1. Chair Finchum called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.

2. Roll Call

   Attendance
   ASFC Present: Isabel Alvarez-Sancho (FLL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Lee Brasuell (TH), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Babu Fathepure (MICR), Allen Finchum (GEOG), John Gelder (CHEM), Emily Graham (HIST), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Bin Liang (SOC), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jeffrey Loeffert (MUSI), David Meinke (PBEE), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Stephen Nemeth (POLS), Peter Richtsmeier (CDIS), Jennifer Shaw (IBIO), Mark Sisson (ART), Gil Summy (PHYS), Lan Zhu (STAT)
   
   ASFC Absent: Jay Gregg (GEOL), Apple Igrek (PHIL)

   Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

3. Approval of the Minutes
   a. Motion to approve by Barchini. Seconded by Brasuell. Minutes approved.

4. Approval of the Agenda
   a. Motion to approve by Liang, seconded by Shaw. Agenda unanimously approved.

5. Standing Committee Reports


7. New Business
   a. Issues Concerning College Allocation Policies
      i. Dean Danilowicz: Dean provided background information and explained that the draft policy aims to set up principles and facilitate the procedure for discussion to allocate space, and mentioned that similar policies have been adopted by some other universities. Dean will pass this draft to department heads, would like to see discussion at two different levels (department heads and regular faculty) to bring in different perspectives and would like to have a final draft by December to vote on. Larry Mullins chaired the committee to draft this policy, and Dean encouraged contact with Mullins for detailed background information and questions.
      ii. Shaw: asked about who served on the committee which drafted this policy? Dean provided information about committee members, including Larry Mullins (Chair, Associate Dean, Psychology), Gil Summy (Physics), Stephen Nemeth (Political Science), Estella Atekwana (Head, Geology), John Kinder (History/American Studies), Charlie Smades (A&S Facilities Staff) and Ritch Frohock (Head, English)
iii. Meinke: This policy is potentially sensitive, and there are cases where administrative space grew, not lab and teaching spaces. Dean echoed the concern and explained that it will be an annual request from each department (e.g., additional space, change of space use). Proposals at the department level will go through the proposed Committee per this new policy, and the future Committee would have a role to play in dealing with such issues.

iv. Liang: asked about the timeline of the policy. Dean: confirmed the December timeline and mentioned that there are some requests already, and would like to move this forward so that these requests can be taken care of in Spring 2017.

v. Nemeth: asked if we could share this draft policy with colleagues? Dean encouraged council members to share with other colleagues and bring back feedback (comments, questions, concerns).

vi. Chair Finchum: please share with all colleagues, collect and bring back feedback by the next meeting, and we will revisit this issue as old business.

b. Issues Concerning Foreign Language Requirements for BA Degree (9 or 12 hour requirement?)
   i. Heisterkamp: the Curriculum, General Education and Extension Committee is going to meet next week to discuss on this issue.
   ii. Alvarez-Sancho: provided some background information (BS vs. BA degrees), explained the difference between 9-credit hour (novice level) and 12-credit hour (intermediate level) requirements for the BA degree, pointed out that all except one Big 12 peers institutions required 12 or more (the average is 14 hours), and emphasized that if we decide to go with the 9-hour requirement, it would put us at the bottom (in ranking).
   iii. Lewis: how many hours are required for the Phi Beta Kappa? Two-year requirement (12 hours) for the Phi Beta Kapp;
   iv. Graham: 12-hour requirement would be equivalent to an intermediate level for students, and it would be helpful for study abroad and/or graduate programs;
   v. Barchini: also favored the 12-hour requirement and it would be valuable to our students;
   vi. Dean: from the feedback collected (from 14 departments, feedback interpreted and reported by department heads), the majority favored the 9-hour requirement which would allow more flexibility for students, and the question is whether we should require the 12 hours to separate the BA degree more from the BS degree. Personally, Dean favors the 12-hour requirement. However, Dean would support whatever decision reached by the Curriculum Committee (which received all departmental level feedback).
   vii. Chair Finchum: the 12-hour requirement would be beneficial to some majors down the road;

