

AGENDA

Attendees: Dean Tymas-Jones, Associate Dean Projansky, Associate Dean Leckie, Assistant Dean Horejsi, Assistant Dean McIntyre-Martinez, Associate Dean Cheek-O'Donnell, Paul Stout, Tom Hoffman, Emina Tataravic, Vanessa Romo, Jay Kim, Pamela Geber Handman, Michael Wall, Mackenzie Allred/Molly Cook, Natalie Gotter, Kevin Hanson, Sarah Sinwell, Craig Caldwell, Mia Mortensen, Hannah Weber, Paula Lee, Miguel Chuaqui, Julie Wright-Costa, Hasse Borup, Cathy Clayton, Kaitlyn Seymour, Claudia Restrepo, Michelle Addison, Gage Williams, Barbara Sturgis, Jasmin Peterson, Colleen Hirst, Marina Gomberg.

1. **Call to Order:**

Dean Tymas-Jones welcomes everyone to the meeting. It begins at 3:03 pm.
2. **Approval of Minutes:**

From April 22, 2016 Meeting
Dean Tymas-Jones asks for a motion to approve the minutes. All are in favor and the motion passes.
3. **Request for New Business:**

Dean Tymas-Jones asks for any new business. Hearing none, then the agenda stands as printed.
4. **Consent Calendar:**
 - **See Appendix A**

Dean Tymas-Jones mentions that on the back of the agenda is the consent calendar. It includes retirements, resignations, appointments and promotions. He directs everyone's attention to the list.
5. **Dean's Report:**
 - **2016-17 Request for Position (RFP) Process**

Dean Tymas-Jones says that last year we had two rounds of faculty position requests. That was for the purposes of adhering to the stated recommendation and desire of the SVPA. She wanted there to be a college-wide dialogue to discuss the distribution of available faculty lines. Because of that request, we utilized the FCC (Faculty Counsel Committee) that consists of all of the faculty on the College Council to meet and to go over the various proposals to make a recommendation to him whether the position met the basic criteria of demand & sound pedagogical purposes. If the positions came to him and he had questions about them, he met with the author of the proposals. As you can see from the consent calendar that we were able to allocate funds out for new positions. There were six allocated and filled last year. There are two in Theatre and 1 in Music that were allocated last year but that the search is occurring this year. This round is based on replacement requests and desires for new positions. The process of engaging the FCC in reviewing the proposals has nothing to do with the resources available for positions. If there are no resources in the College to fill the line, there will not be a position filled. If it is a replacement, one can assume that the funds are there. He has heard that there are faculty who intend to retire at the end of this year. If we don't have official notification of that retirement at the time of these deliberations, the funds can't be allocated out. So if there are faculty in your department who intend to retire this academic year, it is important

that we get that paperwork as soon as possible so we can inform the FCC that the funds would be available for reallocation.

Dean Tymas-Jones says that additionally, the forms have been revamped to make it simpler this year. We are asking you for the data for your departments. For example, with undergraduate majors, we have the college-wide data and need the units to fill out their own data. That way we can see what the demand is. The area section allows for even further data. For example, if the position was in Voice, then you could give the number of voice majors and not just music majors. So it's discipline-specific. All that does is show where the student demand is for the position that you are asking for. Are there any questions?

A member of the Council says that some areas are more service areas—like Theory and History in Music. If it's a service area to the undergraduate majors, the data would speak to that.

Dean Tymas-Jones says that the next part of the form is the narrative. The more information, the better it will be. And remember that you are writing this for people who are not in your area. The first page has information that you need to fill out. Remember, research is the basis for tenure-line, based on the definition from SVP Watkins. So she is looking for research as the reason for the line, rather than teaching. So if it is a teaching emphasis, then it is career-line position. For all of the proposals coming out of the department, the chair must prioritize so we know how the chair ranks. And lastly, if you could give an idea of some type of salary for the position.

Dean Tymas-Jones says that the FCC instructions are streamlined, as well. There are categories and corresponding numbers. At the gathering of the committee itself there will be an opportunity for dialogue. We are not asking the FCC to make a determination. We are asking for input. What we are looking and asking for is input of the faculty in terms of the decision-making process and the importance of that position, because it is a part of the CFA.

