

College of Health and Human Services

Faculty Council

Minutes

November 6, 2015

11:30-1:00 PM, ET 235

In Attendance: Christine Scott-Hayward (CCJEM), Roudi Roy (FCS), Tony Sinay (HCA), Fiona Gorman (HSC), Tiffanye Vargas (KIN), Natalie Cheffer (NRSNG), Adam Butz (PPA), George Beneck (PT), Laurel Richmond (RLS), Pei-Fang Hung (SLP), Janaki Santhiveeran (SW), Jennifer Ostergren (CHHS)

Absent: Grace Reynolds (HCA), Keith Fulthorp (RLS)

- I. The meeting was called to order at 11:30 am
- II. Approval of the Agenda
 - a. Added Online Course Evaluations to VI. New Business
 - b. Added Dean's Search update to VII. Reports
 - c. **The Agenda was approved**
 - i. **Passes: Unanimous**
- III. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. **The Minutes from the Faculty Council Meeting on September 11, 2015 were approved**
 - i. **Passes: Unanimous**
- IV. Announcements
 - a. None
- V. Old Business
 - a. Proposal for Revision to Procedures Manual for CHHS Committee/Councils
 - i. Considering revising the policies governing the Educational Policy Committee to mirror those of the Graduate Council policies
 - ii. The EPC would be chaired by the Associate Dean of CHHS
 - iii. Requires a Faculty Council vote to make these changes
 - iv. A task force was created to tackle changing the language of the EPC policies and procedures: Pei-Fang Hung, Christine Scott-Hayward, and Roudi Roy
- VI. New Business
 - a. Online Course Evaluations
 - i. The university would like to implement online SPOT evaluations
 - ii. They will form a faculty group that can provide student online evaluations
 - iii. One (1) tenured faculty member needed from each college
 - iv. Directions were given for Faculty Council members to go back to their departments and solicit names to be on the group
 1. Need names no later than two weeks from meeting date, but preferably as soon as possible

2. Follow up emails regarding the online evaluations to be sent by Tiffanye Vargas
- b. Planning and Implementation Committee for a University Distinguished lecture
 - i. The Faculty Council needs names of faculty who can serve on this committee
 - ii. Open to Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty in any department
 - iii. Need names no later than two weeks from meeting date, but preferably as soon as possible
 - c. Improving communication between the Academic Senate, Faculty Council, the department Chairs, general faculty and administration
 - i. There have been issues with over-solicitation of information from different levels, and responses not being correctly communicated
 - ii. It was opened to discussion how to improve communication
 1. Require that someone from the Academic Senate attend every Faculty Council Meeting, if an Academic Senate representative were not already a part of the Faculty Council that year
 2. Another option was to limit attendance of the Academic Senate representative to short ten minute report at every Faculty Council Meeting
 - iii. Action on this matter was tabled until the next Faculty Council Meeting
 - d. RTP Incentives and Support
 - i. Dr. Ostergren shared her difficulties in filling the RTP member positions this year and opened it up to discussion about how as a college we can increase incentives to participate in this committee, and all college level governance committees as well
 1. The goals are to utilize resources effectively
 2. Including lecturers if necessary (not RTP)
 - ii. The problems facing RTP Committee membership are:
 1. Work and time intensive committee
 2. The compensation is not adequate in the opinion of many faculty
 3. Only Tenured Faculty can serve on this committee, severely limiting the pool of possible members
 - iii. Opened discussion about how to improve the RTP committee
 1. Currently there is a course buyout for the chair of the RTP committee of 3 units release time per year, while committee members (non-chair) receive a \$1,000 stipend for two years of service
 2. Many faculty see this compensation as severely lacking, and that it is not about the dollar amount, but about the time and effort required
 3. It was suggested that more release time would be fair compensation and incentive for faculty members to serve on the RTP Committee
 - a. This idea was supported by those who have served in previous years and received 3 units for 1 year of service
 4. The point that knowing how many faculty will be going forward in any given year is important to gauge compensation

