

Report from the General Faculty Meeting

February 17, 2021

- 1) Approve minutes – General Faculty Meeting minutes from Nov. 16, 2020, Jan. 20, 2021, Jan. 27, 2021 meeting
 - All three minutes approved by acclamation.

- 2) an update on the Board amendments and the Faculty Handbook Committee alternatives
 - The board will vote on their own amendments on 3/1, and on the FHC counter-proposal on 3/8. If both amendments are approved, the FHC amendments would replace those proposed by the board.
 - The FHC, FC executive committee, and AAUP JCU chapter continue to work with the attorney.
 - To date the Faculty Legal Fund has received 65 unique donations and 9 repeat donations.

- 3) Announcement of a new Faculty Council award to recognize an outstanding Administrative Assistant
 - Nominations are welcome.
 - An ad hoc group will be formed by the Faculty Council to select the recipient.
 - The award comes with a certificate and \$250, consistent with other staff awards.
 - The award will be given out at the end of the academic year.

- 4) Votes on two new program proposals
Earl Spurgin moved to send the proposals to the full faculty, Rodney Hessinger seconded
 - A) Italian Studies major and minor
76 yes, 3 no
 - B) Leadership & Social Innovation
65 yes, 9 noBoth proposals will be sent to the full faculty to vote.

- 5) Vote on the University Tenure & Promotion Committee
 - Jeff Dyck talked about the rationale and the revisions of the proposal (see Overview, Rationale, and Proposal as supplementary materials)
 - Hessinger: With the university T&P committee, we are adding a new body, and also retaining the T&P processes at the departmental level. I'm hoping over time departments might feel comfortable to let go their controls a little bit. Would the departments have the discretion to work with the deans to revise their T&P process?

- Jeff Dyck: I'm not sure the current proposal speaks to that question. Should that come up to the dean and to AVP, this faculty body would be there to provide feedback to the departments and make recommendations to the AVP. It wouldn't be a body to make decisions.
- Hessinger: it's good to know that we are not ossifying the processes.
- Brossmann: there are a lot of differences between how departments assess tenure. It's not completely consistent. I would think that in the interactions between the board and the departments, some modifications would naturally take place. Similarly, if the proposal of the reorganization of CAS goes through, A lot of annual review work will be done by associate deans, in the long term this may also have implications for the tenure process. Adjustments can be made down the road as those realities come to bear.
- Question from Chat: How is the two-year opt-out period determined?
- Dyck: there is no criteria behind it. It's a somewhat arbitrary date.
- Brossmann: During the 30-day review period and the two open hearings, there was no objection to the 2-year period.
- Question from Chat: Given Bo and Gerry's contracts were terminated after their department closed, how can we say we are still tenured to the university, and base any proposal on this premise?
- Dyck: RTP looked at the Handbook, and the Handbook has the language that individuals are tenured to the university. If there's a clause elsewhere in the handbook that under certain circumstances a department as well as its faculty can be eliminated, and therefore you are not tenured to the university, RTP would like to push back on that notion and state that it's a university process.
- Brossmann: we will continue to make efforts and fight for tenure. The issues regarding Bo and Gerry are not resolved yet.
- Johansen: FHC supports the proposal and recommends its passage. Having the committee strengthens the idea that faculty is tenured to the university. The proposed process is more faculty-driven and silo-breaking etc. In terms of the service load, there are currently 59 full professors in the university, the proposed T&P process needs 5 of them as primary committee members, and 5 as backup. This shouldn't be an unbearable load.
- Pam Vanderzalm moved to send the proposal to the full faculty, Dan Kilbride seconded, 76 yes, 7 no.
- Brossmann: University T&P committee is a handbook issue, therefore it requires a different threshold for election. we need at least 60% of the eligible faculty to vote or it automatically fails, and 60% of those who did vote to vote in favor in order to pass.

6) Vote on TRS proposed change to the Core

- Core curriculum currently requires that students take one 1-200 level TRS class, one 300 level class. There have been fairly common petition (10-12 times a year) to take two 300-level classes. They are approved every time. The proposed change requires students to take 2 TRS classes, at least one of which is 300-level.
- Core committee voted unanimously to approve it.
- Ed Hahnenberg moved to send it to the full faculty, Earl Spurgin seconded, 74 yes, 2 no.

(Spurgin asked, when the meeting participants vote using the poll function of the zoom, is it limited to those who are actually eligible to vote. Brossmann replied that it's currently not possible to limit the poll votes to only people who are eligible to vote. So all present can vote, but he can check later if anyone ineligible has voted)

7) Other issues:

- Finance committee still looking at faculty productivity measure proposed by Mariah Webinger.
- CAP is looking at the model of other universities in terms of a Univ. curriculum committee.
- Steve Herbert has asked to speak to FC in the near future about academic health measures—how to figure out which programs need help in terms of academic health.
- Still reviewing FC constitution. Close to voting at the end of last year. still trying to figure out if we will have 5 or 4 divisions, 3 or 4 reps from each. With respect to the restructuring of CAS, we could potentially have 4 divisions—Boler, Stem, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Professional Programs. If the FC constitution changes pass as they were designed, it would open the election of the FC executive committee to the whole faculty, not limited to within FC. Hoping to have a vote on this by the end of the semester.
- Amy Wainwright: Library is one of the check points for campus clear. You are not allowed into the library if you do not have the green check mark on campus clear. The library did not come up with this policy.
- Barbara D'Ambrosia: A few of the proposed revisions of the FC constitution, such as the way we elect FC officers, require Handbook amendments, so not sure we'll get to that by the end of the semester.
- Brossmann: will do our best to work with Jeff to figure out a timeline.