

Faculty and Professional Affairs Committee

November 18, 2015

Meeting Minutes

Members Present:	Heather McKeever	Teodora Cox
	Meral Arnavut	Daniela Peterka-Benton
	Marilia Antunez	Derrik Decker
	Chris Taverna	Kevin Hahn
	Liz Lee	Peter McCord

Guests Present:	Mary Beth Sievens	Rob Deemer
------------------------	-------------------	------------

Meeting called to order at 1:00pm by FPAC Chairperson Heather McKeever.

I. Action:

- *Approval of Meeting Minutes:*
 - Change: Meral should be added as present at September 9, 2015 meeting.
 - Liz motions to approve September 9, 2015 meeting minutes; Meral seconds.
 - Tedi motions to approve October 14, 2015 meeting minutes; Meral seconds.
 - Minutes approved unanimously.
- *Nomination and Appointing of FPAC Secretary:*
 - Motion for Kevin Hahn as FPAC 2015 – 2016 Secretary.
 - Motion passes. (Thanks, everyone!)

II. Introduction of Guests – Rob Deemer and Mary Beth Sievens, University Senate:

- Rob and Mary Beth brought paper copies of the 2014 – 2015 FPAC annual report for the group. Heather shared that she would be happy to post the report to the FPAC Google folder.
- Rob clarified that the annual report was not submitted by the June deadline, but it seems to be completed in full.
- Tedi asked about whether University Senate Executive Board members receive compensation for their work; Rob affirmed that Executive Board members are paid through modest stipends.

III. Discussion about CONFAC:

- Should we have a liaison between FPAC and CONFAC? Furthermore, should CONFAC be represented at FPAC, or FPAC be represented at CONFAC, or both? We would not want FPAC to control CONFAC, but we also want to acknowledge the added commitment involved in any CONFAC member attending FPAC meetings.
- Could we just invite CONFAC to FPAC meetings when needed?
- Should CONFAC really be a subcommittee of FPAC? It seems that they are talking about different concerns. It is important for CONFAC and FPAC not to work against each other.
- Perhaps CONFAC could be an affiliate committee to FPAC. There are 2 full-time faculty members on CONFAC. As long as communication exists between the groups, it seems that our need would be fulfilled.
- Dani asked if it might be possible to create an optional CONFAC seat on FPAC. This way, CONFAC would feel invited, but not obligated to participate in FPAC.

- Communication between leaders of the 2 committees is most important – we should work to create and sustain a means of communication.
- From Peter's perspective, CONFAC wants guidance from and connection with FPAC.
- Liz suggested that we modify the bylaws of the 2 committees to reflect connection and need for communication between the leaders – language in both versions of the bylaws should be consistent.
- We decided not to nominate an FPAC member to liaison with CONFAC. Instead, we will invest our energies into developing a means for consistent communication between the 2 committees.

IV. Discussion about 2015 – 2016 Goals and Activities:

- *Old Business:*
 - Handbook (tabled):
 - Rob mentioned that there has been progress with the handbook and the Department Chair Selection Policy. At this stage, Dr. Horvath and University Senate are deciding who should be responsible for what. UUP might need to be involved. Hopefully, by the Spring semester, movement will be more noticeable.
- *Senate:*
 - Campus-wide surveys, forums:
 - Chris reasoned that surveys might address and uncover misperceptions; surveys used to be implemented every Spring, which is too often. Many people feel over-surveyed, and sometimes the only people who respond to surveys are the people who want to complain. Forums provided a venue for new ideas to be exchanged. It seems that campus participation in general is lacking – people are spending more time in their offices. A forum might be helpful, given that it has been a while since our last.
 - Meral offered that multiple surveys based on demographics could be helpful – faculty, professional staff, administration.
 - Kevin volunteered to assemble the survey(s) after FPAC decides what to ask campus faculty and staff.
 - Rob suggested planning an FPAC Open Forum for Spring 2016 Professional Development Day. Mary Beth agreed, saying that this is how we can capture an audience and establish a following.
 - Liz verified that the date of Professional Development Day is February 5. She mentioned that we should try to be included in the overall schedule. If this happens, we should prepare an agenda in advance instead of leaving it completely open-ended.
- *Open Discussion:*
 - Dani mentioned that it would be helpful for us to tell people about what FPAC is. We want to motivate people to get involved, and people will not be involved without knowing who we are.
 - Heather posed a general question to the group: How can we define FPAC and the work of FPAC? The roles of UUP and FPAC tend to overlap, too, which further complicates matters. Tedi explained that, even as of now, our third meeting of the semester, FPAC is without direction.
 - In a related question, Meral asked whether FPAC is a subcommittee or standing committee of University Senate. Rob explained that FPAC is 1 of 5 standing committees of the University Senate.

- Meral then asked about where the FPAC committee charges come from. Providing context, Liz shared that FPAC was formed in reaction to a single complaint – children at the workplace. Then, Dr. Horvath charged FPAC with reviewing the handbook and policies and fixing errors therein. It became a busy-work committee. But who are we now?
- Rhetorically, Rob asked whether there should even be an FPAC. If FPAC were to dissolve, how else would we address the issues which FPAC has been addressing? What is the practice at other schools? Historically, FPAC has functioned as a catch-all for projects not related to any other standing committee. This contributes to the lack of direction of FPAC.
- Liz asked if an Ombudsman might be helpful – someone who would serve as a guide in instances of bullying or unreasonable workload. It seems that the larger SUNY institutions – Buffalo, Stony Brook, and Binghamton – feature an Ombudsman Office.
 - Mary Beth agreed that moving towards an Ombudsman and an Advisory Committee might be a worthwhile option to pursue, especially if FPAC is no longer effective as originally constructed. Rob suggested that we research other schools' systems and scale them back for what we would need at Fredonia.
- Chris mentioned that, as much as we bemoan the broad scope of FPAC and the lack of a defined purpose, the blurriness of FPAC is also an advantage. It gives us flexibility to be creative in identifying and addressing problems. Without an Ombudsman, FPAC can be helpful with faculty and staff retention.
- Peter wondered aloud about how anyone with a concern would even contact FPAC. Are we publicizing ourselves at all?
- Rob shared that FPAC could be best served by figuring out what needs to be addressed – by being the voice of faculty and staff.
- Heather announced that our December meeting will probably be devoted to FPAC carving out a role for ourselves. We seem to be heading into a time of unrest on campus (e.g., problems with workload, enrollment), but FPAC can be part of the solution. We can be motivators!

V. Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, December 9, 2015 | 1:00 – 2:00pm | Foundation House
 - bring topic of conversation – Liz will start a Google document for us to share concerns and discussion topics.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kevin Hahn