

Faculty Council Meeting
September 4, 2019
BR 33

Minutes

In attendance:

Council members: M. Barnes, B. Brossmann, A. Canda, M. Chercourt, J. Dyck, K. Ehrhardt, G. Guest, K. Gygli, B. Hull, D. Kilbride, M.L. Kwan, S. Lim, M. Lynn, E. Manilich, Z. Saritoprak, B. Saxton, Y. Shang, C. Sheil, E. Spurgin, C. Swearingen, K. Tobey, M. Waner, G. Weinstein, J. Feerick

Guests: J. Krukones, J. Burke, B. D'Ambrosia, E. Butler, D. Bruce, S. Herbert

1 Chair's announcements

Introductions of members and guests

Kilbride expressed thanks for running for council seats

Oct 16 next council meeting – moved since he'd forgotten to check the Jewish Holidays, but will now conflict with finance town hall. Not moving it again.

Thanks to volunteers who stepped up as Board Liasons, Mon. Sept 9 at 11am orientation. Important to attend!

Received 1 new program proposal- undergraduate wealth planning and financial management in department of economics and finance

Question from TRS about planned revision to minor. It was determined that this proposed change does not meet threshold for submission to CAP.

2 Items for discussion

a. Faculty council constitution review

B. D'Ambrosia, E. Butler., K. Ehrhardt were part of an ad hoc committee to revise and propose amended constitution

Arose from work of previous group of faculty.

Have been talking about much of this in Faculty Council last few years. Smaller numbers of full time faculty, difficulty in filling seats on some committees. Also tried to remove some redundant language.

One substantive change is proposing the election of council officers at large, rather than by just Faculty Council from among its members. Other reason to do it is to assign terms and allow for continuity (i.e. overlap of terms)

Also recommending that committee chairs be elected at large rather than just elected by and from Council. Harder to recruit FC members knowing that they might be member and committee chair.

Size of council and election at large are Faculty Handbook issues

Proposed change in size. 16 (4 from 4 div.) + 3 officers. Committee chairs would attend council meetings only when they have business/things to present.

Questions from council about whether it would still be difficult to recruit people with proposed model.

Chairs of committees could also be on council, but don't have to be. Could have terms assigned for continuity (rather than a council member who might only serve only 1 year depending on where they are in their Faculty Council term).

Was reducing number to 3 per division considered?

Size of council and taking chairs of committees out need to go together (strong feeling of the ad hoc committee)

Election of officers – open to all faculty for nomination or other? Would still be up to election/nominations committee to recruit and put slate together.

Another felt that further reduction in size should be considered (e.g. 3 rather than 4 per division)

Ad hoc committee members indicated that this is meant as a starting point for conversation. Committee is open to considering further changes, such as the further reduction in size.

The current plan is to come up with a single Faculty Handbook amendment for all changes to the constitution.

Some current and previous Council members have heard some say Faculty Council is obstructive and slow. Suggest need to add provisions for business between Faculty Council meetings (e.g. as simple as sending proposal to a committee).

Moved some prior amendments into body of document.

Suggestions for make-up of new divisions just a place to start. Kilbride said latest faculty list is not out yet so he couldn't verify numbers in current or proposed divisions
Recommending elimination of Faculty Research and Service Committee since it serves only to populate University committee.

Faculty Council member suggested having all STEM departments together could limit participation since currently many are engaged and involved.

Appendix D – Punted on this. Tossing it back to Council. Think some changes could/should be made, but that is a wider conversation.

Kilbride asked if we want to introduce this at next general faculty meeting? Put up for discussion on Canvas?

Some expressed a sense that it might be worth putting it out there for conversation.

Two people indicated not supportive of incremental changes, but rather move all the issues together.

How to handle some of the options (e.g. possible make up of divisions)? Need to have these settled before putting up for a vote.

Faculty Handbook issue is just the number of divisions, not the make-up of the divisions.

