

Minutes from Faculty Council Meeting, April 9, 2014 DRAFT

The Faculty Council (FC) Meeting on April 9, 2014 was held in the Mackin Room of Grasselli Library and began at 2:06 pm. The following members of FC were in attendance: , Ryan Allen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Roy Day, Chair, Jeff Dyck, Tina Facca, Simon Fitzpatrick (replacing Michael Eng who is on leave), Gerry Guest, Karen Gygli, Dwight Hahn, Vice Chair, Tom Hayes, Abdul Imam, Simran Kahai, Marc Kirschenbaum, Linda Koch, Cindy Lenox, Sheila McGinn, Michael Nichols, Secretary, David Shutkin, Elizabeth Stiles, Dianna Taylor, Mariah Webinger, Sheri Young, and Tom Zlatoper. The following FC member was absent: Thea Ford. Scott Allen is on leave and a replacement for him has not been appointed.

The meeting agenda was originally distributed electronically to all FC members and faculty via e-mail on April 8, 2014 and is included as Appendix A in these minutes. FC Chair distributed his announcements prior to the meeting and they are included in these minutes as Appendix B. The following proposals were also included: Minor and Certificate Program in Professional Healthcare Preparation (Appendix C); Major and Minor in Healthcare Information technology (Appendix D); and Interdisciplinary Program in Sports Studies. (Appendix E).

I. Chair's Announcements

These were distributed electronically prior to the meeting.

FC Chair clarified that the committee abbreviated as FFCWRP is the Committee on Finance, Financial Compensation and Work-Related Policies.

Mariah Webinger indicated that the Untenured Faculty Organization is going to lobby Matt Berg, Chair of the AVP/Provost search committee for time to meet with the candidates during their on campus interviews. Dwight Hahn reported that the Handbook Committee will not be formally meeting with candidates as well. It was pointed out that the Handbook is an important part of the AVP/Provost's job and only the Chair of the Handbook Committee and the AVP/Provost make interpretations regarding Handbook policies. FC Chair indicated that Handbook issues could be brought at the FC meeting with the candidates as a large number of the Handbook Committee members are on FC. John Day could not remember if he had met with the Chair of the Handbook Committee during his candidacy. (NOTE: The Chair of the Handbook Committee did participate in the FC meeting with the candidates.)

A. Minutes of Faculty Council Meeting held on March 26

No corrections or objections to the minutes of the March 26 FC meeting were offered so they were deemed approved.

- B. Election results
- C. Spring elections

These are outlined in the Chair's electronic announcements. David Shutkin, Chair of the Committee on Elections, indicated he would send out an e-mail to the Faculty soliciting nominations for vacant seats.

- D. Update on AVP/Provost search
- E. Update on Learning Management System Comparison Project
- F. NAC&U Ambassador position

These are outlined in the Chair's electronic announcements.

- G. Report on Provost Council meetings

No report was given.

II. Items for Business

- A. CAP reports
 - a. Minor and Certificate Program in Professional Healthcare Preparation (See Appendix C.)

Barbara D'Ambrosia made a motion to place consideration of this proposal on the agenda of the April 23 2014 General Faculty Meeting. Linda Koch seconded. There was no discussion and Barbara indicated that no one came to the open hearing. **The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.**

- b. Major and Minor in Healthcare Information Technology (See Appendix D.)

Marc Kirschenbaum made a motion to place consideration of this proposal on the agenda of the April 23 2014 General Faculty Meeting. Sheila McGinn seconded. There was no discussion on the proposal. **The motion passed unanimously.**

c. Interdisciplinary Program in Sports Studies (See Appendix E)

Barbara D'Ambrosia, Chair of CAP, indicated that this is an interdisciplinary major to be housed in the newly formed Department (as the Department of Education disaggregated) that will administer programs in Exercise Science, Physical Education (the Department has not been named).

