College of Health and Human Services

Faculty Council

Minutes

February 5, 2016

11:00-12:30pm, ET-235

In Attendance: Dina Perrone (CCJEM), Roudi Roy (FCS), Sandhya Shimoga (HCA), Fiona Gorman (HSC), Tiffanye Vargas (KIN), Natalie Cheffer (NRSG), George Beneck (PT), Adam Butz (PPA), Keith Fulthorp (REC), Yolanda Green (SW), Pei-Fang Hung (SLP), Terry Robertson (CHHS)

Absent: Christine Scott-Hayward (CCJEM), Jennifer Ostergren (CHHS)

I. The meeting was called to order at 11:06 am
II. Approval of the agenda
    a. Added IV. Announcements on grade appeals
    b. Added section b. Dean's Search Candidate Questions under VI. New Business
    c. The agenda was approved
        i. Passes: Unanimous
III. Approval of the minutes
    a. The Minutes from the Faculty Council Meeting on December 4, 2015 were approved
        i. Passes: 9 yes, 2 abstentions
IV. Announcements
    a. A memo was written by the CHHS level Grade Appeals Committee reminding faculty of steps they can take to help avoid grade appeals
    b. If there are issues regarding protected statuses, you must contact the Office of Equity and Diversity
    c. The memo reminds faculty to cover themselves in writing
    d. Dina will email the Memo to be sent out to Faculty Council for reference
    e. Natalie will send out confirmation on moving the April Faculty Council meeting, as the original was scheduled during Spring Break
V. Old Business
    a. RTP Section 3.62
        i. Dr. Robertson came back with some questions from Mark Wiley (Faculty Affairs) on the rewrite of the RTP language
        ii. Language was confusing on the re-election/terms served between terms
            1. The discussion centered on clearing up the language
                a. "After serving four consecutive years, an individual is ineligible to serve the following year"
                b. Does this include serving as an alternate?

2. The language was changed to "Members shall not serve more than two consecutive two-year terms (i.e. more than four consecutive years). After serving four consecutive years in any capacity (e.g. alternate), an individual is ineligible to serve the following year in any capacity."

iii. Concerns about the Department Chairs serving on the RTP Committee

1. Administrators are concerned about the limited pool of Full Professors, and that eliminating Chairs automatically narrows the pool
2. The discussion revolved around how to include Chairs but keep the integrity of the different levels of the RTP committee
3. It was proposed that they change the language to reflect that Chairs can't serve on review for their own faculty at the college level RTP
4. The Chair's letter creates more concerns, as they are exerting some level of influence on more than one level of RTP
   a. Should or shouldn't the chair write a letter of support for candidate being considered if they also serve on the RTP committee
   b. Also concerns that if the Chair doesn't write a recommendation letter for the faculty up for review, that reflects poorly on the faculty member
5. It was decided that the concern is more about any one person serving on two levels of the RTP Committee, not just Chairs
6. After multiple adjustments to section (E), the language was changed to "The RTP candidate cannot be reviewed by the same faculty member at more than one review level (e.g. Department, Department Chair, College)."

iv. Faculty Affairs stated that the Dean cannot appoint someone to the RTP Committee, so that proposed section was deleted

v. **The changes to the *College of Health and Human Services Procedures Manual for Committees/Councils, Section 3.6.2 Membership* were approved**
   1. **Passes: Unanimous**

b. Academic Senate Representation Task Force (Fiona, Natalie, Grace)

i. This task force researched information regarding the accuracy of data, elections, and other colleges' processes

ii. Three departments do not have any representation at the Academic Senate (KIN, NRSG, HSC)

iii. Tiffanye reported on the Chair's thoughts on the idea of Academic Senate representation as discussed during the Chair's Meeting, and they were split on how to approach the problem

1. The Chair's discussed how to create an election that allows for the possibility of equal representation but also allows for whatever would naturally happen if equal representation is not feasible

iv. The Faculty Council should also come up with ideas and suggestions for equality and for flexibility

VI. New Business

a. The Lottery procedure
    i. There was a discussion on the current procedure, what happened last year, and what can be done to make the process better
        1. There was limited funding last year because the top proposals requested high dollar amounts
        2. The idea of a percentage cap was discussed but not decided on
        3. Should we consider additional money if the proposal is collaborative
        4. We should ask if any proposals have alternate funding options
        5. Possible to split costs of funding across two funding types
        6. All proposals need to go through the Department Chair first
    ii. Questions that were added to the Lottery Proposal Form
        1. Sources of alternate funding
        2. Collaborative proposals – list departments
        3. Chairs' signature line
    iii. The question of equity across departments was discussed
        1. It is hard to come up with one solution since some departments have very expensive equipment needs
        2. Should every department get some funds?
        3. Some proposals were poorly written and therefore were denied
        4. Is it fair to spread out funds when these funds won't be well used?
    iv. As of this meeting, the College does not know how much money the lottery will be worth this year
    v. The Faculty Council should remind departments of issues encountered last year in order to avoid them now
        1. Show examples of good proposals
        2. Things that the lottery cannot fund – travel, speakers, etc.
        3. Proposals should be instruction related – they should help students in research or in service
            a. Often software, equipment, technology, computer lab space
            b. An example is the mobile computer lab for REC
            c. We can help departments that don't normally rely heavily on equipment think about areas they could use funds to cover updated technology, software, etc.
    vi. How to deal with the issue of partially funded proposals
        1. Should we add a part to the application that distinguishes between what is absolutely necessary and what could be done without
            a. Wish list items listed differently?
            b. Would be difficulty to get proposals to be honest
            c. This might be a conversation to have after the fact with the individual proposers
    vii. Changes to the Lottery Proposal Scoring Rubric
        1. Add weight to collaborative proposals
        2. How to score the impact factor (how many students impacted)
        3. Scoring is based on how well the proposal justifies the need

4. It would be beneficial to have a discussion about the proposals after individually scoring, but before the final scores are tallied
5. Good to hear others opinions to help us understand
6. Unfunded proposals should get feedback (sent to the Chairs)
viii. The Faculty Council should ask the departments to start working on their proposals now so there is time for questions and discussion before they are due
ix. March 1, 2016 will be this year's proposal deadline
x. We need to inform departments that collaborative proposals will be favorably weighted
1. The change in weights was reflected throughout the proposal document
2. The language on proposal limits was updated to include collaborative proposals (included as part of the five max)
xi. The changes to the Lottery Proposal Application for AY15-16 were approved
1. Passes: Unanimous
b. Dean's Search Candidate Questions
i. The Chairs came up with questions for the candidates, and narrowed it down to eight essential questions
ii. It was recommended that the Faculty Council come up with questions that are tailored to their role on campus
1. What issues as a group do you deal with?
iii. Some suggestions were related to differentiated workloads (i.e. some faculty that focus on research, etc.), or on graduate program issues, or what do they see as the Associate Dean's role
1. Leadership, personnel, budget questions would be appropriate
iv. Instructions were made for Faculty Council members to email a first round of potential questions to Tiffanye Vargas (Chair)
1. Please prioritize the top ten questions in your email
VII. Reports
a. Dean's Office
i. The Associate Deans will send out a list of announcements as the meeting has already gone over the allotted time
b. Academic Senate
i. Christine Scott-Hayward was absent
c. Chair's Meeting
i. (items from the meeting were discussed throughout the Faculty Council meeting, as stated above)
VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 12:35pm

Submitted by Natalie McGlocklin