

Attendees: Associate Dean Projansky, Assistant Dean Leckie, Assistant Dean Hovsepian, Brian Snapp, Dan Evans, John O'Connell, Nolan Baumgartner, Trevor Myrick, Marc Pearson, Linda Smith, Jay Kim, Rick Wacko, Rob Wood, Stacie Riskin, Kevin Hanson, Lien Fan Shen, Connie Wilkerson, Steve Pecchia-Bekum, Adam Terry, Jahanara Saleh, Stephen Koester, Ellen Bromberg, Sharee Lane, Juan Carlos Claudio, Samantha Matsukawa, Laquimah Vandunk, Sara Francis, Michael Chikinda, Bruce Quaglia, Mitchell Bodily, Shana Osterloh, Mary Ann Dresher, Sarah Shippobotham, Amy Oakeson, Leah Plassett (for Marcella Pereda), Penny Caywood, Rob Baldwin (for James Gardner & Russ Schmidt). Excused: Dean Tymas-Jones

## AGENDA

### 1. Call to Order:

Associate Dean Projansky calls the meeting to order at 3:04 pm. She announces that Dean Tymas-Jones is out of town and so she is chairing the meeting today. She thanks everyone who is in attendance. Associate Dean Projansky says that for any College Council meeting where we will have a debate, we will have a Parliamentarian, just in case we need one. Bob Nelson is serving that capacity today. She thanks him for his service.

### 2. Approval of Minutes:

#### From November 15, 2013 Meeting

Associate Dean Projansky asks if there is a motion to approve the minutes. A member of the Council makes a motion and it is seconded. The minutes are approved.

### 2. Request for New Business:

Associate Dean Projansky asks if there is any new business for the College? There is none.

### 4. Consent Calendar:

### 5. Dean's Staff Reports:

- E-Catalog (Assistant Dean Leckie)

Assistant Dean Leckie says that the U is moving next catalog year to an electronic catalog to allow for search capability. It will allow students to save their preferred courses to the catalog. What that means is that it will change how we do catalog edits. Right now the university has created a mock 13-14 catalog that will never go live, but that is what we will use to update. Your departments will have departmental changes and any program or emphasis will have its own page. The catalog will reflect the DARS at the undergrad level and degree requirements at grad level. Liz says that changes that come through the College Curriculum committee will automatically be input into the catalog. However, the departmental pages will need to be updated. Training for departmental reps will start two weeks from now. Liz asks if there are any questions? There are none.

- Lassonde Institute Collaboration (Assistant Dean Leckie)

Assistant Dean Leckie wants to bring attention to an e-mail that came out earlier this week. The Lassonde Center has been funded to build a student center on campus and they want to know what needs we might have that we might like to see in that center. Whatever you can think of that would help your students (or you, as students) have a great experience, they want to know. They have specifically targeted the Arts. They're having an open house on Feb. 25<sup>th</sup>, and if you can't come to the open house, just send them an e-mail with what you would like to see. Liz encourages everyone to send them our wishes. If you have something in your unit that is really cool, but we need another one, let them know. If

you need something to make a dream center for the students, let them know. E-mails should be sent to the Lassonde Center—lassonde@utah.edu.

## 6. Special Committee Reports:

- **Curriculum Committee Report (Sydney Cheek-O'Donnell)**

Associate Dean Projansky welcomes Sydney Cheek-O'Donnell to the meeting. Sydney says that to date the Curriculum Committee has met in person twice during the 2013-14 academic year--once in August and once in December. The committee will meet again in March to discuss the next round of curriculum changes. The next deadline is coming up soon. Sydney says that Sarah will review them and send back any proposals that need adjustment.

Sydney says that in August the committee reviewed 27 proposals--16 were new courses. Also, the committee reviewed two new emphasis: String Performance & Pedagogy, and Animation. In January, 107 proposals were reviewed. Sydney says if you're wondering why your Curriculum Committee chairs look haggard, this is why. That was a large amount of changes to review. Also, an adjustment to an existing minor was approved, as well as the reactivation of the BFA in Theatre teaching.

