As delineated in the Statutes of the University Academic Senate, an annual written report from the University Faculty Council to the University Academic Senate at the end of the academic year follows.

I. University Faculty Council Membership
   Kurt H. Gering, Chair (College of Business), Dawn Smith, Vice-chair (Health Sciences), Valerie Beech, Secretary (Library), Said Audi (Engineering), Ralph Anzivino (Law), Kati Berg (Communication), Alan Burkard (Education), Joshua Burns (Theology), Marilyn Frenn (Nursing), Arndt Guentsch (Dentistry), Anne Pasero (Foreign Languages), Darren Wheelock (Arts & Sciences)

II. University Faculty Council Meetings
   The University Faculty Council met formally for one hour, each month, from September of 2016 to May of 2017, as well as virtually as needed throughout the academic year.

III. University Senate Charges to the University Faculty Council
   a. Dean's Search Protocol
      At the beginning of the 2015-16 academic year, as two colleges commenced searches for a new dean, the Provost removed the existing dean search protocol from the Provost's website and unilaterally changed it without prior consultation with the University Academic Senate. Concerned faculty in the affected colleges expressed their concern both formally to the Chair of UAS and informally to Senate members regarding this change. The Preamble of the Statutes of the University Academic Senate states in part, “The Marquette University Board of Trustees, President, Provost and administration endorse shared governance as a process in which the faculty has an essential role as participants in deliberations regarding academic and administrative areas that affect the academic mission of the University. . . In shared governance, administrators consult with such faculty bodies in a timely manner and give serious consideration to their recommendations before decisions and actions are taken. . . As a deliberative body, the shared governance responsibilities of UAS include: . . . appraising initiatives and policies relevant to the faculty and the academic mission of the university.”

      In response to the lack of consultation with UAS prior to instituting this change to a policy that is relevant to the faculty and the academic mission of the university, and the concern expressed by faculty in the affected colleges, the Chair of UAS charged the Faculty Council with reviewing the previous dean search protocol and proposing changes that would be brought to UAS for deliberation and possible endorsement. Given
the number of issues that Faculty Council addressed in the 2015-16 academic year, they did not complete their review and proposed revision of the dean search protocol prior to the end of the academic year. The Chair of UAS requested and Senate endorsed the formation of an ad hoc committee to meet to review proposed changes to the dean search protocol in light of the experience of the two dean searches that were undertaken under the new de facto protocol. The Chair invited representatives from the two search committees undertaken under the new protocol and from the last two search committees conducted under the old protocol to participate in a review and to recommend changes in the dean search protocol that will come to Senate for review, consultation, and possible endorsement.

The crux of the proposed changes to the dean search protocol is to establish a process by which the faculty of each college will be given a free and unfettered opportunity to choose between a traditional dean search in which the finalists are publicly announced and vetted by the full faculty and a closed search in which only search committee members know the identity of the finalists. The key change to the protocol is to start with a presentation by the provost or his representative to the college faculty explaining his view of the benefits of a closed search, followed by a full discussion by the faculty, and a secret ballot vote to determine whether the search will be closed or open. In the event a closed search format is chosen by a majority of faculty, the faculty members of the dean search committee will be elected by the faculty in a manner that insures representation by department and rank.

b. Changes to UAS Chair and Vice-chair
At the end of the 2015-16 academic year, we (TM and CM) were appointed as a work group of the UAS to consider possible improvements that might be made in the terms of office for UAS officers to increase continuity of leadership and more effective shared governance at Marquette. We were asked to present options that could be further studied and considered by the Faculty Council and the full UAS during the 2016-17 year. Our recommendations will be passed on to the Faculty Council for their review before they will be forwarded to the full UAS for review and possible approval.

