

Faculty Council Meeting
November 2, 2016
Mackin Room, Grasselli Library

The following Faculty Council Members were present:

Barbara D'Ambrosia (chair), Jean Feerick (vice chair), Brendan Foreman (secretary), Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, William Bockanic, Emily Butler, Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima, Roy Day, Gwen Compton-Engle, Kristen Ernhardt, Simon Fitzpatrick, Marcus Gallo, Rick Greci, Dan Kilbride, Mike Martin, Annie Moses, Jackie Nagle, Mindy Peden, David Shutkin, Peifang Tian, Jerry Weinstein, Tom Zlatoper.

The following Faculty Council were absent: Nancy Taylor

The following people were also present: Dr. Brent Brossman (Parliamentarian)

The meeting began at 2:03pm.

1. Minutes of the October Faculty Council meeting were approved as posted
2. Announcements from Chair
 - a. The Faculty Council (FC) officers had a scheduled meeting with the Provost (Dr. Jeanne Colleran) a few weeks back, which was cancelled by the Provost. The rescheduled time was available only to the Chair, who met with the Provost last week. One topic of discussion at this meeting was course load reductions for faculty members with regard to faculty governance. The Provost agreed to continue the standard 1 course load reduction per semester for the Chair of FC, and 1 course load reduction per year for the Chair of CAP and the Chair of the Compensation Committee. She also agreed to one course load reduction per year for the Chair of the Gender and Diversity Committee.
 - b. The Chair re-affirmed the FC Attendance Policy – if you miss more than 3 FC meetings or more than 3 General Faculty (GF) meetings, you are resigned from FC.
 - c. Draft policy for mandatory sexual harassment is on the faculty canvas website and should be read and commented
 - d. Nomination for Miles Award – The Chair asked that everyone consider nominating their colleagues. Dr. Simon Fitzpatrick noted that there has been relatively few nominees in past few years. He advised that all FC members talk to their department chairs to get some nominees

- e. The Chair asked whether there were any other announcements.

Dr. Mindy Peden brought a topic that was recently discussed in a CAS Chairs' Meeting. Namely, the Dean revealed to the Chairs that the external reviewers of the current APRs have been consistently stating the need for a university-wide tenure and promotion committee. Furthermore, the Dean wants to know how such a committee could be considered and possibly implemented. Dr. Peden wondered how should FC be involved with this.

It was moved (by Dr. Roy Day, seconded by Dr. Dan Kilbride and Dr. Jerry Weinstein) to charge the Rank, Tenure and Promotion Committee with the task of reaching out to the Office of the Provost, the Faculty Handbook Committee and the Deans of CAS and Boler to start a discussion about a university committee on tenure and promotion.

During the ensuing discussion, FC members brought up the fact that this topic has come up for faculty vote, always failing to pass. Some members expressed strong misgivings about such a committee. Another member wondered why external reviewers of APR's would have anything to do with this issue. It was explained that some programs are having staffing problems because the faculty members involved continually have tenure and promotion issues with their departments.

The motion was passed (17 for; 4 against; 1 abstention).

3. The Vice Chair of FC reported on the last two Provost Council (PC) meetings, focusing on one particular item from each meeting.

During the 1st meeting, Dr. Nick Santilli presented a review of the student surveys from HLC meeting. There was a substantial amount of student complaints regarding their experiences with academic advising. It was asked in the PC meeting whether it was time to revise their advising structure. In particular, should CAS model its academic advising structure after the Boler School model (in which one full-time person acts as the primary advisor)? In addition, the question of a university-wide student evaluation was raised.

At the 2nd meeting, it was announced that the Provost and other administrative leaders had met with the African American Alliance (AAA), following up on the demands made by AAA last academic year. According to the Provost, it was a mostly positive meeting. The Administration was able to respond positively to several of the "demand" items. Other items on the list were rather prohibitive. In particular, AAA had demanded that all

faculty members be required to take diversity training. But the PC refused since it wasn't required by a government mandate. AAA asked if voluntary diversity training might be provided. Although apparently some members of the PC were skeptical that many faculty members would participate under such circumstances, the Vice Chair of FC, when reporting this to FC, expressed interest in participating in such training – as did several other FC members.

The Chair asked anyone with ideas regarding AAA and Diversity Training to email her in order to get it onto the agenda of the next FC meeting.

4. The Chair and Dr. Gwen Compton-Engle reported on meeting with the Provost and Brian Williams last week regarding faculty involvement with student enrollment. According to Brian Williams, there's currently no substantial way for faculty to be involved with enrollment policy, since the current enrollment protocol is so transitory.

Regarding students post-enrollment, the Chair presented a draft of a charge to form a high-level University Committee on Education Policy and Academic Programs. This committee could potentially act as a direct link between the Provost Council and faculty-run committees such as CAP. In this way, faculty involvement with enrollment might commence. There was a murmur of concern over the formation of yet another university committee (that is, another layer of bureaucracy) at a time when everyone is eager to eliminate redundant committees. The Chair noted that this is meant to streamline university activity regarding student success and academic excellence on campus.

