

Draft Minutes of the November 2, 2006 COE Faculty Council Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm by Jack Mecholsky. The agenda, was distributed at the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Jack Mecholsky

Jacob Chung

Jian Li

David Mazyck

Jenshan Lin

James Klausner

Oscar Crisalle

Tim Davis

Bhavani Sankar

David Bloomquist

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of August 4, 2006 (David Bloomquist) – Approved

2. Discussion of Chair's Survey (Secretary – FACS - David Bloomquist)

David distributed the draft Survey Form and the FAC Chair (FACC - Jack M.) asked the members to review it and submit comments/suggestions to the FACS. A discussion ensue – primarily on wording. The FACS reiterated that the Career Resources Center will be able to administer it. In addition, after a brief discussion, it was decided that for this first survey, no written comments will be solicited from the faculty. This will mitigate the concern about confidentiality of any comments.

With regards to the above, Jack also mentioned that the Dean wanted to meet with the FACC semi-monthly and that he hoped the survey instrument would be completed prior to Thanksgiving in order to implement it in the Spring. In order to obtain as much feedback as possible, Oscar suggested that th draft survey instrument be posted on the Web for COE faculty for comment.

3. A question arose on whether the departments should follow the Faculty Senate's "Shared Governance model" vis-à-vis, implementing "mini" Policy Councils. One example would be a department budget committee similar to the Faculty Senate Budget Policy Council. The Dean was not opposed to this, but it was decided that the choice to create this or any other subcommittee should be up to the individual departments and not instituted via a college wide mandate. If a particular department's administration was opposed to the creation of a budget committee, the faculty should contact the FAC for assistance.

4. Issues about T&P deliberations was raised. Some feel that discussions outside of the T&P committee may be unfair to a candidate and therefore bias the members' votes. A second concern was should administrators (Associate Chairs, etc.) be allowed to serve. While no decision was reached, the consensus was that perhaps this practice should be curtailed. A subcommittee should be formed to develop a "Best Practices" procedure to maintain the integrity of the process. James Klausner, Oscar Crisalle and Tim Davis volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. Cammy will be asked to also serve. This committee will report back to the

FAC. Another idea was to create an "Honor Court" to adjudicate misdeeds by T&P members, but ultimately it was decided to forego formulating rigid rules.

5. The next agenda item focused on COE Faculty meetings. One meeting each semester is called by the Dean for approval of graduation lists. There is a second one each semester, termed a Special Meeting, organized by the FAC. While specified in our constitution, it was decided that such meetings would be called for as needed, for example if a new policy was being proposed, budgetary issues arose, etc.

6. How to implement Shared Governance was the next item on the agenda. Just as there is at the University level, there should be mechanisms in place for department faculty to have a voice in governance. The decision was made to ask the Chairs to report back in writing how they are implementing SG in their respective Departments and what mechanisms are in place to accomplish this objective. The FAC would then look over the various practices, distilling them into a best practices recommendations to share with the other departments.

With respect to the above issue, an example involved the process for new hires. While it was agreed that the Chair makes the ultimate decision, do the faculty have input into the decision process? It is the responsibility of the faculty to develop policies that are then implemented by the Chair. Some departments have strong input, while others very little. The FACC will ask the Dean to contact the Chairs for their responses.

7. The opportunity fund. Last year over 200 proposals were submitted and 18 funded. This year they are only accepting 6 total from the COE. Tim Anderson wants the FAC to help him develop a policy/mechanism to vet the proposals. The members would come from the faculty at large – not the FAC. Discussion ensued about the criteria used to rank them. For example, how does OTL (Licensing) factor in vis-à-vis commercialization prospects? Another idea was to create a joint panel, made up from various disciplines (medicine, engineering, etc.) to review proposals. Maybe have past winners serve. The final decision was to create the Policy Council and let them decide how to proceed. For the short term, the FACC will contact the 5 COE winners and ask them to help Tim with the selection process as well as begin the policy/mechanism effort for the long-term.

8. The Dean has volunteered to attend the next meeting to discuss the COE budget. The FAC wants to know how the budget is distributed so that the COE senators can be better prepared for upcoming Senate meetings.

9. With regards to future meetings, it was proposed to meet on Thursdays to alternate with the Senate meeting dates. The decision was to meet at 3 pm on November 30th. The Dean wants to know what the FAC is doing, specifically, what are the FAC concerns? What role does the FAC have with respect to SCH – especially for summer teaching. Does the FAC want to be involved in this? The consensus was that yes, but only with regards to policy issues (e.g., priorities) not specific decisions. The FACC is to relay to the Dean that the two concerns the FAC has is: fairness in the T&P process – across the College, and that shared governance is implemented down to the department level with respect to decisions.

A concomitant issue was should a student be added to the FAC. It was decided that it would not be that helpful.

10. The last issue, prior to adjournment was to strongly encourage the University Senate to take responsibility for evaluating the President and Provost. The CLAS predicament, in which upper administration has instituted department level changes (i.e., removing the Chairs of

Math and English) with little or no faculty input, may eventually spread to other Colleges. No decision was made on this, but that the conversation will continue.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David Bloomquist, Secretary