

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FAEC) Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2016
SSHGS Conference Room
10:00am to 12:00pm

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

Excused Absence: Eva Ogens

Secretary: Mark Skowronski

Guests: None

- 1) Approval of FAEC minutes from September 14, 2016
 - a. Approved.

- 2) Report from Tae
 - a. Prof. Kwak will have monthly (30 minute) meetings with President Mercer. Prof. Kwak will also have weekly (hour long) meetings with Provost Barnett.
 - i. Prof. Kwak may only bring guests to his meetings with the President if the President's office is notified in advance.
 - ii. It is unclear if prior FA presidents were allocated more face-to-face time with the President.
 - iii. Prof. Kwak wants to ensure that his conversations with President Mercer are two-way dialogues—an imperative for effective shared governance.
 - iv. Library Task Force
 1. President Mercer does not appear to support increasing the number of faculty reps on his library task force.
 2. Does the President's task force have a formal charge? Who is chairing this task force?
 3. The FAEC is concerned about the transparency of the library renovations process.
 4. The FAEC is also concerned about the extent to which faculty input has informed architectural design across the campus (including future library renovations).
 5. President Mercer believes that state funding is limited to renovating/repairing the existing library.
 - v. FA has been asked to nominate one faculty member for the space committee.
 1. Dr. Cataliotti (SSHS) served as the faculty rep in prior years.
 2. Prof. Kwak will ask department secretaries to email faculty about this opening and solicit faculty nominations.
 - b. Without a definition of shared governance that is accepted by both the administration and the faculty, it is difficult to distinguish between academic and administrative matters. Prof. Kwak has asked the Provost to charge a task force

on shared governance that will include both faculty and administrators (as including both stakeholders is more likely to reach a mutually agreeable definition).

- c. Can the Grant Thornton consultants' report be shared with faculty (with or without redactions)? Should the FAEC make a formal request in writing?
- d. The FAEC is concerned that reports from FA committees (e.g., the FA's Library Renovations Task Force) are not being reviewed or considered by the administration.

3) TAS Lab Credits and Shared Governance

- a. The Provost has rejected several proposals by TAS faculty for changing lab credit hours. She has not communicated exactly what changes she considers acceptable.
- b. Should the FAEC schedule a FA vote on the current proposal made by TAS faculty?
 - i. Prof. Kwak is concerned about the risk of the proposal being voted down by the FA (although the FAEC is willing to schedule such a vote if requested by TAS faculty). Alternatively, the FA can make a motion requesting the Provost to propose her own plan for adjusting lab credit hours. If the Provost can ask faculty for a proposal, then faculty should be able to request a proposal from the Provost.
 - ii. What would happen if TAS faculty miss the Oct. 15 deadline?
- c. Faculty morale is low in TAS.
- d. The scheduled faculty forum is an opportunity to discuss how these changes may have an impact on other faculty members (not just those teaching lab courses). The FA needs to explain what is at stake for the faculty at large (e.g., control over curriculum).
 - i. Prof. Atkinson (as a non-TAS faculty member) volunteers to explain to the FA what is at stake with this lab credit hours change.

4) AAUP's conference on shared governance is scheduled for next week. Profs. McMurdy, Torres-Baumgarten, Kwak (and hopefully one administrator) will attend. Prof. Kwak will seek confirmation about travel expense funding from the Provost's office.

5) AFT would like the faculty to be aware that our master contract permits "instructor" positions. These positions have higher teaching loads and lower service requirements. Some faculty are opposed to the use of this job title. And the implications from accrediting bodies would also have to be considered.

6) Gen Ed Implementation.

- a. The fact that the administration is willing to stagger the implementation of Gen Ed suggests that a one-year delay might be feasible. A strong case for a one-year delay might be possible if GECCO and ARC receive an excessive number of applications next month. Changes to TAS lab credits may also increase the number of applications sent to ARC.

