



SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

NOVEMBER 9, 2010

1:00 P.M. in SKH 369

Present: English, Joiner, Newman, Miller, Gupta, Etkorn, Warboys, Karbhari

- ✚ Provost Karbhari stated he had been looking at the resolution on the Research and Creative Achievements and Scholarly Activities Committee. He understands the request for the Committee and is not against it but has concerns for overlap. Why have another Committee when there are already Committees to address this.
- ✚ Richards Miller stated we have other Committees in the Senate but no single Committee for looking after Scholarly Activities and serving as liaison for the faculty and administration in an advisory capacity. The Research Council is not an advocate for the faculty on scholarly activities. Not trying to circumvent anything that already exists but wanted a faculty driven Committee to inform on policy and have people to facilitate faculty scholarly activity. Someone to communicate.
- ✚ Provost Karbhari stated there are faculty representatives on the Council. To create a parallel organization because the existing organization does not meet the needs does not seem the right way to deal with the issue. If faculty does not have a voice on the Research Council then tackle that problem. Reformulate how the research council operates. Get to the root of the problem.
- ✚ Timothy Newman stated this is a Faculty Senate Committee and not a University Committee and can bring things to Faculty that the Research Council cannot.
- ✚ Richard Miller stated this addresses what is needed, what is wrong and what is needed to fix what is not helpful.
- ✚ Provost Karbhari stated things need to be fixed. We need to fix the problem where it is. It is more copious to take one topic at a time and solve the problems.
- ✚ Timothy Newman stated regular faculty are not well served by VPR and Research Council and not sure this is fixable.
- ✚ Richard Miller stated the emphasis is on top down not bottom up.
- ✚ Provost Karbhari asked what should the VPR address versus what the department chair should address. What size request should go to the VPR versus the department chair.
- ✚ Richard Miller stated purchasing as an example: what chemicals are needed and how to get things, how to establish a research lab, etc. commonalities.

- ✦ Provost Karbhari agrees some of these things are at the VPR level and he will be glad to talk about those with the VPR. All proposals go through the VPRs office. Structure needs to be established. The department chair should do more than schedule courses, the chair needs to mentor the faculty. Department chairs should be given opportunities for development and do the same at the faculty level. You could end up creating policies that prevent perfectly good research.
- ✦ Jennifer English stated that there could be a group of faculty that truly represent the faculty at Research Council and have specific items on the agenda and tie this to the Senate and eventually the Faculty Center for Excellence.
- ✦ Provost Karbhari requested that he meet with the group again. He is not saying no. He understands the current structure is not working.
- ✦ Jennifer English suggests a large group of faculty could see something not working and bring it up and put it on the agenda.
- ✦ Richard Miller stated there is a fear factor for faculty serving in these capacities.
- ✦ Provost Karbhari has heard the concerns and will take the concerns to the VPR.
- ✦ Meet again and talk about What mechanism can be brought to allow discussion. Specific agenda items. Consider other items needed. How to have more voice in the Research Council. Changes to the Research Council to make it work across the Board. Look at examples at other universities.