There has been considerable concern in recent years regarding lack of continuity of UAS leadership from year to year and the subsequent loss of institutional knowledge and familiarity with the issues and people involved. The UAS chair has typically served for just one year and then leaves the Executive Committee as well. That person’s knowledge of the issues and his or her working relationships with other members of University leadership are then lost and momentum on addressing campus issues is slowed. As new officers assume responsibilities at the end of each academic year (i.e., terms of office begin in May), too much time is spent on learning the history and context of issues and the role and responsibilities of the people involved.
Whereas there is typically major continuity in the University administrative leadership from year to year, faculty leadership on the UAS often experiences significant turnover on an annual basis. This inhibits the ability of the UAS to be a more important body for providing informed decision making and leadership on campus priorities, carrying initiatives to fruition, and developing longer-term relationships with the President, Provost, and the University Leadership Council. Effective shared governance at MU is likely inhibited as a result. This has been a major concern of the last two/three UAS chairs.
Some may argue that the current UAS statutes allow, through the election process, the ability to providing continuing leadership across years. This has not been our experience, however, at least recently. In most years over the last decade [we can ask Dale Kaiser for the exact numbers], UAS Chairs have served only one year in that position, and Vice Chairs were elected to the chair position in xx years. This sometimes presents major issues after the Chair and Vice Chair assume their new roles at the end of the academic year (in May). They may be quite unfamiliar with their roles and responsibilities for dealing with any major issues that might arise during the summer in particular. In general, it is difficult to have longer-term goals and aspirations for shared governance with such limited terms of office.

The purpose of this document is to briefly describe what the work group considers to be the best options that could increase continuity of UAS leadership and thereby enhance the effectiveness of shared governance at MU. Other options are of course possible, but the following three options can serve as a starting point for discussion by the Faculty Council. The work group believes each of the following options will enhance the functioning of the UAS. If the UAS decides to implement any of these options, revised statutes reflecting those changes would need to be drafted.

Option 1: Increase the term of office for the UAS Chair to two years.
- This option would significantly increase continuity for the Chair position.
- There is a lot to learn, so it takes time for a new Chair to get up to speed. Rapid turnover of leadership arguably decreases the effectiveness of shared governance and the ability of Senate to pursue initiatives that cannot be completed in one year.
- For what it is worth, this is the option President Lovell prefers.
- This option might discourage some Senators from running for the Chair position because the two-year commitment is longer than some faculty may want to undertake.

Option 2: Increase the Term of office for the UAS Chair and the Vice Chair to 2 years.
- This option would significantly increase continuity on the Executive Committee and the UAS as a whole. If the election for both positions occurred in the same year, there would be significant turnover every other year (unless they decided to run a second time and won their elections or the Vice Chair won the election for Chair).
- The two-year terms for Chair and Vice Chair could/should be staggered so that there would be a three-year overlap between them. In the event the Vice Chair would seek and get elected to the Chair position, a procedure for replacing the Vice Chair for the second year of their term would be needed (e.g., the EC could seek a replacement from among the sitting senators for a one-year term).
- This option might discourage some Senators from running for the Chair and Vice Chair positions because the two-year commitment is longer than some faculty may want to undertake.
- This is the option that President Lovell prefers (for whatever that is worth). However, the desire for greater leadership continuity is addressed, it is clear that the president has a strong desire for greater continuity of Senate leadership than exists in the current structure.
• This option may discourage Vice Chairs from running for Chair, since this would increase the length of the commitment even more (a minimum of 3 years).

Option 3: Annually elect a Chair Elect who would serve as Chair the following year and Past Chair the third year.
• All three individuals (Chair Elect, Chair, and Past Chair) would serve on the UAS Executive Committee.
• This structure would provide the most continuity in terms of orienting a Chair Elect to the position of chair, and the Past Chair being able to guide and advise the Executive Committee in her/his third year on that Committee.
• The Chair Elect would replace what is currently the Vice Chair position, who would assume those duties. The Chair Elect would serve on the University Leadership Council (as the Vice Chair currently does). Effectively this is equivalent to the Vice Chair automatically being the Chair Elect.
• This option has the advantage over the earlier options of committing the Chair to lead the Senate for only one year, which is a more attractive option for some faculty. The three-year commitment to serving on the Executive Committee, however, might be unattractive to some faculty. This appears to serve as a useful model for many professional societies, however.
• This option would reduce the number of positions that would need to be filled each year on the UAS Executive Committee by two. This would lighten the task of UAS elections somewhat. (i.e., each year only a Chair Elect would be elected instead of a Chair and Vice Chair, and the Past Chair would automatically fill another seat on the Executive Committee. We could reduce the number of at-large Executive Committee members by one, if desired).
• The current Chair would probably not be allowed to run for a second consecutive term as Chair because the Chair Elect would be expected to move into the Chair position. The outgoing Chair (or, alternatively, the outgoing Past Chair) could run again as Vice Chair, however.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Chair 2 yrs</td>
<td>Chair 2 yrs</td>
<td>Chair elect 1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Chair 2 yrs</td>
<td>Chair 1yr</td>
<td>Past Chair 1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>continuity over 2 yrs (for Chair only)</td>
<td>continuity over 3 yrs (overlap Chair/Vice-chair)</td>
<td>continuity over 3 yrs 1 position per year to fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>discourage Senators (to long)</td>
<td>discourage Senators (to long)</td>
<td>no second consecutive term for chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unclear regulation for Vice-Chair</td>
<td>discourage Vice-Chair (3 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRENT UAS STATUTES: ARTICLE 3 – OFFICERS