A Council member asks if there were any changes to the question part of the process? A lot of people weren't happy with the form. Dean Tymas-Jones says yes, there are only four questions that have to be answered this year.

A member of the Council asks when this will be available? Dean Tymas-Jones says that they are available now. They are in the Box link for the Chairs.

A Council member asks if the searches can happen this year? Dean Tymas-Jones says that if you are awarded a position and if by the time that a decision is made and you think that you don't have enough time to do a search, the monies in that line will be allocated to the department for a one-year replacement. Does that make sense? You get the line, you get the money to support the teaching aspects of the position, even if you wait to do the search until the next year so that you can take the time to do the vetting for the new hire.

- **Strategic Pathways Meetings: Sept. 23rd & Oct. 7th**

Dean Tymas-Jones says that on Sept. 23rd and Oct. 7th from 3-5 in this room will be the college-wide Strategic Pathways meetings. You don't have to come to both. If you don't come on the 23rd you can come to the one in October. Students are doing an anonymous survey. So these meetings are for faculty and staff. This is to see what we accomplished in our previous strategic plan and to see where we want to go in the future. We are not trying to write a strategic plan this year, but identify what areas strategically we want to pursue. So the idea is to do an assessment of the 2011-2016 plan and see what has emerged in the last 6 years that might not have been a part of the original plan, at all. If you feel as a community that you would like to see a development over the next 5 years, those should be pathways that eventually find their way into the new strategic plan.

Dean Tymas-Jones asks if there are any questions? There are none.

- **UMFA Update – Gretchen Dietrich**

Dean Tymas-Jones introduces Gretchen Dietrich who is the Executive Director of the UMFA and she has come to share with us an update on the UMFA and the renovation.

Gretchen says that she keeps being stopped by people on campus and asked questions, so she thought it would be good for her to come by and give an update. Her building is only about 17 years old, but they have had difficulty keeping the temperatures steady to protect the art collections. The University has known this, and they have decided to rectify that. The Legislature is providing money to the University that then comes to the UMFA—and it's not coming from the College. It's a 3-fold plan. The first \$2.5M comes from the state and helps with the vapor barrier and the windows so that the condensation won't leave puddles in the museum—which is bad for the artwork. And they are refinishing the floors, improving the AV in the Dumke Auditorium and the acoustics and the sound system in that space. They are repainting everything, as well. Another improvement is improving the acoustics in the Great Hall space. So they have spent an awful lot of money to improve that situation. The Museum is encouraging their donors to help support the reinstallation of the collections. They'll have two dedicated galleries for Asian art, and potentially a black box space. They're also redoing the Café. The Café will be open next month and you'll see when that is ready for you to come back. The galleries won't be open until next fall so that they can really dedicate some time to getting the galleries and installations ready. Soon they'll be able to move back into the Dumke Auditorium. And they've created ArtLandish, as well. They're also having a community meet-up to go out to the Spiral Jetty. She's brought a few flyers that she'll leave if anyone is interested. Are there any questions? Gretchen says that she wants to do better to serve the faculty and students in the College and across campus. So she welcomes your thoughts.

A Council member asks if the Campus Advisory Committee is still in effect, because he has it on his CV still. Gretchen says that they got a Hearst Foundation grant that year—and it makes sense to get something like that going again. They are a University art museum and a community art museum, so they are trying to make sure that the broader community knows, as well.

Are there any other questions? No. Gretchen thanks everyone.

6. Dean's Staff Reports:

Assistant Dean McIntyre-Martinez

- **Update on MAT**

Kelby McIntyre-Martinez says that some of you might be new on the College Council and so she just wants to bring everyone up to speed. The MAT (Master in Art Teaching Degree) took the last year and a half to really structure, since it will be a new graduate program in our College. The MAT has been built as a hybrid/low-residency degree that supports working professionals in the field of arts teaching. There are two summer intensives and four online courses. The MAT will require 30 semester hours of graduate-level course work in the CFA. It will focus on the development of rigorous pedagogical expertise required to improve the delivery of high quality arts experiences appropriate for community and studio settings as well as K-12 public schools. MAT is a professional degree, and not intended for going on to PhD or MFA.