She indicated that some changes had been made as a result of the open hearings:

- (1) The major has an experiential requirement of an internship. The previous version of the proposal required an external internship. The word external has been removed, allowing for on-campus internships.
- (2) There was a history course that was required but the faculty member teaching that course has retired so that course is no longer required.
- (3) A concern was expressed at the open hearings that the title of one of the tracks would be misinterpreted. One track called Sports Management was changed to Sports and Athletic Management. Additional requirements have been added - additional management and marketing courses. These give the students more business courses and may encourage students to pursue a minor in business.

There are external factors dealing with a donor (and his/her impatience). There is a concern that if the proposal is not approved this semester, it may lose the support of the donor, who has offered a financial gift and his/her contacts for internships.

A question was asked which marketing class was required - Marketing 301. It was stressed that this is not a business major and not housed in BSOB. There was concern about students being confused that the Sports and Athletic Management track is a business major. This is a liberal arts major that is meant for students to explore the three tracks prior to selecting one. John Day indicated that the proposal does state that sports management programs exist at other universities where students could pursue further studies in sports management.

There was considerable discussion and concern on the role of the potential donor (who was unknown at that time), the potential confusion of the Sports and Athletic Management track, and the timeline of the proposal. If FC decides to send it back to CAP, then it would not get acted upon until Fall 2014.

Linda Koch made a motion to place consideration of this proposal on the agenda of the April 23 2014 General Faculty Meeting. Barbara D'Ambrosia seconded. The motion passed with 11 for, 7 against, and 3 abstain.

Barbara indicated that she would have further discussions with Jeanne Colleran, Dean of CAS, regarding the program. It was proposed that the issue of the donor should be discussed at the General Faculty meeting and that any changes to the proposal should be offered as amendments on the floor during that discussion.

B. Proposal to create a new Faculty Council Committee on Revenue and Spending

Abdul Imam made a motion to establish a new FC Committee on Revenue and Spending.* It was seconded by Cindy Lenox.

** Secretary's Note: As outlined in Part A of the ad hoc Committee's report - Feb. 12 2014. This has been included as Appendix F of these minutes. It was subsequently amended twice and those changes are shown in Appendix F. The final approved description for the FC Committee on Revenue and Spending is included as Appendix G.*

There was considerable discussion on the proposal and included the following points:

- The ad hoc committee recommends forming this committee in part, because in doing so it may help to resolve the apathy of the Faculty in dealing with the Administration. They believe that this committee provides an avenue for all members of the University can propose ways to generate revenue and reduce "wasteful" spending. All can have a stake in budgetary matters.
- There seems to be overlapping interests with this proposed committee with the Enrollment and Compensation Committees. This proposed committee could have interactions with those and other committees.
- This committee could allow for transparency as they can ask for and obtain information from the Administration in investigating revenue and spending issues.
- It was pointed out that recently it has become difficult to staff full committees or have competitive elections. Initially, there may be a number of individuals interested in serving on this new committee, but that could change in the future. Barbara D'Ambrosia suggested that language evaluating whether there are staffing issues on the committee after a number of years be included. (Perhaps after 5-6 years.)

- There was a discussion about the length of terms and it was concluded that FC committee terms are 3 years. With new committees, terms are staggered (1, 2 and 3 years).
- A question was asked as to whether the ad hoc committee believed that the new committee would be fully staffed. Desmond Kwan indicated that at the present time, they had about 60% of the committee staffed.
- Sheila McGinn wondered whether there may be overlap with the compensation committee duties. Marc Kirschenbaum indicated that there was not sufficient time for the Compensation Committee to study and address spending issues.
- Liz Stiles suggested that since there are faculty that are energetic and creative and may propose new ideas for revenue and spending establishing this committee would be a positive.
- Roy Day suggested that this committee may present an additional bureaucratic hurdle to new initiatives. He used Part B of Dr. Kwan's original proposal as an example where a group of faculty have been able to gain some administrative support for that proposal. He also indicated that anyone can send a proposal to the Chair of FC and if necessary, an ad hoc committee can be formed to investigate the proposal. Paul Challen responded that while anyone can currently submit a proposal to FC on revenue and spending, how many times has that been done recently? If it hasn't been done, then perhaps faculty are apprehensive about bringing up revenue and spending issues because they are powerless to affect change. If a committee is established, then there will be a formal process to communicate between this committee, the Administration and the stakeholders in the University. Paul indicated that he did not see the committee as a gatekeeper but as a pump (to bring ideas forward) and a filter (to prioritize ideas before bringing them to FC). Sheila proposed that having a standing committee might streamline the process if proposals on revenue/spending were brought to FC.
- Barbara asked if the committee needed to be as large as proposed. Could it be smaller, with at large membership. Individuals that bring proposals to the committee could then play a part in the process. Abdul indicated support for a smaller committee and said that the initial structure of the committee was to be as inclusive as possible.
- John Day indicated that he believed that the University has a number of governance challenges that should be addressed. Some mechanisms of governance are working well and others could use improvement. The AVP/Provost has responsibility for two areas. The first is the University Planning Group, which he believes has been largely successful (and these will be outlined in the upcoming Town Hall on April 30). The second is the University Budget