Sydney says that in addition, Associate Dean Projansky sent around a memo to the department chairs, the Curriculum Committee chairs, and other relevant individuals regarding two items that the Curriculum Committee discussed at the meeting. One was the use of the word "attitude" in grading, and two, when a syllabus will be required by the Curriculum Committee in order for approval of a course. This memo describes the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee. "Attitude" might describe personality, and so it was recommended to use terminology that can be used to replace "attitude" to describe participatory behaviors --like positive contribution, engagement, etc. If you want your own copy, Sydney says to just let her know and she can send that memo to you directly. Regarding the syllabi question--when do you submit a syllabus to the Curriculum Committee? One is for a new course proposal. The other is if a course that is being reactivated. If that course has been inactive for less than 5 years, the most recent syllabus is fine. If it's been longer than 5 years, then a new syllabus is required.

Sydney says that the last thing regarding syllabi which came up in Curriculum Committee was about "special topics." In many departments they offer special topics where the subject matter of the course changes from semester to semester. So there was discussion about what do we do when there is a special topics course. What is recommended is writing a brief memo explaining the rationale for the class, explaining the approximate list of subjects that might be covered and the type of work that will be expected. That way the Curriculum Committee can have an idea of what will be happening in the course. This also allows the committee to determine if the course number is appropriate for the level of work being asked of the students.

Sydney says that Associate Dean Projansky has done an amazing job with the curriculum committee since she's taken over.

Associate Dean Projansky asks if there are any questions? There are none. She says that the new Animation Emphasis is all the way through the process, so that is on the books, and the String Emphasis is nearly there.

- **ArtsForce Report (Trevor Myrick, Christina Jones, Karem Orrego, & Samantha Matsukawa)**

Trevor Myrick says that they wanted to give a brief snapshot of ArtsForce. Danielle Powers introduces herself. Karen Orrego introduces herself. Samantha Matsukawa introduces herself. Trevor says that two goals for this report were to give feedback on what the interns did, and share some of the student feedback from the surveys they sent out.

Samantha says that she was in charge of logistics. Through this experience, she learned how to articulate what she has learned through the degrees she is seeking. She realized how important that was this year as she is looking for jobs.

Karem says that she was an intern in charge of Alumni and donations. They contacted alumni and different arts organizations and let them be involved in the networking event. With donations it was the same—talking to them and asking if they would like to donate prizes, etc. She was also one of the designers to design the logo. As she is studying Film & Media Arts, you have to learn film, but you also have to learn work experience. The ArtsForce experience was really great for her. She could talk more with people from arts organizations and let them see their passion about art. Also, work experience is great for the resume. She also gained more self-esteem as an artist. When she started to do this with her teammates she realized that she can create things—that allows her to see herself as an artist and apply for different internships. Thanks to the experience, it's a great opportunity. Not a lot of students can say they organized a conference this huge.

Dani says that she learned how to take a lead role on a large project. In EAE the breadth is very apparent and ArtsForce taught her to become a leader and bring those factions together. She would love to do it again.

Trevor says that ultimately the interns had a great experience putting on a conference. We talk a lot about how important it is to have a degree, but it's also important to have work experience. So this was great for them.

Trevor shows the evaluation they gave out at ArtsForce on the screen. About 161 people when through registration. Approximately 150 people participated in the Networking Event. 94.4% of the respondents would recommend and attend a future ArtsForce conference. 97.2% left feeling that they gained valuable experience from this. Trevor says that with the preconference they were trying it out to see if students liked the types of workshops that were offered. Regarding career management, the response averages were very good. It was almost unanimous that it was a valuable workshop. These same numbers were throughout the rest of the pre-conference workshops, as well. At the end, the comments/suggestions were that people wanted more time with these workshops. The interns were scared that the students wouldn't want to spend so much time, but it turns out that they wanted more time in the workshops. The networking workshop was listed by many of the students as the most valuable thing they learned at the conference. Some said they hated it, but the majority of the students felt like they have a new approach to networking now. Making those connections was important. Overall the students were grateful that this was put on. Most people want this to continue. During the conference they talked about mind-mapping. Most of the presenters did mind-mapping exercises and most of the students enjoyed it. The students like to think about themselves and their craft and what they are doing. Other suggestions included having more time, and being able to attend more than one panel. For the preconference workshops, they wanted more time and asked if we can make those workshops throughout the year and not all at once. A handful of students wanted it to be major-specific. However, this is a college-wide effort, so arts in general were focused on. Also, they wanted to see an on-line component for this. Overall there was an almost unanimous request to continue with this.

Trevor asks if there are any questions? There are none.

7. Notice of Intent:

- Minor Updates to College Charter

Associate Dean Projansky says that in the next College Council meeting we will discuss some minor changes to the college charter—typos and title changes and updates.

