

**Faculty Council Meeting  
October 6, 2021**

Faculty Council Members Present:

Medora Barnes	Sebastian Brockhaus	Brent Brossmann	Chrystal Bruce	Angie Canda	Mina Chercourt	Gwen Compton-Engle
✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Deniz Durmus	Jeff Dyck	Joanna Garcia	Karen Gygli	Brad Hull	Danielle Kara	Anne Kugler
✓		✓	✓	O/L	✓	✓
Desmond Kwan	Sokchea Lim	Marc Lynn	Malia McAndrew	Tamba Nlandu	Tom Pace	Yi Shang
	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Earl Spurgin	Kristen Tobey	Mark Waner				
✓	✓	✓				

I. Motion to approve September 1 minutes from Chrystal Bruce, second Gwen Compton-Engle; passed by acclamation.

II. Announcements:

A. Mark met with Steve: 14 faculty have made some level of commitment to retirement; there are an additional handful seriously considering it. Anticipating a total number of 15 to 20. No plans for any firings. Some departments had more retirements than expected; some fewer; that's ok too.

B. Steve talked to Tiffany about SAS and testing. Communication imminent within next few days, updating what procedure will be. Available classrooms have been identified and SAS is hiring grad students on an hourly basis to act as proctors. This doesn't necessarily help for first round of exams which are already happening. It's a case study of a cut in personnel where faculty consultation would have been helpful for consequences. In fairness, the staff cut happened when everything was online, so perhaps administration didn't realize not providing testing space and proctoring for students with accommodations would be a problem once we were back to in-person.

C. Prompted by the general faculty meeting, Mark consulted with Brent Brossmann about appointing a parliamentarian. The idea is to appoint Dwight Hahn because he's done the job before. Brent moved, Anne Kugler seconded, to appoint Dwight parliamentarian. 16 yes votes.

### III. Committee Reports:

A. CAP has program proposals for: B.S. in Nursing, M.A. in Sports Leadership, Certificate and M.A. in Digital Marketing and Strategy, and a minor in Business Analytics. There is also a proposal for a Law and Society minor in the works. The other major item of business this year is to develop a proposal for a curriculum committee (more on this below).

#### B. Compensation:

1) Revising faculty self-evaluation form to make more streamlined and flexible. Talking with Jim Krukones. The previous draft was not getting a lot of traction, so started with clean slate.

2) Three committee members are serving on the Benefits Committee: Earl Spurgin, Simon Fitzpatrick, and Rosanna Miguel.

a) There is a meeting tomorrow. The Benefits Committee is under time pressure because the administration wants to make a change before open enrollment, which starts at end of October. The concern therefore is that the faculty on the committee are being asked to rubber stamp. HR has a proposal; unclear how the three faculty reps will have time to get faculty feedback or how much impact faculty will even have on the proposal.

b) What does the single group consolidation mean for birth control for the one group of faculty who don't have access currently? Steve has said goal is not to collapse everything at once and bring everyone down to same level because would be a big, sudden change. So one thing to change right away might be to add birth control coverage for those who don't have it. But it is unclear how incremental it will be.

c) How to reconcile variation in university retirement contribution?

d) Whatever the proposal is, faculty expect to communicate dissent if necessary.

C. RTP (Mark for Angie Canda): UTPC is short committee members and the Handbook amendment creating the committee does not specify how to deal with this. Angie suggests we charge RTP with coming up with a process for filling spots. Suggestions and concerns:

1) Lottery? But what about people whose names are drawn and they just can't do it for one reason or another (like already overburdened with service work, or ill health). What about people whose names are drawn and they feel compelled, but resentful, and it affects their outlook on the candidates?

2) FC appoints someone until next election? But while we do those for FC committees, this is sort of its own thing, kind of like the Core Committee. So which process to emulate, if any?

3) Elect alternates as a separate description from committee members? So one could run to be the occasional replacement, rather than having to be a full committee member.

4) Maybe separate committee membership for promotion to full vs tenure/promotion to associate, so that can open committee slots to associate profs for the tenure/promotion part?

5) Additional observations: Nobody thus far who is going up for tenure/promotion has opted for the UCTP route. Starting next year, those hired then will have to use UCTP but cases then not coming up for awhile. And, we'll be even further short on the number of full profs needed for this committee once all the retirements happen.

Chrystal Bruce moved, Medora Barnes seconded to send issue as charge to RTP. 16 yes.