- a. In previous years, members chaired 2-3 applicants, and were required to read all applications
 - b. Many departments have a very low number of Tenured/TT faculty and will have a large schedule coming forward soon
 - c. This would require even more work on the part of the RTP committee
 - 5. Streamlining the process
 - a. Several Faculty Council members brought up the issue of streamlining the application and the entire RTP process
 - b. The idea of online submissions was suggested
 - i. Issues of security and following procedure discussed
 - c. Decisions were tabled for discussion among Faculty Council task force group
 - iv. The status of the change in RTP language to include extra committee members
 - 1. Although this language was voted on and approved last AY, the provost must approve of the change, and the new process must be implemented well before the semester in which the changes are effective in order to give applicants ample notice about who will be reviewing their work
 - 2. Any suggested changes will be effective next Fall 2016
 - v. An RTP task force was created of members Janaki Santhiveeran and Adam Butz, with Tiffanye Vargas to follow up with absent members Keith Fulthorp, Grace Reynolds, and George Beneck (left meeting early) to fill the third spot
 - 1. The task force will be focusing on streamlining the RTP review process and coming up with an incentive plan for faculty
- e. Lecturer participation in College Faculty Governance
 - i. Part of the issue with finding enough faculty to fill all the spots on College level Faculty Governance committees is that they require Full Tenured, sometimes Tenure-Track faculty to serve, largely limited the pool of candidates
 - ii. The Council was tasked with discussing if it would be possible to open up membership to full time lecturers on specific committees
 - iii. There was a discussion on the issue of faculty, especially junior faculty with very little service experience, wanting to serve on committees but not being elected
 - iv. It was generally agreed that department chairs should steer faculty to serve, and to promote service that encourages Tenured/Tenure-Track faculty to serve on those committees that require that status, and leave other committees open for Assistant professors and lecturers, thereby alleviating issues
 - 1. The idea of adding Full Time Lecturers to some committees, such as the Awards and Scholarship Committee was discussed but not voted on
 - v. The suggestion of providing blurbs was discussed in regards to getting newer faculty elected to committees, continuing on from the last faculty meeting,
 - 1. **There was a motion that for all committee elections run by the college, each name may be accompanied by a candidate submitted statement of no more than 100 words**

a. The motion was approved

i. Passes: Unanimous

vi. Any other decisions were tabled until after the Spring 2016 elections, where administrators and faculty could flag problem committees and come up with specific strategies

f. Academic Senate Representation

i. The university appoints the number of Academic Senate Representatives allowed for each College, in a 1 rep to 20 faculty proportion

ii. It was discussed at the chairs meeting that there is a disproportionate number of representatives from each department, and would it be beneficial to prevent that from happening again

1. Dr. Huckabay's reasoning was that the Academic Senate makes big decisions on health care related issues, especially clinical

iii. There is no language in the constitution that allows or prevents limiting representation

iv. It was suggested that on the ballot, current members are listed along with their departments so faculty voters can make an informed decision about the composition of the committee

v. A task force was created to tackle these issues, Fiona Gorman and Natalie Cheffer, with Tiffanye Vargas to follow up with three absent members about filling the last spot

g. ALL task forces to submit their reports to the Faculty Council chair Tiffanye Vargas no later than 1 week before the next Faculty Council meeting on December 4, 2015

i. If reports are not received, task forces may present their information at the meeting to the entire council

VII. Reports

a. Dean's Office

i. At the university level, they have begun looking at forming a task force on internships in our college and across all colleges

1. An executive order was passed two years ago that all campuses must have policies on internships

2. This is extremely relevant to our college and we need to have a voice in the decisions being made

b. Academic Senate

i. The FPPC was asked to define "conflict of interest"

ii. They will be discussing intellectual property at the next meeting

iii. Fall 2016 scheduling discussion will also open next meeting

c. Dean's Search

i. The committee has been formed and convened

ii. They are not reporting meeting events in order to keep confidentiality of applicants

iii. Things will be moving faster after the start of the Spring 2016 semester

The meeting was adjourned at 12: 57 PM

Minutes submitted by Natalie McGlocklin