Section 1.0 The Presiding Chair of University Academic Senate
The Presiding Chair of the UAS shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term. The Presiding Chair receives a one course buyout per year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years. The Presiding Chair shall:
1. Formulate the draft agenda for full UAS meetings
2. Convene and lead the meetings of the Executive Committee and the full UAS
3. In extreme circumstances, the Chair is empowered to act on behalf of the UAS until such time as the Chair can convene the Executive Committee
4. Serve as a member of University Leadership Council (ULC)
5. Attend a Dean's Council meeting along with the UAS Vice-Chair at least once a semester
6. Meets with the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Excellence once a year

Section 2.0 The Vice-Chair of University Academic Senate
The Vice Chair of the UAS shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term. The Vice-Chair receives a one course buyout per year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years. The Vice Chair shall:
1. Serve as ex-officio member of the Faculty Council and on the Faculty Council Executive Committee.
2. Preside over the UAS in the absence of the Presiding Chair.
3. Serve as a member of University Leadership Council (ULC)
4. Attend a Dean's Council meeting along with the UAS Chair at least once a semester
5. Meets with the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Excellence once a year

Section 3.0 The Secretary of University Academic Senate
The Secretary of the UAS shall be a full-time faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term and may be re-elected. The Secretary receives a one course buyout per year. The Secretary shall:
1. Oversee the accuracy of and corrections to the UAS meeting minutes, which will be recorded by the Executive Administrative Assistant to the Provost.
2. Work with the Provost's office to ensure proper distribution of meeting materials, meeting arrangements, posting of UAS documents to the website, and supplemental activities.

IV. University Faculty Council responses to the University Academic Senate Charges
a. Dean's Search Protocol
On March 20th, 2017, the following was passed by the University Academic Senate by unanimous consent:

College deans occupy positions of great responsibility, charged not only with representing their colleges and the university in many settings, but also with providing intellectual leadership for their faculty, and above all, guaranteeing the quality of students’ education. To identify candidates capable of such work, the search committee and provost must closely coordinate their efforts to ensure that the president, who has ultimate responsibility for making the appointment, feels confident that all relevant factors have been considered and that the appointee fits the university’s expectations.
The following plan describes the strongly recommended steps the provost and search committee will typically take in dean searches. Although each step is strongly recommended, the process described should neither be followed rigidly nor disregarded. In some cases, the participants in the search may see need to subtract, add, or modify the elements described as a result of disciplinary differences, market conditions, advice from the search firm, or other unforeseen circumstances. Thoughtful changes that are mindful of the intent of this procedure are permissible and encouraged. In general, the search committee handles the detailed evaluation of candidates’ qualifications, the provost coordinates and oversees the overall search process, consults regularly with the president and committee chair throughout the search, and makes a final recommendation to the president. The final decision on all dean appointments, however, rests with the president.

Preparation for the search: Open or closed searches
Before constituting the search committee, the provost will consult with the College faculty (in a face-to-face meeting, where practical) to provide information about the search and expected timeline. One key consideration to discuss is whether the search will be “open” (meaning the finalist candidates’ identities will be disclosed to the faculty and public) or “closed” (meaning the finalist candidates’ identities will only be known to those conducting the search). Each approach has advantages and disadvantages which may be more or less relevant in any particular search. Open searches allow greater participation of the faculty and other members of the university community. Some argue that closed searches typically produce larger and better pools of candidates because they include those who would not be willing or able to pursue the position publicly. After a full discussion weighing such factors, the faculty will advise the provost on their preference for an open or closed search and the reasons for that preference. The faculty will determine their preference at their sole discretion, which can include a secret ballot vote of all eligible faculty.

