Faculty Council - Minutes of September 12, 2018

Location: 320 TL (Library Director’s Conference Room)

Present: Emily Newberry (Chair), James Schirmer (Secretary/Chair-Elect), Ricardo Alfaro (Past Chair), Mickey Doyle, Suzanne Selig, DJ Trela, Aviva Dorfman, Adam Lutzker, Sy Banerjee, Judy Haefner

Absent: Cathy Miller, Marilyn McFarland

Meeting brought into session at 9:06am

Minutes of June 27 approved with minor corrections

Chair updates
E. Newberry provided an update on issues of campus authority and regental bylaws. Following numerous inquiries to the Office of General Counsel, OGC determined that these are not issues on which they will be able to provide any opinion. However, E. Newberry noted that the April 23 SACUA meeting was more helpful and potentially signals a better working relationship.

E. Newberry also met with Interim Provost Susan Alcock and discussed the work of Faculty Council. According to E. Newberry, S. Alcock has a classic academic perspective and is interested in campus governance and faculty involvement in decision-making.

There is no news on the chancellor’s reappointment, about which much speculation exists. E. Newberry suggested council members attend the Regents’ meeting on campus scheduled for Thursday, October 18, 2018.

Faculty Council meeting dates
Faculty Council established meeting dates for the 2018-19 academic year.
October 10 & 24
November 7
December 5 & 19
January 9 & 23
February 6 & 20
March 13 & 27
April 10 & 24
All meetings will begin at 9am in 320 Thompson Library. Meeting dates may be added or cancelled as needed. E. Newberry’s term as chair ends April 24 and new council members begin in May. There is a need to schedule a joint meeting with new and old members.

**Campus issues**

E. Newberry also observed that, at a Council of Deans meeting, the provost showed interested in problem-solving on campus and offered a range of topics targeted for discussion, including internationalized and global studies, graduate student housing, enrollment and recruitment, advising and advancement, equity in budgeting, diversity support, and community perspectives. A. Dorfman suggested more mindful scheduling as an additional topic, given that some recent open calls have been on major holidays.

Faculty Council then discussed faculty morale and frustration as related to the academic calendar, the “murky approval” of recent unit-specific changes, and apparent preferential treatment of publicizing new academic programs. R. Alfaro asked which version of the academic calendar was submitted and approved. E. Newberry replied that AAAC doesn’t know. S. Selig noted that if faculty knew of the options available for promoting new/revised courses and programs, all could benefit.

**SOM update**

S. Banerjee shared that SOM expected to hear about the reappointment of their dean, but received nothing over the summer. SOM faculty later learned that the regents had in fact approved a three-year appointment, but that no terms or conditions are presently known. This matter will be taken up with Interim Provost S. Alcock as there are concerns with the reappointment process and the lack of communication. A. Lutzker noted that for faculty to be learning about administrative moves from regents’ updates alone is a shocking development. S. Banerjee also shared that SOM has lost 30% of its in-seat headcount and that while there has been online growth to compensate, there are also faculty governance implications and that this should also be raised with the provost.

**Committee work and expectations**

E. Newberry noted that there are other issues as well, including faculty recruitment for and involvement with unit and university committees. Such work is made more difficult if committees themselves are not valued by university administration. R. Alfaro suggested a lack of faculty involvement with strategic planning, that the process is more idealistic than realistic. J. Haefner raised a question about practicality and the
potential of fulfilling the university strategic plan. R. Alfaro raised a question about consultancy and the absence of concrete results. E. Newberry raised a question about accountability and who is responsible for whatever work might follow implementation of the strategic plan itself. S. Selig related the university strategic plan to the upcoming HLC reaccreditation process, how every reviewer will be looking at the strategic plan and its implementation. DJ Trela said that CAC/BSP has had little to no involvement or discussion of strategic planning, but that the chancellor attended a recent meeting and made a reference to strategic planning, which will be a standing agenda item for that committee this year. E. Newberry stressed that CAC/BSP should provide regular minutes.

Climate study
E. Newberry also stated the importance of revisiting the campus climate study, that Faculty Council look ahead to new strategies for university committees gathering information and reporting out. R. Alfaro concurred that now is the time to start a new conversation on the campus climate study. E. Newberry noted that plenty of issues in the study are deserving of attention. S. Selig suggested that, to reengage faculty, it might be helpful to communicate the major issues raised by the campus climate study. A. Lutzker offered the possibility of other stakeholders’ responses, including HR and the chancellor’s cabinet. E. Newberry will contact HR Director Beth Manning about HR’s audit report and also inquire about the status of SPG 201.96, which should be brought to governing faculty for endorsement (at some point).

Governing faculty meeting dates
Faculty Council then discussed dates for governing faculty meetings, deciding against a September 28th meeting as all may need more time for procedural activities and substantive updates from standing committees. Faculty Council established the following dates for governing faculty meetings:

- October 19, 1-3pm
- November 30, 1-3pm
- February 15, 1-3pm
- April 12, 1-3pm

Potential reports/visitors
E. Newberry suggested a November or December report from the university’s senate assembly representatives (Mihai Burzo, Greg Laurence, Sarah Lippert) and asked if there are other parties from which Faculty Council might like to hear. R. Alfaro suggested a possible report from VC for Enrollment Management Kristi Hottenstein.
A. Lutzker suggested visits from the chancellor and VC for Business and Finance Mike Hague. E. Newberry noted that Faculty Council leadership met with the chancellor last fall. S. Banerjee asked about the possibility of an outside observer taking minutes for the chancellor’s visit, given disagreement over records of prior conversations. DJ Trela, while understanding the motivation, disagreed. S. Selig noted that there are ways to avoid antagonism, by restating at the meeting’s end what’s been recorded and by behaving in a way that Faculty Council hopes the chancellor will behave, and that, with the interim provost, we have an opportunity to rebuild trust and understanding of faculty governance. E. Newberry said that no meeting with the chancellor has been set yet, but that there is a 30-minute standing date with the provost and that the chancellor has a standing invitation with Faculty Council. J. Haefner observed that there is potential for less hostility now. E. Newberry expressed a desire to start fresh if we can.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20am