Kelby says that the MAT went to the Curriculum committee today and it was approved. It will then reach graduate Council and if it's approved from there, it will move through all the way to Northwest Accreditation. If it is approved, we are expecting the first cohort of students in Summer 2018.

A Council member asks if this is going to be housed in the CFA? Kelby says yes. The Council member asks if all of the information will be on the website? Sarah Projansky says that we will have an interdisciplinary program in arts teaching and it will have a steering committee and a chair. A program can't hold tenure, but because it is interdisciplinary for all 5 of our disciplines, that's the way we have to do it.

There are no other questions.

Sr. Associate Dean Projansky

- Update on Career-line Policy

Sarah Projansky says that she has finally gotten comments back from the campus committee about the Career-line Policy today. They have a few suggested changes and there are four things of note. If folks are interested in talking about this today, we can sustain a motion to move it to the debate calendar during this meeting. To reiterate, campus is suggesting these, and not Sarah.

A Council member motions to move it to the debate calendar. It is approved and all are in favor.

Sarah says that campus is encouraging us to say “units will write an appendix.” Now that is different than what we wanted originally. So the question for the group is whether or not we want to do an appendix. No one wanted to do the work previously, and that is why it wasn’t included in the original document.

A member of the Council clarifies that what campus wants then is to have 5 appendices, one for each unit? Sarah says yes.

A Council member asks how extensive the appendices have to be? Sarah says that it can be whatever you want.

Dean Tymas-Jones asks what the downside would be if we didn’t do what campus wanted? Sarah says that there is a lack of clear policy about what each unit is doing. But if you want to change an appendix, then you have to change this entire document and go through the approval process again.

A Council member asks if this will slow down the pace in which we interact with our career-line faculty members? Do we have to write another appendix if they decide to change their processes—like putting someone on a committee?

Sarah says that she is hoping that everyone will write a general-enough document so that it is not restrictive.

A member of the Council asks how much this document has changed? Sarah says that this policy governs the College. The Council member says that if documents are not general enough, this feels redundant. So she feels that if the department agrees, and wants to do an appendix, then they can. But it shouldn’t be mandatory.

A different Council member says that it’s a good idea to define it clearly because right now the original document just says that the departments are to vote on who gets the right to vote. They just had that vote and it was left vaguely as to how that is implemented. So that’s probably why campus is asking for it. All it is specifying is what the bylaws are—who is in what meeting, etc.

Sarah says that this policy says that units may allow the long-term career-line faculty to be on committees. That’s probably why campus wants it clarified, as well.

A member of the Council asks if there is any advantage in terms of the future? He doesn’t see the advantage to having a specific policy unless that means that at some future moment the rights aren’t taken away.

Sarah says that if a unit has it in an appendix that the career-line faculty member has a right, and then if a chair wants to change it, it has to go to College Council for approval.

A Council member clarifies and asks if any appendix has to come to this body for approval? Yes. The Council member says then it would be possible for the college to vote it down and then the unit can’t use it at the unit level.

Sarah says that the appendix can't contradict this document, but Music had a creative solution by creating an additional committee. And if the College Council votes it down, that means that it couldn't be used.

A Council member says that it would mean that it was a vote of the college, rather than the department.

Dean Tymas-Jones says that the wording includes the phrase "the extent to which each unit of the college."

A Council member says that to maintain independence, then, they don't want to have an appendix. That's a backwards way of saying that you have to do what your colleagues in the college wants.

Another member of the Council agrees.

A Council member says that he wouldn't vote for an appendix if it had to come to this committee.

A different member of the Council says that perhaps we need to get clarification on the point of whether or not appendices would come to this committee.

Sarah says yes, we can do that.

A Council member says that the approval process means that the CFA is making decisions again. Sarah says that this is coming from upper administration.

Sarah asks if there is any motion to vote on this? There is no motion.

Sarah moves to the next change. They have included the phrase "It is ordinarily expected that a multi-year appointment will be proposed for the reappointment of any candidate who has been employed for five or more years, with satisfactory performance as reflected in a five-year review." Which means that ordinarily after you have been here for 5 years and had a positive review, that you would be appointed for a multi-year appointment.

A Council member says that a multi-year appointment needs more documentation as part of the review. Sarah says that the multi-year appointment requires the same documentation. The Council member realizes that he was talking about a multi-year review.

