

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 21<sup>st</sup>  
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.