendations for initial appointment, promotion, or tenure shall receive full higher review up to and including the president's. Such review shall extend to the level where authority for decision rests and may be extended beyond an intermediate level at the discretion of the dean of the faculty member's academic unit. *Self initiations are entitled to such full review at 3 year intervals.* A tenure review is mandatory if

(i) a denial of tenure would result in a terminal appointment or

(ii) the candidate has already received one denial of a tenure application which had received full higher review.

##### IV Professional Responsibilities

##### D. Hearing Procedures

##### 4. Conduct of the Hearing

d. The president's representative and the faculty member shall each have the right to an advisor of his or her choice, chosen from the faculty or administration, *excluding the office of the University Attorney.* Such advisor shall have no right to participate in the proceedings except to advise his or her principal.

### **Agenda Item 9: Report of the Nominating Committee**

In order to discharge our responsibilities according to the by-laws, the members of the Nominating Committee will accept nominations from the floor of the Faculty Senate for the position of chair-elect and membership on the Executive Committee at the March 23 meeting of the Senate. Elections for these positions will be held at the April meeting.

Robin Dubin, Chair, Faculty Senate Nominating Committee  
Associate Professor and University Marshal  
Department of Economics

### **Agenda Item 11: Committee on Research Report**

March 8, 2006

The Committee on Research will have met seven times through March 2006, with the last meeting of the academic year scheduled for April. This academic year, the Committee has proposed updates to the Data Custody, Research Misconduct and the Human Subjects Policies to the Faculty Senate.

The Guidelines on Authorship, revised in the 2004-05 academic year by the Committee, were distributed to the Case Community under the signature of the Provost in fall, 2005.

Other agenda items brought to the Committee by faculty and currently under discussion include 1.) facilitating research-related interactions across schools and 2.) issues related to collaborative grants, specifically fair financial management and intellectual property protection. New issues recently brought to the Committee on Research by University faculty include plagiarism, data custody upon PI retirement, and IRBs for oral history projects.

The Committee on Research Chair is invited to attend the Provost's Research Council meetings and has been asked by the Provost to report on the Council meetings to the Faculty Senate. The Research Council has met twice this academic year, most recently February 22, 2006. Among the topics of interest to Faculty include considerable discussion about: the research infrastructure at Case; how to facilitate interdisciplinary initiatives and discussions among researchers; the possibilities for bridge funding between grants for projects with high likelihood of funding; and the need to give appropriate credit to multiple PIs and Co-Is on projects when such investigators provide a unique and substantial contribution, with implications for updating promotion and tenure policies. The next Provost's Research Council is scheduled for May.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carol Musil