Faculty Council
August 22, 2012
3:00 – 4:30pm
Clark Hall – Room 220

present: L. Acord (Chair), E. Afinoguenova, J. Bosio, P. Cervenka (invited), S. Chubbuck, B. Silver-Thorn, B. Srivastava, A. Stewart, L. Whittenberger (recording)

absent: K. Factor, J. Marten

Welcome and Introductions

Recorder (volunteer): L. Whittenberger volunteered to record

1. Review of UAS Statutes – Faculty Council Responsibilities.
   a. The group reviewed UAS Statute, Article 4, Section 1.0.
   b. <for internal FC records only?> FC chair informed the group that the UAS executive committee was discussing creating a task force to review and possibly revise the UAS statues, as mandated by the UAS statutes (Article 1, Section 2 – point 1). The FC chair has been asked to draft a charge for the possible task force, and she has requested for a volunteer from FC to serve on the task force if convened. S. Chubbuck volunteered.

2. Actions from Last Year
   a. P. Cervenka (invited, FC chair for 2011-2012) gave an overview of FC accomplishments for 11-12, as summarized in the FC Annual report 2011-2012 and the “Progress in Shared Governance” report given to UAS in March 2012.
      i. Noted that, per FC recommendation, the UAS Chair and Vice-Chair are now invited to attend both Dean’s Council and University Leadership Committee meetings
   b. Cervenka reported that 2 members of the NCA self-study committee (Mike Akers & Jeff Janz) had met with her over the summer to discuss the FC “Progress in Shared Governance” report. She encouraged the FC to maintain open lines of communication with the self-study committee.
   c. Acord reported that self-study committee members had also met with James South (UAS chair) and the Provost over the summer as well to discuss shared governance issues.

3. Possible Issues for FAC Actions in 2012-13
   a. FC reviewed the “Committee recommendations/unfinished business” section of the FC annual report 2011-2012:
• Retain communication with Gary Meyer in order to provide input on shared governance for the university’s self study.

FC 2012-2013 should continue communicating with the NAC self-study committee. The meeting with Cervenka (FC) and Akers/Janz (self-study) this summer established a line of communication between the two committees, and we should try to keep that line open to allow FC to provide input on shared governance for the self-study.

• The date for the Fall 2012 orientation for new Senate members and faculty committee chairs should be set soon after the election

Per Acord, the UAS executive committee is currently working on a schedule for Fall 2012 orientation for new members.

• The appointment of faculty to the University Budget Committee was a good first step. However, a line of communication back to the Senate about the budget process should be included. In addition, the Faculty Council would like to know the University’s policy and procedure about the allocation of a retiring faculty member’s line and the opportunity for faculty input about those allocation.

There was much discussion over this point. The committee decided to divide this issue into component parts as follows:

1. Budget Committee appointment process: there is a need for clarification/codification on how a person is selected to be on the Budget committee.
2. Budget Committee communication/reporting: there is a need for clarification/codification on how the Budget committee member communicates information; what information is communicated (minutes, FYI items?); and who that information is shared with (UAS executive committee?, UAS?, Faculty?).
3. Allocation of lines: there is a need for clarification on what the University policy and procedure is for open lines. Is there an overarching University policy or is policy set by individual colleges? Within a college is there a written policy or does the college follow ‘unwritten rules’ (precedent)?
4. Allocation of lines: there is a need for communication with faculty on the process: informing faculty of a college (or university wide) what the policy/procedures are; and providing a mechanism for faculty to provide input into the process.

• Create procedures to govern requests for information from OIRA, including whom to contact, how the requests should be made, and timelines for getting the needed information.

Committees of the UAS will occasionally need information from OIRA. FC needs to communicate with OIRA and ask them to provide UAS/FC/Faculty with a protocol for requesting information. The OIRA protocol for information requests should be ‘public’ (meaning available to MU faculty/admin/staff?)
• The University policy of maximum course load for non-tenure-track full time faculty should be addressed.

FC will begin addressing the issue of Participating Faculty. Four issues were identified:

Is there a University-wide policy on Participating Faculty? If not, do individual Colleges have policies on Participating Faculty? Are any of these policies documented & if yes, where is the documentation and is it freely available for MU faculty to view?

Issues of course loads. Informal reports indicate that ‘standard’ course load for Participating Faculty varies from college to college. Question of what should be a ‘reasonable’ course load.

Issues of multi-year contracts. Need for documented procedures/timeline on requesting multi-year contracts.

Issues of when contracts are awarded for Participating Faculty. Informal reports indicate that some colleges(?) are not informed of the ability to award contracts until mid-summer. (LW: I’m not sure if I’m reporting this accurately….)

• The date for a faculty forum with the President should be set early enough to give everyone adequate planning time so that the maximum number of faculty have the opportunity to attend.

Acord will contact the president’s office to set a date in spring 2013. Once the date is set, FC will work on developing the format of a Forum.

• One of the campus problems is that very little information is given about job descriptions for new hires and appointments. Clear guidance should be given as to where to find the job descriptions.

Issue can possibly be addressed if/when a task force reviews the UAS statutes.

• The previous recommendation was that UAS members attend two Deans’ Council meetings per year. This year invitations were extended for only one meeting.

UAS Executive committee will follow-up with the Deans’ Council & Provost.

NEW ISSUE:

FC / Faculty interaction with Trustees. Specifically the Trustees’ Academic Excellence Committee. Whittenberger & Chubbuck noted that the faculty forum with Dick Fotsch (chair of the Acad. Excellence Committee) in 2010 was very well received & the Mr. Fotsch expressed a desire to continue open communication with the faculty at that time. FC should explore ways of increasing faculty communication with trustees, including the possibility of having another faculty forum with the Academic Excellence committee.
Next meeting – **September 26 from 3:00 – 4:30pm (Room 220 Clark Hall?)**

Future meetings: Clark Hall, 220 (?), 3-4:30: October 24, November 28, January 23, 2013, February 27, March 27, April 24.
Minutes respectfully submitted by Lynn Whittenberger.