

In attendance:

- Eric Adler (CLAS) [EA]
- Linda Aldoory (COMM) [LA]
- Amanda Bailey (ENGL) [AB]
- Sabrina Baron (HIST; Faculty Senator for part-time lecturers) [SB]
- La Marr Jurelle Bruce (AMST) [LMJB]
- Anthony Colantuono (ARTH) [AC]
- Dan Conway (Theatre) [DC]
- Claire Goebeler (SLLC; ARHU Staff Council) [CG]
- Sam Kerstein (PHIL) [SK]
- Katie King (WMST) [KK]
- Omer Preminger (LING) [OP]
- Bonnie Thornton Dill (Dean, ARHU) [BTD]
- Daryle Williams (ARHU, Assoc. Dean for Faculty Affairs) [DW]
- Thomas Zeller (HIST) [TZ]

Dean Thornton Dill:

- President has announced that there will be a set of discussions on diversity and inclusion on council
 - Dean has had discussions with undergrad advisory board, grad advisory board, and administrative council, on possible contributions of ARHU to this process
 - we're already doing a lot of this here in the council
 - grad students liked the idea of a "teach-in"
 - undergrads wanted some forum, or fora, that felt like a safe space
 - ability to, e.g., write questions anonymously, and have a panel address them
 - felt like this was an issue that was burning on a lot of people's minds, but they were yearning for places and ways to have these conversations
 - Story Exchange:
 - an international group where people tell each other's stories to the group
 - there is research showing that these kinds of exchanges promote and produce empathy
 - School of Journalism: StoryCore
 - events will be communicated in a campus-wide fashion so people from different colleges / units can attend each other's events
 - LA:
 - we should try to come up with something that really gets at the dialogic nature of the issue
 - what do we, as those who control classrooms and programs, need to do to promote the kind of change that we're looking for
 - there are professional and non-profit dialogue facilitators and trainers

- “Everyday Democracy”; Montgomery Public Schools has a “study circle” program
 - KK:
 - also important to flag, and make accessible and visible, those things that we are already doing
 - since so much of this relates to a kind of *story activism*, ARHU seems like the perfect body to spearhead such activity
 - LMJB:
 - are there particular trouble spots, silences, difficulties on campus that we would like to work on as part of these activities?
 - some of this has already taken place, but not necessarily in fora that were driven by ARHU faculty
 - e.g. Black Lives Matter, islamophobia
 - KK: controversies surrounding microaggressions; safety and safe-spaces; free speech
 - SB:
 - one thing that was proposed was a day off of classes that would be dedicated to these issues
 - BTD: this idea has not gone forward
 - Senate Executive Committee passed unanimous resolution supporting name change of Byrd Stadium; perhaps something that ties into the name-change event?
 - AB:
 - there needs to be funding and administrative support for these kinds of activities
 - calling in external professionals requires resources
 - LMJB: as a department, AMST is uniquely equipped and skilled to provide many (if not all) of these services in-house to the university
 - LA:
 - we probably need multiple “spokes”; in situations where faculty are one of the discussant bodies, faculty shouldn’t be the ones moderating
 - in that particular situation, it does make sense to have an external professional
 - EA:
 - we should also discuss antisemitism, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict
 - KK:
 - there should also be a discussion of the tactics that different interested groups employ
 - BTD: we need to come up with a plan by the beginning of the spring semester
- There was an email (yesterday) by the Provost with a draft of the Strategic Plan, that includes a section specifically about a vision for the Arts and Humanities
 - please take a look and provide feedback on this
 - there is a place where you can send your comments directly, but it would also be useful to discuss your feedback at the college level
 - DW: the Provost’s deadline is Jan 29, 2016 (presented to the Senate on Feb 11, 2016)
 - issues:
 - a Humanities Center
 - a center for Digital Media Studies

- institute for Arts and Design

Updates on subcommittees for review of Plans of Organization

- SK and EA have examined Plan of Organization for WMST, added comments, questions, and suggestions; and forwarded to DW
 - DW: this will come to them as a letter from the Council; will come back to us in the spring term
- LMJB and AC have examined Plan of Organization for LASC
 - primary issue is the status and importance of the Caribbean within the mission of LASC

Updates concerning Professional Track Faculty

- DW and AB met with ERG (Senate subcommittee on Election, Representation, and Governance) concerning Plan of Organization for the College
 - we need to make some decisions rather quickly (by Feb 12, 2016)
 - perhaps devising an ad hoc, non-binding solution for now
- issues:
 - how to elect Professional Track representatives both for Collegiate Council and for the Senate (at the unit level? at the College level?)
 - remember, not all units have the same amounts of Professional Track Faculty (a few may not have any at all)
 - Senate apportionment is 3 per senate; what should be the apportionment for the Collegiate Council?
 - what is the mechanism by which the elected representatives communicate back to their constituency?
 - SB:
 - currently, there is no access to the relevant mailing lists; nor do *replies* to mailing list communications go back directly to the representatives
 - only Executive Director of Senate (Reka Monfort) currently has access to Professional Track Faculty listserv
 - this communications issue has been something that SB has been trying to fix since 2004(!)
 - note also that the representation above (3 senators) concerns only *full-time* Professional Track Faculty; SB's constituency includes also the *part-time* Professional Track Faculty, which should also be represented
 - and we can control this, as far as the Collegiate Council is concerned
 - TZ:
 - note that current representation on the Collegiate Council is not currently proportional to the size of each unit
 - SB:
 - on the senate: one senator per 4 members of the tenure track, while SB is one representative for ~800 Professional Track Faculty
 - CG:

