

Chair Doe: Called on Reising, have a couple positions open, one on the University Curriculum Committee and the other for the Committee on Faculty Governance.

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, would like to move the nomination of Azlan Munir for the graduate student representative position on the University Curriculum Committee for a one-year term.

Chair Doe: No second needed for the motion. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion passed. Graduate position on the University Curriculum Committee approved.

2. Motion for Faculty Position on Committee on Faculty Governance –
Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, would like to move the nomination of Jessica Witt as the College of Natural Sciences representative on the Committee on Faculty Governance.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion passed. Jessica Witt confirmed as member of Committee on Faculty Governance.

3. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Proposal for Non-Tenure
Track Faculty to be Considered in the At-Large Representative Count
– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty has proposed two motions to increase representation of non-tenure track faculty, who are also called contract, continuing and adjunct faculty (CCAF). Committee on Faculty Governance has considered these motions carefully, have met with the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Considered implications on the rest of the code, Section C of the Manual. Compiled considerations on the content of the proposals, including the effects on apportionment of at-large representatives among the colleges. Distributed these on October 21st, and the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty distributed their own comments and rationale. Asked everyone to discuss these with their department, and to send reactions and comments before our meeting on November 16th. Committee on Faculty Governance voted to provide these motions for today's agenda for consideration. There are two motions to change the code, Section C of the Manual. Have to pass with a 2/3 majority of the Faculty Council members present.

Morse: Thanked Reising, appreciated the process and the feedback that was collected. On behalf of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, the first motion is to include contract and continuing faculty in the apportionment of at-large representatives so we would count all our faculty, tenure-track, contract, and continuing when creating the numbers for how many voting members of the Faculty Council exist.

Chair Doe: We have a motion. Requested a second.

Reising: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked for any discussion.

Dylan Yost: Brought this to faculty meeting, had some fairly serious concerns. This section of the code represents direct proportionality, concerned that it doesn't acknowledge that individual colleges have diverse interests. For instance, Engineering could lose representation. Didn't see a cap on representation by college. Asked: Is the point of this to basically proportion out the at-large representation or is it only to apportion out the total representation? Way it's worded means that it's the total representation, which means that if one college has a majority of the faculty, they would get the majority of votes on Faculty Council. From our position, one possibility is to make it so that only at-large representation is proportional to the total faculty, including continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty. Another possibility is to include a cap, but have concerns about it being a straight direct proportionality.

Harris: Stated in the chat in appreciation for the acknowledgement by Yost that this concern is distinct from continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty representation. Expressed hope that everyone can agree on the principle of continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty being counted for the purposes of representation.

Morse: Appreciated the concerns brought up by Yost. Wanted to clarify the motion. Only change that is being proposed is to include contract and continuing to the part that is underlined. Question of apportionment was changed by the Committee on Faculty Governance back in April or May, the change to the 45% was a separate motion in a separate conversation. Only piece that would be changing here is the addition of these two appointment types.

Yost: Stated agreement. Issue isn't created by this, but do have to acknowledge the fact that there's a little bit of disagreement on the numbers. For instance, Engineering could potentially go from nine members to six, a relatively big change. Important that people realize that representation could quickly go down significantly.

Moti Gorin: On question of apportionment, non-tenure track faculty have varied interests based on colleges. Will not always vote the same way. Non-tenure track faculty are currently underrepresented.

Yost: Concern is not that we do not want continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty to not have a voice. Cap on representation for a college could give representation and still be in the spirit of the proposal. Protecting the rights of a smaller college.

Makela: Noted in the chat that if we look far down the road and come up with concerns that do not exist now, there always can be reconsideration when the situation is new and different in ten years. This is not putting the change in concrete.

Ruth Hufbauer: The departments are always going to be the same. Think that this is a very separate issue from the non-tenure track issue, and that if there are problems with not having a

cap by college, then we can address that in the code later rather than conflating it with the continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty representation on Faculty Council.

Yost: Point is that we are addressing the same exact part of the code where it says it is going to be direct proportionality. That's the goal stated in that part of the code, so if it is not the goal to make it for direct proportionality, thinks now would be the time to change it.

Hufbauer: All departments will be represented by faculty members, so it is just the at-large that will shift.

Yost: Asked: That's correct, but if a certain college has 50% of the faculty, won't they get 50% of the vote as was written here? That is what we are concerned with.

Conner: Asked for a point of clarification. Sounds what was stated was that direct proportion is not part of the motion that is being proposed. Seems that it should not be up for discussion since it's not part of the motion.

Makela: Stated in the chat a motion to call the question.

Chair Doe: Clarified from our Parliamentarian that calling the question requires a 2/3 vote. If it gets the 2/3 vote, there will be an immediate vote in the main motion on the floor. Placed motion for a vote in the chat.

Motion to call the question passed.

Reising: The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty puts before Faculty Council whether contract and continuing faculty should count in the apportionment of at-large representatives.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in Forms in the chat.

Motion passed.

4. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Proposal for Non-Tenure Track Faculty to be Elected to Serve on Faculty Council – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Morse: The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty submit this motion to allow contract or continuing appointments to become elected representatives of Faculty Council.

Reising: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Was there further discussion to be had on the second motion?

Pedros-Gascon: Wanted to clarify that this means that a non-tenure track faculty member may be a candidate for the department representative or the college at-large representative. Can then be

on equal playing field with tenure-track faculty in serving their candidacy and standing for election for these positions.

Chair Doe: Asked for any additional discussion. Hearing none, requested a poll in the chat.

Motion passed.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Yielded time to allow Karen Barret to speak. Posted report in the chat for members to view.

2. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons: There is a Board of Governors meeting this week. Nothing else to report at this time.

I. DISCUSSION

Chair Doe: Has been a significant interest in the last two weeks that has been vocalized by a number of different parties regarding the fall procedures around grading. Last spring, we allowed late withdrawal and S/Us after the end of the semester. This is being raised again for this semester. Put together a group that represents the chairs of many of our standing committees, including the University Curriculum Committee, the Committee on Teaching and Learning, the Committee on Scholastic Standards, the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, the Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education, and the Executive Committee. Discussed the issue of a late withdrawal and S/U grading for this semester as an emergency measure, much like it was in the spring. Enormous implications to making these kind of decisions. Not considering in any way a general policy change, just asking about this semester based on a lot of student outcry.

Karen Barrett: Gave background on what the policies were last spring. Students could opt to replace their traditional grades with S/U grades after they saw their grades at the end of the semester. Could also withdraw from individual classes until the final day of the semester rather than the usual eighth week of the semester. Teaching Continuity Committee decided not to continue that policy in the fall before we started classes. Committee on Scholastic Standards recommended at least having the late withdrawal, brought this to the Teaching Continuity Committee, Committee on Teaching and Learning, and the University Curriculum Committee, and all agreed it was a good idea. Felt the S/U grading was less clear-cut. Undeclared student advisors wrote a letter requesting that S/U grading be allowed again this time as well. Students have been affected by multiple quarantines, mental health issues, needs to go home and/or care for others. The Faculty Action Input Response (FAIR) Committee recommends to resume Spring 2020's policy for this semester. This will need to be done hand in hand with careful advising. More options are better.