

**Faculty Council  
Meeting Minutes  
March 22, 2007**

**Present:** Cliff Bekar, Associate Professor of Economics; Dinah Dodds, Professor of German; Deborah Heath, Associate Professor of Anthropology; Elizabeth Safran, Associate Professor of Geology; Julio de Paula, Dean of the College; Jane Hunter, Associate Dean of the College; Mervyn Brockett, Assistant to the President; and Terri Banasek, Executive Assistant and Recorder.

**Guests:** Rebecca Copenhaver, assistant professor of philosophy; and Thomas Olsen, Associate Professor of Physics.

Dr. Copenhaver and Dr. Olsen attended the meeting to present changes in procedures for departmental and program reviews. Dr. Copenhaver presented some background. The shift from the divisional dean structure to the Office of the Associate Dean and Faculty Council presented an opportunity to separate oversight for departmental and programs reviews from the responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee. The committee ran into two problems: 1) It was not clear what the responsibilities of the subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee were; and 2) it wasn't clear to departments when and to what degree they were required to respond to external reviews. The committee decided to use this opportunity to eliminate one layer of bureaucracy by removing the subcommittee, putting the oversight responsibilities where they properly belong – with the Associate Dean and the Faculty Council. It needs to be made clear to departments what the timeframe is for response to external reviews.

The Curriculum Committee already has accepted this recommendation, and Dr. Olsen expressed his desire for Faculty Council to do the same. He proposed that Dean de Paula, Faculty Council, and the Curriculum Committee jointly present the proposal to the faculty at the April 4 meeting. Dr. Olsen believes the changes are better for everyone and that they make it explicit who is responsible and why. Dr. Olsen added that the chair of the subcommittee is a member of the Curriculum Committee and is responsible for recruiting other members to serve on the subcommittee. Some members with no experience and historical viewpoint were called upon to serve. These changes invest in the Faculty Council a certain amount of oversight responsiveness to the resource questions and give the chair of the Curriculum Committee some of the roles that the subcommittee chair had in the formulation of the charge and meeting with the external reviewers upon their arrival. Dr. Olsen hopes these changes will make for a better functioning scheme.

Associate Dean Hunter asked if the Faculty Council felt it could take on more duties, adding that the logical connection makes sense to her as Faculty Council is the appropriately constituted body that considers resources. Dr. Dodds responded that this can be a fairly time-consuming job, depending on how many reviews are done. Dean de Paula noted that he wants to hold it to two per year, requiring one meeting per review. The real work comes in evaluating the review document, going over changes, and reviewing the changes with the Curriculum Committee. The agenda could be configured so that the meetings concerning the reviews could happen in the fall

semester. Dr. Copenhaver pointed out that this regularizes and formalizes the details of how the reviews and responses are conducted.

Dr. Bekar is concerned that Faculty Council is getting bogged down with day-to-day issues and becoming a responsive body, limiting its planning capacity. Dr. Safran noted that external reviews are more big picture – more of a part of long-term planning exercise. She raised some questions about the proposal:

1. Point 1.4 – Should that recommendation come from the Dean or the Faculty Council? Change the wording to Office of the Dean. This was considered a friendly amendment.
2. Step 3 – Schedule for review. Does that suggest a subset of the members of the Faculty Council? Dr. Copenhaver responded that the document remains neutral – it allows maximum flexibility on the part of Faculty Council. Dr. Olsen noted that the representative of that division would be most appropriate. Dr. Dodds added that it would make sense for the whole body to meet. Faculty Council would need to meet at the beginning to help to frame what to address in the review. If you want to receive their input in a pretty direct form, you meet at the end.

Associate Dean Hunter noted that the charge gets circulated before the review team even gets to campus. That could go through the Faculty Council also. With attention to drafting that, there are special questions for each review that are above and beyond the previous iteration.

Dr. Brockett noted the absence of views of graduates and a method for soliciting those views; he believes their views to be important. Dr. Copenhaver responded that it wasn't in the previous document but that she is not opposed to adding it. Dean de Paula added that it can be included in the charge to the reviewers. It also should be included how many students go on to graduate school and other post-graduate work. It is reasonable to let departments know what the Faculty Council wants.

It was agreed that the changes should be presented at the April 4 meeting and that it be presented jointly by one person on behalf of both groups. It may not require a vote. It was agreed that the document should be circulated to the faculty in advance of the meeting.

Dr. Olsen distributed a document to establish a faculty load policy that addresses collaborative research. This proposal was approved unanimously by the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Olsen would like the Faculty Council to address this as soon as possible, personally asking that it be placed high on the agenda for 2007-08. He will include this in his report to the faculty at the April 4 meeting.

## **Announcements**

- Dean de Paula announced that the faculty development group under the direction of Gary Reiness is interested in using the fall retreat for a number of mini-workshops on faculty development. It would be a day and a half retreat, with the second half-day devoted to advising. Faculty Council approved.

## Agenda Items

1. The minutes of March 8, 2007, were approved.
2. Dean de Paula noted that there is a lot of uncertainty in the area of fund-raising for the College. He understands that and how it affects the work of the groups drafting the vision statements. There will be a meeting on April 13 of all chairs in which President Hochstettler will address matters of fund-raising strategy head on. In the meantime, Dean de Paula asked for help in communicating with colleagues the importance of these vision statements. Comprehensive campaign or permanent fund-raising, we need to be able to articulate what we want donors to help us with. Without vision statements, it is difficult for the Executive Council to determine which initiatives we want to prioritize and which foundations and donors to approach. Dean de Paula gave the Faculty Council a revised due date of the week of April 2 for the draft vision statements. Dr. Heath noted that, apart from bricks and mortar, one of the questions that has come up in the ILC is that of what sort of funding opportunities there are for programmatic initiatives. Is it realistic to imagine we can obtain that sort of funding?

Dean de Paula responded that the College is always looking for funded professorships, and those can be tied to specific initiatives. Some programmatic issues can be related to, for example, the York Center. It is a collection of activities, and we could fund those activities with foundation money. Dean de Paula would like drafts of the vision statements before the all-chairs meeting.

3. Faculty Council continued its discussion of position requests.
4. The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Next meeting: Week of April 2 – date and time to be determined.