

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting Minutes
April 12, 2017
SSHGS Conference Room
10:00am to 11:45am

Attendees: Tae Kwak, Christina Connor, Cristina Perez, Roark Atkinson, Kim Lorber, Renata Gangemi, Christina Connor, Gladys Torres-Baumgarten, Kathryn Zeno, Eva Ogens

Secretary: Mark Skowronski

Guests: Provost Beth Barnett

- 1) Visit by Provost Barnett.
 - a) Last year, the FAEC and the Provost agreed that all task force charges, drafts, and reports would be reviewed by the FAEC (who would provide the Provost with feedback) before the documents get shared with the FA. The Provost asks that the FAEC review and provide feedback on the Restructuring Task Force draft. The Provost has already shared the draft charge with Deans and Cabinet.
 - i) There is a feeling that there is an unevenness in reporting FAEC discussions back to Unit Council meetings.
 - b) There are differences across the Units as to how the faculty are selected for committees and task forces (including the School Restructuring Task Force). In some Units, faculty are elected. In other Units, faculty are selected by Deans. Although Deans have the right to appoint or hold an election for a specific committee assignment, they need to be communicating with the Unit. The Provost will ask Deans to establish a process for how individuals are selected for committees. She will also remind Deans that they need to be sharing information with the Unit.
 - c) The lack of specific constituencies represented by task force members is perhaps the most controversial element of this draft. FAEC members are on both sides of this issue.
 - d) Provost Barnett stated that having two restructuring models gives the College the option for review and further discussion before implementation.
 - e) Some faculty feel that discussions about restructuring are problematic given the Provost's prior statements that faculty should create a procedure for program closure. The Provost stated that she is not seeking to close any programs at this time. She does believe, however, that it is in the faculty's interest to have a procedure, as none currently exists.
 - i) (Prof. Kwak's response) There is a fear that having a procedure would make it easier for administrators to take it out and use it. It is also difficult to create criteria for such closures, particularly since, unlike graduate programs that are explicitly expected to generate profit, undergraduate programs do not have that explicit mandate (that some undergraduate programs are necessary for curricular needs and are understood to effectively be subsidized by other programs).
 - f) The Provost was told by several members of the FAEC that more clarity about the need for restructuring should be included in the charge. Also, different objectives for restructuring might also lead to different types of structures. Therefore, a clear rationale would be helpful.

- i) Prof. Kwak stated that assessment of the current structure should occur before restructuring. Also, the establishment of criteria for restructuring is important.
 - g) Although the task force will not consider new programs, different structures might allow for that.
 - h) The Provost was asked why this can't be done a year later (and not Fall 2018). She responded that she is worried about enrollment and time.
 - i) The Provost does not want administrators to serve on this task force. However, the group may consult administrators as part of its research activities.
 - j) The task force is expected to create its guiding principles. However, the Provost wants to give the task force flexibility. She does not want the group to be perceived as simply validating a preordained structure.
 - k) FAEC reps should have discussions with their Units about the Task Force and communicate feedback back to the Provost before the summer.
- 2) FAEC Discussion about next week's Extraordinary FA meeting and "no confidence" vote.
- a) Are we creating a list of shared governance failures to bring to FA?
 - b) What are the Middle States implications of a "no confidence" vote?
 - c) What are the implications for when the College conducts its search for new leadership 2-3 years from now? Will a "no confidence" vote now limit the applicant pool down the road? Will it lead to an applicant pool that will look askance at the faculty's role in shared governance?
 - d) What are the consequences of a split faculty vote? Or if the "no confidence" measure fails?
 - e) What if a motion is made to delay the vote?
 - f) Morale at the College is very poor, perhaps even in crisis.
 - g) The meeting will occur on April 19 from 11:30am to 1:00pm in the H-wing auditorium.
 - i) Administrators will be asked to leave in the middle of the meeting.
 - ii) The vote will be conducted by paper ballot after the FA/FF.

