

CAS Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
November 20, 2019
4:00 pm HCC 111

In attendance: Drew Delaney, Jackie Gallagher (secretary), Helen Housley, Larry Lehman, Miriam Liss, Laura Mentore (Vice President), Sarah Morealli, Angela Pitts (President), Gregg Stull. Visiting: Anand Rao.

I. Review and Approve:

- a. Minutes of Sept. 19, 2019 meeting APPROVED
- b. Minutes of CAS Curriculum Committee: This committee is scheduled to meet next Monday, Nov 25, before the UFC meeting on Weds; we plan for expedited review by email.

II. Reports: none

III. Old Business

A. Working Group on Faculty Governance: Recommendations for stream-lining faculty governance for discussion.

The group presented a document with four distinct ideas:

1a. Establish one Gen Ed Committee that handles all business of general education, including approving intensive designations. This includes all areas considered general education. CourseLeaf seems to support this approach. Make directors of WI/SI/CE/FSEM ex officio on the Gen Ed Committee.

1b. Eliminate college-level curriculum committees, so that the University Curriculum Committee (with representation from all 3 colleges) handles all the curricular business of the university faculty. To further streamline, the business of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee would be rolled into the University Curriculum Committee, and Honors course designations would be handled by the UCC.

These ideas were generally well-received; proposals would go directly from the proposer to one committee and then the UFC. The council tried to think through problems, reasons for more checks than just the UFC. Do departments approve curricular changes as a whole, or as individuals? Who is aware of resource needs and usage, or potential costs of a change? Could the dean and chairs encourage departments to review their needs? In their own meetings, CAS Chairs are moving toward some parallel role with the UFC so that CAS Chairs as a body have a formal interaction with the UFC. Chairs could discuss curricular changes with one another before those change reach the UFC, making college-level curricular committees unnecessary.

2. Empower University Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Awards to advise/award all associated grants, fellowships, and awards for the three colleges to eliminate the need for college-level grants committees (as currently exists in CAS).

The CAS Faculty Development and Grants Committee is appointed; doe COE and COB have similar committees/funding sources? How would faculty feel about having someone in another college evaluate their research and funding requests? The council feels it would be good to do away with an appointed committee. Perhaps the size of the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Awards committee should be enlarged, and made to include divisional representation; and/or sub-groups

could work on each type of award. Or is timing such that the whole committee can do all the work? One of the positive arguments is that while committee workload would be high, one would only have to serve on one committee. How many faculty really serve on more than one committee?

The working group did not discuss details like number of people on a committee, but rather concentrated on overarching structure. Will the administration argue for or against having appointed vs. elected committees? Do they feel that they have more control over the outcome when a committee is appointed? The council wants to increase transparency and streamline governance – there are ALWAYS more new committees being created (e.g. campus environment just suggested two new committees). With a more streamlined governance, we'd have more flexibility to respond to changes.

3. Rein in the proliferation of advisory committees. Should the directors of Centers answer to faculty committees? Do they need the advice of formal committees? Or could all faculty see themselves as advisors and offer input as they feel inclined or should directors of these areas seek faculty input when needed? Eliminate advisory committees—Teaching Center Advisory, James Farmer Multicultural Center, Honors, Community Engagement, Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory.

- Discussion about the role of a faculty advisory committee before and after a Director is formally appointed to a center (e.g. CE Advisory was really important before a director was appointed – but now members feel superfluous; meetings are just reports; the director can reach out when needed, anyone can put in advice when they feel like it). Is this true across the board? Maybe an argument in favor of keeping an advisory committee when someone is new in director position, or only calls on friends for advice and *should* have external input.
- Could all directors meet and be each other's advisory committee? Can we keep only those that are really needed? But how would we know, for all time?
- UFC can dissolve advisory committees. Perhaps we recommend that advisory committees within academic affairs should be eliminated – and they can argue for reinstatement.
- Advisory committees that interact with non-faculty might be more important. Faculty should decide. Other committees work with students - supervise and overview projects, examine applications. These ought not be eliminated.

Our goal is to streamline not to amputate! Is a committee useful, can members argue for validity?

How to proceed? Start broad discussion; move forward if majority is on board?

4. Eliminate the CAS Faculty Council, since deliberation of issues relevant to faculty responsibilities and welfare may be properly taken up by the UFC.

- Discussion about the role & duties of CAS FC
- We could meet less frequently, or only as necessary, so that we can still react when a problem arises. All are members of UFC; we could still appoint a chair, so that a faculty member can reach out and the chair has the potential to call a meeting. Are we afraid of

losing our power or advocacy? Perhaps a new default could be no meetings – unless a member says we should meet.

- We could be a caucus within UFC, a collective. A caucus is more flexible than a council – has shared interests, but is less formal.
- Further discussion about the role of CAS FC, Department Chairs, other colleges and structure of UFC.
- Wonder what CAS Curriculum Committee thinks?
- We will submit recommended changes to UFC to see what others say, hopefully to open a discussion, which will ideally be university-wide.

B. Working Group on Revising Appendix F: verbal report on progress

- This is written up in a google doc that is still being worked on; the working group has made good progress.

C. Working Group on Electronic Meetings: verbal report on progress

- CAS FC will hold its next meeting by Zoom.
- Anand reports that UFC will discuss purchase of institutional licenses for Adobe Pro and Zoom in December.
- There is some concern about how faculty are encouraged to create online courses that require closed captioning and electronic meetings with students, but there is not enough funding to purchase software that would make these things possible. Promotion & Tenure has moved to a PDF system – having Adobe Pro seems vital.
- Anand pointed out that Skype for Business is part of the Office 365 system, which is already paid for.
- The Working Group continues to consider how to implement electronic faculty committee meetings, in particular.

IV. New Business:

Our next meeting is Dec 2 according to the Provost Calendar – we are holding this meeting time in case of questions arising from CAS CC. Otherwise, we plan to meet electronically on January 22 at 4pm.

Moved to adjourn at 5.07pm