8. Debate Calendar:

- Career-line Faculty Review Policy

Associate Dean Projansky says that before we get started discussing the policy, she wanted everyone to know that the University requires that the Colleges do this. We are

complying with regulations with this policy. She says that this was originally discussed last Spring, and it went back to committee in the Fall. It went through multiple revisions, and after that the committee went back to work. The committee met three times in person, very lengthy meetings, and communicated online, as well. There were 14 people on the committee—with representation from every department. 50% were tenure-line and 50% were career-line/adjunct. Sarah says she wants to thank the committee publicly, and reads the membership list: Kim Martinez, Bruce Quaglia, Mike Cottle, Bettie Jo Basinger, Rob Wood, Chris Duval, Jay Kim, Andrea Jensen, Marnie Powers-Torrey, Ellen Bromberg, Lien Fan Shen, Russ Schmidt, Brenda Van Der Wiel, and Nolan Baumgartner. She thanks them all for a lot of work.

Sarah reminds everyone that if you are not a member of College Council you can participate in the discussion, but you can't vote. If you are a member of College Council you will vote. She also says that we have several proxys here today. If you are a proxy, you need to have written notice of your proxy.

A visitor at the meeting says that he would suggest that the Council have a written ballot. He is not a member of the Council, so Sarah asks if a member of the Council would like to request it. It is requested by a member of the Council, and the Council determines that there will be a written ballot.

Sarah gives a brief explanation of Roberts Rules. She says there are two useful parliamentary procedures that are useful to know. We have a handout with common motions that you might find useful. Professor Nelson's definition on any motion is definitive. She asks if there are any questions about process? There are none.

Sarah asks if there is a motion? A member of the Council moves to approve the document. Another member of the Council seconds it. It is opened up for discussion.

A visitor says that he wants to say how grateful he is for the policy. It has a lot of great things. The Council has done a great job. He raised some questions at the CWF&S meeting and wants to reiterate them here. He is concerned about the role of the chair in the process. Sarah says that the committee discussed his concerns virtually. A change was suggested, but the committee didn't approve the change and so the policy stands as it was previously.

A member of the Council asks for clarification of the visitor's concern. The visitor says that the chair is involved in setting up both the Review Committee and the Appointment Committee. The chair also decides if the person actually receives a contract. His point is that the chair has too much power. Sarah clarifies that it is the "Advisory Committee," not "appointment committee." She also clarifies that the department chair will chair the Advisory Committee, but has no vote. The visitor says that the chair has a lot of influence all along the way and he has concerns about it every step of the way. There are things in his department that are relevant to this that he would like to see this policy go to the departments for them to take a look at this. The idea is to have something general, but in specific details, the kinds of things that can happen, like in Music, will be most specific. For example, they will need several committees. And that raises all kinds of questions that need to be addressed. That discussion needs to go beyond this body. His preference would be a motion to have this ratified and then have it go to the departments for their approval.

Sarah says that a point of clarification is that this policy has to be set at the College level.

A member of the Council says that it has gone to the departments. It has been distributed by him to his faculty, and it was distributed to his faculty so that they could bring comments. When this was first explored, they gave comments.

Another Council member says that she made a suggestion in the College-wide Faculty & Staff meeting--why do we have to use the wording in the policy? Why can't we say the department should have a process to appoint the AC committee? It is the same idea that

the committee had, but the departments could have their own process. Is there any University policy for this?

Sarah indicates that the particular piece of this policy that is being referred to is not coming straight out of University policy.

A member of the Council says on page 2 of the document it states that it should be determined at the department level. How is it determined? Sarah says that the committee did not feel that different approaches were necessary. Sarah says that every college and department is unique from each other.

A visitor says that he would like to have that conversation. The fact is that you may have committees convened that overlap, so they need to be discussed in the departments. The chair has enormous power in this case. If a chair has something against the candidate, there is no provision for this kind of situation.

Sarah says that the way the committee has phrased it in the policy is that it can be larger, or subcommittees can be used. You can do multiple committees.

The visitor asks if there can be competing committees? Sarah says that each department could determine it.

A Council member says that the procedure for review, and what the visitor is addressing is that there are two committees. The first is charged with fact-finding and reviewing. The Advisory Committee is the group that then votes on the recommendation. So what we're talking about is that the department chair appoints the initial Review Committee. Then the next question is whether it is appropriate for the chair to appoint the chair of that committee. The Council member says that he objected to that, and says that he sees little difference. If there was a chair who was going to abuse their power, they would appoint someone who would do their bidding. The secondary concern is that where there are a huge number of adjunct faculty, and in the smaller units where there is someone who has to take on that responsibility by themselves, it is a huge task. The Council member asks if each department could do a faculty vote to see if they have the department chair appoint that committee.

