MINUTES OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, September 2, 2015, 3:30pm || Suite 1600 Student Union

AGENDA

1. Chair Caldwell called the meeting to order at 3:31pm.

2. Introduction

3. Roll Call

Attendance
ASFC Present: Liz Roth (ART), John Kinder (HIST), Kimberly Loeffert (MUSI), Lloyd Caldwell (TH), Allen Finchum (GEOG), Ramesh Kaipa (CDIS), Doug Heisterkamp (CS), Lori McKinnon (SMSC), Andy Fullerton (SOC), Jennifer Shaw (ZOOL), David Meinke (BOT), Lynn Lewis (ENGL), Jay Gregg (GEOL), Leticia Barchini (MATH), Gil Summy (PHYS), Ed Burkley (PSYC), Lan Zhu (STAT), Erik Ekman (FLL), Kim Burnham (MIRC), Apple Igrek (PHIL)

ASFC Absent: Barry Lavine (CHEM), Stephen Nemeth (POLS)

Administration Present: Dean Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean Bruce Crauder

4. Approval of the Minutes of the August 2015 Meeting. Motion to accept the minutes by Jennifer Shaw. Seconded by Liz Roth.

5. Approval of the Agenda.

6. Election of the Curriculum Committee Chair – postponed until later in the meeting to accommodate Associate Dean Wikle.
   a. Assoc. Dean Wikle Presentation
      i. Wikle: Curriculum committee chair is comprised of members of the A&S Faculty Council and additional A&S faculty and students. The committee is comprised of 2/3 faculty and 1/3 students. The committee is charged with serving as the Dean’s first eyes on the review of new courses, changes to courses in terms of number of hours/prerequisites/description, new programs/minors/degrees. This is the only time that faculty and students outside of the department have an opportunity to weigh in on curriculum in the college. They always appreciate having a chair who has been on the committee before because the additional insight is very helpful. Amy Martindale and Tom Wikle serve as ex officio members who do not vote. Sometimes committee takes on difficult tasks, such as proposal to change college requirements. There are no standing operating rules – these are formed as committee members see fit. An open forum can sometimes be used to attempt to obtain input from the faculty.
Sometimes the issues can be contentious, but are not generally. The workload is imbalanced between the two semesters. Most of the work is in the fall, and the workload is light in the spring semester. Departments are represented on a rotational basis.

ii. Caldwell: Does the committee chair need to be an associate or full professor?

iii. Wikle: There are no rules as far as Wikle knows regarding rank. (Caldwell indicates that Assistant Professors are working towards tenure and the serving as the chair of such an important committee may not be in their best interest). Tom Wikle and Amy Martindale do the “dirty work” – not the chair. Faculty members recuse themselves from decisions in their own departments.

iv. Caldwell: The ASFC needs a volunteer to chair the curriculum committee.
   1. Since there are no volunteers for this committee, the ASFC will draw numbers out of a hat that includes assistant professors.

v. David Meinke question: Isn’t helpful for the chair to have been a former member of the committee?

vi. Caldwell: It would be helpful if a previous member of the committee would step forward. [John Kinder is the only previous member of the curriculum committee].

vii. Kinder indicated that he volunteered to serve on the space allocation committee during the previous meeting.

viii. Gil Summy mixes the hat numbers. Leticia draws number 8, which is her own number.

ix. Caldwell: Thank you to Leticia for volunteering to chair the college curriculum committee.

7. Old Business
      i. This document integrates the changes suggested by the council at the previous meeting.
      ii. Liz Roth question: The Art Department codified a rule that a faculty member may not vote on a candidate unless s/he attended the presentation. Would this document supersede such a rule?
         1. Dean Crauder: Yes, the Dean would want input from all possible sources.
      iii. Lynn Lewis question: The returning officer will also distribute non-ballot input sheets to students – which students? Majors? Is there a distinction between undergraduate and graduate students?
         1. Caldwell: This should be clarified.
         2. Roth: Departmental students? Or leave as “students” and leave it up to the department?
         3. Gregg: Perhaps the selection should come from declared majors, upper division and graduate students. Could this be left up to the department?
4. Erik Ekman: Would be loath to waste undergraduates’ time with this. The undergraduate students would likely not have a strong opinion on this issue nor be prepared to provide insightful information for the decision-making process.

iv. Jay Gregg question: what was the old process like?
   1. Dean Danilowicz: Previously the sitting head has the first right of refusal.