- there are similar issues of representation on the Staff Council
 - KK:
 - the most useful way to have representation is by *interests/concerns*
 - LA:
 - what kind of representation we want depends on the explicit stated goals of the Collegiate Council, which is ultimately a mandate from the Dean
 - AB:
 - one important purpose of representation is *accountability*
 - BTD:
 - an 11-item mandate for the Collegiate Council is articulated on the College website
 - it is an advisory body for the Dean
 - many committees in the College report to the Council
 - DW:
 - there is currently something of a constitutional conundrum – since we want constituencies other than Tenure Track Faculty to have a voice; but the only constituency that currently has a vote on the Plans of Organization is Tenure Track Faculty
 - TZ:
 - let us remember that it is not the case that the interests of the Dean and the interests of the Collegiate Council are always 100% aligned
 - **should apportionment be based on unit (and proportional to size of each unit)? or based on status (e.g. full-time/part-time, tenure track/research/professional-track)?**
 - KK:
 - one important piece of shared governance is thinking about vulnerable constituencies and how to address their vulnerability
- DW: Professional Track Faculty APT task force
 - Julie Wright and DW will come up with a draft of APT criteria (Appointment, Promotion, and Periodic Review) for Professional Track Faculty
 - draft presented to Dean after spring break, and then to other campus bodies
 - by the end of Academic Year, there will be an official document on APT for Professional Track Faculty
 - some things that this document will include:
 - provisions on length of contract
 - roles and ranks
 - next Academic Year (2016–2017): each individual unit/dept will have to come up with their own Professional Track Faculty APT documents
 - this is simultaneous with, but parallel to, the aforementioned representation/governance issue
 - KK: are Professional Track Faculty represented on the task force itself?
 - DW: yes, there are 4 Professional Track Faculty on the task force

Faculty Reapportionment on University Senate

- DW: by February 2016, the College is required to appoint three Professional Track Faculty to sit on University Senate (for three staggered terms: a 3-year term, a 2-year term starting the following year, and a 1-year term starting the year after that)
 - we will have to come up with an ad hoc mechanism for this upcoming deadline
 - SB and KK: it almost seems unavoidable that this would be organized by interest (e.g. full-time, part-time, and at large)
 - AB: do we have College-level reflectors for full-time and part-time Professional Track Faculty?
 - DW: in the College, there is no distinction in the communication/mailling-lists between full-time and part-time Professional Track Faculty
 - given the concerns that have been raised by Professional Track Faculty in the College so far, this distinction has not proven particularly relevant
 - esp. since particular individuals are full-time one semester and part-time the next, and vice versa
 - AB: if we were to go on the “cluster” model, which are the units with the most Professional Track Faculty?
 - English (~120); Communications (~70)
 - the total FTE is 260
 - KK: whether the full-time vs. part-time issue is important needs to be decided on *by the constituency*
 - e.g. in whose hands is the decision on whether a particular individual gets to be full-time or part-time? the individual? the unit?
 - SB: at the campus level, SB is seeing more and more distinctions made between full-time and part-time Professional Track Faculty
 - and it looks like part-time faculty are being marginalized in some respects
 - **DW and AC: how about just the top 3 College-wide vote getters?**
 - **this would also be clear and straightforward to administer**
 - we need to give people enough time to self-nominate or be nominated, and to campaign
 - Dean’s office will administratively support this election
 - SB: send communication both directly to Professional Track Faculty and to department chairs to inform and promote
 - BTD: nominations would have to be in by the first week of Spring classes; then there would be ~10 days for the election
 - remember that this is an ad hoc process; we can revisit and revise it in the future
 - LMJB: let’s give candidates an opportunity to provide a paragraph articulating their vision for the position
 - top vote-getter will get the 3-year term, second vote-getter will get the 2-year term, etc.
- SB: apportionment for Tenure Track Faculty also went up slightly during recent reapportionment

Spring Plenary

- AB:
 - let us table, perhaps for next year, the idea we were contemplating during the last Council meeting
 - most pressing concern seems to use this Plenary to have an open-forum conversation between the Dean's office and Professional Track Faculty, as well as Tenure Track Faculty
 - focusing on the relation between Professional Track Faculty, staff, students, and the College in its entirety
 - there is a lot of misinformation – or, at least, false impressions – on this front
 - therefore, such a forum could have (among other things) a “myth-busting” purpose
 - perhaps also a representative that would convey the University-level vision concerning Professional Track Faculty
 - SB: if the finalist for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has been selected by then, that might be a good person for this
 - BTD: another possibility (esp. if Vice Provost is not decided on yet) is Mark Arnold, Director of Faculty Initiatives
 - LA: what would motivate people to come to such a Plenary?
 - KK: to reconcile different visions that different constituencies current have
 - AB: it is an issue of inclusion/integration, and raising awareness of changing constituencies
 - LA: these are all absolutely valid points; but from a “public relations” perspective, we want to make sure to get them in the door / create interest
 - KK and SB: this is a *national* issue, relating to other very general issues on minorities and gender representation
 - CG: will there be a desire to form a Professional Track Faculty Council, along the lines of, e.g., the Staff Council?
 - DW and BTD: we can certainly provide a forum for this to be discussed
 - BTD: in a forum along the lines of the Staff Council it is possible for what starts as “casual conversations” in safe environments to percolate into more formal channels
 - KK: there are certainly Professional Track Faculty who feel vulnerable to even engage in activism; we should work to provide support for such activism
 - KK: do we want to also flag this Plenary as one of the College's *diversity and inclusion* activities? after all, this touches directly on issues of diversity and inclusion on campus