Feb. 16th, 2011
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting

Present: Jim Morley, Elaine Risch, Max Goldberg, Jeremy Teigen, Sam Mustafa, Ruma Sen, Alex Olbrecht, Jillian Weiss

Not Present: Eric Haye

Secretary: Kristin Kenneavy

Eric Haye has resigned as all-college representative to the FAEC. It will be necessary to replace him, but his resignation must be received in writing prior to announcing the vacancy to the Faculty Assembly. The new by-laws state that, after a formal resignation, the faculty must vote on a replacement at the next assembly meeting.

1. **Approve the minutes**

Minutes approved.

2. **Preparation for FA Meeting at 11:30 am in the Pavilion**

a. **SBR Task Force Motion**

This motion is included in the FA agenda. The taskforce will examine whether the prohibition on teaching can be lifted and will need to have AFT input on this because SBR is contractual. Representative Mustafa has agreed to compile the names, but then the taskforce will vote on its own leadership. Anyone who wants to do it should contact Sam Mustafa or Jim Morley. Some key constituencies include those with experience with the financial aspects, someone to represent AFT, faculty under 10 years and over 10 years, and opposing viewpoints on stipends vs. expense-based requests. If no one wants to do it, then it may be construed as a vote that faculty members are content with the status quo. The goal is to have the task represented rather than the unit. Anecdotally, this seems to be an issue that faculty are interested in.

b. **Once-per-week Courses**

The FAEC needs more time to deal with the issue of once per week classes and will need to state this at the FA meeting. FAEC only has a consulting role on this issue anyway, but the administration would rather have FAEC on board (according to Jim Morley). Gordon Bear and Rikki Abzug sent literature to ARC. The literature review sent by Gordon Bear is from a psychology of memory perspective and indicates that fewer once per week classes would benefit student learning. Prof. Abzug’s research takes the opposite view. Different topics may call for different approaches. This debate has real implications for online courses. Also, there may not be enough physical space to fix this problem.
c. Faculty Conference Discussion (dates are May 18th and 19th)

Rep. Olbrecht reported that ASB would like 3 to 4 hours devoted to unit assessment. The rationale is that Middle States requires that we demonstrate that we are working on assessment activities.

A suggestion was made that, if convening groups are given time to work, interdisciplinary convening groups must also be allocated timeslots.

Pres. Morley indicated that he would like some help organizing this conference from other faculty members and would also like to have time for faculty members to socialize and one non-instrumental activity.

Both the Curricular Enhancement Design team and CWAC (the all-college assessment committee) have indicated that they would like time at the conference. These groups should be asked to come to the FAEC and provide their rationale for asking for the time.

Need to check on the assertion that Middle States requires an all-college assessment meeting.

It was suggested that having some of the conference pertain to Student Life might be interesting, especially in light of the planned trip to Lehigh University by President Mercer, Rep. Olbrecht, and Pres. Morley.

Rep. Sen stated that the general sentiment in Contemporary Arts is that the conference should not include any activities that are not required.

d. ARC Proposals (to be voted on at the FA meeting)

The Convener of Law and Society had some concerns about the proposed Criminology minor, as it utilizes a LAWS course, but Law and Society was not presented with a copy of the proposal in time to discuss it and consider the effects on Law and Society. Pres. Morley noted that Prof. Rainforth (ARC) had stated that Sociology is withdrawing the motion for the Criminology minor.

Online Course Manual is being proposed by ARC. This is a complex proposal of some magnitude and faculty may not have had time enough to reflect on it. There was some debate regarding the issue of having deans approve online and hybrid courses. Further discussion revolved around whether the manual should have been presented to the FAEC first. It was suggested that ARC be asked to withdraw the proposed vote on the online manual pending further review by the FAEC and Faculty Assembly membership. Rather than a decision item, the manual could be converted to a discussion item. Pres. Morley indicated that he would speak to Prof. Rainforth on this issue prior to the FA meeting.

The FA will vote on the two other proposed minors.
Rep. Olbrecht indicated that, in the future, the MBA program, which has already been through ARC, may be revived.

