

Council for Faculty Affairs Minutes
September 11, 2018
Room 3B (3.05), Kelly Commons

Attendance: Shawn Ladda (chair), Sarah Scott, Quentin Machingo, Nevzat Ozturk, Br. Robert Berger, Bernadette Lopez-Fitzsimmons, Natalia Boliari, J. Patrick Abulencia, Kashifuddin Qazi, Sister Remigia Kushner, Parisa Saboori, Dan Savoy, Matthew Volovski, Nuwan Jayawickreme, Heidi Laudien, Musa Jafar, Robert Suzzi Valli, Bryan Wilkins, Margaret Groarke.

Excused: Ira Gerhardt

I. Welcome

S. Ladda welcomed all committee members and distributed the CFA Bylaws. The CFA Bylaws are located in Chapter 2 (p. 120-126) of the Faculty Handbook, which is posted on Moodle.

S. Ladda asked if anyone has conflicts with the minute taking schedule. It was suggested and agreed that the date of the next CFA meeting be Tuesday, October 9th. Time and location of the meeting was to be determined.

II. Introductions

Each member attending the meeting introduced themselves.

III. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

IV. Approval of May 8, 2018 Minutes

The minutes were approved as submitted.

V. Constitution of the Agenda Committee

S. Ladda informed that we need nominations for the following positions: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and At-large member. Nominations were presented and voted occurred. The Agenda Committee for 2018-2019 will be H. Laudien, vice chair; P. Saboori, Secretary; and I. Gerhardt, the at-large member.

VI. Approval of Members for Faculty Welfare Committee

S. Ladda and I. Gerhardt agreed to be the CFA designee members for the FWC. Both were approved unanimously.

VII. Selection of CFA representatives to the Board of Trustee (BOT) Committees

The BOT Committees' tentative meeting schedule and list of representatives was distributed and reviewed. The following faculty will serve on these BOT Committees: Committee on Academic Affairs - M. Groarke; Committee on Development - N. Boliari; Committee on Enrollment Management - K. Qazi; Committee on Facilities Planning - B. Lopez; Committee on Finance - I.

Gerhardt; Committee on Student Life & Admissions - H. Laudien; and Special Committee on Strategic Planning - S. Ladda.

VIII. Board of Trustees June 7, 2018 meetings report

S. Ladda reminded that the June 2018 Report of the President (handed out at the meeting) already contains summaries and highlights of all BOT meetings held in June. She asked if CFA representatives had any other information to add. B. Lopez-Fitzsimmons (representing CFA on the Facilities Committee) added that 2019 commencement is expected to happen in Gaelic Park; preparations for that change are underway. She also brought the ongoing issues with construction and renovations in Leo. The committee discussed specific problems with elevators and the suggestion to have a combination of unionized and non-unionized workers on the construction site. P. Saboori commented about frequent changes in the construction plans for the South Campus. S. Ladda suggested that we hold these concerns/issues until the Provost joins us at 4:15 pm.

IX. CFA Committees

Information on standing CFA committees was collected back in May. All standing committee members were unanimously approved.

X. Promotion & Tenure Rules Committee Recommendations

S. Ladda explained that the P&T Rules committee summarizes the recommendations made by the P&T committee during deliberations from the previous February, brings them to the CFA committee, and asks CFA members to approve the recommendations. A P&T document with nine recommendations was handed distributed and S. Ladda explained/clarified briefly all nine. P. Saboori raised fairness issues with regards to recommendations #1 and #2; P. Abulencia and S. Ladda clarified that the logic is to provide flexibility to faculty who are subject to the situations described in recommendations #1 and #2 and hired by the college. Recommendation #6 generated a brief discussion: S. Ladda clarified the meaning of teaching versatility (variety of classes taught versus the needs upon which a faculty is asked to teach courses; consideration is also given to different course levels). P. Abulencia, K. Qazi, H. Laudien, and M. Groarke commented on why the clarification is needed in the first place.

It was decided that Recommendation #8 be a future agenda item. S. Ladda suggested that Recommendation #9 demands subcommittees to review the processes involved. Because of time constraints the CFA unanimously approved to table this agenda item for future discussion.

XI. Institutional Assessment & Faculty Perspective (Guest Bridget Miller, Director of Institutional Effectiveness)

Bridget Miller joined the meeting and explained that the institutional calendar and assessment plan handout (distributed at the meeting) is to start a conversation about institutional assessment.

She explained that the first type of assessment (the Institutional Priorities Survey) is done at the college level and that aggregate data is what is collected. An outside consulting firm does the second assessment; therefore collected individual data lives with that consulting firm. Additional material in regards to the third type of assessment was handed out as a second sheet to explain the nature of the assessment.