Sarah asks if the Council member would like to withdraw his original motion and put forward a motion to amend the document. The Council member makes a motion to amend the language: each department or school shall vote on who chairs the Advisory Committee.

Sarah says that once this policy passes here, it goes to the University and it will need to be passed there, as well.

A visitor suggests that the Advisory Committee votes on the Review Committee. Sarah says that the Advisory Committee contains all tenure-line, and all long-term career-line faculty--as long as the tenure-line faculty contains a simple majority. The Advisory Committee is the voting body, so whether or not the long-term career-line faculty will vote will go to the departments. If that gets approved, then the shape of the Advisory Committee will be the career-line and tenure-line faculty, as long as the tenure-line has majority.

Sarah says that she heard this suggestion: the Advisory Committee of each academic unit shall vote on this. Is this a motion? The Council member who made the motion withdraws the motion altogether.

Another member of the Council makes a motion that the Advisory Committee appoints the Review Committee and then the Review Committee votes for the chair of the committee. That would take the department chair out completely. The department chair could also be influential in favor, as well.

Sarah restates that the motion would be the Advisory Committee of the academic unit shall elect the Review Committee, which will then elect its chair. A different Council member seconds it.

The Parliamentarian clarifies that the motion is to amend the document. So the motion is just to rewrite this sentence.

A member of the Council says he wants to go back to what the visitor was saying. Although we have all gotten the e-mail of this document, it could be more substantially discussed at the department level. This is a pretty big shift in the way we are thinking about career-line faculty, and the way that we are evaluating them. It might be a good discussion at the department level. Also, it would provide not so much of a top-down feeling.

Another Council member asks if there are other units that have adjuncts at the level that they do in the School of Music? A member of the Council says that they do in Art & Art History.

A member of the Council says that it seems to him if we move to make specific rules to make who appoints the chairs of each committee, that you are in fact making it less likely that each department will find their own procedure.

A visitor says that this is very specific. He doesn't see that it's possible. In fact, it doesn't take into fact taking multiple Review Committees. Sarah says that it does. It could be an entire committee or subcommittees. The visitor says that the role of the department chair is very clear. There is nothing ambiguous about it.

A member of the Council says that the idea would be the Advisory Committee, which (in theory) could only consist of tenure-line faculty, determines who would be on the Review Committee. That strikes him as problematic. So it's the tyranny of the chair or the tyranny of the mob. It's true that chairs/directors are answerable and if they behaved badly, and the faculty objected to it, there would be consequences. He agrees with the anxiety about it, but as long as the tenured faculty are the only ones who have the power, you give power to smaller hands. The spirit of the document was fact-finding. If it turns into an interpretive effort, that would be a difficulty.

A Council member says that the department chair is answerable to more people in this situation than anybody else is. He has to answer to career-line faculty, tenure-line faculty, the Dean's Office and University regulations. He also says that the department chair is going to decide whether there is a course for the person to teach or not, anyway, so with that fact, who is over the review process is of secondary importance.

Another member of the Council says that she sees three options on the table. The first is the original suggestion. The second is the one that the other member of the Council suggested, which will entail a lot of work. The third is that it can be vague.

Sarah says that they must vote on the Council member's motion first. Then another motion can be made.

A member of the Council asks if University regulations are driving this policy? Sarah reiterates what she said at the beginning of the discussion. The Council member asks if the departments already have a policy, then? Sarah says there is a College policy, but that only one unit follows it currently.

Another Council member says that a lot of work is on the Review Committee. There is a lot of information that has to be reviewed. There was a concern as to whether or not the tenure-line faculty members would even want to take on this work.

A Council member says it's also work for the career-line faculty, because the committee is 50/50. If the Advisory Committee appoints the Review Committee, then it's problematic. It

has to come about partly through a volunteer process. They don't want more work if it doesn't count and they don't get paid for it.

A Council member says that the Law School has had this policy involving career-line faculty being part of the review process for over 6 years. There, the Dean appoints the Review Committee and there hasn't ever been a problem with that. From an administrator's perspective, there is a good opportunity to balance workloads. Sometimes it's hard getting someone to run for a job. So in the College of Law, the Dean appoints, and it works.

Another Council member says that the Law School is dealing just with law, and the CFA has a lot of different units. We're trying to be as specific as we can for general departments within a college. Though Law does have different branches within it, we're in a unique situation in that regard.