Vote to move to discussion at general faculty meeting: Yea - 22, Nay - 1, Abstain – 0

b. RTP charge: college/university tenure & promotion committee

J. Dyck would like to have a clear charge to develop a proposal, if that is the will of Council (not clear from 2016 charge which directs committee to seek input and conversation). Worth discussing whether Faculty Council would like to see this develop into a proposal.

A. Canda made a motion to charge RTP with developing proposal for University wide tenure and promotion committee. 2nd by C. Sheil

Discussion of whether University or College committee makes most sense (1 layer, 2 layer or 1 parallel layer)

Work of past 2 years by RTP suggests not big enough to have multiple layers (A. Canda)

Consideration of interdisciplinary programs – S. Herbert suggests that this is trickier with College vs. University committee.

Vote on motion: Yea - 20, Nay - 2, Abstain - 1

c. Fall election

List of open seats (there are many!)

Kilbride confident about filling pools (grievance and board of review), but there are many other positions that are more difficult to fill. Asking Faculty Council members to help recruit colleagues to fill these seats from their departments/divisions.

Send email nominations to K. Ehrhardt (make sure to say whether person has been formally recruited, or if she needs to ask them).

d. Possible syllabus statement on basic needs

Brought forward by M. Webinger. Idea came from a blog post and wider higher education discussions.

Statements below were from various meeting attendees:

Support for such a statement, but often not in the know of where to point students.

Uncomfortable with first line (academic distress pointed directly to dean of students).

Different resources for personal vs. academic distress.

Last sentence (referring students to talk to instructor) not needed (e.g. PT faculty won't know where to point them).

Uncomfortable with having students directed to faculty. Point them to the resources directly. Instructor not necessarily the best resource.

Point directly to CSDI, since they do some of the things discussed? May be beyond what that office can supply.

Perhaps set conversation of faculty with dean of students on the issue.
Concern that this goes in syllabi – they may not be reading them much. Should be promoted more broadly.
Might want new VP for diversity to weigh in.
Concern about whether there are enough resources. Another pointed out that we do need to know if there are issues though.
Learner Support tab is good to have. Good to point students to the various things available there.
Should be in that tab, not copied into all syllabi. Have syllabi refer to this tab.
Kilbride will discuss this with S. Crahen

e. Strategic plan/planning process/"case for change" -- discussion?

Throwing it out for discussion or not. No discussion.

Anything for ITS? (since J. Burke was here)

Sept. 26 – open opportunity to see different tools. Some in room will be demonstrating.

3 Committee reports: what's on the horizon, 2019-20

a. CAP

Z.Saritoprak – 1st meeting Sept. 11. The committee has inherited 2 items – update structure for new programs, grading policy, and new proposal from department of economics and finance. Kilbride asked about who is chairing the academic policy committee since C. Sherman is no longer at University. Someone pointed out that A. Krueger is co-chair, so she would likely continue as chair.

Question was asked: We have someone on Grauel. What do we do?

Kilbride indicated person leaving should campaign to recruit someone, then committee can accept them or not.

b. Rank, Tenure, Promotion;

Issues brought up above.

Need to replace L. Koch (needs election), S. McGinn in spring when on leave

c. Research & Service;

Doing the usual. Read lots of applications last year, lots of interest in faculty research. Suggest that research be in strategic plan. Ran out of money for requests near the end.

d. Gender & Diversity;

K. Tobey – Just came to attention. President Johnson told students that Drag Show would not happen this year. Potentially an issue on the horizon.

M Barnes pointed out that University is in process of creating policy about who can be a speaker on campus. Faculty need to have robust input.
Some of drag performers are alumni and may come in as speakers for programs PJHR, Gender studies

e. Compensation

G. Weinstein – Seating A. Kugler on comm. Working on changes to Faculty Evaluation policy/procedure.

K. Tobey – How do we fill spot on RTP from gender and diversity committee?
Need to have volunteer

f. Elections

Will be formally announced at general faculty meeting and nominations taken from floor and for a period after the meeting.

4 New business

Killbride asked for any agenda items for next meeting and/or Sept. 18 general faculty meeting.

J. Krukones – general reminder about Celebrate the Spirit Mass on Sept. 12

3:07 adjourned