**HSS College Faculty Council Meeting**

**February 13, 2018 at 3:30 p.m., Dean’s Conference Room**

**Minutes**

In attendance:

Al Churella (HIST-PHIL), Beth Giddens (ENGL), Brandon Lundy (GEOG-ANTH), Chuck Aust (SOCM), Jennifer McMahan-Howard (SCJ), Michael Lahey (TCID), Sarasij Majumder (ISD), Steve Collins (PSIA), Tim Hedeen (SCMPD), Tim Martin (PSYC).

I. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the previous meeting (January 16, 2018) were approved without changes.

II. Dean Dorff’s update

1. Adobe partnership/collaboration with the School of Communication & Media. A cohort of SOCM students is receiving it for free. The plan is to eventually push it out to all CHSS units and eventually to all university students. Currently non-SOCM cohort students must pay a subscription fee. All faculty and staff now have free access through UITS, which has sent some emails recently to invite faculty and staff to start utilizing it.
2. An announcement is coming soon about the issue of online teaching losing revenue. Tammy Powell and Elke Leeds are meeting tomorrow and Dean Dorff expects an update shortly after that.
3. Budget update. Right now there is a lot of back-and-forth tweaking for the next few months. Units have been asked to construct 3 versions of a budget: 1) a “super budget” containing a dream wish-list of wants, 2) a budget as if a 10% cut to discern most pressing priorities, and 3) a strategic budget that uses a “crisp” approach that matches funds with strategies. Dean Dorff is optimistic that the new approach to budgeting will be an improvement, bringing more predictability and stability over time.
4. A CFC member asked for an update on MWF schedule structure. Dean Dorff asked Ken Harmon to launch conversations about it. Dean Dorff asked CFC members to go back to chairs and/or schedule builders in their units to invite them to email Carmen Skaggs. The idea here is to convey the urgency with which this issue needs to be brought to clarity and resolution, so schedule builders can proceed confidently instead of hesitantly. Carmen would then be able to point to these emails to document the extent of the urgency to higher levels that this needs to be resolved so planners and schedule builders can proceed.
5. A CFC member asked about the new classroom building. Dean Dorff said the rumors are not true that it has been killed. It is still on the list of requests for new construction. But he was told the list is not prioritized; a projects is either on the list or not, and it is still on the list. The money has been allocated to pay for design phase and planning is proceeding.

III. Annual reviews being conducted by “directors” and other non-chair personnel

Beth Giddens was asked by her English constituents to bring up and seek clarity about annual reviews being conducted by “directors” and other non-chair personnel.

Lengthy discussion ensued that involved several questions, such as what the department bylaws stipulate, what some constituents would propose for changes to bylaws, what department guidelines currently indicate, and whether a director or a person with a supervisory title is capable of or ready to perform this role in a fair and meaningful way.

Dr. Giddens quoted from pages 107-110 in the faculty handbook that seem to contribute to the ambiguity and lack of clarity, causing a lot of distress among her constituents about this important issue.

Dean Dorff stated that bylaws and guidelines that have been approved at all levels through the level of the provost must be followed for now. Chairs cannot assign annual review responsibilities to “just anybody.” In fact, the dean pointed out, annual reviews remain the sole responsibility of the chair. Chairs can assign pre-review duties to other faculty. This would need to be discussed within the department as part of shared governance process, but chairs still decide.

Current approved bylaws have to drive the process. He urged that for the future a full, frank, open discussion should be held in a shared governance manner to decide procedures to follow in the future. He acknowledged that having a very high number of annual reviews to conduct can be very difficult and quite a burden on chairs.

Steve Collins in his role as CFC chair suggested taking the points that emerged in today’s discussion back to constituents. And he promised that the CFC will make this topic the first order of business at its next meeting on March 13.

Dr. Giddens offered the concluding thought that the ideal is for all faculty to receive equitable treatment and a lot of her faculty colleagues in English fear that is not happening currently.

IV. Review of and decisions about low-enrollment programs

Brandon Lundy asked that we discuss this. He reports that there is a concern about lack of transparency in the way this has been done in the past and is currently being done.

Dean Dorff stated that a committee exists at the provost level but that there are lots of questions about its origin and focus.

Concerns were expressed about what constitutes “value” and about inequitable faculty workloads.

Dean Dorff noted that with a new interim administration arrangement and a presidential search underway, there will continue to be some ambiguity vis a vis transparency and the criteria driving the questions involved in this process.

Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Minutes taken by Chuck Aust