Faculty Assembly Executive Council Minutes
October 1, 2014
ASB-230
915-1100 AM

Present: Emma Rainforth, Susan Kurzmann, Ken McMurdy, Rebecca Root, Susan Eisner, Kim Lorber, Bonnie Blake, and Roark Atkinson
Absent: Jonathan Lipkin
Secretary: Dean Chen

1. Approving the FAEC minutes from 9/24

2. Followed-up on the questions, concerns, and suggestions raised during the FA meeting on 9/24, and discussed next steps
   a. FAEC members addressed some of these questions and concerns including Deans’ reappointment process, the Provost’s Charge for the Data Analysis Task Force, functions of the Task Force, and (membership on) composition of the Task Force
   b. Items within purview of existing Task Forces and/or committees will be forwarded to them directly. FAEC will then follow up with them
   c. FAEC put together additional agenda items for FAEC based on suggestions from the FA meeting:
      i. Public safety and security issues: FAEC will invite Kathleen Hallisey, Melissa Van Der Wall, Vinnie Markowski, and Donna Singer
      ii. International Risk Assessment Committee (IRAC): Donna Singer and Ben Levy are co-chairs, so FAEC may invite one or both to discuss how to increase faculty participation and oversight
      iii. Strategic enrollment management plan: may invite Chris Romano to discuss how enrollment numbers can be better distributed across the college instead of overloading some majors and leaving others with low enrollments; and to discuss impact of a changed curriculum on enrollments
      iv. Conversations and coordination with chairs of existing Task Forces
      v. Inviting Martha Ecker (AFT) to discuss AFT’s purview
   d. Recommended agenda items for future FA meetings:
      i. Major issues that surfaced from FA meeting were status of curriculum/academics (including the new Data Analysis Task Force), and shared governance
      ii. Procedures and membership of the Data Analysis Task Force: what will happen to the Task Force’s recommendations? What is the provision for FA input? What is the role of Faculty Assembly? How does the FA provide its input? How will the faculty’s recommendations be implemented?
      iii. Rigor – Definition of rigor and survey has been circulated amongst faculty

3. FAEC’s point person for the Board of Trustees subcommittee representatives
   a. FAEC proposed that Jonathan Lipkin continue in this role
4. Delineating FA purview vs. AFT
   a. Issues of workloads, working conditions, personnel procedures etc., should fall under AFT

5. College open houses and orientations:
   a. Faculty should be notified in a timely fashion about upcoming College open houses and orientation events, etc.
   b. FAEC suggest that the dates, times, and room #s should be sent out to faculty members well in advance (in the beginning of the semester). President Rainforth will discuss with Chris Romano.

6. Discussion about the Krame Center:
   a. Center was approved without faculty endorsement (or input, aside from ARC); contra to the Board of Trustees policy & procedures. Issue of shared governance.
   b. Mindfulness is now being infused in courses, without ARC (or faculty assembly) endorsement. It’s almost being treated like a Pillar?
   c. However, any courses that are created or revised to include mindfulness, as well as certificates (credit-bearing or not), will need to be approved by ARC

7. Shared Governance Subcommittee:
   a. Ken McMurdy will circulate a written backgrounder (including description and status report) as basis for determining optimal membership for 2014-2015 of this group
   b. Ken will continue to chair that Subcommittee, and will provide regular updates to FAEC