

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Council**  
**April 8, 2009**  
**Excerpts**

Present: J. Cummins, B. Ferguson, K. Jacobson, C. Lindgren, M. Schneider, P. Smith, B. Trish

The meeting came to order at 3:30 p.m. in Macy House conference room.

The minutes of 4/1/09 were approved.

**President's Remarks**

The President was traveling.

**Dean's Remarks**

The Dean made no remarks.

**Council Remarks**

J. Cummins asked about pre-registration materials he received recently. He noticed that the listing of pre-requisites has been altered to not include the traditional phrase "or with permission of the instructor". Council members discussed the range of circumstances in which students felt encouraged to try to add a class for which they lack the pre-requisite. J. Cummins and B. Trish asked for a clear and immediate message to be sent to all faculty providing them with information about the policy change...if it is indeed a change. It was decided, after much discussion, that this issue should go to the Curriculum Committee for discussion.

M. Schneider noted that the faculty governance group met again this morning. Kelly Herold has agreed to chair the group. It was noted that the present day formal faculty meeting has turned into a forum for presentation rather than discussion and Schneider believes the faculty suffer from lack of a forum for discussion. He has agreed to hold informal faculty discussion sessions at 4:15 in Room ARH 302 on those Mondays that are not designated as formal faculty meeting days. The topic of the first discussion is the budget and faculty salaries. There was discussion.

Schneider noted that he and B. Trish had met with the Staff Relations Committee regarding the establishment of a faculty-staff emergency fund. Schneider offered to produce a program prototype that might be useful in financially difficult times.

The Dean noted that the Registrar asked her why she cannot tell students that they will be receiving honors prior to commencement. There was discussion. It was decided to let her try it and see what situations might occur as a result of early release of this information to students.

**Proposed Prison Certificate Program**

The Dean distributed a draft proposal dated April 8, 2009 entitled “Certificate in the Liberal Arts for Incarcerated Students” authored by Kathleen Roberts Skerrett and Emily Guenther. She also distributed to motions (dated April 8, 2009) that could be brought in sequence to the Faculty meeting.

Motion #1: The faculty of Grinnell College approves the proposal to grant credits to incarcerated students at Newton Correctional Facility and Mitchellville Correctional Facility for Women in cases where:

- qualified incarcerated students
- have fulfilled all the requirements of a course taught by a Grinnell faculty member
- to meet commensurable or identical standards of courses offered on campus.

No incarcerated student may earn more than 40 credits from the College. The transcript of incarcerated student will show that they participated in a special academic program of the College.

MOTION #2: The faculty of Grinnell College approves

- a 5-year Pilot Program to develop and phase in a 40-credit Certificate in the Liberal Arts
- to qualified incarcerated students in Newton Correctional Facility or Mitchellville Prison for Women,
- subject to budgetary constraints.

At the end of the 5-Year Pilot Program, the Dean will report to the faculty on outcomes and sustainability of our offering the Certificate.

The Dean noted that the Curriculum Committee met on this yesterday. They made a motion to allow the program to go forward and then tabled the motion to allow Executive Council discussion and division discussion with their Curriculum Committee division representatives. After the discussion within the divisions, the proposal will be distributed to the faculty for discussion at the May 4<sup>th</sup> faculty meeting. K. Jacobson raised concerns about the viability of staffing these courses with our long-term temporary and SFS faculty. The Dean agreed on the need for some clarifying language which acknowledges the tension between the needs of the departments and the interests of the faculty members who would like to teach in the Prison Program. M. Schneider asked who approves the specific courses to be taught for credit. The Dean responded that she would imagine that, after being taught as special topics courses for a couple of times, the process of regularization of courses currently used for the Grinnell in London program would serve as a model. Schneider also observed that the proposed Prison courses meet for a limited number of hours per week and, in this regard, the students face great limitations on access to library resources, no access to the Internet and their professors. J. Cummins asked about the source of funding in relation to internal competition for budget allocations. The Dean noted that the Lilly Endowment grant will provide program funding for this year and the next. As for next steps, the division representatives to the Curriculum Committee will have discussions within the divisions and then the Curriculum Committee will untable their motion and vote on it. The Dean asked Council if they need to see this again. It was decided that they did not need to take action.

## **Draft Policy on Regular Part-Time Faculty**

The Dean asked Council for guidance on next steps. She noted that there are other places in the Faculty Handbook that touch on the subject of regular part-time faculty which will be affected by the proposed changes in one area of the Handbook. K. Jacobson referenced a memorandum from the President dated 2/3/06 regarding benefits eligibility and suggested that Council make recommendation to the President for changing it to come in line with the new Handbook language. Finally, J. Cummins offered to re-write the proposed language changes with regard to regular part-time faculty incorporating changes from Council discussion last week. He noted that the last action in this regard is to restore the voting rights of certain part-time, term faculty. The Dean suggested that the whole handbook needs to be reviewed with regard to this issue by both the Faculty Organization Committee and a second set of fresh eyes. M. Schneider agreed to undertake the first reading of the Handbook looking for necessary revisions resulting from the proposed changes.

## **Academic Department Reviews**

The Dean noted that she has not received the Mathematics and Statistics Department response to the 2007-08 external review so discussion of this item will be postponed.

## **ACM Mellon FaCE Grant on Integration of Athletics and Academics**

The Dean announced that the ACM will be holding a collaborative conference in fall 2009 on the subject of the integration of athletics and academics. The Athletic Committee wants to do some brainstorming with faculty about issues associated with this subject.

## **Preliminary Overview of Tenure-Track Position Proposals**

The Dean noticed that there has been variability in the process of previous Council reviews of tenure-track position proposals which has resulted in a greater or lesser degree of efficiency in decision-making. She distributed a list of factors that might be weighted in considering this group of proposals. She also distributed a chart of the basic information about each proposal and asked the Council to decide which ones should be forwarded to the EKI Advisory Board for comment regarding interdisciplinarity eligibility under the EKI. She also asked Council whether it was advisable to follow the same process of consideration of merit as used in prior years, regardless of the current budget constraints. It was decided to do so. B. Trish asked if Council was being asked how to treat replacement requests, since that was a fairly straightforward situation in prior years and under different, more favorable, financial situations. B. Ferguson suggested that Council consider that group first. A question was raised with regard to EKI eligibility of replacement requests considering those positions have not been interdisciplinary while held with the incumbent. It was decided that only the Education proposal would be sent on to the EKI Advisory Board because it has not been filled recently and there may have been some reconfiguration of the position. It was also decided that all expansion proposals would be sent to the Advisory Board. For consideration of those EKI designated proposals, J. Cummins suggested also using the list of factors for consideration listed on the EKI web page as well as those

distributed by the Dean. It was decided that the review process would culminate in ranking the proposals and making recommendations to the President. Council will consider the replacement position proposals at its next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary  
Karen Wiese