

Faculty Council Meeting
Wed., April 3, 2019
SB 107, 2 pm.

Faculty Council members in attendance: Brent Brossmann (Vice Chair), Angie Canda, Mina Chercourt, Gwen Compton-Engle, Greg DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kris Ehrhardt (Secretary), Richard Greci, Gerald Guest, Brad Hull, Dan Kilbride (Chair), Sokchea Lim, Bo Liu, Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak, Colin Swearingen, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil.

Agenda

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

1. The minutes of the March FC meeting were approved by acclamation.

2. Election update

Kilbride noted that there would be an election coming up. He urged people up for reelection to run again and to help recruit people for committees. He noted that shared governance only works if people run for offices.

3. Faculty Council chair and faculty communications

Kilbride noted that he had received feedback that it had been a mistake for the FC chair to pass on a letter from AAUP. It was noted that the Facultyforum email discussion group was discussed and implemented as a solution for this problem in 2018. Brossmann urged leaving this matter alone and reminding anyone who wants the chair to forward a thing to tell them to send to the Facultyforum email group.

4. RTP update

Dyck announced the committee was looking at two issues: counting time served to tenure; and what to do when an associate professor comes up for tenure but the guidelines have changed. He noted that the school once had offered the option of counting time served previously (e.g. at another institution or when someone begins as a visitor) but now all that time is counted. He noted that this would be a handbook revision, so it's a little tricky. Brossmann asked why this would matter, given that you have the option of going up early. Canda and Waner noted that that's not really an option; deans will often dissuade people from doing that. A question was raised about the extended clock. Brossmann asked allowing a candidate a choice would hurt a department. Webinger noted that the issue is the automatic tenure issue. Greci noted if someone is coming in at a senior level it could be difficult. Dyck noted that when a dept makes a hire, they want to be able to tenure them and you want them to succeed. Waner pointed out that the resistance is that the AAUP says nothing should stand in the way of a person going up

for tenure more quickly because it forces people to take more time before having the academic freedom afforded by tenure. The faculty in general are harmed by not having this protection. Compton-Engle noted that the 7 year restriction comes from a time before most came in without some years of VAP. Waner noted that it also comes from a time when a number of faculty came in before finishing the PhD. It was asked whether this was a thing where taking a couple lines out of the handbook might resolve the issue.

5. Finance, Compensation and Work-Related Policies update re: annual review

Weinstein noted that the committee met on Monday to discuss the proposed evaluation form: they'll make a revision to the form, and either put it back up for more comments or bring it to FC to bring it to a vote. They're going to stay away from the 3-year idea. Kilbride asked if it will be annual? Weinstein stated that it is annual now, because that's what's in the handbook. The committee hasn't had a discussion about how a 3-year form would be handled. He noted that ideally, they would talk to deans about this, but right now we only have one dean; it's difficult to imagine that there would buy in with an interim dean.

6. Other Business

Grenci announced that CAP has looked at Boler proposal for MS on Innovation and Entrepreneurship and approved it as ready, but they hadn't released the proposal before the meeting today. Discussion ensued about whether it could just be approved to go to the faculty, sight unseen. Canda proposed a motion to meet following the Presidential Forum on April 10 for five minutes to consider this proposal in order to send it to the next general faculty meeting; Seconded by Webinger. The motion passed unanimously.

Thoughts about last meeting with president?

Kilbride stated that he thought it went well and was a step in the right direction and that it showed the need for more communication. Another Council member countered that they believed that this wasn't a case of not understanding—"if we had said nothing, it would have just gone forward. I know that it was the official line that 'we misread.' I think what was missed is that he missed the timeline and he was forced to reevaluate the timeline, and if we didn't push back he would have just pushed it through." Another Council member noted that it came it up at the CAS chairs meeting that someone asked what FC was going to propose as the next steps: what is Council asking for as our role in the process? Do we want to make a request? Another Council member stated that they agreed that it was a good first step, but it doesn't stop any of the difficult questions. We can fight for more representation, but we need to put a faculty response about what we think the priorities of the faculty are. It was noted that the chairs were also interested in FC addressing the following issues: The timeline is still unclear; regarding prioritization, you can see that money is important, but what about mission and values? Are the goals already determined? Why doesn't the president talk to faculty in smaller groups more? what is FC going to do? lack of clarity btw roles of steering group and working group?

Kilbride noted that members of Council who were available would be meeting with the president on Tuesday (4/9) at 11:30. He noted that we should go in with an agenda and urged members to send in their priorities.

A question was asked about the working group—we should push to have this be a group of elected faculty. The president said he didn't want to run afoul of the Handbook, and we should point out that it is in the HB that committees with faculty need to do their business before May 20 or wait to do work until next year. Another question was asked whether Council would ask about what is happening with CAS dean?

The meeting adjourned at 3pm.