**FACULTY COUNCIL**

**Minutes**

 **Wednesday, December 18, 2013**

**3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 306, WTC**

**Members Present:** Bowen, R.; Classen, T.; Friend, P.; Graham, D.; Gupta, G.; Jay, W.; Kelly, B.; Lash, N.; Macksey, S.; Miller, H.; Ramsey, G.; Ruppman, T.; Ryan, J.; Shoenberger, A.; Shanahan, A.; Solari-Twadell, A. **Guest:**  Noah Sobe, US

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:17pm by Gordon Ramsey. Invocation – Gordon Ramsey.
2. Approval of November minutes. Amendment suggested by Battaglia: friendly. Moved: Lash; Ruppmann seconded. Motion passed 12-0-1.
3. Chair’s Report
	* I have received feedback on our response. For example, SSW faculty unanimously voted to support it (administrators abstaining). Other feedback has been positive.
	* Other issues for next term with increasing salience: decisions at HSD/SSOM with *no* faculty input; IDEA survey issues.
4. SSOM/HSD: No report.
5. University Senate report (TC)
	* The University Senate met on November 27. All four of the deans who drafted the FAS were present. There was a general discussion of the FAS draft and of the US response to it. Some minor modifications to the US response were made. Most importantly, the deans present agreed that the last 2 sentences on page 5 of the proposal be stricken — that is, the section having to do with possible “post-tenure review.”
		+ Noah Sobe: “I have been appointed to the committee to finalize the language of our response. I don’t think revising our language to strike the ‘poor performance’clause fully would be a very productive approach.” Discussion.
	* **Motion to amend draft:** The language regarding “poor” ratings and their consequences (p. 5, under Tenure-track faculty, bullet point 3) should be revised as follows:
		+ The first sentence should read: “If a faculty member earns a poor rating overall for two consecutive years, or more than three poor ratings overall in four years, the responsible party must work with the faculty member to develop and execute a performance improvement plan, which includes specific standards for performance.”
		+ The second and third sentence should be deleted entirely.
	* Motion approved 13-0-2.
6. Discussion of FAS Response Draft
	* Concerns discussed:
		1. Strike recommendation 1 on the background statement.
		2. Workload section: Combine the 3 recommendations with modifications to the first one:
			+ Recommendation: We agree with the ‘inclusive approach’ to counting faculty contributions indicated in the proposal, and suggest that units should develop workload criteria and disseminate these to each faculty member, specifying the effort expected in areas of teaching, research and service to meet the goals of that unit. Other factors should be considered in workload determination:
				- Class size and online courses
				- Clinical instruction
				- Course/curriculum Program Directors
				- Undergraduate and graduate student research supervision
		3. Evaluation form, Recommendation 1: The narrative portion should not be limited in length.
		4. Page 6, second bullet point: Strike.
7. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Lash); second (Shoenberger). Meeting adjourned 5:03pm.

Respectfully submitted by

Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary