

2003

Faculty Council Minutes, October 1, 2003

Faculty Council
Eastern Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.emich.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

Faculty Council, "Faculty Council Minutes, October 1, 2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 298.
https://commons.emich.edu/sen_all/298

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

FACULTY COUNCIL
Eastern Michigan University
104 Pierce Hall
Phone 734/487-0196 Fax 734/487-0763

Faculty Council Minutes
Recorder: E. Broughton
October 1, 2003

- I. The FC meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.
- II. The Minutes of 9/17/03 were approved with an editing change.
- III. Any Agenda Items: Moved item IV to an action item.
- IV. Appointments are still open for several committees. University Sabbatical Leaves Committee: need COB and CAS nominations. There is still one appointment for the Public Safety Oversight Committee. Richard Douglas was appointed to IAAC Committee.
- V. **ACTION ITEM: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ISSUE.** The Academic Issues Chair provided a compilation of peer institutions regarding faculty development structures. There was also a draft document for Faculty Council to respond to regarding faculty development. A motion was made to separate the three items on the draft for discussion. 14 Yes, 14 No, 1 Abstention. The President broke the tie and the motion passed to separate the three items. (1) Reporting Lines. A motion to adopt item #1 regarding reporting lines. A discussion occurred on this issue as a policy issue and not a personal matter. The proposed reporting line to Academic Human Resources would be contrary to peer institutions in which other schools have strict academic reporting lines. This could be a potential danger for assistant/associate professors with reporting lines to Human Resources. A major concern is confidentiality. Council members expressed the concern that FC Development should be viewed as enrichment as well as a remedial process. Provost Schollaert commented on the faculty Development statement: His stated several issues: (a) this was a broad institutional investment, not only remedial and also enrichment of pedagogy; (b) EMU has a narrow view of Academic Resource Human Resources; (c) he commended the benchmarking of the peer institutions; (d) he agreed that confidentiality is a critical issue. The view is broader than labor only. The only peer institution with collective bargaining on the peer list is Western Michigan University. A discussion occurred regarding California State. A question was asked inquiring why the reporting lines were not to Dr. Harris. The major concern was that the Faculty Development Offices at peer institutions are focused on teaching and learning and are not under Human Resources. Council members expressed their fears and asked for a guarantee of confidentiality from the Provost. The motion passed: 19 Yes, 9 No, 3 Abstentions. (2) Faculty Advisory Committee for faculty development as stated in the draft document was moved. The motion to accept was unanimous. (3) FDP as stated in the third paragraph of the draft document was moved. The motion to accept was unanimous.

VI. **CHHS Reorganizational Proposal.** There was a motion for version #2 draft document to use for discussion, which passed. There was a concern for the language in last paragraph which was accepted as a change to the fourth paragraph. In the Task Force, all programs in HPERD were discussed, but there was not consensus on the Task Force. Leadership & Counseling faculty support reorganization, but believe that the input process was not followed. Special Education faculty did support the procedures and Task Force. A Council member asked how come the Task Force recommendations were not followed? Graduate Council did not support the Task Force recommendations. There were shortcomings in the Task Force report. Irrespective of the Task Force recommendations, the Council supported the search for a Dean. Provost Schollaert stated that he tried very hard to open the Task Force as broadly as possible. The original plan was not only CHHS. The Provost stated that: (1) he wanted colleges large to manage themselves and a better evenness among the colleges. (2) There would be small administrative savings. "We made the best effort with the Task Force for the colleges." A Council member raised the issue of our procedures and asked that programs be included along with departments. A motion was made to support the draft document from the Executive Board which failed. Vote: 6 Yes, 19 No, 3 Abstentions. Recommended procedures for adjusting the realignment guidelines: (1) foster inter-college council interactions; (2) include language for programs as well as departments. There was a motion to accept the Task Force recommendation which passed. 22 Yes, 3 No, 2 Abstentions. Executive Council to look at policy and draft response.

PRESENT: S. Moeller ACC; V. Okafor AFS; M. Ruggiero ART; S. Sonstein AHP; H. Zot BIOL; T. McDole BTE; T. Brewer CHEM; S. McCracken CTA; S. Haynes COSC; J. Knapp ENGL; P. Sanchez CIS; M. Zinggeler FLABS; C. Mayda GEO/GEOL; J. Armstrong HPERD; K. Chamberlain HIS/PHIL; D. Silverman HECR; Carol Haddad INDT; G. Mitchell IT; E. Broughton L&C, R. Baier HALLE; R. Hill MGMT; D. Barton MKT/LAW; G. Ahlbrandt MATH; K. Cole MUSC; P. Alford NURS; B. Grady PLS; A. Westman PSY; M. Bombyk SWK; R. Orrange SAC; L. Lee SPED; C. Burns TED.
GUEST: Patricia Zimmer, Graduate Council
ABSENT: ECON, PHY/AST, WMST.