

**Faculty Council Meeting
November 3, 2021**

Faculty Council Members in Attendance:

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|
| 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 O/L | 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. Approval of minutes of 10/6/21
Approved by acclamation.

II. Announcements

A. Jeff Dyck is resigning from Faculty Council, hence why not at the meeting. He has too much on his plate.

B. Ed Peck was originally on the agenda; going to move to another date; new agenda item is the resolution from the Committee on Gender and Diversity.

C. Ed Peck will chair the search for VP of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion which will be occurring pretty much simultaneously with the search for the Finance VP.

1) Paul Hulsman suggested one faculty member for Finance search; Mark was ok with that for non-academic committee.

2) Mark suggested more than one faculty member for DEI, given current issues with SAS, communication, academics, faculty impetus for position in the first place. Ed agreed, so we will be looking for 1 Boler, 1 CAS elected faculty.

3) Because of rearrangement of faculty meeting schedule to accommodate town halls, next week is our next general faculty meeting; nominations then too.

D. Al charged Brendan Dolan with redoing faculty lounge/meeting room into a faculty and staff lounge. First events (coffee, tea, snacks; stop by and see space): Thursday, November 11, 3:30-5:00 and Friday, November 12, 8:00-9:30.

III. Faculty meeting format and logistics: based on last week's general faculty meeting experience, what can we do to make things better? Last week there wasn't a cart in Donahue like there was in September, because there was a town hall the same day. Discussion:

A. Could we use AD 226 or AD 258 or a similar room already set up for zoom? The number of people in-person at last week's meeting (ca. 40) would fit in AD 226.

B. Is it worthwhile do to hybrid while most people choose remote?

1) We need administrators giving us bad news to be in-person to look us in the eye (does that actually have an impact?)

2) It's hypocritical to insist students have to be here in person when we're hybrid? But there's a scale difference between 30 and 200 in-person

3) Why is Donahue not fitted for zoom, rather than just a cart?

4) It's much harder to hear/catch people on zoom who want to speak; so if something important to say, issue to bring up, should be in-person

5) We already don't have enough interaction; worth it to keep in person for the 40% who do show up in person. Alternately, more people showed up last year when meetings were remote, so more interaction remotely. But also issues last year probably prompted higher attendance.

C. So: ok to move room for meeting next week? Please let us know concerns

III. Proposed new constitution issues arising:

A. What happens if no one runs for executive committee, or for chair, in new constitution?

1) For UTPC, no fallback if no one runs for that committee or being alternate, but RTP working on this; so maybe follow their lead for this issue, too?

2) Revert to current practice? If we can't find candidates independently, we would select from Faculty Council. Which would put us in the place we are right now. We could even say we have to find somebody outside the Faculty Council twelve members. It's not a worse place than now, anyway.

3) What about a candidate who wants to use chairship as a vehicle to deal with a particular obsession? Others would need to run against, but would we know in time?

4) What about absence of experience, of working together previously on Faculty Council, or inability of chair and vice chair to get along?

5) Discussions as to who would run will still happen.

6) Having a separate slate for the executive committee feels like more faculty have more input. Maybe too many what-ifs here.

7) Maybe compromise of: elected faculty council, then nominations, and if there's more than one candidate, then all faculty can vote if there's a contest. At least from people already in FC

8) Could general faculty just approve or disapprove the entire slate?

9) Maybe there should be 15 on Council if the executive committee is not going to be separately elected.

B. Attendance policy: what's the fallback for someone who misses two? Do we want to think about formalizing in constitution for accountability, and what do you do if there's a reasonable excuse? There's not a spelled-out policy.

1) What about health concerns? Don't want to have to make public; maybe discussion with chair?

2) What about conflicts with Board Committee meetings? After all, the person would be representing Faculty Council, so a reasonable absence, but it would be good to make that clear.

Mark will send out an email to gather a subcommittee to develop a proposal on these issues so it can be voted on by end of year. Handbook Committee will need to weigh in also.

IV. RTP Concern:

A. A faculty member has raised the issue that while the policy for departments is that faculty evaluating tenure/promotion cases have to be at the rank of associate or full, but since the interim dean is an assistant professor, that will not be the case on COAD this year.

1) RTP wants to make a statement, but time is an issue because dossiers are due. Is this a bigger issue than RTP, maybe FC more broadly? And where does such a statement go?

2) Handbook doesn't specify rank, because presumption that everyone who is a dean is at full rank.

3) Angie asked interim dean Scott Moore his plans re: COAD, given rank issues. Scott responded he participated in 3rd year reviews in spring, that went well, and that he has been a member of the community for a long time so it's not an issue. He does plan on serving on COAD for anyone going up for tenure/promotion or promotion to full.

4) Is there anything faculty can do about this?

5) Is there an issue if UTPC membership is limited to full professors, but at administrative level it's ok not to be?

6) Precedent? Have interim deans who were associate professors recused themselves from COAD? Karen Schuele did recuse and had a full professor stand in for her until she was promoted to full. And this time, the interim dean is at assistant, not associate rank.

7) For departmental decisions, peers are bringing someone into their ranks, whereas these are deans. So maybe dean role is sufficient, if we've decided he's capable of being the dean, then that involves all functions.

8) But assistant judging people associate to full? It's a big jump. Candidates need outside letters, experts within profession, after all.

9) How to proceed, timing, and which bodies involved? The time lapse in terms of when a resolution would appear and be discussed is not fair to those going through the process right now.

10) A resolution would be both about scrutiny and about being on record, especially since the university is about to search for permanent dean. Presumably the administration will repeat the long service and dean's-role-is-different arguments as reasons why it's ok for someone at the rank of assistant professor to be on COAD.

11) Legal implications if a COAD decision is negative and one of the deciders is an assistant professor? Accreditation implications?

V. Gender and Diversity Committee: Resolution regarding sexual harassment allegations at Borromeo Seminary

A. As per newspaper articles to be sent out, there have been allegations of sexual harassment of students at Borromeo Seminary and given that we have a relationship with Borromeo where seminarians receive a JCU degree:

1) The issue needs to be surfaced and a statement needs to be made

2) Title IX training, reporting, investigating obligations need to be clarified

3) Not clear where best to go with this: general faculty meeting? FC votes on resolution? Substantive? Voice vote? Mark will put it on the agenda for the general faculty meeting next week.