B. Miller explained that she looks for feedback from us to assess faculty perspectives; how do they align with students' perspectives, what we need to do to comply with the college's strategic plan. P. Saboori commented on the reliability and variations of the assessment types. R. Berger asked if she wanted anything more specifically. B. Miller replied no and that she is looking for feedback from faculty. M. Groarke asked if information on all or some of those assessments (and their results) is public. B. Miller replied yes and said she plans to put all available survey information on the O'Malley Library site. N. Jayawickreme asked if he could find detailed information by following the link provided in the description about the third assessment type B. Any additional feedback and questions should be directed to B. Miller.

XII. Concerns to address 2018-2019 (This agenda item was imbedded in next agenda item with a discussion with the Provost.

XIII. A conversation with Provost Bill Clyde

S. Ladda welcomed the Provost and agreed to discuss issues that we think are of priority.

S. Ladda brought the South Campus construction and renovation issues forward. The following are points made by Provost Clyde. He explained the domino effect of construction; many changes (expected or unexpected) to original plans become necessary as the process evolves. There have been communication issues since the beginning of June. There are three committees where updates on the construction process are discussed and communicated. The first one is the Steering Committee, which is the biggest but was not meeting regularly in the past. Since June, this committee has monthly morning meetings and Andrew Ryan tries to be more responsive with regards to communicating the updates and addressing concerns that are raised. Deans must attend these meetings and they are open to faculty. It is projected that the construction will continue for a few years and it will be loud and messy but given the nature of the process there is only so much that can be under complete control.

P. Saboori commented that changes in plans are understandable but they are less so if they are drastic changes made by the architect and not communicated on time. Provost Clyde agreed about some of the arbitrary changes, which have not been coordinated and communicated properly. This was followed by a small question on the scope of the Operational meetings. Provost Clyde suggested that looking at the big picture or at things as a whole is with the Steering Committee. Looking at specific, single pictures is with the Operational Committee. He

suggested that we all keep an eye, attend meetings, be alert, ask for more information, coordination, and communication of changes and updates. P. Saboori also asked if and in what way meetings have become more effective as a result of having them happen more often. Provost Clyde replied that having an operational meeting every Monday morning hold parties involved in the process more accountable.

P. Saboori asked how the challenges related to the construction process are affecting junior versus senior faculty. Her point was that junior faculty may bear more negative effects in the form of worsening evaluations or performance, in general, at a time when they are on tenure track. The Provost suggested that such issues should be resolved at the department chairs level. Specifically, the chairs could or should include a note for every faculty member that may have been negatively affected by having to teach in a classroom, which was frequently affected by construction issues. He added that what is important is that in the long term, we need to get the better location/sites we need.

Provost Clyde brought the faculty advising issue that he addressed during convocation. He explained that the main goal is to create responsibility for faculty to assist students in their decisions. We could think of creating a syllabus for advising and defining student versus faculty responsibilities. In general, we could think of noninvasive ways of getting a sense of how to improve advising. He also suggested that we could create an assessment tool for advising and include it in evaluations. The bottom line is that we have to measure advising and faculty (may be the Educational Affairs Committee task) has to decide how.

M. Groarke shared her and some of her colleagues' feelings that fewer and fewer students are coming for advice and they wonder why. H. Laudien suggested that this is because of Degree Works which is a guide for students in terms of what courses to take and when. The Provost commented that this might be because of the characteristics of the iGen (referring to Dr. Twenge's book/term used to describe the generation born after 1995) who seem to avoid personal contacts with people, in general. He suggested that we nevertheless have to find ways to force students to come and talk to us. H. Laudien commented that faculty should be held accountable for not doing the things they are supposed to be doing (in general but specifically in the case of advising). Chairs too, need to be coached and hold accountable by their Deans in a meaningful and constructive ways.

S. Scott raised the issue about what she called the "other side of advising which is being a therapist for suicide, sex assault, and other situations" which demand faculty's "emotional labor". She asked if faculty could receive any guiding or support on that. H. Laudien commented that faculty should not bear that burden and suggested that S. Scott contact counseling services to come and talk to her department. She added that in no way faculty should faculty deal with that.

Provost Clyde supported H. Laudien's comments by requiring that faculty get students in such situations to counseling services as soon as possible.

As a final issue, Provost Clyde discussed the need to design a specific process, which could bring visiting professors to a tenure-track path or a path that will allow them to apply for promotion. The faculty handbook does not contain anything about such a process and Provost Clyde believes it is unjust to not give visiting instructors a path, and that we should. He asked if we could come up with ideas looking to formalize such a process. He emphasized that something needs to be done because the handbook does not speak to such a need or process at all. S. Ladda stated she would circulate the last proposal related to this issue and have the CFA further discuss.

XIV. New Business

Two items were suggested by P. Saboori. First, getting a follow up on the savings that were made as a result of moving faculty dining room from Kelly to Thomas Hall. Second, having a clear follow up on the responsibilities of faculty to submit attendance, grades, mapworks updates, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
N. Boliari Boliari