I. Convening of the Meeting — Ellen Thomas, President
The faculty meeting started at 11:31 AM

II. Roll Call

The following non-voting members were present: J. Shafik (Student Senate), J. Yuan (GSA), K. Belfield, R. Lazer, J. Yuan (GSA), L. Hamilton, A. Hoang, M. Stanko, G. Chottiner, and K. Riismandel.

The following guests were present: W. Fox (MTSM), M. Kierst (OIE), and C. Brooks (OIE)

III. Approval of Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting on October 31, 2019
The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on October 31, 2019 were approved, with two abstentions.

IV. Report of the Faculty Senate President (15 Minutes)
   a. November 21st meeting: Cancelled
   b. IFM December 4th
      Fadi to give update and quorum will be needed to vote for DP motion.
   c. Update on meetings
      Norma Rubio informed FS leadership that testing of digital measures to populate faculty profile pages should be complete in two weeks
      FS leadership reached out to BOT chair and chair-elect to begin work on Presidential search process. No response has been received yet.
      E. Bishof continues to meet with FS leadership every month to inform about budget issues. This year there was a $1M shortfall in tuition revenue. Meetings will continue to discuss budget priorities
      E. Bishof requested information on any issues faculty are having with Anthony Travel

V. Report from Faculty Senate Committee on Assessment (Mary Kierst, 20 minutes)
Each academic department should have its own Assessment Committee. OIE will provide templates and rubric, and the committee will review before implementing. Faculty would like specifics on budget cuts and see if OIE will be able to poll faculty senate to rank priorities. Faculty with questions please reach out to Mary Kierst (OIE) directly.

VI. IT Roadmap (Gregg Chottiner, 30 minutes)
Presentation and discussion, followed by Q&A. Need for additional ad hoc committee for R1 University to support IT needs. IT to schedule quarterly meetings with individual departments to review needs and issues. Q: There is a clear need to establish a sustainable computer model. Is there a budget for research computing staff? A: G. Chottiner agreed that a sustainable model is
needed and that they are trying to increase funding. Q: What about the consultant recommendation regarding the initiative to outsource IT activity? A: The consultants agreed that outsourcing was not the answer, and there are no plans for major outsourcing initiatives. Additional support is needed. Q: Is there evidence that online training works? A: Based on what other R1 Universities are doing—yes, it helps educate the community. IT looking to create newsletters for mass community. Q: What is the timeline for the implementation of Digital Measures? A: Will follow up with Norma Rubio for an answer.

VII. **CFRR report – see attachment (Gordon Thomas, 20 minutes)**  
Presentation and discussion.

T. Rosato motion to add “7.1.3.5 Appointment by the Provost/President for Deans, Provost, Senior Vice Provost for Research” back into the handbook. E. Michalopoulou seconded. Motion was approved (18 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

G. Thomas motion to restructure search committee for Provost and Senior Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs, and search committee for Deans of Degree Granting Colleges and Schools. M. Bandelt seconded. Motion was approved (18 yes, 2 no, 1 abstention). Both motions will go to the IFM for voting on December 4th. If approved, it will go on to the Provost office. Please pass this on to each department and urge faculty to attend.

VIII. **GER committee comment on FS motion**

The Faculty Senate asked the GER subcommittee to discuss the following motion brought before the Faculty Senate, which was moved by Y. Perl and seconded by D. Blackmore.

**Motion:** If an academic unit wants to propose a GER course in a specialty of another academic unit (e.g. Math GER, Humanities GER), the course should be designed by and have the approval of both units.

After discussion at its meeting of October 28, 2019, the GER Subcommittee agreed to the following comment:

The GER Subcommittee does not support the motion. GER subcommittee practice is that any unit that presents a course for consideration as meeting a GER literacy in areas usually taught by another unit, shall consult with the other unit before submitting the course for review.

Comments were: The GER committee is not delivering and has no clear mechanism for resolving the issue. There should be more cooperation between departments. GER is too political. The FS President can make changes. S. Pemberton stated that the GER had a constructive/collaborative discussion during the October 28th meeting. S. Pemberton continued that this motion will not achieve the goals of FS and it is not a practical mechanism, as no one unit owns a literacy. There is an assumption in the wording of the motion that certain units do own a literacy. Updated language is needed. I. Gatley stated that he would vote against the motion. M. Bandelt asked who would own certain literacies such as Social Science. R. Sodhi suggested that courses be designed in consultation with other units. Literacies should be reevaluated. Blind ballots were distributed. Motion failed (10 yes, 11 no, 1 abstention).

IX. The meeting ended at 1:30PM