

College of Education and Human Development
Faculty Meeting – March 8, 2006
Floyd Theatre, 9:00-11:00

1. Welcome and Announcements

- a. Dean Felner welcomed Bill Pierce, Chair of Faculty Senate. Bill stated that he is visiting every unit to review the role of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Pierce shared a handout of faculty roles in shared collegial academic governance at the University of Louisville, and Roles of Faculty as defined in The Redbook. UofL operates under Position Paper on Shared Collegial Academic Governance *Endorsed by the Board of Trustees – University of Louisville July 23, 2001*. He also pointed out that collegial governance is characterized by:

- *the recognition of and respect for the many and varied roles that members of the academic community perform in a complex institution;*
- *the timely disclosure of information needed to participate meaningfully in the discourse that makes good policy and practice, wherever those conversations take place;*
- *the opportunity for members of the academic community to provide input before decisions are made;*
- *the principle of dissent. In a diverse academic community, the participants will not and should not always be of one voice on matters of policy and practice. It is imperative that dissent from the majority view be respected by all involved.*

Dr. Pierce explained that the Faculty Senate plays a strong role in three general areas: (1) university policy development and review, (2) oversight of the academic affairs of the university and (3) matters of faculty welfare and stewardship of intellectual freedom.

Following his presentation, Dr. Pierce welcomed a question/answer period. Pedro Portes asked if it was customary for motions and issues to come from the floor of the Senate aside what's on the agenda? Dr. Pierce responded that it does not usually happen, but when something is added it is sometimes referred to committees.

Pedro Portes asked if it was customary of other units to have administrators as faculty senators? Dr. Pierce responded yes, other units have administrators on the senate.

Robert asked Dr. Pierce: Does the CEHD have what is functionally called a Faculty Assembly? Dr. Pierce: Yes. The group that contains the entire faculty is considered the Faculty Assembly.

2. Approval of Minutes from August 25, 2005 Meeting (Attachment)
Randy Wells made motion to approve the minutes of August 25, 2005. Motion seconded.

Discussion: Anita Moorman asked that on page one of the minutes in the section Overview of upcoming year – issues, challenges, tasks, and opportunities, that the last sentence in the fourth bullet point be stricken from the minutes: *“It was the consensus of the faculty to allow Robert to work with the committee on making these required editorial changes and then to have the revised documents posted for review and comment.”*

In response to Anita’s request, Robert reminded faculty that two revisions were sent to faculty via email requesting comments/input, but he received none from anyone.

Anita Moorman also had concerns that the document did not track changes and suggested that changes be made clearer in the future. Robert said we will track future changes, but pointed out that the changes were made at the request of the Redbook Committee, and the Redbook Committee did not see these changes as substantive. Anita felt that the change which tied the workplan to annual review was substantive. Robert reminded everyone that the Redbook Sec. 4.3.1.A (Annual Work Plan and Presence at the University) governed our document and it specifies: *“A. Working with the department chair, each faculty member shall present an annual workplan for the approval of the dean. The workplan shall specify the responsibilities of the faculty member for teaching, research, service, other institutional obligations, and other activities or requirements for the faculty member's presence on campus. When circumstances require changes in the workplan, the faculty member and chair shall file an amended plan (including an explanation of the necessary changes) for the dean's approval.”*

Bill Bush asked that in the first bullet point of the section Overview of upcoming year – issues, challenges, tasks, and opportunities, that *“for the Math/Science Center”* be stricken from the minutes.

Bill Penrod moved to approve minutes as amended/Seconded by Randy Wells.
Motion passed.

Pedro Portes asked to be recognized from the floor and then proposed a motion to add two motions to the agenda. Robert asked Pedro to tell the faculty what the two motions would be. Pedro submitted the following motions:

Motion 1: *“Move that a vote of No Confidence in Dean Robert Felner now by secret ballot by tenured and probationary faculty.”*

Motion 2: "That an ad hoc committee be formed to promote faculty governance, to revise the Bylaws of the College of Education and Human Development, and that the committee be comprised of one faculty member from each department, elected now, at this meeting, by the entire faculty, by secret ballot."

Motion to add motions was seconded by Ellen McIntyre. Call for secret ballot. Robert clarified that a "Yes" vote would add these items and suspend agenda to deal with these items first. A "No" would mean that the meeting would continue with agenda as written. Vote: Yes=36; No=16 *Motion passed.*

Motion from Pedro Portes: Vote of no confidence in Robert's leadership. Motion seconded. Discussion. Robert asked for those who wanted to speak to the motion.

Pedro Portes gave the following reasons why he supported the motion: Public humiliation of faculty, work place harassment, retaliation for voicing opinions, little or no governance, decisions that hurt College, unacceptable and unfair hiring practice; rude, offensive, unethical behavior by CEHD representatives; denial of support for research to those who differ in opinion; and extreme inequity of pay.

Namok Choi said when she came to this country sixteen years ago, she believed in fairness because that is what this country represented to her, and that her experience in the college for the last few years has shaken her belief in fairness. She said she experienced the exact opposite. One of the things that has bothered her is that the hiring practice and committee works have not been respected and that many times people were hired without being interviewed by the search committee. She said many people, from assistant to full professor, came to tell her how depressed they were. She stated that we are working in an environment where people do not trust one another any more. She is committed to this college and this university and plans to work here for the next 20 years. She closed by saying we need to set things right, and the moment has come for us to speak up.

Sam Stringfield – votes like this should not be taken lightly. A vote such as this will be extremely harmful to our reputation. Directions of the College are keeping with the university; Robert has hired wonderful young faculty in recent years. Sam stated to Pedro that he is open to looking at data, but not voting on slanderous remarks.