   1. Dean Danilowicz: It depends on the department. The department would have to decide that. Nationally, more faculty members get voting rights because 67% of credit hours are taught by adjunct/part-time faculty in American universities.
   2. Liz Roth: “Faculty” in the language allows each department to determine.
   3. Dean Crauder: Traditionally, departments have decided who attends faculty meetings.
   4. Allen Finchum: It’s still an advisory vote. The Dean can appoint who he wants.
   5. Lori McKinnon: The Dean is requesting as much advisory information as possible.

vi. Jay Gregg: Doesn’t the department head serve at the Dean’s pleasure?
   1. Danilowicz: Yes, according to the contracts.

vii. Caldwell reads sentence as it is and the change: The returning officer will also distribute non-ballot input sheets to “departmental” students and staff.
   1. 4 options
      a. as is – 6 hands
      b. “departmental” – 12 hands = majority = passes
      c. “junior and senior declared majors, graduate students, and departmental staff” – 0 hands
      d. replace the word “will” with “may” – NO unanimously

viii. David Meinke: It appears that there is no requirement by an internal candidate to submit anything in writing. That’s odd.
   1. Dean Danilowicz: In the current process, I ask heads seeking reappointment to provide a written vision statement including goals they would like to achieve during their next term. This statement is distributed among the faculty.
   2. Caldwell: Asks Danilowicz to work out verbiage for this.

ix. Meinke: Has anyone been in a department where a sitting head is running against an internal candidate? What were the problems?
   1. Roth: The process was awkward but was resolved.
   2. Caldwell: A previous situation in the Music Department was a bloody mess.
x. Meinke: Would there be merit on seeking input on this proposal from current heads?
   1. Caldwell: Yes, because it is part of their process. My personal opinion.
   2. Gregg: The whole thing seems cumbersome, but I can see why you would want to have a written procedure. In my experience, nobody wants to be a chair or a head. This is usually not a contentious issue.
   3. Finchum: A lot of this stems from situations when there were people who wanted to run against sitting heads but there was no mechanism.
   4. Roth: The chairs serve at the pleasure of the Dean. Other mechanisms in which they can or cannot be reappointed are really irrelevant in a sense.

xi. Caldwell: Can we redraft as proposed?

xii. Movement to table this pending redrafting (vision statement and “departmental”) –
   1. Danilowicz: If this is adopted by the next meeting, there is time to implement it this year, but there is not time to take it to the heads for feedback. There are ten possible reappointments and two head searches this year.
   2. Caldwell: Ballots online are possible.

xiii. “Following the 10-day working period…” after the seventh sentence.
   “Each candidate will present a vision statement and current vitae to the Dean, faculty, and staff.” Motion to approve: Liz Roth. Seconded Gregg. Motion approved.

b. Upcoming vote on changes to the College RPT document and the College Strategic Plan
   i. Vote will be completed by 5:00 p.m. on the 9th of September. Please tell faculty members.

8. New Business
   a. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Classes (Councilors Barchini, Fullerton, Lewis)
      i. Conclusions: administration and monitoring suggestions:
         1. Proposals for new online courses should be evaluated by the departmental and curriculum committees following the existing guidelines for the evaluation of new courses. Each course should have a significant final examination appropriately monitoring for an online environment.
         2. Existing university document is thorough.
         3. Recommendation is that it is not necessary for a standing committee to be established by this body. The current system is exhaustive.
         4. Lewis: ITLE is working on documents for these issues.
         5. More discussion is needed – Roth; I am not sure whether we should use the ITLE guidelines at this time as the documents are not completed.
a. Leticia: We saw the latest versions. There is talk about examinations and a lot of supporting ideas on how to do your best and best practices. It will be up for full faculty vote/consideration.

b. Lewis: We don’t have the official document because it is going to the university curriculum committee.

6. Caldwell: Do we adopt the recommendation from the committee? There is merit of taking this up once ITLE is complete.

7. Motion to adopt that there will be no standing committee from this body created today. Motion to approve by Shaw, seconded by McKinnon. Motion approved.

9. Dean’s Report (Bret Danilowicz)
   a. Feedback on Town Halls and College Convocation
      i. With respect to RPT document, the two town hall meetings were lightly attended, but we received some feedback and made small changes.
      ii. Was this process workable? What else should be happening at the college level?
         1. Leticia: There was strong language about not asking about feedback from collaborators.
         2. Danilowicz: That was changed as a result of the town hall meetings. Please bring information from department meetings about any suggested changes to this process back to A&S council in the future.
      iii. Barry Lavine will chair that committee again, and they will discuss how to review clinical faculty. We will go through this process again. So we are trying to make adjustments now.
   b. Feedback on Dean’s Office staff /Service Evaluation
      i. There is an imperfect process in evaluating the Dean’s office. When do you want to opportunity to review the Dean’s office? When this goes out in March, the response is very low (7-8 responses last year). Is there a better time to send this out than in March?
         1. Roth: January?
         2. Shaw: End of November?
         3. McKinnon: February?
         4. Danilowicz: Should we try sending this out to faculty February 1, due at the end of February with reminders in between? This is your chance to provide feedback.
         5. Meinke: My take may be that the date may be less important than the feeling that taking the time to submit a response will make a difference. Could you explain during the evaluation process how the response information would be used?
         6. Shaw: Also providing a brief description of the different roles in the Dean’s office could help make this process more clear.
      ii. Danilowicz: We will try it this way this year and assess whether or not this is the right approach.
10. Announcements
   a. Caldwell: Everyone here is distinguished. Yesterday, several members received awards at yesterday’s convocation: John Kinder, and Jeff Loeffert. Leticia Barchini also received a service pin.

11. Adjournment Finchum moves, Roth seconds. Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.