

**Faculty Council Meeting
September 1, 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
✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
Desmond Kwan	Sokchea Lim	Marc Lynn	Malia McAndrew	Tamba Nlandu	Tom Pace	Yi Shang
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Earl Spurgin	Kristen Tobey	Mark Waner				
✓	✓	✓				

- I. Minutes of May 19, 2021 approved.
- II. Announcements
 - a. As per Provost's presentation August 27, with updates in meeting with Mark September 1, the Board will vote on the budget on September 16. The administration is working on a retirement incentive that they intend would result in reducing the number of full-time faculty by 18-20 lines (which would include the 7 or 8 faculty already on phased retirement). The idea is that much as the Board will likely make a determination of hardship on the 16th, the administration has a plan through new program development, retirements, and cost savings to demonstrate significant progress over the next few years in reducing the deficit. If the Board is convinced by the plan, they may refrain from actually voting a resolution of hardship that would trigger drastic budget cuts and thus faculty firings. The retirement incentive will need to be published soon, as there would be a 30-day window for faculty to decide to take it.
 - b. The faculty's attorney has developed an interpretive document regarding the hardship amendment and communicated it to Colleen Trembl who is discussing it with the Board and the administration. Through the attorney's efforts to minimize costs, the bill thus far is much less than expected. Discomfort was expressed with discussing legal matters while the relative of a Board member was in attendance, as it raised the appearance of a conflict of interest. Mark Waner offered to share details with anyone who inquired who was part of the faculty client group. As soon as we have a current full-time faculty list, we can create a client group list and communicate legal developments to that group.

III. Faculty Representatives for Board Committees

- a. Faculty volunteered to serve (assuming, in the absence of a schedule, that the meetings did not interfere with teaching times) as follows:

Academic Affairs: Mark Waner

Advancement: Malia McAndrew

Finance: Sebastian Brockhaus

Investment: Brent Brossman

Mission and Diversity: Joanna Garcia

Properties and Facilities and Technology: Anne Kugler

Student Affairs: Tom Pace

- b. Faculty who had served as representatives previously articulated the role of a representative as someone who provided a brief, oral update to the Committee from the faculty perspective and reported back to Faculty Council about the meeting. While faculty members do not have a vote, and do not stay for the entire meeting, depending on the Committee they may be observers or have more opportunity to advise. Since it is the only interaction faculty have with the Board, it at least is worthwhile as an opportunity for communication.
- c. Medora Barnes moved, Chrystal Bruce seconded, to approve the above slate of representatives. 19 yes; 0 no.

IV. Fall Elections (it will take the effort of all members of Faculty Council, not just the Elections Committee, to recruit faculty to stand for all of these committees):

- a. University Tenure and Promotion Committee: heavy lift, first year of operation, shrinking pool of full professors to draw from. As soon as we have the updated list of full-time faculty we will know who the full professors are.
- b. Academic Technology Committee: Jim Burke would like faculty input into classroom technology and is anticipating this new committee would be possibly 8-10 people total with 2 or 3 ITS staff and perhaps 3-5 elected faculty. Suggestions for how to arrange seats, perhaps 1 CAS 1 Boler 2 at-large or 2 CAS 2 Boler 1 at-large—Mark will follow up with Jim re: the precise number of faculty slots.
- c. Associate Provost of Student Success Search: Steve's intention is an advertised but likely internal search and he sees the need for faculty input. The idea would be to unify Boler and CAS advising under this person in a more consistent model across colleges.
- d. Boler College of Business Dean Search: Steve intends for this to be an abbreviated search (without consultants or airport interviews, for instance) but as Mark pointed out, the documented University agreement with faculty as to Dean and above academic searches is they must be national in scope and have a majority of faculty on the search committee. So Steve will choose the Chair (a faculty member) and in alignment with how the CAS Dean search was conducted, Faculty Council members envision 3 Boler, 1 CAS elected faculty (plus administration, staff, and student representatives).

V. SAS Testing Concerns

- a. While before COVID it was the case that SAS could proctor exams for students with extended-time and distraction-free space accommodations, in light of increased demand to evaluate and approve accommodations (including non-academic ones), reduced staffing, and reduced space, even now that we are back on campus, SAS will no longer proctor exams—it is up to faculty to make arrangements. (See the SAS memo and FAQ document attached to the agenda and to be sent to faculty.).
 - b. Concerns raised: What happens if multiple students need accommodation for the same exam? Where would faculty be able to locate them and how much time might that take? What about part-time faculty's ability and/or extra time to arrange this? Where would distraction-free environments in departments even be?
 - c. Possible avenues to pursue: What about using Academic Success space? What about paying graduate students to proctor?
- VI. Meeting schedule adjustments
- a. Much as Mark Waner scheduled General Faculty meetings in late May, now that the President's Office is scheduling town halls, they want to use those times because of when the President is actually in town. Currently, Mark has agreed to move the October 20 faculty meeting to October 27 and the President's Office has proposed the following:
 - i. September 29: 2:15-3:00 Town Hall; 3:00-4:00 Faculty Meeting
 - ii. November 17: 2:15-3:00 Town Hall; 3:00-4:00 Faculty Meeting
 - b. Concern raised that this involves disenfranchisement of faculty who teach at 3:30, since votes are held in faculty meetings that they would miss.
 - c. Suggestions: move November 17 faculty meeting to November 10, even though that's only a week after the Faculty Council meeting; flip at least one of those split sessions so that faculty meet 2:00-3:00, not 3:00 to 4:00.
- VII. Proposed Survey from Anthony Tarescavage and Tom Frazier
- a. Concerns expressed that Faculty Council sending out the survey might convey that Council is not on board with the administration's decision on this, which is not the case. Steve affirmed that vaccination for COVID will be added to the list of required vaccinations for students for the future. It is a settled decision.
 - b. If the underlying issue is a larger one of consultation, communication, and listening, then two suggestions for our colleagues are: to enlarge the scope survey and work with Institutional Research to make it a campus climate survey; or to manually compile the email list from faculty lists, as faculty do on other occasions when they have specific issues they wish to investigate/communicate.
 - c. Earl Spurgin moved that Faculty Council would not send out the survey because of the misinterpretation that might entail, but suggest either a larger campus culture survey or individual initiative in developing a faculty email list. 17 yes, 0 no.