Collegiate Council meeting minutes
Friday, November 1, 2013

In attendance: Profs. Jan Padios (AMST), June Hargrove (ARTH), Hasan Elahi (ARTT), Eric Adler (CLAS), Xiaoli Nann (COMM), Scott Wible (ENGL), Holly Brewer (HIST), Rachel Manekin (JWST), Ellen Lau (LING), Chris Gekker (MUSC), Rachel Singpurwalla (PHIL), Laura Nichols (STAFF); Assistant Dean of Academic Technology & Administrative Operations Kathy Cavanaugh (Dean’s Office); Associate Dean Charley Rutherford (ex officio)

Absent: Profs. Nan Jiang (SLLC), Alaa Elgibali (alternate to Nan Jian, SLLC)), Leslie Felbain (TDPS), Ashwini Tambe (WMST); Dean Bonnie Thornton Dill (ex officio), Associate Dean Daryle Williams (ex-officio)

1. Minutes from meeting of October 4, 2013
   • Errata: Associate Dean Rutherford corrects his title as printed in the minutes from October 4th, 2013.

2. Announcements (following introductions of those present)
   • On November 18th at 5:30pm, John Lithgow will be speaking as part of the WordWise program
   • On November 20th, from 3:30-5pm, Associate Dean Rutherford’s retirement celebration will take place at the Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center
   • On November 4th at 3pm, the first Staff Council event will take place in the Maryland Room. The meeting is w/t the Gallup foundation work on employee engagement.

3. Council Representative on Committee on New Technologies (CNT)
   • The College’s Plan of Organization calls for one representative from the Collegiate Council to serve on the CNT
   • Currently, Prof. Hasan Elahi (ARTT), the Collegiate Council’s Vice-Chair, chairs the CNT. Prof. Elahi began serving on the CNT before serving on the Collegiate Council.
   • The question is raised as to whether the CNT is shorthanded.
   • The following is noted about the CNT: CNT is independent from the university. It is a tech initiative that takes places at the college level. Potential new members will be reviewed. It usually requires just one year of service from the Collegiate Council.
   • Proposals are requested from units for instructional technology. This is exclusive from workstations for faculty and staff. It may include such things as mobile equipment for use in classroom instruction.

4. Review of the College’s Plan of Organization (A copy of the Plan of Organization containing tracked changes and comments (balloons) was sent to the members of the council from Associate Dean Rutherford via an e-mail from Veronica McDougal-Bartholomew on October 31st, 2013).
• Associate Dean Rutherford thanks Profs. June Hargrove and Laura Nichols for meeting at length to review the 2004 Plan of Organization and to discuss it at length.
• The biggest piece of the plan that needed to be addressed was the description of the Staff Council.
• The following parts of the Plan of Organization are discussed:
  o **I.A.1 Constituent Units** has been changed to reflect changed units. Concern is raised about the extent to which centers embedded within departments and/or centers and institutes that do not report directly to the Dean (or to multiple Deans) can be included. Associate Dean Rutherford tablesthis discussion, in recognition of the need for the Dean’s advice on the matter.
    ▪ Other issues raised pertaining to “Constituent Units”: difficulty representing interdisciplinarity in this part of the document; no Living Learning programs listed (some are wholly under ARHU, some are only partially so).
    ▪ Two questions raised pertaining to “Constituent Units”: Does this further beg a discussion about the second item (Governance of Academic and Administrative Units) under Part 1 of the Plan? What is the defining feature of an “academic unit”?
  o Other items of the Plan of Organization discussed: **I.B.2 Academic Planning Advisory Committee**, (a) Membership, (b) Selection of members, (c) Functions, (f) Voting; **I.C.1.b. Duties of the Dean** (vi) “To Promote” and (xii) “To report”; I.C.2.a “Selection” and (b.v.) “To Promote”; **II. Collegiate Representation and Governance**, A.1.d. “To actively solicit.” The change from “Affirmative Action” to “diversity and inclusion” in parts of the above is discussed.

The Chair notes the challenge of conducting the review without the Dean present and asks for a vote from the members regarding a potential request that the Dean inform the committee of any planned absence from the Collegiate Council and therefore a rescheduling of the meeting. The membership votes in favor of such a request. The Chair agrees to send an e-mail to the Dean about this matter.

Review of the Plan of Organization continued.
• A motion is made to strike **Part II.4.c.**, which stipulates that one graduate student and undergraduate student shall serve on the Collegiate Council.
• The following issues and questions are raised:
  o How would the change affect the rest of the document?
  o The PCC has one undergraduate student and one graduate student representative.
  o Given discussions from the previous year about recruitment of students into the college and the decline of graduate school applicants, as well the need for networking, the striking needs further discussion.
  o The membership votes to change the language to “may” serve
• Discussion of how the student representative would be chosen; the appointment of students from Dean’s undergraduate and graduate advisory boards is one suggestion.

• **II.B.2.b Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure.** Discussion of item 1, Membership; reminder to the Dean of this point.

• **II.B.2.c Committee on Programs, Courses, and Curricula.** Acknowledgement that this process has grown more difficult. Problem lies with classes fulfilling a number of requirements

• **II.B.2.d Committee on New Technologies.** Prof. Scott Wible makes a recommendation to strike “full time.” Rachel Singpurwala seconds. The question is raised of whether anyone on the College Council is willing to serve on CNT. The Chair states she will send out an e-mail regarding this.

• **III. Staff and Student Council.** The Staff Council’s composition committee (11 people) has created a whole document that addresses questions raised by this part of the plan. Prof. Laura Nichols offers the following for consideration: that Staff Council be designated as III in the Plan, and the possibility of a student council being IV. Asst. Dean Kathleen Cavanaugh offers the following to ponder: the Collegiate Council may decide that the Staff Council be a standing committee (which serves the Dean, rather than the Collegiate Council) and is therefore a parallel body to that of the Collegiate Council

5. Old Business

• **ARHU Spring Forum.** The Collegiate Council ought to elect 2-3 people to address the forum.
  - What issues do we want to see vetted at the forum?
  - Who might be able to speak at the forum? Suggestions are Senior Vice President and Provost Mary Ann Rankin, President Wallace Loh, and Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President Kumea Shorter-Gooden

• **APT Task Force**
• **Freshman research**
• **Moyer and Dowling on the freshman experience**
  - Subcommittee now or address this at the next meeting

6. New Business

• The Chair encourages council members to be proactive about business brought up for discussion at the council meetings. She issues a reminder that members should be talking to people in respective departments about issues that can be raised at the College Council meetings. Previous issues raised have been graduate funding and graduate education in the humanities, the decline of the humanities in higher ed, and National Humanities Advocacy Day. The Chair offers to send a number of articles related to these issues.

Meeting is adjourned at 2:40pm.

Minutes submitted by Jan M. Padios