The Council was further surprised to find out that this committee had already begun to meet. In particular, the Provost and others had met with Dr. Tian, the Chair of CAP, to sound out how this committee may work with CAP and current faculty governance structure. [The FC Chair later determined that the meeting Dr. Tian described was more of an exploratory meeting, rather than an actual meeting of the yet-to-be-formed committee.]

The Chair noted that another way that faculty can be involved with student enrollment and post-enrollment success is via the PC Committee on Student Success and Thriving (CSST), which currently has no faculty representatives. The Vice Chair pointed out that this was not by design. All Members of PC had been asked to self-select which of the PC Committees they were most interested in, and none of the faculty members of PC chose this committee.

The Chair suggested that a way to fix this from happening again is to have two at-large faculty members on the PC – that is, not attached to being an officer of FC or a chair of an FC committee – and to insist that at least one of the people in these at-large

positions be a member of CSST. She stated that she would put this issue on the agenda for the December FC Meeting.

The Vice Chair, as a stopgap, would self-select herself to this committee for the time being.

5. Report from CAP

Dr. Tian announced that reviews and open hearings for the three proposals of academic programs had occurred. Since there was absolutely no faculty feedback, questions, or concerns expressed at the open hearings nor the online comments, the final CAP reports would be forthcoming. CAP was in favor of all three proposals.

Dr. Tian announced that, now these proposals were done, CAP was open for any new charges. She presented two possible charges regarding Academic Partnerships with other Higher Education institutions.

The Chair noted that a charge had been given to CAP last Spring (2016) to start working with the Provost in developing a procedure for developing and implementing new 3+1 programs. So, CAP can get working on that right away.

In addition, FC discussed how CAP should ensure the academic integrity of partnerships that already exist.

It was moved (Dr. Roy 1st/ Dr. Gwen Compton-Engle 2nd) that CAP work with the Deans and Provost to review all existing partnership programs and develop a plan for monitoring and collecting centrally accessible information about them. The motion passed 20-0-1.

6. Core Committee proposal

The Chair gave some background on the proposal submitted by the Integrative Core Committee about how Study Abroad students may satisfy the “Engaging the Global Community” requirement. In the Core document, there are 3 integrated experiences, one of which was Engaging the Global Community (EGC) and needs to be team-taught or alternately taught by a instructors from different academic disciplines in a learning community. The proposal is to give students studying abroad a chance to fulfill their EGC requirement through an appropriate course that is neither team-taught nor taught in a learning community.

The Chair asked whether FC felt this proposal should go to CAP. Dr. Jerry Weinstein moved that the answer is “No, let the Core Committee make this decision.” Dr. Mindy Peden seconded the motion.

During the discussion, it was pointed out that, under this proposal, a student can avoid any social science courses on campus and that off-campus courses will be approved that wouldn't count as Core when taught on-campus. Another concern was what type of precedent this decision might make. However, another FC member was delighted that the Core Curriculum went to FC first, rather than just enacting the policy without consultation.

A Friendly Amendment that the Core Committee always consult with FC before enacting any amendments to the Core Curriculum, was added by Dr. Roy Day.

The motion passed (14-3-4).

7. Another academic program wants to change name and requirements:

Dr. Medora Barnes explained that the proposal was to change the name of the Women and Gender Studies program to “Gender and Sexuality Studies” as well as changing the make-up of some the courses.

The Chair asked whether this is something CAP needs review. Dr. Peden moved that, no, this was not something CAP needed to review. Dr. Compton-Engle agreed. The motion passed unanimously.

8. The Chair asked: Are we going to conduct a review of faculty governance? She put forward a proposal that would provide a protocol for beginning such a review. An FC member asked whether we may get an outside reviewer for this. The Chair thought that this was likely. Other FC members expressed concern that this outside reviewer should be chosen by the faculty. There was much enthusiasm in bringing in someone with a lot of experience working with faculty governance on other campuses.

The Chair's proposal was moved by Dr. Weinstein (2nded by Dr. Peden). The proposal passed unanimously.

9. Finally, the Chair brought up the issue of how FC should interact with part-time faculty members. The Provost asked FC in her Summer Report to begin thinking about how this interaction might work. The Chair presented and moved a proposal that would create a delegation of FC members to develop a means to engage with PT faculty (Dr. Weinstein 2nded).

Several FC members expressed skepticism as to whether this is an area that FC has any real business with or could be effective about. Another wondered whether any interaction between FC and part-time faculty might jeopardize the ability of the part-timers to unionize. Yet another FC member noted that we certainly can't have any voting part-time faculty, unless the Faculty Handbook is modified to allow this.

The motion passed 13-5-2.

10. The meeting adjourned at 3:17pm.