D. RSFD: Kristin Tobey: Office of Sponsored Research wants to dovetail Grauel process with opportunities to seek outside funding.

E. Elections: Sokchea Lim: Agrees with collecting candidates for UTPC committee issue; there are also still some other committees where don't have candidates. Will have to check where FC can appoint, once election is done.

F. Gender and Diversity: Deniz Durmus: One concern is lack of support for GSWS program--repercussions for students in relation to drag show cancellation, VPAC elimination--when the committee meets, they will take up.

1) Discussion: should the new self-evaluation include an element of DEI? How to show involvement with DEI? How broadly-defined, how not? How explicitly and with what measures?

IV. UCEP proposal re: definitions: draft, looking for feedback before bring final proposal.

A. Feedback questions:

1) Process: where does this proposal go? CAP? Subcommittee of a new Curriculum Committee?

2) How to/when to phase out particular BAs? What process and through what body?

- 3) Are descriptions accurate re: distinctions BA/BS degrees? What about social sciences, where, for instance, faculty actually have BS undergrad degrees. Do these descriptions work?
- 4) What about 33 credits for major? In Boler it's 24 plus Boler core; languages it can be 30.
- 5) Wording point: and/or the minor field should be "and" plus a potential minor
- 6) Email Mark with additional points if you have them.

V. New Curriculum Committee proposal in development (Chrystal Bruce):

A. Difficulties of current system: student success, communication about changes, duplication, cross-committee communication (UCEP, Boler, CAP). Need improvements for process for new program proposals; all the letters that need to be acquired but are not, makes CAP look recalcitrant. Faculty oversight of curriculum; CAS owns university core; Boler owns Boler core. Original constitution charged with oversight of core, departmental, and new programs, but now mostly new programs, so need to have broader vision and intention.

B. Goal is to streamline curricular change process. Registrar has Coursedog now, and just got the curriculum package, so could use for new programs, or add new courses or whatever, because now we would have the workflow capacity. So could set up process which sends out to pertinent bodies/offices to provide input, so committee would get once all parts are completed. Then could do communication part, so send out to departments for input and notification (departments can't veto, but impact has to be communicated).

C. Structure would be University Curriculum Committee with an eye out for entire university and what would be impacted. Then there would be 4 subcommittees:

- 1) Boler (UG and Grad), new programs in Boler would start there.
- 2) CAS (new programs would start there; if crossdisciplinary could start either place?)
- 3) UCEP would become policy subcommittee
- 4) Core Committee

D. Big questions: committee membership; workflow and routing; who votes on what? (For instance: can Core Committee vote on ISJ, but not substantial change to Core? Does full faculty need to vote on all new proposals (new degree, sure, but minors?) Also sunseting: if to be under faculty control, there should be a process for that too.

- 1) The idea is that this is a Faculty Committee, like Core, but everything doesn't need to go through Faculty Council first.

2) Does need ex officio membership from Registrar, other staff who deal with operations

E. Additional questions, observations:

1) Need to make sure there's a communication process with FC, so maybe FC representative on this?

2) New course approval process needs to happen. Currently some not best practices on how new courses appear.

3) Ideally, eventually, Coursedog would replace On-Base core course proposals.

VI. Faculty Council Constitution Reform (Mark Waner): it got waylaid by COVID and hardship amendments. Would like to get it to point of sending to faculty handbook committee so we could elect via new process. The idea is to reflect smaller faculty size and difficulty filling council seats, and to have a smaller FC in light of all the heavy-lifting committees.

A. Representation: idea is to collapse from 5 to 4 divisions. Still proportional and wherever possible clustered by disciplines. Four divisions would each have 3 representatives and then we'd separately elect the chair, vice chair and secretary. Full council would be 15. Comments:

1) There was a big discussion at the time about different divisions; now would be good to have idea of real numbers per division in light of retirements.

2) Could we use divisions as they are constituted right now? HaSS, STEM, Professional, Boler

3) If we reduce to 4 divisions, does UTPC become 4 divisions? (No, 5 members, one would then be at large.)

5) Why separate executive committee elections? Because everyone elected to be a representative for their division, but then become executive committee member without full faculty input.

6) What happens if nobody stands to be chair? Someone will eventually step up, but we will know in March, earlier than now when we don't know until May.

B. Mark will send out proposal as it was, then it will be on the agenda next time to move forward and also through full faculty.