Faculty Council Meeting November 30, 2016 Mackin Room, Grasselli Library

The following Faculty Council Members were in attendance: Barbara D'Ambrosia (chair), Jean Feerick (vice chair), Brendan Foreman (secretary), Mary Beadle, Emily Butler, Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima, Roy Day, Gwen Compton-Engle, Kristen Ernhardt, Marcus Gallo, Rick Grenci, Dan Kilbride, Mike Martin, Jackie Nagle, David Shutkin, Nancy Taylor, Peifang Tian, Jerry Weinstein, Tom Zlatoper.

William Bockanic, Medora Barnes, Annie Moses, and Simon Fitzpatrick were absent.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance as well as all other needed material. The meeting began at 2:03pm.

Minutes:

- 1. Quorum reached at 2:03pm (17) and meeting began
- 2. Chair's Announcements
 - a. Minutes of previous meeting approved.
 - b. Board of directors meeting is next week. As usual, the chair of Faculty Council will give an address. If anyone has pressing issues to be brought out, let her know.
 - c. Student Union Bill: tobacco free campus. We usually discuss this type of thing at a faculty meeting and the faculty decides whether to endorse it.
- 3. Business Items
 - a. There is no Provost council report (since no meeting since last Faculty Council meeting).
 - Report from the University Committee on Collaborative Governance (U..G): There was a conference call about streamlining the governance structure. There is a new proposal for the structure. This will be posted, and there will be community forums regarding this proposed structure.

Quick thumbnail sketch of the proposed structure: There will be 4 high level strategic university-level committees: student experience and campus culture; educational policies and something else; resources including budget, personnel time, space, facilities, it; institutional effectiveness and something else.

U..G will be making NO recommendations regarding faculty committees. It's only concerned with university committees.

It was pointed out that the previous draft had several faculty committees within the university level committees. But, no, it will not include any of the faculty committees formed by the Faculty Handbook (FC, FHB, Grievance, ...).

 c. It was moved and the seconded by Dr. Weinstein and Dr. Compton-Engle, respectively, to replace Dr. Weinstein by Dr. Karen Schuele on the UBAC and Dr. Compton-Engle by Dr. Julia Karolle-Berg on Faculty Council for the Spring semester, due to faculty leave. This passed unanimously.

However, it was decided to table Dr. Chrystal Bruce's proposed replacement on the ENW Subcommittee, since Dr. Katie Doud (the proposed replacement) is a Visiting Faculty Member. The Council decided to take up this issue again upon consultation with Dr. Bruce and others.

For the others: Jerry moved; Gwen 2nd: passed unanimously.

d. The meeting with Provost about involving faculty around decisions regarding student life and enrollment etc. was reported by the Chair. At this meeting, it was suggested that the best way right now was to add some at-large faculty representatives to the Provost Council. The current faculty representatives on the Provost Council are there due to Faculty Council roles, not focused on the issues at hand.

The Chair asked the Faculty Council to decide whether we want to approve these positions so that we can put them on the next slate of elections.

After much discussion about what the Provost Council actually does and whether we really need any more faculty representative, the matter was tabled until later in the spring when the U..G proposal will be put forth.

e. CAP report

There are three proposals, all from MT/CS – data science, actuarial, ccp.

CAP reviewed the academic merits of each and concluded that the academic integrity and resources for these programs are sound. CAP requested that Faculty Council decide whether to bring the proposals to faculty for a vote.

After some discussion, Dr. Weinstein moved that we bring the proposals forward for a faculty vote. Dr. Dan Kilbride seconded, and it passed unanimously.

f. The Department of Management, Marketing and Logistics wants to merge two of its majors into one major and asked Faculty Council to decide whether this needs to be sent to CAP (new program vs. adjustment of current program).

After some discussion, the Faculty Council thanked the Department for bringing this proposed change to its attention and voted unanimously to decline to bring this to CAP (moved by Dr. Peden and seconded by Dr. Day).

g. Much discussion was had regarding the Integrative Core Committee proposal on linked courses. It was pointed that there haven't been enough proposals for linked courses within the Core and that the University will be facing a huge amount of upcoming waivers. This was the impetus for the proposal. Several folks thought that the proposal warranted a faculty vote.

Dr. Martin pointed out that he notified the Science chairs two years ago that there were simply not enough available faculty members and faculty-time to satisfy the number of Core person-hours needed.

Other faculty members said that more than piecemeal changes was needed. We need a large-scale proposal (or at least discussion) from the Core Committee on how it is dealing with looming problems. One faculty member in particular noted that by continually changing small parts of the Core one at a time, we could end up with a completely different Core Curriculum than was originally voted on.

Faculty Council asked for more discussion about state of Core, current problems, and possible solutions.

4. Meeting adjourned at 3:14pm (Pi-Time).