I. Approval of Agenda
The agenda for the meeting on March 12, 2019 was approved.

II. Approval of February 19, 2019 minutes
The minutes from the February 19, 2019 meeting were accepted with edits to section XII, New Business. B. Litkouhi suggested the minutes reflect that a proposal was drafted stating the rationale for discussions about promotion from associate to full professor and leadership expectations. A motion to accept the minutes, with edits, was passed unanimously.

III. Parking
The Office of Student Life recently introduced a change to the overnight parking rules. This proposal was presented to the Senate during their January, 2019 meeting. Included in this proposal was the elimination of employee overnight parking. I. Gerhardt reached out to the CFA in early March requesting feedback from faculty about this issue and raised concerns about the lack of transparency in the proposal’s justification for these changes. CFA members raised concerns that there was no attempt to have faculty weigh in on this topic and that it is “extraordinary” that no detailed data has been put forward supporting the proposed changes. I. Gerhardt was informed that a parking survey was performed, yet no faculty has been provided this information, specifically, in regard to who carried out the survey and how that data was interpreted.

This proposal was ultimately withdrawn by the Senate. R. Satterlee declared that there is currently enough parking. I. Gerhardt pointed out that this declaration complicates ongoing parking issues created by the loss of spaces due to Leo renovations and construction. There has still been no statement from A. Ryan or Provost, W. Clyde, concerning parking on south campus.

M. Groarke asked about the requirements to provide parking to local residence through the community parking program. She suggested that we see NY State/City regulation language regarding this issue. Does the school, by law, have to provide a
defined number of parking spaces to non-college associated residence? I. Gerhardt suggested that the issue be reassessed to determine how many accessible spots are actually available in the garage before continuing discussion.

IV. Faculty Handbook Updates

S. Ladda reported meeting with the college attorney in the previous week to discuss changes to the language in the Faculty Handbook. These edits were recommended form the subcommittee of R. Marinaccio, P. Abulencia, and H. Tyler, and their review of the handbook and attempt to maintain language consistency. Sections are in the review process across several offices on campus and will ultimately need to be reviewed by the Provost. Development is coming along, and all new language is expected to be reassessed by the subcommittee and finally by the CFA body. It is expected that general edits will be available by the April CFA meeting.

Member discussion included statements that parts of the Faculty Handbook are to be moved to the Employee handbook. B. Litkouhi raised concern that we should be careful about what is removed and suggested that it might be worthwhile having a second attorney see the new draft. P. Abulencia and S. Ladda each assured the committee that the new language and edits were only changing in order to be clearer and more consistent, and that they did not feel it was altering the meaning of any text, or the handbook in general.

E. O'Connell submitted a proposal to change the existing language of the handbook regarding promotion from associate to full professor (sec. 2.8.4.1). Current language states that in order to be promoted to the rank of professor a candidate must present evidence of “excellence in leadership”, both within the School/College and in the wider academic world. The proposed changes to the language were that the word “and” be changed to “or”. The change is intended to give faculty more flexibility in how they fulfill excellence in leadership. This proposal was ardently discussed with multiple concerns raised. Examples include:

1. What accomplishments are considered sufficient leadership?
2. What is the definition/measure of excellence?
3. What effect does assuming leadership roles have on scholarly work?
4. Do the white papers for each school sufficiently outline the expectations of leadership and are the expectations uniform for each School?
5. Are the provost’s expectations in line with those of P&T?
6. Would we want a faculty member promoted to full professor who is not a leader outside the campus community (aren't these the expectations at other institutions)?

Following discussions, the committee agreed that each school’s Guidelines should lay out what the expectations for promotion should be. It is clear that the definition of “excellence” and/or “leadership” is variable and dependent upon which school and department the faculty resides. B. Litkouhi advised that the language change from “and” to “or” may be acceptable, however the rationale put forth in the
proposal is too weak. M. Groarke recommended that the CFA review the Guidelines before a vote. A motion was made to table the discussion until the papers were revisited. The motion carried with 18 in favor and 1 abstention. This topic will be an agenda item again at the April CFA meeting.

V. Faculty and Assessment (COACHE Survey)
All faculty should have received a link to take the COACHE survey. I. Gerhardt queried senior faculty in his department about the survey and they reported that the questions were vague at best leading to at least one faculty member choosing to abstain from the survey completely. H. Laudien also voiced similar concerns from her department, where she asked them to put into writing their issues with the evaluation. S. Ladda asked the committee to confer with their individual departments for further feedback from faculty. Any concerns will be put into writing and sent to H. Laudien to collect.

VI. Administration and Assessment
I. Gerhardt reported for the Administration Evaluation Committee. The same tools that were used for the previous assessment are being used for development of a new evaluation, however, the Provost has stated his disapproval of the past evaluation. S. Ladda urged the Provost to see that there was data that could be used from the survey to assist administrators. Consensus was that too much time passes between administrative evaluations and that they should be conducted annually. A new subcommittee was formed to continue working on these assessments. H. Laudien, P. Abulencia, I. Gerhardt, and K. Fairchild volunteered to serve on this subcommittee.

VII. Board of Trustees Committee reports from December 2018
For student life, H. Laudien reported that conduct and crime statistics were ok. M. Groarke discussed the student satisfactory survey. The evaluation revealed that students were generally satisfied, except with the residence halls. Students reported the condition of housing as “not good” and that their complaints were not being addressed. H. Laudien added that students have complained of mold, security issues and broken elevators. There appears to be opposite reporting from the administrative Board Highlights vs. students on these issues. B. Litkouhi encouraged that CFA continue to be a strong voice on behalf of the students at the Board meetings.

For finance, I. Gerhardt reported that tuition is to go up 3% and room/board to go up 4%. The rise in living costs gave concern considering the lack of attention to housing issues and student dissatisfaction. Higgin's construction and Leo remodeling are estimated currently at $140 Mil.

For enrollment, K. Qazi reported he had a stand in for him during the meeting. Once he receives the information from his replacement he will follow up with CFA.
S. Ladda reported for the Special Committee of Strategic Planning. They are currently collecting data, using different variables to predict who will apply to MC, who we maintain, how these students perform, etc. The committee is evaluating details such as how far the student’s home is from MC, did they attend a Catholic high school, and if they are first generation college students, among other variables. This is a continuing analysis.

**VIII. New Business**

K. Qazi, on behalf of the Faculty Technology Committee, asked about the status of electronic paystubs. I. Gerhardt informed the CFA that this is now in progress and is expected to be implemented as early as May, 2019.

I. Gerhardt reported that EAC approved a 1 year academic calendar. He also informed the CFA that no official discussion has occurred concerning a movement away from block scheduling. The Provost has stated that he would welcome faculty consideration of such a move. CFA will discuss this further to consider realistic alternatives to the current blocks.

Meeting adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Bryan Wilkins