

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Dolan A202/203**  
**Oct. 4, 2017**

Faculty Council members in attendance: Medora Barnes, William Bockanic, Brent Brossmann (vice-chair), Emily Butler (chair), Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima, Gwen Compton-Engle, Ruth Connell, Jeff Dyck, Kris Ehrhardt (secretary), Brendan Foreman, Marcus Gallo, Nathan Gehlert, Richard Greci, Dan Kilbride, Bo Liu, Michael Martin, Frank Navrati, Chris Sheil, Paul Shick, David Shutkin, Kristen Tobey, Mariah Webinger

The agenda was distributed in advance and the meeting began at 2:02pm.

Minutes

1) Chair's Announcements

- Minutes of the Aug. 30 Council meeting (posted on the Faculty Council website) were approved by acclamation.
- Butler announced that Staff Council would be holding a First Friday Coffee Social on Friday morning, 8:30-9:30.

2) Items for Business

Two replacements due to leave were approved by acclamation:

- Faculty Council leave replacement – one semester
  - For Dan Kilbride: Rodney Hessinger
- Faculty Council Committee leave replacement – one semester
  - Chair of CAP, for Dan Kilbride: Chris Sheil

Butler announced the course releases for various Faculty Council positions:

- Chair of Faculty Council: one CLR per semester
- Chair of Compensation: one CLR per year
- Chair of CAP: one CLR per year, taken for 2017-2018 as stipend which was split between the two chairs of CAP (Fall/Spring)

Butler suggested the following priorities for Faculty Council for the year:

- final approval for the cohort advising program (on the agenda of CAP)
- dealing with mandate about governance document review from Board
- figuring out how the relationships between FC committees and the university super-committees. This includes mapping out the number of obligations, figuring out what committees still exist, figuring out which ones don't need to exist.
  - Part of this includes seeking feedback from anyone who is serving on a committee which hasn't met, etc.
- other concerns for the year should be brought to an FC officer.
- Under the category of governance document reviews, discussion moved to what a Faculty Council Constitution review will entail.
  - This review of the Constitution doesn't mean abolishing things, it is just a review. Officers have talked with Provost Santili, who outlined the main time constraints, namely when he needs to give a progress report to the Board.

- The most likely areas that will need updating include compliance, outdated practices, and the creation of a schedule for an ongoing review cycle. The committee may also discuss possibly controversial changes, such as whether to keep FC the same size, whether committee chairs need to be on FC, whether votes might be allowed on the floor of Faculty Meetings, the relationship between FC and the Faculty Handbook, and how to include involvement of part-time faculty.
- The provost has asked faculty to form an ad hoc committee to take on this task. The committee will consist of legal counsel, provost (or a representative), and 4-6 faculty members. Ideally, the group would meet at least once before November, so that provost can report that the group has met and done something by the time provost reports to Board in December
- It was suggested that FC should make appointments since that is what is already in the FC constitution. The number of committee members is arbitrary—the key is small enough to be functional, but big enough to have a diversity of opinion (i.e. including people who are pre-tenure or Boler faculty).
- Mariah Webinger noted that even with a small committee doing much of the work, at the end, Faculty Council will be able to see the final product; Brent Brossmann added that the committee will bring things as package that FC will also vote on.
- Butler asked for suggestions of people to serve, and stated that she planned to send out a note to the full faculty, attempting to get people involved who haven't been involved; other voices chimed in to support casting a broad net.
- Santili spoke to the overall goal of review, noting that the Board resolution was that every group should review its governance documents. This includes the FC Constitution, and the Faculty Handbook, plus the Staff Council Constitution, and the Board is reviewing its own docs. In December, Santili will need to give an update: Board wants to know that things are getting started and that there's a timeline.
- The next order of business was to determine faculty representation on the newly created IT Strategic Priority Committee. According to Dennis Hareza, this new University IT Committee will take over and the old IT Steering Committee will be disbanded. He thinks it's important to not be doing secretive things behind closed doors.
  - Hessinger stated that the old IT committee didn't meet at all last spring and it didn't seem functional—it seemed to consist of randomly-invited people who had no real oversight—so a reboot is a good idea. He suggested that it would be good to have a rational set of stakeholders at the table. In the past, committee members only received a list of decisions that had already been made.
  - The suggestion was made that in order to get people who have a stake in the committee, it should be filled with elected instead appointed faculty representatives.
  - It was reiterated that regardless of whom the administration might pick, it's ultimately up to FC—that FC is the people who decide how faculty

representatives are put on committees. When the FC Constitution was written, people were adamant about that.

