THE MEETING MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS
Thursday, March 7, 2019
McKenna Hall Auditorium

ATTENDANCE

Deans: Dean: Sarah Mustillo; Associate Deans: James Brockmole, Essaka Joshua, Margaret Meserve; Assistant Deans: Maureen Dawson, Collin Meissner, Nicholas Russo, Joseph Stanfiel

Chairpersons and Directors: Mary Kearney, David Campbell, William Carbonaro, Lee Anna Clark, Brian Krostenko, Jesse Lander, Diarmuid O’Giollan, Dianne Pinderhughes, Peter Smith, Thomas Stapleford, Yongping Zhu


Graduate Representatives: Jillian Snyder

Regularly Invited Guests, Observers, and Resource People: Maria Di Pasquale (Dean’s Office), Kate Garry (Dean’s Office), Geraldine Meehan (Global Gateways at NDI), Joanna Want (University Writing Program), Matthew Zyniewicz (Dean’s Office)

Excused: Liang Cai, Denise Della Rossa, Ben Heller, Peter Holland, Tara MacLeod, Tim Matovina, Brian O’Conchubhair, Siiri Scott, Jeff Speaks

Dean Sarah Mustillo convened the meeting at 3:30 pm.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

S. Mustillo asked for any amendments to the February 5, 2019 College Council minutes. The Council approved the minutes without corrections.

COLLEGE BUSINESS

Leave Policy for junior faculty and new hires

S. Mustillo invited Margaret Meserve to lead a discussion about a leave policy for junior faculty and new hires. M. Meserve stated that the College will revise the reference guide during the summer months. Meanwhile, office staff have found many internal inconsistencies in the guide. From one University-supported leave to the next, faculty must teach ten semesters. M. Meserve first addressed leaves for assistant professors. We want to support their research, but we also need them here teaching,
especially for tenure purposes. They need a record of teaching to be tenured. The reference guide allows much latitude in terms of having a semester off before renewal and after tenure. As the guide is currently written, an assistant professor can approach the department chairperson for a leave after teaching two semesters. The reference guide, however, also shows the standard leave policy that an assistant professor can take a leave after the three-year renewal. But the guide also shows that an assistant professor can take an externally funded leave and bank the University-funded leave for another time. M. Meserve asked the Council to discuss whether or not the College should limit the amount of leave an assistant professor can take before tenure, because the reference guide remains unclear. After much discussion, the Council suggested that 3 semesters of leave before tenure should be the limit and that the College should more clearly state the types of fellowships that would qualify for a full year of leave.

M. Meserve also observed that the reference guide remains unclear about when a new faculty member who comes with tenure can apply for a leave. The guide states that the faculty member may apply for a leave after 6 semesters of teaching. The new faculty member, however, may have a contractual year leave which would not be limited by the 6-semester rule.

M. Meserve offered to re-write the language in the reference guide with regard to leaves, taking the Council’s advice.

Conflict of interest policy
S. Mustillo asked Lee Anna Clark to talk about issues that have arisen with the conflict of interest policy. L. Clark was appointed by the provost to provide a revision to the conflict of interest policy. In this era of big science, to discourage collaboration will make it difficult for younger faculty to do their work. The proposal was dismissed by the Provost’s Advisory Committee (PAC). The provost said the University will follow the policy already in place, and yet there was no guidance for chairpersons to give the younger faculty. The current conflict of interest policy was distributed before the Council meeting. At issue were Guidelines ##3-4.

“3. The faculty member has participated in a collaborative or creative process with the candidate for Promotion and Tenure, but not limited to including the preparation, submission or publication of a peer-reviewed manuscript in the last 3 years. “

“4. The faculty member has a current grant, is a PI on a submitted grant proposal that is under review, or is preparing a grant proposal for submission with the candidate for RPT.”

How does the College interpret these guidelines and what sort of advice should the College give to department chairpersons who have to counsel young scholars about collaboration? Some departments have interpreted the above guidelines to mean that young scholars should not collaborate with senior faculty. S. Mustillo observed that this year Conflict of Interest waivers were liberally granted, and in general PAC trusted the chairpersons’ judgements in each case. The issue arose in multiple departments this year. Most cases showed that faculty members’ careers were not tied to the senior collaborator’s work, and therefore waivers made sense.
S. Mustillo concluded the discussion by stating that the Conflict of Interest policy is an evolving document. The Provost wants faculty to collaborate with their research. The policy has a shelf life of about 3 years before it will be revisited.

**Attendance Policy**

S. Mustillo asked Joseph Stanfiel to introduce the topic about the attendance policy. The academic code states that faculty set their own attendance policies. They have complete discretion on how it is applied. The problem is that “regular attendance” is not defined in the academic code, and so enforcement of any attendance policy has become a challenge. Do we need an actual figure at which point the College can make a decision when attendance issues arise? Should a student fail a course after missing five classes? Seven classes?

After some discussion, the Council determined that the faculty must articulate their attendance policy and work with the Undergraduate Dean’s Office should any issues arise.

**ADJOURNMENT**

S. Mustillo adjourned the meeting at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew C. Zyniewicz
Dean’s Executive Administrator