Choosing a search committee chair and members
The provost appoints a committee chair in consultation with faculty, department chairs, and other members of the provost team. Committee chairs need to be highly respected as faculty in their colleges, experienced, reliable, discreet, and discriminating. For an open search, the provost will invite the committee members, including internal faculty representatives, a faculty member from outside the college chosen from a list of nominees proposed by the Academic Senate, a distinguished alum/trustee, a dean from another college, a staff member and a student. The provost should choose search committee members with an eye to expertise, diligence and willingness to invest time in the search. The provost should also consider the representativeness and diversity of the members when making selections.

For a closed search, the internal faculty representatives will be elected by College faculty. The provost can make additional faculty appointments to produce acceptable representativeness and diversity. If staff members and/or students are desired, they will be elected by the faculty. The provost will appoint a faculty member from outside the college (from a list of nominees proposed by the Academic Senate), a distinguished alum/trustee, and a dean from another college, a staff member and a student.
A provost or college staff assistant will be assigned to handle tasks such as taking minutes, scheduling rooms and meetings, handling hotel and flight reservations, and managing relations with the search firm and the candidates.

Once seated, the provost will meet with the committee and deliver the charge, which will include listening sessions, the timeline for the search, and the work product: a written evaluation of each finalist. The committee’s role is to advise the provost and president whether, from their perspective, each finalist is highly acceptable, acceptable, or unacceptable, and to identify strengths and weaknesses for each. The committee and the provost will discuss the particulars of the search and the provost will answer any questions from the committee members.

Preparing the committee members
Before the committee begins the search, it should meet with the Executive Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion to discuss strategies for encouraging diversity in the applicant pool; the Vice President for Mission and Ministry to discuss the role of the Jesuit, Catholic mission of Marquette in guiding their work; and the General Counsel and the Director of Human Resources to ensure that it adheres to legal requirements and best business practices.

Choosing a search firm
Universities routinely employ search firms to conduct dean searches, in order to gather a better pool of candidates, guarantee a back-channel through which candidates can confidentially explore a position, provide more expert comparison of candidate strengths and weaknesses, conduct thorough reference checks, and relieve faculty search committees of correspondence and scheduling tasks. If decided by the search committee and provost that the use of a search firm is necessary, the committee WILL choose a search firm in consultation with the provost. Once chosen, the search consultant should attend early meetings of the search committee to help structure the search and solicit the information needed to do its work. Search firms are typically central to the process of developing the job description, the position announcement, and candidate profile. The search firm will typically assist the committee in conducting interviews, focus groups, and meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, and other stakeholders to develop the search profile. The act of writing the draft position announcement is an important early step in helping the committee work together as a group, and it allows important questions to surface (e.g., how much weight do we want to give a candidate’s scholarly record?) so that they might be addressed early in the process in collaboration with the provost and president.

Conducting the search
The search firm will assist in structuring the search and in conducting key search tasks, including: advertising the position, identifying and contacting potential candidates, initial screening for minimum qualifications, arranging for airport interviews, coordinating candidate schedules, and conducting reference checks. Search committee members should solicit names of potential candidates from their professional networks, but they should allow the search firm to make the initial contact both to ensure equal treatment and to assure candidates of confidentiality.

Developing slates of candidates
As the search firm identifies candidates and completes its preliminary research on them, working closely with the committee chair, it begins to share with the search
committee slates of candidates it has developed from its own research or from applications or nominations it has received. The search firm representative reviews each qualified candidate, offers initial impressions, and answers questions from the committee. The committee then deliberates further on its own and decides whether any of these candidates would be worth an airport interview.

**Conducting airport interviews**
After it has identified a short list of promising candidates, the staff and search firm should arrange airport and/or phone interviews. It should share with the provost the CVs and letters of any candidates chosen for a preliminary interview.

These preliminary interviews are typically one to 1.5 hours long. The provost will also usually hold a 20-minute meeting with each candidate. In preparation, the committee decides on key questions it wants to ask, and identifies members who will take the lead in asking those questions. When conducting the interviews, the committee should recognize that, beyond its immediate task of evaluating the credentials of the candidates, it is also trying to encourage candidates’ interest in, and enthusiasm for, working at Marquette.