c. Issues Concerning Future Budget (Cut)
   i. Dean Danilowicz: explained the budget deficit situation. The legislature provided one-time funding to meet budget shortfalls ($700 million) last year (2015), but this is no longer available. There is a revenue failure (midyear cut 4%) and another 5% cut forward (for year 2018), a total of 9% at the College level.
   ii. Barchini, Meinke, and Liang asked for more questions on these numbers. Dean: In the 2015-1016 academic year, there was a 12% budget cut to the University from the State. Despite tuition and fee increases (7%), the College still realized a 5% cut. The College is preemptively preparing a 9% ($3.3 million) budget cut/reduction. Unlike last year when each department was asked to provide its plan for budget cut, it would be difficult to ask every department to plan the 9% budget cut universally.
   iii. Dean Danilowicz: based on input from a Department Head Retreat, Dean prepared, distributed, and explained a list of options for potential budget reduction, and encouraged council members to share with other colleagues and bring back feedback after internal discussions.
   iv. Barchini, Gelder, Meinke and Fathepure made further inquiries about the proposed budget reduction plans (e.g., maintenance costs, whether cuts would be one-time cut or permanent). Dean: maintenance cost (e.g., decorations) is a very tiny share. The biggest
shares are faculty salaries and benefits, GTAs, and administration costs. Eliminating summer face-to-face teaching was mentioned as an example (saving $900,000). It is possible to restore items being cut if the budget situation improves. But there is no automatic restoration of cut items. Better budget/more money in the future will be utilized to help the College where it needs the most, not to automatically restore cut items.

v. Gelder, Lewis, Meike, Fathepure, and Sisson commented and questioned the impact of the budget cut on students (e.g., potential, more tuition increase) and adverse political environment against Higher Education, and suggested ways to ameliorate communications with the community (e.g., educate parents). Dean: The political environment surrounding Higher Education is not good, and some groups (e.g., OCPD) are actively lobbying the legislature against state funding for Higher Education. Dean and the College proactively reached out to The O’Collegian to disseminate information about the budget reductions to avoid rumors and misinterpretations.

vi. Lewis inquired about the early retirement plan possibility and departmental level budget planning flexibility. Dean: There is discussion about the early retirement plan at the University level, but the College has no control over it. Compared to last year, there is less flexibility for each department because of the bigger cut. Instead of asking each department to give back money, another option for some departments is to increase seats (in classroom) for no budget increase, which would be equivalent to budget cut.

vii. Shaw, Barchini, Graham, McKinnon, Loeffert, Alvarez-Sancho, and Meike made further inquiries and comments about the budget reduction planning (e.g., budget cut discussion at other levels, estimate numbers for each projected cut item, timeline, how to communicate at different levels, potential impact on departments). Dean: A&S is doing this planning early (ahead of many other colleges). Dean and the College are working on the estimate numbers and hope to bring more information to the next meeting. Dean explained how the midyear 4% cut would be taken care of (mainly via the carry-over cash money from last year), and therefore it won’t affect the department immediately. Departments will have some leeway/flexibility to deal with cuts, but less so compared to last year. Dean encouraged internal discussions at different levels (among colleagues, departmental meetings, A&S Faculty Council meetings) and would like to have the feedback in by November so that decisions can be made at the College level in December.

viii. Gelder: to whom to turn if any questions about the list (e.g., term clarifications)? Dean: bring questions to Finchum and feel to contact Dean as well.

ix. Chair Finchum: we will form an ad-hoc committee to take on this issue. Dean emphasized on broad and balanced representation of this ad-hoc committee. Dean also emphasized that the distributed handout is for discussions only (not implementation).

8. Dean’s Report
   a. Dean Danilowicz: Despite the recent revision of the RPT document (two years ago), the section on clinical faculty still needs to be revisited and revised.
   b. Dean Danilowicz: with regard to Faculty Council Awards, there has been complaint about the lack of feedback for non-winners/nominees (e.g., no notification). Dean is happy to implement future changes.

9. Announcements
   a. Chair Finchum announced that the A&S Faculty Council website has been updated and all materials will be updated promptly.

10. Adjournment