Committee, which he believes has been less successful. He indicated that he hopes the new Executive Assistant for the President, Jerry DeSanto, who has experience at another institution can help the process become more successful. He also indicated that it was unclear to him who in the Administration the committee would communicate with, as outlined in Section 2.a.1 of the proposal. Official lines of communication already exist with the UBC and UPG for strategic decisions on revenue and spending and he indicated there may be some role for some place in faculty governance to play a role but this proposed committee does not have any administrator on the committee to facilitate this. He also indicated that communication between the Compensation and Enrollment Committees could be better. He noted that he didn't see how the existence of this committee is going to address University challenges in the area of finance.

- Sheri Young pointed out that the Compensation Committee is the model for a committee that the University, initially, did not see as being necessary. However, once formed it had an impact and was able to marshal the energies of the Faculty. She also indicated that members of the Compensation Committee are contacted by individual faculty about an issue that they would like the Compensation Committee to take up on behalf of faculty.
- Marc asked John if the communication between the proposed committee outlined in Section 2.a.1 could be established with the UBC. John indicated that it could but that even then, the communication felt cumbersome and repetitive. John also pointed out that at some point, a proposal must make its way to a group with representation from multiple areas of the University (UBC, UPC, Provost Council, etc.) (An example was given about whether block-scheduling students in NSO would provide a cost savings. This idea originated in informal FC discussions at the Feb 12 2014 meeting, that did not have a quorum. It was then taken to the Provost Council by FC Chair.)
- Roy indicated that any proposals out of the proposed committee would need to end up in the UBC.

Barbara D'Ambrosia offered a motion to amend the proposal and add the statement: "Five years after the formation of this committee, FC will evaluate the efficacy of and faculty interest in the committee, and determine whether the committee should be modified." The motion was seconded.

In the discussion that followed, Dwight Hahn spoke against the motion, stating that FC has the power to review any committee at any time. Barbara responded that FC could review this committee before five year time frame but that the review would

be built in to its creation. Liz suggested that perhaps automatic reviews of all committees should be considered. Roy suggested that could be proposed in next fall's FC meetings.

The motion passed by a vote of 10 for, 7 against, and 3 abstain.

Dwight Hahn made a motion to change the composition of the committee to: a Chair, who must be a FC member, and three at-large members. It was seconded by Sheila McGinn.

In the discussion that followed, a statement was made against the motion; administrators have made comments that they do not place much weight on the opinions of committees that are made of small numbers of members. Those administrators feel that a small number of faculty may not represent the entire faculty. A counter argument was made; some administrators already have that opinion of some FC committees, regardless of their size and composition.

The motion passed by a vote of 16 for, 0 against, and 3 abstain.

A vote was then held on the amended motion to establish a FC Committee on Revenue and Spending. It passed by a vote of 15 for, 0 against, and 4 abstain.

No additional business was conducted and the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 pm.

Submitted by Michael A. Nichols, Secretary, April 27, 2014. Approved XX XX, XX.