**Addressing mission and diversity questions in the hiring process**
The search committee should make sure that it talks explicitly about the Jesuit, Catholic mission of Marquette with each candidate, and emphasizes the importance of mission and diversity leadership as a factor in our evaluation and choice of deans. Candidates should be told that these topics will be raised by a variety of groups they meet in the course of a campus interview. All finalists are asked to meet with Marquette’s Vice President for Mission and Ministry and the Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, during the campus interview. Dean candidates of any race, ethnicity, faith, and sexual orientation are welcome at Marquette. Questions asked during the interview will address the candidate’s familiarity and alignment with Catholic and Jesuit pedagogy and philosophy of education; understanding of research as a constitutive element of the mission; understanding of key diversity and inclusion issues and enthusiasm for supporting our diversity and inclusion goals within a Jesuit university context; ability to work collaboratively with colleagues in the college and at the level of senior leadership; and comfort with questions of faith and transcendence in the university community and student learning experience.

After the interviews, the committee deliberates on what it has heard and begins to decide whether each candidate might be a possible finalist. To use its time and money well, the committee should expect to conduct no more than 8 to 10 preliminary interviews in most searches. Throughout this process, the search firm representative will communicate directly with the committee chair, who in turn will communicate regularly with the provost to update the search’s progress. The provost will update the president as needed.

**Recommending finalists for campus interviews**
After it has conducted its airport interviews, the committee identifies a short list from which it chooses as many as three finalists for campus interviews. With permission from the provost, the committee can invite more than three candidates, but only when it is absolutely convinced that a fourth or fifth candidate is equally competitive.
finalists are contacted, the search firm can begin to contact references provided by the candidate. After recommending its finalists but before inviting anyone to campus, the committee should meet with the provost and president to affirm that all parties consider those finalists viable.

For open searches, the committee chair should ensure all candidates understand that coming to campus is a public event which will be noticed in the press or on the Internet, and recommend that the candidate inform key people on their home campus before Marquette announces his or her visit.

**Bringing candidates to campus**
The staff member and administrator assigned to the committee work with the chair to schedule a two-day campus visit. The committee may consult prior dean search visit schedules to design the visit, although there will be differences by college and whether the search is open or closed.

**Making an offer**

*Evaluating finalists*
Typically, within one week after the last finalist has visited campus, the committee should meet to compare their impressions of the candidates, discuss the evaluations they have received from others, and hear the results of the search firm reference checks and other inquiries committee members have made. Before beginning its deliberations, the committee should receive all of the available written feedback from stakeholders who have met with the candidates or attended any of the public forums. The committee should treat all such feedback as confidential.

Once this deliberation is complete, the committee chair should prepare a brief summary of the committee’s discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, and evaluate each candidate as highly acceptable, acceptable, or unacceptable. That report is shared with the provost and the president.

*Consulting with the search committee*
After the committee has completed its review, the provost should schedule a follow-up meeting with the committee and search consultant to discuss the committee’s evaluations of each candidate in more detail. The president may choose to participate in this meeting.

*Consulting with University Academic Senate*
Prior to extending an offer, per UAS guidelines, the UAS Executive Committee will be invited to discuss and evaluate the candidates.

*Further Reference Checks*
Before an offer is extended to any finalist, the search firm will conduct “off-list reference checks.” The firm will contact the candidate for permission to conduct such checks and will ascertain who the candidate would bar from such a check and honor that request.

*Consulting with the president*
Throughout the search process, regular contact between the provost and the president, and between them and the committee chair, is crucial. The finalists discussed at the end of the process should all be realistic and serious aspirants to the position. The mode of communication should be dialogic, with committee chair, provost, and president all
feeling free to ask questions, and expecting that their concerns will receive a full and fair hearing.

b. Changes to UAS Chair and Vice-chair
On April 10th, 2017, the University Academic Senate was informed on the motion to amend: Statutes of the University Academic Senate: Article 3-Officers: Section 2-The Vice Chair of the University Academic Senate and Article 4-Standing Committees:

Suggested Changes to the University Academic Senate Statutes
Submitted by The University Faculty Council

ARTICLE 3 – OFFICERS

Current Statute:
Section 2.0 The Vice-Chair of University Academic Senate
The Vice Chair of the UAS shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term. The Vice-Chair receives a one course buyout per year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years.
The Vice Chair shall:
1. Serve as ex-officio member of the Faculty Council and on the Faculty Council Executive Committee.
2. Preside over the UAS in the absence of the Presiding Chair.
3. Serve as a member of University Leadership Council (ULC)
4. Attend a Dean’s Council meeting along with the UAS Chair at least once a semester
5. Meets with the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Excellence once a year

