

Faculty Council Meeting
May 1, 2019, 2pm
SB107

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, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Colin Swearingen, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger. Absent: Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak, Gerald Weinstein.

Minutes

Quorum at 2:03pm.

1. April elections

Kilbride announced that elections were in progress and urged everyone to vote. He noted that there would be an additional meeting in the week between finals and commencement to elect officers for next year.

2. Proposed Office of Diversity Equity and Inclusion

Ed Peck (with committee members Megan Wilson-Reitz and Medora Barnes also in attendance) discussed the DEI committee's development of an office to provide leadership and accountability. He noted that the previous iteration of the office came on the heels of HLC and that this version has used that experience as a learning experience. They presented Pres. Johnson with two plans—he's accepted this one. The VP of Diversity and Inclusion will report directly to the President; to help the VP be successful the committee created a model that brings together different offices: CSDI, SAS, and Title IX (although Title IX would still report directly to Pres), and a faculty-staff diversity coordinator. Divisional liaisons will work together. Canda asked whether the liaison team replace the current committees. Answer: they're advising to keep the current committees to help the new group, namely the Division Liaison Team—a couple people from CAS and Boler—this "divisional" is university-wide. Barnes noted that DEI is a committee on campus where faculty and staff are working together. Canda asked further how the new faculty-staff group fit in with other committees on campus and if this work been done already. Answer: it's new. Is it faculty or administrative? Answer. it's administrative. There will be two new hires the VP and a Coordinator of Diversity for faculty and staff. This would depend on how the VP views the position—there needs to be someone to work with the VP to do the work that hasn't been done so far. Brossmann asked whether *that* person will have support too? Answer: perhaps, though there isn't really budget for that. We have to be realistic about what the budget can take. Webinger asked what Peck's role would be if diversity no longer reported to Mission. Answer: he'd still work with them, not in a way that it would report to him but as a liaison. The committee has said that the position needs to be a direct

report to the president. Barnes noted that every VP would create diversity goals and there would be more interaction between diversity liaisons and their VP. This isn't a whole bunch of faculty members. Sheil asked if the diversity team would communicate with the VP as a group or individually? Answer: I see the VP working with them as a group to find ways to collaborate. Brossmann asked about the dual lines of communication with the Title IX. Answer: it's a dotted line from Title IX to the VP. The current Title IX officer has worked in a situation like this before. Setter asked where HR fit. Answer: they'd be one of the liaisons. Waner noted that it seems like there should be some faculty in your committees, but you're also doing work in the summer and faculty can't do that. it's the same with a number of staff who have shorter contracts. Does that mean an administrator rather than a faculty member? Answer: yes, until it isn't. e.g. if there's a faculty member who would be useful or if it's staff this would make their position into a 12 month. Greci asked about the budget, since there had been basically no budget for anything before. Answer: Terry Mill's position had been in the budget and then it got taken out of the budget. The president doesn't want to add additional burden—he'll use presidential funds to keep it as budget neutral as possible. Greci asked further if the idea is that these initiatives will lead us to get more students? Answer: we can't afford not to do something like this, we're doing it as leanly and creatively as possible.

Peck noted that the timeline is aggressive: now is the good time to start a search like this. They're discussing whether we need a search firm to do this. While the search is going on, they'll identify liaisons and what their position descriptions will be and do professional development. Workload in summer will be relatively light: get a team of people thinking about how plan can come together in their areas. If we fall short and need to wait for someone until after fall, that's okay.

Sheil asked whether the search has started and whether faculty will be involved in process? Answer: the president suggests a 5-7 person group on search committee. Kilbride noted that it's obviously too late to hold an election on this but representatives could come from G&D or DEI. Barnes noted that both she and Saritoprak were elected to DEI. Brossmann asked about compensation for work over the summer. Sheil asked whether a search firm had been found yet. Answer: not yet—a couple have been suggested, but we haven't made any decisions yet.