- The previous iteration of the committee included two faculty members who were appointed while the new version will have two elected faculty members.
- At this point, a spirited discussion ensued about the selection of faculty for it (how and for how long?) and the role of faculty on the committee, including how decisions would be made.
  - Hessinger asked whether ex officio members would be included, e.g. the CTL head, since IT money will need to be invested in classroom tech which is important to faculty.
  - Brossmann added that one advantage of a larger committee in which faculty have some voice is that currently things get done in ad hoc ways, or through individual perseverance; if faculty have a voice, even if it's not a strong voice, it's more than they have now.
  - Gallo asked for clarification about what the importance was that it be called a University Committee. —answer: University Committees can do more than just recommend things, they can actually do things.
  - Another thing to think about ought to be do we stay with Banner? The decision was made by a small group of administrators that have made a great impact on students. A big difference between Banner and Canvas is that with the latter, people came to campus and pitched the plans; whereas the only reason we're going to Banner 9.0 is that they're discontinuing 8.0 and not supporting it anymore, even though they're not done making 9.0 yet.
  - Moving back to the discussion of faculty representation, Dyck suggested that least one should come from FC, though Webinger noted that it's always an issue of trying to get enough faculty on committees. Brossmann thought the question was less about the number but more who needs representation. someone who knows this stuff. For example, to have someone who knows registration software at the table.
- Ultimately, it was decided by consensus that two representatives will be appointed by Faculty Council in consultation with the CIO for two-year, staggered terms.
- The FC Chair's involvement in campus communication
  - This issue arose with the question of how best to disseminate the AAUP letter written in response to the presidential search news. One time during her term, the previous FC Chair, Barb D'Ambrosia forwarded an AAUP letter to the all-faculty list, but in doing so she worried that this set a precedent making the Chair responsible for forwarding things. The Staff Council newsletter is another thing—to forward, or not? Butler asked what ways are there for people to communicate with faculty at large? She wants to make sure that when she sends something out it's something that people will look at, but she also doesn't want Council to be a gatekeeper. Perhaps Canvas could be another option?

- Webinger noted that there isn't a way to email the full faculty without either going through FC Chair or making a workaround email list. Canvas doesn't make an auto-update daily thread unless one is set as the instructor. Maybe a listserv or Google Groups would be better. Shick noted that the use of the all-fac list is restricted and warned that the all-fac email list also includes administrators and board members. Grecni thought it could be dangerous to send anything to all faculty at any time without people opting-in, since the all-fac email is official campus communication and not for opinion. He recalled that few years ago a faculty member sent an email blast that caused issues.
- Ultimately, this discussion split in two directions: 1) what is the role of FC Chair in campus communication? 2) how can individuals communicate with the full faculty body? The indented notes which follow provide a summary of the issues raised in discussion, the final resolutions are numbered at the end.
  - The original question of who decides what gets sent to all people was, by default, that it went on the head of FC Chair. On the contrary, Webinger thought that only FC communications should come from the FC Chair.
  - Brossmann suggested that flame wars would probably not be a large issue and that opening up a channel to create a back and forth of communication is the reason that we have FC in the first place. He didn't view the AAUP letter to be FC business but he did think it was really important faculty business
  - Shutkin agreed that opening more communications is a good thing and noted we could revisit any problems as they arose.
  - Another question arose regarding Butler's appointment to the Presidential Search Feedback Committee and it was suggested that when that decision was made, then the AAUP letter became FC business. [amended 11/1 to note that this opinion was not held universally by all members and that the point was dropped as discussion continued.]
  - Foreman noted that last year, D'Ambrosia made the decision to send out the AAUP letter by asking the officers—she was afraid that if she sent things out that she would be seen as endorsing it, second, she was afraid if she sent out one thing that many more would come out. We're such a small campus but we don't know what's happening among ourselves.

1) Webinger made a motion that the listserv of Faculty Council is used only for official Faculty Council business. Shick seconded. The motion carried (19 votes for; 1 vote opposed).

  - A general consensus of "what is official Faculty Council business?" was that it concerns matters that pertain to FC; e.g. a big enough concern to call a meeting or include on an agenda.

2) Webinger made a motion that the Chair of the Elections Committee will create and pilot an open Google Group for all full- and part-time faculty by the beginning of spring semester. Gallo seconded. The motion carried unanimously (20 votes for; none opposed).

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 pm.