3. Extending Winter term/Earlier Submission of Final Grades

This item will be announced during the president’s report as a future discussion item. Those who support this plan would like to see the winter term extended for about a week, but realistically, the semester may only be able to start a few days later. More facts need to be collected to make an informed decision about whether the trade-off of grading time is worth it. Also, the FAEC needs to assess whether there is broad support for the changes. Regarding winter online courses, professors need more time to effectively offer the material. For instance, trying to offer a 4-credit study abroad in two weeks is preposterous. Face-to-face courses used to be offered during this time – need to investigate the parameters under which this happened. There is a pedagogical rationale for this change. There was further discussion regarding how this might impact the types of tests administered at the end of spring semester (more multiple choice?), course projects, and the prohibition on giving exams during the last week of classes. Along those lines, it was suggested that the exam schedules be posted sooner so that exam dates could be added to syllabi.

Faculty will need more information about what the actual gains are here. Year to year variability may mean that this problem persists in some Spring semesters (depending largely on when weekends fall).

4. Motion to End SBR Prohibition against Second Summer Session Teaching

FAEC had to postpone this motion on the FA agenda due to needing facts about the relationship of AFT and the union contract to this matter. Will constitute the taskforce first and the taskforce will investigate the possibility of ending the prohibition. Irene Kuchta, AFT president, has no objection to renegotiating SBR. Union members would eventually have to vote to approve the changes.

One viewpoint was that the Administration and AFT shouldn’t decide how faculty members manage their time (should be able to do research and teaching at the same time).

5. Proposal of Calendar/Schedule Task Force

Pres. Morley proposed a taskforce to look at the whole schedule and the calendar (including lunch and three hour classes). Several representatives expressed concern that such a taskforce/committee wouldn’t actually able to change these issues, since the faculty don’t have purview over the schedule. The representatives were more supportive of looking at this issue less broadly, perhaps restricting the task to evaluating alternative approaches to course scheduling. It was suggested that the units should be dealing with the once versus twice per week classes. It was also asked whether this issue was related to the administrative contention that faculty aren’t on campus often enough.

The FAEC would need to work with the administration to convene a taskforce (possibly also in conjunction with AFT). Administrative cooperation is needed because they have authority over the
schedule and facilities. This taskforce would first need to see whether faculty members are actually unhappy with the current schedule of classes. The deans are having a hard time scheduling because there are not enough classrooms for certain times during the day (hot times). Students don’t like to have Friday afternoon classes.

Rep. Olbrecht stated that he would not mind serving on this committee.

6. Discussion of meeting with BOT (Board of Trustees) Representatives

Anita Stellenwerf will replace Mary Ellen O’Grady Harvey on the audit committee. There are 5 total BOT representatives, who used to stand up and give reports during FA meetings. It was suggested that the BOT reps be asked to communicate reports via emails that could be shared with the FAEC.

Further discussion was tabled until next week.


Prof. Teigen will likely be gone next Fall on a Fullbright. The FAEC needs to find out whether the by-laws make any provision for temporary replacements, although it was stated that this issue was rather unclear in the current by-laws.

Further discussion was tabled until next week.

8. Governance Structure Approved

The results of the vote were as follows: 144 votes were cast. 6 were abstentions which do not count in the denominator when calculating percentages (so 138 votes count).

Votes to approve the current structure: 114/138 = 82.6%

Votes to revert to the old structure: 24/138 = 17.4%

Representatives voiced concern regarding the 2/3 of votes cast versus 2/3 of all teaching faculty and staff issue. Pres. Morley suggested that he remind the FA that no one had objected to this interpretation at the last meeting.

Technically, the parliamentarian would make this call. Rep. Olbrecht (who is acting parliamentarian) indicated that he would take the issue under advisement and issue a ruling in writing after the FA meeting (if the issue arose).
4 votes came in one day late. It was speculated that these individuals thought that the slips had to be mailed by Monday rather than received by Monday. After discussion, it was decided that the votes should count (err on the side of including votes).

Meeting adjourned.