

Faculty Council Meeting
(held in lieu of general faculty meeting)
Nov. 15, 2017
2:00PM – 3:15PM
Donahue Auditorium

Minutes

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

A quorum was met at 2:04 and the meeting began.

1. Chair's announcements

- Minutes of Nov. 1, 2017 Council meeting will be posted on the Faculty Council website before the next meeting
- Important dates
 - Nov. 29: Faculty Council meeting **in Dolan E228**
 - Dec. 5-6: Board meetings

2. The following slates of committee appointments were approved by acclamation:

- On the IT Strategic Priority Committee: Mike Nichols (CH) and Rick Greci (MMS)
- On the Task Force on Information Security: Tracy Masterson (PS)
- On the Faculty Council ad hoc Committee to review FC Constitution: Dwight Hahn (PO), Annie Moses (ED), Mariah Webinger (AC), Ali Dachner (MMS), Bill Elliott (EC/FN)

3. CAP items—Counseling Substance Use Disorder proposal and online hearings

- Sheil noted that CAP had worked with Counseling ahead of time to figure out what would be a complete proposal. The proposal had been on the agenda for discussion a couple times, they met with Cecile Brennan and Anne Kugler to talk about concerns/comments, Counseling made changes and sent it back; CAP has the updated proposal—there are still a few small things, but the proposal is now at the point that it can be considered for open hearings now. They'd like to have online hearings, including periods of online availability.
- First issue: Will FC approve an online open-hearing process for CAP?
 - A vigorous discussion about the issue ensued. It was asked whether this could be run as a test, rather than making it a policy. Sheil responded that he didn't think there's anything anywhere that outlines any policy about how hearings are run, but we could do it as a pilot. Compton-Engle noted that in the past it had been done online, but it was also run with in-person hearings too, though usually in-person hearings have zero people come. Hessinger suggested that it could maybe be hybrid, because some things can be done more efficiently in person. To which Butler pointed out that hybrid is what we had been doing. Sheil then suggested that CAP could leave the discussion up, but also have some real-time sessions where actual people can respond, and Shutkin wondered

whether synchronous live audio could work. Navratil noted that some sort of feedback to report on what worked well should be included. And Barnes voiced support for moving ahead to have this be a pilot.

- A motion was made to pilot a fully electronic open-hearing process for CAP and CAP will provide feedback and approved (19 votes for).
 - Second issue: Should this proposal be sent to CAP?
 - Barnes asked whether the department expected not to add any more hires for this. Brennan responded that if many more students decide to come—maybe an adjunct. But that they’re already running and staffing three of the five classes. Gehlert asked what the next steps would be in the process and Sheil replied that after the vote in FC there would be open hearings, CAP would compile the comments, this comes back to FC as a recommendation, and finally FC sends it to the full faculty for a vote. Butler noted that it probably wouldn’t make it to the general faculty until the January meeting. Grecni asked Kugler for her input from an administrative perspective, and she nodded assent that things were moving along.
 - A motion was made to move the Substance Use Disorder program proposal to CAP and approved (19 votes for).
 - Finally, Sheil noted that CAP met this morning and will try to figure out how to deal with UCEP items 5 and 6. He also said he would be putting things in order to ensure a smooth transition to the next semester when Kilbride takes over as CAP chair.
4. UCEP proposals—discussion continued from 11/1 meeting.
- Butler noted that the question here is whether each item is a faculty issue or if it’s an administrative issue—this is not a debate about the content of each item. In the last meeting, we still wanted to talk about items 3 (Excused Absences), 7 (Student Responsibility syllabus statement), and 9 (Transcript Notation and Conduct Letter Policy).
 - Item 3: does faculty have ownership or should it go to UCSLE?
 - Despite the admonition to avoid debating the content of the proposal, further discussion revealed that additional wording would make it stronger. The discussion leading to this wording raised the following issues: Barnes asked how much information will be conveyed to faculty if student has a note? Foreman noted that it’s unclear if we are forced as faculty to do something with the excused absence. But it was noted that the point of the excused absences would be to document that a person really **was** at a thing, not to force a professor to change their rules. Someone asked about religious holidays or absences due to sports or extracurricular activities. Here, Grecni pointed out that in the UCEP discussions, they thought that faculty should be talking about excused absence issues. This change is part of a bulletin clean-up process; the bigger discussions won’t get solved with this. At this point, Barnes suggested that the longer she looked at it, if the advising office was willing to take on the admin processes in the 2nd paragraph, she could be fine with sending it on. Sheil noted that this practice is in already place—they’re doing this now, and it’s been great. Cima said that he’d like to see some wording about the nature of the absence. This led to a group editing project that resulted in the following motion, which was subsequently approved:
 - MOTION to send item 3 to UCSLE with a recommendation to add the following wording at the end of the paragraph: “After verifying the student’s

documentation, the appropriate office will communicate the request to the faculty member(s) who retain(s) the discretion to grant the excused absence.” (18 votes for, none opposed)

- Item 7—Student responsibility—syllabus statement
 - At issue here was whether this item was more academic or more procedural in nature. Greci noted that UCEP thought there should be larger discussion of it, since it concerns both faculty and administration. Webinger wondered if it was something faculty could just say on each syllabus to look at the Bulletin. Foreman thought it was not really academic, more procedural. Compton-Engle objected that it is academic because students petition all the time because they didn’t know about a certain requirement, noting that it’s as academic as anything else we talk about. But Gallo pointed out that there wasn’t much difference between this statement and the previous one. Thus, the following motion was made and approved:
 - MOTION to send Item 7 to UCEP to hold open hearings. (16 votes for, none opposed)
 - Item 9—Transcript Notation and Conduct Letter Notation
 - Webinger suggested that since this one was more controversial, we should request that UCEP bring it to a general faculty and present it for discussion. Greci noted that what’s controversial is the substance, but not who has ownership of it. Faculty have never been in charge of transcripts. Many others supported the presentation of the item, as a chance for public comments on it, in addition to the online period, so the following motion was made and approved:
 - MOTION to ask UCEP to come to a general faculty meeting to present Item 9, but to allow the committee to move forward with comment period. (16 votes for, none opposed)
5. Committee Reports
- RTP: Dyck reported that this semester RTP is responding to the issue of counting time spent as a visitor. They’re also discussing a new proposal for a University Tenure Committee. Last year there was a vote on how we handle faculty handbook amendments, and the committee was going to wait and see after that vote. They are beginning to work with the Handbook Committee on this. As far as a Term Faculty proposal, that is not being pushed forward right now. Instead, they are reaching and trying to set meetings. Compton-Engle asked how does this work with HB review? Connell responded that the Handbook Committee has been looking at that and will be willing to look with other committees and noted that all our discussions can run together with the overall Handbook review.
 - Compensation: Navratil reported that the committee was meeting about annual evaluation process.
6. The meeting was adjourned at 3:17.