Sarah says that time is moving swiftly, and suggests to limit debate on this motion to five minutes. It is seconded. More than 2/3s of the Council are in favor. It is determined that the discussion for this motion can continue for 5 more minutes.

A Council member says that the Law School is full of experts in procedure and in the arts, the administrators are paid to administrate. The way the policy is currently written would allow for department chairs to do what they are paid for.

A visitor asks if it is possible for the Review Committee to elect it's own chair? Sarah clarifies that his suggestion is not the motion currently, and that motion has to be voted on before any other motions can be made.

A member of the Council calls the question. It is seconded. A written vote is taken and recorded. The motion is passed 26-13.

Sarah calls for another motion. Another Council member makes a motion to amend the language for the department chair to not be involved in the Review Committee. Sarah says that the clarifications that were just made to the policy will be cleared up after the meeting, and any contradictions will be fixed. The sentence makes clear that the chair could serve. The Council member says that you could change it by adding—the chair/director could serve on the Review Committee if elected.

Another Council member makes a motion to pass the policy as it now stands. It is seconded.

A Council member says that we have a policy that was passed in 2009 and we don't follow it. So the goodwill and faith of this policy is only as good as its application and enforcement. He's not sure the policy is strong enough to enforce itself. Only one unit in the CFA is following policy. That is a problem.

Sarah says that every policy is enforced by the members of the College. A Council member says that the problem is that this affects career-line and adjunct faculty, and there is no grievance procedure for them. So he wonders about that.

Sarah says that she has spoken to Hank Liese and that problem of not having grievance procedure is going to be reviewed University-wide.

A member of the Council asks if the Dean's Office has a current procedure for grievances? Sarah states what the current procedure is, and says that the campus will soon have one.

A visitor asks about letter A on page 3. Part one says career-line research faculty participate in the academic program. This category is rarely used in the CFA. When would that be used in the CFA? Also under scholarly and creative research, if the research category is rarely used in the CFA, but then we will put in requirements for research—that seems contradictory.

Sarah says that currently there are no research faculty in the CFA, but a unit might write a grant to get one.

A Council member says that on upper campus there are faculty designated to do nothing but clinical research. So it's not really a contradiction. It's only an extension of research.

Another member of the Council says that he's concerned that the line between tenure-track and career-line faculty will get blurred.

Sarah says that Hank Liese suggested that she put that language there. In our College they sometimes have service obligations that need to be written into the contract. She says that it really is "if," not "when."

A member of the Council says that he could imagine a moment in the future when it would allow a career-line faculty member to have a research component as part of their job. And you would want to have that there in order to support that possibility in the future.

A Council Member says that it does apply in many units. Visiting Faculty are often visitors because they're a tenure-line faculty member somewhere else and they would be doing research. The career-line faculty might be doing research.

Another member of the Council says that in many of the units the research that is done is performance, and a lot of their work isn't academic. Sarah clarifies that research in the College is creative or scholarly. Sarah will clarify that in the document.

A member of the Council asks for clarification of "appointment" versus "contract." Sarah says that an appointment is not the same as a contract. Appointment means only that the person has been vetted to be a faculty member. A contract is only given after an appointment has been made.

The Council member says that faculty members who have been moved to 3-5 year appointments think that they have been given a contract, and that is not accurate. Sarah says she will make clear in the policy between "appointment" and "contract."

It is called for the vote. The motion passes, 34-4.

A member of the Council asks if this is now policy? Sarah says that the Dean will have to approve the policy, and then it will go on to campus. There isn't a committee to review this on campus yet, because they won't set those up until there are career-line faculty on the committees to review, which is being addressed in Senate right now. Hank Liese and/or Amy Wildermuth will give us provisional approval.

A Council member asks if this year we should use this policy? Sarah says that you can use either this policy or the previous policy. However, Sarah says that there is a provision in the document that each unit must have a vote of the tenure-line faculty in order to give the career-line faculty a vote.

A Council member asks if they already give their career-line faculty a vote, do they need to vote again? A Council member from Film says that their department did vote on it. The Parliamentarian says that the language will be tinkered with slightly. Sarah agrees. Hank Liese has already tinkered with it. Sarah will read through it and make sure there are no contradictions.

9. Information Calendar:

10. Adjournment:

Future Meetings: April 11<sup>th</sup>

There is a motion to adjourn. It is seconded. All are in favor and the meeting concludes at 4:41 pm.