A member of the Council says that this doesn't stop anyone from giving a 3-year appointment. Sarah says that it also just says "probably."

A different Council member asks what it means if it says "reflected in a five-year review."

A Council member responds and says that you have to review everyone every five years.

A member of the Council says that they have a rotation system because they have so many to do. Sarah says that every unit is doing that.

A Council member says that the basic implication is that there is a 5-year review that has happened.

A different member of the Council says that you probably wouldn't give someone a multi-year appointment without a satisfactory review.

A Council member says that the hard part is the 5-year review.

Sarah says that she could recommend changing it to be "most recent review."

A member of the Council says that the use of "ordinarily" means that it is not required.

Dean Tymas-Jones calls for the question. Is there a motion to vote on this one?

A Council member motions and it is seconded. He moves that we accept their suggestion.

Sarah calls for debate. A different Council member asks if we can have this reviewed by the faculty in the departments. He makes an amendment to the motion.

The original Council member doesn't accept the amendment. Sarah asks if there is any further discussion of the motion? A different Council member says that she would like to have it changed to be "the most recent review" and asks for an amendment to the motion.

The original Council member amends his motion to vote for it with "the most recent review."

A different member of the Council says that is even more complicated. With any of these, it is only fair that the faculty knows what is coming. There are things that matter in this policy. So if we just go ahead without the faculty seeing these documents, then that is not fair.

A Council member says that there are enough people missing that it should be sent to our chairs.

A vote is called. The vote in favor of accepting the change with "the most recent review" includes 12 in favor. 5 opposed. 15 abstained. It passes.

A member of the Council says that he thinks it's a good idea to go through the changes so the chairs know what they should go back and say.

Sarah says that the next change is "service...strongly encouraged and highly valued."

A Council member has a question about that. If you are a career-line faculty member and you have a large teaching load, doesn't it seem onerous there? Sarah says that is exactly why we didn't include that originally.

A different member of the Council says that it seems like we are trying to get people to work for free again.

A Council member makes a motion to deny this suggestion.

A different Council member asks what if a career-line faculty member didn't agree to serve on this committee (the College Council)? There are certain committees that require career-line faculty members to do service. How do we enforce that if we take this out?

A member of the Council says that doesn't have anything to do with this change. The language means that it is still valued.

A different member of the Council asks what if we remove "strongly" and just say that it is encouraged and highly valued.

A Council member says that he tries to give credit to career-line faculty, but if it is encouraged and highly valued, that is problematic if we don't reward them.

A different member of the Council says that if we want to change it, then we should reward them.

Dean Tymas-Jones asks first Council member what makes him think that career-line faculty members don't get rewarded for it?

The first Council member asks what percentage of the FTE should it be then?

Dean Tymas-Jones says that it is possible for that service that is rendered to be rewarded. There is nothing saying that you can't reward them.

The first Council member says that you have to give some full-time equivalency. He suggests that we amend the motion to have highly valued.

A different member of the Council says that we labored over the wording on this originally, so he doesn't accept the amendment.

The motion is to reject the change. Vote: 1 abstained, 0 no, 30 yes. The motion passes and the change is rejected.

Sarah says that the last change is added language to "Excellent and Effective" using the language from the RPT template.

A Council member has a question. If the candidate is in a unit where they aren't able to make contributions to curriculum, why is it included? Sarah says that was the thinking of the group last time, which is why it wasn't included originally.

A different member of the Council suggests that we change the "and" to "or."

A member of the Council makes a motion to reject the suggestion. It is seconded. 19 are in favor. 0 opposed. 11 abstain. The motion passes and the suggestion is rejected.

A different Council member asks if we need to substantiate the reasons why the suggestions were rejected when we tell campus? Sarah says that she wants to make your arguments, so she will make sure to know which ones did and didn't pass.

- **Update on RPT documents**

Sarah says that as of today, the Film RPT Document has finally been approved. Theatre is close to getting it back to her, and it will go on to campus. Art has been approved and Dance is semi-approved. The Modern Dance document has been approved and soon they will do a new document. Music is still in the works.

A member of the Council says that they went over it in the advisory committee meeting in Music, so they are close.

