

Faculty Senate Executive Council
Minutes
December 2, 2014

Members present: Kim Gainer, Vince Hazleton, Jerry Kopf, Susan Schoppelrey, Carter Turner

Members absent: Laura Jacobsen,

Guest: Bill Kennan

1. The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.
2. The minutes for November 18, 2014, were approved.
3. The council discussed whether someone on sabbatical could vote on issues of reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The council concluded that someone on sabbatical, as opposed to someone on unpaid leave, has been assigned to research but is a fully functioning member of the department who may vote on such matters if he or she chooses. Dr. Kopf was directed to convey that information to the interested parties.
4. Dr. Kopf reported on the Board of Visitors meeting, with additional remarks by Dr. Kennan.
 - The BOV toured the Recreation and Wellness Center.
 - The BOV asked questions of Dr. Cox *re* the lack of additional slots for clinical assignments.
 - Drs. Dunleavy and Hawkins gave a presentation on the RU Futures Commission. Details desired by the BOV will be presented at a later meeting.
 - The BOV approved one of the three motions presented by the Faculty Senate: a Motion *re* Revising the T & R Faculty Handbook to Change Composition of College Curriculum Committees.
 - Regarding the two remaining motions, the BOV requested a presentation at its May meeting on how faculty are evaluated and how tenure and promotion decisions are made. Members inquired as to why separate departments develop their own guidelines and asked whether it would be possible to develop a standardized form. Dr. Minner has charged Dr. Kennan with preparing this presentation, and Dr. Kennan will meet with the Chairs Council to begin the process of assembling the necessary documents. Dr. Kennan observed that the Activity Insight program may help answer board member questions.
 - Dr. Kopf reported that the BOV was concerned with return on investment and that its definition of ROI seems to focus on graduates moving into well-paying jobs.
 - Dr. Kopf stated that his own remarks to the board focused on three points:
 - RU's mission is primarily one of undergraduate education.
 - RU needs to budget consistent with this mission, or it needs to change its mission.
 - It is impossible for faculty to have a meaningful impact if they are only informed of these initiatives shortly before their presentation to the board;

greater attention must be paid to the process by which initiatives are developed.

- Dr. Kennan stated that it was important that more faculty members attend those BOV meetings that are open to the public.
5. The council discussed the budget process. Dr. Kopf stated that he would like to see a list of reallocation decisions: the programs the Provost wishes to fund and what would be given up to provide that funding. He expressed concern that during AY 2015-2016 the university would have to come up with money for several of the new chemistry positions, as well as money for Career Services. Dr. Kopf stated that it was important that faculty express their priorities before December 10, 2014, when the provost will turn in a list of budget priorities.
 6. The council discussed the vision for a Career Center. Council members asked whether the difference between \$ 466 thousand and \$ 1.7 million would result in a sufficient return on investment. Members also expressed concern that the difference would come from internal reallocation from the academic side. Members also discussed the importance of reopening the conversation about the direction of career services. Members expressed concern that communication involving provost and faculty most often took the form of a briefing rather than a conversation.
 7. The council discussed its concern that a third of the revenue from student payments, in the form of fees, goes to student services and athletics.
 8. The council discussed the Motion *re* Support for Career Services. The motion was amended by the insertion of the last 'whereas' clause from Dr. Hazleton's original motion: "historically attempts to provide high-impact experiences through non-credit generating and non-revenue generating support units have been unsustainable and generally failed in public universities." In addition, the following language was inserted: "The Faculty Senate Executive Council further recommends that an ongoing conversation on the future of Career Services be maintained via the formation of a new taskforce, with faculty representatives to be chosen by the Faculty Senate Executive Council, and that this taskforce be charged with examining alternative strategies for improving career services outcomes and making recommendations as to the most cost-effective and sustainable solutions." The motion was approved as amended.
 9. The council discussed whether to also bring forward a motion on new graduate programs. Members are concerned about the process by which these programs are proposed and expressed the desire that they be contingent on the availability of new funds and not be established via reallocation of existing funds. Dr. Kenna stated that, based on demand, it was probable that the Masters of Science in Information and Data Management would be self-supporting.
 10. The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.