Kilbride noted that we need to figure out how find faculty representatives for this since an election is out of the question at this point. Barnes and Cherncourt noted that they were both willing to serve. Webinger moved to appoint Medora Barnes and Mina Cherncourt to serve on search committee; Sheil seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Compensation study

Kilbride noted that Jennifer Rick in HR was beginning a compensation study, working with existing peer group and adding new schools to get enough schools. Kilbride noted that the new schools have business schools and education schools. In the past, Mauser argued not to include law schools because it makes overall compensation higher. Canda asked why are we including schools like Loyola-NO which is in really bad shape? Greci noted the Midwest is in a category

of its own which has been hard hit. It's been argued that more local schools should be included? Webinger asked what the point was of using a bigger group. Sheil asked whether the list existed somewhere that we can see. Dyck asked whether the second group created with no help of the compensation committee. Kilbride noted that Jerry W. was consulted. Brossmann stated that the last time we went through this, we went through a year of negotiations, noting that he was a little leery about a list that just appeared now. It seems like anything on this list is something that was considered and rejected or not even considered. Webinger stated that this isn't transparent. Faculty should be looking forward to a compensation study and have real numbers and benchmarks, but let's do it in a way that we can have confidence in it. Waner wondered what would be different with this salary survey from the last one? Webinger suggested that if HR does it it may have some teeth to it. Sheil suggested having a discussion with Rick early in the fall. Webinger noted that if HR wants to put out a reliable study they need to use a reliable set of data and suggested sharing the longer list of 60 schools that the compensation committee made.

3. Aramark contract

Dennis Hareza wanted to know if we wanted a faculty member on the search committee for the new choice? Dept admins have a lot of experience with food service. Setter noted that typically if someone new comes in they will hire the people who want to continue. Kilbride will send out a message to see if someone wants to serve on that search committee.

4. ASP meeting discussion

Kilbride opened the floor to general discussion. Sheil noted that he was not sure what they can do with us. They said that they usually work with schools that are struggling financially. Grenco disagreed that we're not struggling. We're not falling off a cliff, but we need to do something, and if self-reflection won't work because of territories. Brossmann was not convinced that next year is the right year to do that. They seemed to have questions about the leadership/lack thereof. Brossmann was also really concerned about whether to trust the words coming out of his mouth or the words on his page, noting that Dickeson lied to my face about how the Core committee found a place on the schedule. Webinger didn't get a great feeling from them. We're not Wheeling, so we'll be a success story but they didn't sound like they wanted us. Kilbride noted that also they dissed the board in our meeting. Waner noted that they did that *talking to faculty*. Brossmann thought that he sounded like a slimy salesperson. Webinger stated at the end of the day this isn't our decision. I'd like to propose that if we go with ASP that we offer the board to do our own prioritization as well. Anyone can run the numbers—the big question is who does the analysis? Sheil was worried about what would happen if the two studies are radically different. Barnes noted that Todd Bruce reached out to those of us who are supposed to do APRs next year to tell us that those are all put on hold. He's moving forward with the idea that prioritization is moving forward with or without ASP. Kilbride noted that the other guy was concerned about the new provost and lack of dean. Brossmann said that his position was that this wasn't the president but that this was coming from the board. But that's not how he read things. Canda thought he said everything that we wanted to hear but we've done a bad job with

things internally. Compton-Engle asked for clarification about the message from Todd Bruce: did it imply that a decision has been made and there is something happening. Barnes said it says "may happen in near future." Brossmann noted that the president said this is going to happen. Butler noted that she was concerned about how it's been handled here: it isn't healthy leadership to not announce this to faculty first and he's been very defensive to people who have reached out to him. She urged faculty to be involved and also to be cautious. I think he came in with some very particular ideas about things that should be changed. And because he's been off campus a lot this year it means that he hasn't been around to see how things work.

Finally, Kilbride thanked people who were stepping down at the end of this year.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15.