Joe Petrosko said some of his concerns are the same as Sam's. He reminded faculty that we are in the midst of hiring and now is the time to hold together and not divide ourselves. He stated that he doesn't always agree with the dean, but the general direction of the college is going where it is supposed to go. If Robert were to leave tomorrow, we would still need to head down the same road. It is a healthy move because the dean is open to dialogue.

Bob Ronau – Change is very difficult, more in the CEHD than any place within the university, because we did NOT change in the beginning when the rest of the university changed. What has happened since Robert has been here is that we've repaired relationships with school systems and the Kentucky Department of Education, realigned with the university, and have been given an unprecedented amount of resources. Robert was not brought here to make people happy, but to put us on the map.

Robert asked if there were others who wished to speak.

Sue Lasky – In a recent luncheon for junior faculty, the Provost made it very clear that junior faculty hired within last few years were hired to put UofL on the map. She told them that UofL was mandate by the State to become preeminent metropolitan research university. She told them there would be immense growing pains, and it would be very competitive. The Provost/President's agenda is with us regardless of whether or not Robert is in place.

Tori Molfese – The CEHD is moving to align with UofL, not competing with ourselves or within university, but are competing nationally. Robert came to us with national prominence. We need to tone down our stress. Lots of reviews going on, NCATE, new hires, etc. and think of how we're going to get there and do it together. We need to bring in great doctoral and graduate students and this will not happen if we vote against our dean. Get to roots of problems.

Ellen McIntyre - said she did not appreciate Bob's "fear" tactic. She said she was thoroughly excited when Robert was hired. She said many of the "unhappy" faculty are productive and the process started with Ray Nystrand, including years when Doug was here, we've been steadily getting better each year. Extremely hurtful things have been done to faculty over the past few years. Biggest issue is the lack of faculty governance. Almost nothing is discussed, even within departments.

Bill Weinberg – we have brought on much of this ourselves. Faculty need to know what their rights and responsibilities are such as serving on committees, working with the dean's office, and making decisions about curriculum.

Robert Felner – I don't always agree with everybody, and they don't always agree with me. When I got here people were in groups making budget cut decisions; the President was not happy with us; JCPS was not happy with us; we do not have time to deal with issues because we're on a fast track; there are compliance issues, etc.; it's okay to disagree with me...there is a grievance process. I was accused of seizing an entire department's budget, but grievance filed 28 days after person was reimbursed. People are depressed, so am I. There is a tradition of personal attacks on each other and the dean; we are supposed to be civil and stay on issues.

Clarification: In response to Pedro's comment, Robert asked Joe Petrosko if Sam Stringfield was voted on by the ELFH department; Joe affirmed that he was. Affirmative Action has always been followed.

Robert Felner – The Board of Trustees is telling me to go faster and faster. I spend more time dealing with negative issues instead of focusing on funding. Our scorecard target for publications is 150--we have 40. We have not hit our \$10M target in extramural funding. Salary adjustments have been given to many faculty to address inequities. Discussion happens in faculty meetings, and if we need more meetings, then we will have them monthly. President and Provost fully support me [Robert], even though they have concerns about the College.

Pedro Portes – The issue the dean referred to regarding seizing a department's budget and failing to reimburse was another misrepresentation among many others that I will not get into and will be dealt with later. The issue here remains, if the faculty wish this climate of fear, retaliation and ineffective leadership to continue, then vote that way.

Call for vote. Seconded. Request that faculty member be allowed to assist in the counting of the votes. Yes = means no confidence; No = means you support the dean. Vote: Yes = 27; No = 24; Abstained = 2; *Motion passed*

Pedro Portes made a motion "*That an ad hoc committee be formed to promote faculty governance, to revise the Bylaws of the College of Education and Human Development, and that the committee be comprised of one faculty member from each department, elected now, at this meeting, by the entire faculty, by secret ballot.*" And that the following people represent their departments: ECPY: Patrick Hardesty; T&L: Ellen McIntyre; HSS – Anita Moorman; ELFH – Carolyn Rude-Parkins. Motion seconded by Deb Bauder.

Discussion: Bob Ronau pointed that this committee already exists in the form of the Personnel Committee. Nominations should come from the departments, then voted on by entire faculty.

Ellen McIntyre said she tried to approach the Personnel Committee, but it stopped at Robert's desk.

Pedro Portes – when any faculty has a concern and goes to the Personnel Committee, the Committee should meet and the issue not be taken to the dean.

Anita Moorman – The Personnel Committee is limited in its scope, which is why this committee is needed. Important that Bylaws make us safe, not just feel safe.

Motion by Bill Penrod to amend Pedro's motion to include an election to this committee within departments and nominees be brought back to next meeting to be held within next 30 days.

Discussion: Pedro spoke against Bill's motion to keep at the body of this faculty because there's greater communication.

Susan Lasky – spoke in favor of Bill's amendment and would like to see it discussed at department meetings.

Call for question by Deb Bauder.

Yes = amend motion and elect reps at department level

No = elect according to Pedro's original motion

Vote: Yes: 28; No-21; Abstention-1 *Motion passed.*

Amended motion: *"That an ad hoc committee be formed to promote faculty governance, to revise the Bylaws of the College of Education and Human Development, and that the committee be comprised of one faculty member from each department, to be elected within departments and nominees be brought back to next meeting to be held within next 30 days."*

Vote: Yes= 27; No 17 *Motion passed.*

Other New Business

Discussion of athletic board nominations and the process for nominations and election.

The following persons were nominated from the floor to be placed on Athletic Association Board of Directors slate: Mary Hums, Chuck Thompson, and Tom Simmons.

Vote was taken and Mary Hums and Chuck Thompson were elected as nominees.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30.