Amended Statute:
Section 2.0 The Vice-Chair of University Academic Senate
The Vice Chair of the UAS shall be a full-time, tenured faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term. The Vice-Chair receives a one course buyout per year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years.
The Vice Chair shall:
1. Serve as ex-officio member of the Faculty Council and on the Faculty Council Executive Committee.
2. Preside over the UAS in the absence of the Presiding Chair.
3. Serve as a member of University Leadership Council (ULC)
4. Attend a Dean’s Council meeting along with the UAS Chair at least once a semester
5. Meets with the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Excellence once a year

The vice chair of the UAS will automatically become the chair of the UAS the following year.

ARTICLE 4 – STANDING COMMITTEES

Current Statute:
1.01 The Faculty Council (amended by UAS on January 26, 2015)
Membership: Thirteen voting members: twelve elected to three-year terms and two ex-officio members. Arts and Sciences faculty will elect 2 members, while each of the other colleges and the librarians will each elect 1 member. Ex-officio members will be the vice-chair of the UAS and the chair of the Subcommittee on Part-Time Faculty. Each year
FC members will elect a vice chair. The vice chair will automatically become the chair the following year. Elected members will be selected according to the rules of each unit.

**Amended Statute:**
Membership: Thirteen voting members: twelve elected to three-year terms and two ex-officio members. Arts and Sciences faculty will elect 2 members, while each of the other colleges and the librarians will each elect 1 member. Ex-officio members will be the vice-chair of the UAS and the chair of the Subcommittee on Part-Time Faculty. Each year FC members will elect a vice chair. The vice chair will automatically become the chair the following year. Elected members will be selected according to the rules of each unit.

The Presiding Chair of University Faculty Council (UFC) The Presiding Chair of the UFC shall be a full-time faculty member, who has served as vice-president of the UFC the prior year. In the event this is not possible, the UFC shall elect a chair at the first meeting of the term. The Presiding Chair receives a one course buyout per year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years. The Presiding Chair shall: 1. Formulate the draft agenda for full UFC meetings 2. Convene and lead the meetings of the UFC Executive Committee 2. Convene and lead the meetings of the University Faculty Council 3. Serve as an ex-officio member of the University Academic Senate Executive Committee

The Vice-Chair of University Faculty Council (UFC) The Vice Chair of the UAS shall be a full-time faculty member elected annually at the final meeting of the UAS in the year preceding his/her term. The vice chair will automatically become the chair of the UFC the following year. The term of office shall not exceed three consecutive years. The Vice Chair shall: 1. Serve on the UFC Executive Committee 2. Preside over the UFC in the absence of the Presiding Chair

V. University Faculty Council Additional Work and Accomplishments
a. Organized and Hosted the 2017 Faculty Forum with President Lovell
b. Motion forwarded to University Academic Senate to amend membership of Executive Committee to include the Chair of University Faculty Council.
The Vote: Passed unanimously by show of hands 27 agree, 0 disagree, 1 abstention

VI. University Faculty Council Unfinished Business
a. Consider whether to review an appeal submitted by a faculty member of a grievance adjudicated by the Faculty Hearing Committee
b. Consider the length of contracts currently offered for adjunct and participating faculty and after reviewing how they align with AJCU institutions, where necessary make recommendations for improvement
c. Consider the numerous titles for non-tenured or tenured-track faculty and after reviewing how they align with AJCU institutions, where necessary make recommendations for improvement.

VII. University Faculty Council Recommendations for Unfinished and Future Business
a. It is important that a three-fourths majority be gathered to review an appeal submitted by a faculty member of a grievance adjudicated by the Faculty Hearing Committee. Should a review be warranted, it is suggested that summer sessions be held to arrive at a timely decision.
b. It is important that we consider the length of contracts currently offered for adjunct and participating faculty. This should be a lead item for the upcoming academic year and after reviewing how they align with AJCU institutions, make any necessary recommendations for improvement.

A considered effort should be made to review the numerous titles for non-tenured or tenured-track faculty and after reviewing how they align with AJCU institutions, where necessary make recommendations for improvement.