1) Gen Ed Report: Prof. Ed Shannon
   a. Prof. Shannon discussed the Gen Ed survey and upcoming FA vote with the FAEC. The Gen Ed team was pleased with the survey’s response rate. Survey results indicate that the majority of respondents support replacing a language requirement with a global studies requirement (which includes a language option). The ARC committee has some concerns about recommending Gen Ed “Option 3” (which requires all three proposed categories and allows for some double counting). However, Prof. Shannon believes that the Gen Ed team can rewrite the proposal in a way that will satisfy ARC (perhaps by proposing “Option 2” and communicating the strong faculty support for “Option 3”, indicated by survey results, to the future Gen Ed implementation team). Prof. Shannon is optimistic that a proposal acceptable to ARC can be crafted within the next day or two (allowing a vote to occur at the next FA).
   b. There were questions about ARC’s role in the Gen Ed change process. Presently, new programs require ARC’s approval before a FA vote (and that will not change). After this semester (assuming the Gen Ed proposal is ratified by the FA), ARC’s role regarding the approval of courses in Gen Ed will reflect prior content approval by a Gen Ed implementation team, including GECCO. ARC will continue to give the final (faculty) approval of GE courses, but the content decision will be done by GECCO (analogous to WI/WAC).
   c. Prof. Shannon agrees with the FAEC’s recommendation to hold the faculty forum before the FA on Dec. 2, rather than after FA. He and his committee members will use this time as a Gen Ed “open house”. The FAEC’s expects this arrangement to minimize the need for extended Gen Ed discussion before the vote at the subsequent FA.
   d. The FAEC briefly discussed the pros and cons of requiring students to take courses outside of their major (beyond Gen Ed requirements). Should convening groups be able to require non-major courses? How can
course selection be better tailored to students’ career interests? There was agreement during this discussion that the quality of student advising needs to be improved.

2) First Year Seminar: Summer Reading and Convocation Speaker Process
   a. The summer reading committee is meeting today to discuss this issue (see prior FAEC minutes). There is no current College policy that requires a convocation speaker to be the author of the FYS summer reading. This issue does not appear to require intervention by the FAEC/FA nor a new policy. President Rainforth also indicated that Brittany Goldstein-Williams wants to touch base with her regarding this issue.

3) FA agenda for Dec 2
   a. Candidates for FAEC president will deliver a five minute presentation at Dec. 2’s FA. A mail ballot will be distributed to faculty before the Winter break. Votes will be counted when faculty return in mid-January. The secretary will continue to receive nominations for FA president up to and including Nov. 25.
   b. There will be a vote on the charge for the proposed Library Renovations Task Force.
   c. There will be a vote on the proposed Gen Ed program changes.
   d. Changes to the meeting calendar (disciplinary convening group meeting times) will be announced.

4) Items for Unit Council – Nov. 18
   a. See today’s FAEC agenda (and prior FAEC minutes) for Unit Council agenda items. Be sure to mention the option to place desk copies on reserve at the library.

5) Library Renovations Working Group
   a. The working group is making final edits to the charge. Prof. Atkinson will send Prof. Rainforth the finalized charge today. Prof. Rainforth will send the faculty the charge with the agenda for Dec. 2’s FA.

6) Discussion on Campus Climate
   a. Although many faculty have heard little talk about the YikYak racial incidents from last year, some faculty are concerned about campus climate (re: race relations). It was suggested that it might be helpful to have a member of DAC speak to the FAEC (to determine if there is some action DAC is expecting of faculty leadership).
   b. Some faculty are concerned about discussing sensitive subjects in their classes. Some faculty feel vulnerable that students may turn against them when discussing controversial topics. What if students are recording classroom conversations? Will the faculty rally behind faculty members that discuss controversial topics? These questions raised the issue of
“trigger warnings” that has received much attention in Higher Ed trade publications over the last few years.

c. Due to these concerns, the FAEC and other faculty-led groups may want to create an event (e.g., forum, panel, town hall) with representation from AFT, DAC, FAEC, and other stakeholders to discuss these issues. What protections do faculty members have when discussing controversial topics? How can faculty balance academic freedom with sensitivity to student’s concerns?

i. The DAC committee has delivered a presentation on micro-aggressions to at least one college unit. Can these presentations be delivered to all units?

d. There was a brief discussion about the need for student groups to provide notice to the college community before launching a protest.

7) Approval of FAEC minutes from November 11, 2015

a. Approved.