

# College of Health and Human Services

## Faculty Council

### *Minutes*

March 4, 2016

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

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

- I. The meeting was called to order at 11:02 am
- II. Approval of the agenda
  - a. Changes to the agenda
    - i. Move VI. Candidates for Dean of CHHS Memo to VIII.
    - ii. Moved to the end and vote on closed meeting
    - iii. The agenda was approved**
      - 1. Passes: Unanimous**
- III. Approval of the minutes
  - a. The minutes from the Faculty Council meeting on February 5, 2016 were approved**
    - i. Passes: Unanimous**
- IV. Announcements
  - a. Lottery funding update
    - i. Lottery proposals are due to the Provost by March 21, 2016
    - ii. Next year Faculty Council should push for departments to start working on lottery proposals in the fall
  - b. The Dean's office still needs people to serve on RTP – please encourage eligible faculty to serve
- V. Old Business
  - a. Academic Senate Representation (Fiona, Natalie and Grace)
    - i. Task Force recommendations
      1. Each department can put forward as many candidates as they want for Academic Senate nominations
      2. Every department that puts forth a candidate will get at least one spot on the committee
      3. If some departments do not have representatives, the next highest nominees will get the spots
    - ii. Faculty Council recommended changes

1. Suggest allowing up to two people per department
2. We do not want to automatically eliminate someone with high votes
3. It is also hard to meet the requirements of the committee for some of the smaller departments
4. Equal representation is not possible if departments don't have representatives nominated
5. Some faculty members were still worried smaller departments will not have an opportunity for representation, as faculty often vote for their own representatives, and larger departments will automatically have an advantage
  - a. It was suggested that the bios/ short descriptions can help mitigate the issue

**iii. The motion to amend the proposal to allow up to two senators from each department was approved**

1. Passes: Unanimous
- iv. The proposal language was changed to reflect the motion to amend
1. Section #2 was deleted
  2. Up to two senators per department includes alternates

**v. The motion to adopt the changes to the proposal language was approved**

1. **Passes: 9 affirmative, 2 negative, no abstentions**

VI. New Business

a. Lottery proposals

- i. Overall scores from all council members were averaged for each proposal
- ii. Department rank was incorporated into overall scores
- iii. Eliminating lowest ranked proposals leaves a surplus of \$935
- iv. Issues that were discussed
  1. Should Faculty Council fund based on pure ranking, or some combination of rank and department equality
  2. Is it fair that three departments get nothing? These were consistently lowest ranked proposals for a reason
  3. Can any of these proposals try to receive SEF funds? The ASI student group votes on these proposals
  4. Should the surplus go towards the next ranked proposal, or should we try to give a department that didn't receive anything some of the money? Can this small amount actually be useful to any of the proposals?

**v. The motion to use funds based purely on ranking was approved**

1. **Passes: 10 affirmative, 1 abstention**

VII. Reports

a. Dean's Office

- i. Our college is currently in the middle of a fiscal audit by the Chancellor's Office
  1. The Chancellor was on campus four weeks ago for a separate visit as well
- ii. The Graduate Advisors Council discussed having a separate discussion at the summer Chairs' Retreat about graduate programs

- iii. Dr. Ostergren is working on an interdisciplinary community leaders program
        - 1. Names have been requested to serve on the task force
      - iv. Departments are working on enrollment management issues
      - v. The career center is working with faculty who teach introductory courses to create a bank of information regarding individual departments and what careers are available with each degree
        - 1. This information, while available to current CHHS students, will be more widely available to all students across campus
    - b. Academic Senate (Christine Scott-Hayward)
      - i. The Senate passed an intellectual property policy
      - ii. This goes to the Chancellor for approval
      - iii. An Academic Technology Task Force was proposed
        - 1. There is confusion at the Senate about how to staff the task force, as faculty and IT staff should be involved, but many faculty do not understand the different roles of IT on campus
    - c. Chair's Meeting
      - i. Today's Chair's Meeting was postponed, no report
- VIII. Candidates for Dean of CHHS Memo
  - a. **The motion to hold a closed meeting for the remainder of the Faculty Council meeting was approved**
    - i. **Passes: Unanimous**
  - b. Council members discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates applying for the CHHS Dean position.
  - c. **The motion to submit a memo to Cecile Lindsay addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the top three candidates for the dean position was approved.**
    - i. **Passes: Unanimous**
- IX. The meeting was adjourned at 12:24 pm.

*Submitted by Natalie McGlocklin*