7. Special Committee Reports:

8. Notice of Intent: N/A

9. Debate Calendar: N/A

10. Information Calendar: N/A

11. Adjournment:

Dean Tymas-Jones says that our next meeting is November 11th. At the FCC meeting, he will spend more time trying to make sure that the FCC understands the scope of the charge, because it is not just the faculty positions that he needs input on. He thanks everyone for their attendance.

A motion is made to adjourn and it is seconded. The meeting adjourns at 4:17 pm.

Future College Council Meetings: November 11th, February 17th, April 21st
Future Faculty Counsel Committee (FCC) Meetings: October 21st, January 20th,
March 24th

Appendix A

Resignations, Retirements, & Appointments

Resignations

1. Lauren Gallaspy (Assistant Professor – Art & Art History, Effective November 4, 2015)
2. Kirsten Gunlogsen (Associate Professor – School of Music, Effective January 1, 2016)
3. Rick Wacko (Professor – Department of Ballet, Effective July 1, 2016)

Retirements

1. Lenora Brown (Professor, Lecturer – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016)
2. Sandra Shotwell (Professor – Department of Theatre, Effective July 1, 2016)

Administrative Appointments

1. Luc Vanier, Director of the School of Dance, Effective August 1, 2016
2. Sydney Cheek-O'Donnell, Associate Dean for Research (.50 FTE), Effective July 1, 2016

Tenure-Line Faculty Appointments

1. Henry Becker, Assistant Professor – Art & Art History, Effective July 1, 2016
2. Xi Zhang, Assistant Professor – Art & Art History, Effective July 1, 2016
3. Kirstin Chavez, Associate Professor – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016
4. Elizabeth Craft, Assistant Professor – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016
5. Jared Rawlings, Assistant Professor – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016
6. Andrew Staupe, Assistant Professor – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016

Tenure-Line Faculty Promotions

1. Dan Evans, Associate Professor – Art & Art History, Effective July 1, 2016
2. Justin Diggle, Professor – Art & Art History, Effective July 1, 2016
3. Beth Krensky, Professor – Art & Art History, Effective July 1, 2016
4. Ning Lu, Professor – School of Music, Effective July 1, 2016
5. Chris DuVal, Associate Professor – Theatre, Effective July 1, 2016
6. Tim Slover, Professor – Theatre, Effective July 1, 2016

Career-Line Faculty Promotions

1. N/A

Career-Line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty Appointments

1. Horacio Rodriguez, Post-MFA Fellow – Art & Art History, Effective August 15, 2016
2. Emily Bokinski, Associate Instructor – Dance, Effective August 16, 2016
3. Justine Sheedy-Kramer, Adjunct Assistant Professor – Dance, Effective August 16, 2016
4. Katie Scherman, Visiting Assistant Professor – Dance, Effective August 16, 2016
5. Lynne Larson, Associate Instructor – Dance, Effective August 16, 2016
6. Melissa Bobick, Visiting Assistant Professor – Dance, Effective August 16, 2016
7. Devin Maxwell, Associate Instructor – School of Music, Effective August 16, 2016
8. Josh Wright, Associate Instructor – School of Music, Effective August 16, 2015
9. Seretta Hart, Adjunct Assistant Professor – School of Music, Effective August 16, 2016
10. Travis Peterson, Adjunct Assistant Professor – School of Music, Effective August 16, 2016
11. Cristin Mortenson Tillinghast, Adjunct Instructor – Theatre, Effective August 16, 2016
12. Karen A. Waidley, Adjunct Assistant Professor – Theatre, Effective August 16, 2016
13. Lynn Deboeck, Adjunct Assistant Professor – Theatre, Effective August 16, 2016
14. Michael Pinkerton, Visiting Assistant Professor – Theatre, Effective August 16, 2016
15. Robert Scott Smith, Visiting Assistant Professor – Theatre, Effective August 16, 2016
16. Ashley ML Brown, Assistant Professor, Lecturer – Entertainment Arts & Engineering, Effective August 16, 2016
17. Gabriel Olson, Assistant Professor, Lecturer – Entertainment Arts & Engineering, Effective August 16, 2016
18. Jose Zagal, Associate Professor, Lecturer – Entertainment Arts & Engineering, Effective August 16, 2016