

## **Minutes**

### **Faculty Council 2 October 2025**

**256 BSC at 3:30pm**

**Voting Participants: J.D. Bowen, Jennifer Korte, André Zampaulo, Zhenguo Lin, Lucy Cashion, Alesha Durfee, Ted Mathys, Melinda McPherson, Kate Moran, Elizabeth Block, Mike McClymond, Brian Downes, Ruth Warner, Brenda Kirchoff, Emily Hite, George Ndege, Sarah Bauer, Elena Bray Speth, Ellen Carnaghan, Bryan Sokol, Kim Powlishta, Chris Duncan, Ben England**

**Non-Voting Participants: Donna LaVoie, Laurie Russell, Dan Kozlowski, Jen Popiel, Katrina Moore, Mark Ruff, Ashley Milam, Yolonda Wilson, Scott Harris, Laurie Shornick, Jen Rust, Daniel Smith, Ozlem Ugurlu, Evelyn Meyer, Blythe Janowiak**

## **AGENDA**

1. Welcome & Greetings
  - a. Welcome! Chris Duncan (Faculty Council VP) will run this meeting.
2. Policy on Promotion (April Trees & Randy Richter)
  - a. We are spending the fall working on guidelines for UCART, and in the spring, we look at dossiers.
  - b. Can you talk through some of the rationale of this policy?
    1. Response from Randy: the chair has an important role to play, and they write a letter that counts as their vote for or against promotion. The concern from UCART was that the chair's presence may influence the situation such that the chair gets two votes. There is also a question as to whether the chair's presence may influence the conversation and dissuade honest opinions.
  - c. The broader concern on the other side of the issue is that chairs are not hearing the conversation occurring and not keeping the conversation in check. What if a dominant personality takes over the conversation in the absence of the chair?
    1. Response from Randy: it is up to the chair of the committee (not the department chair) to control the conversation when a department is discussing dossiers. Everyone should be given a chance to speak at the department meetings.
  - d. Comment: next year, it may be worth surveying departments about what they think about the presence of chairs. Many departments may welcome the presence of chairs.

- e. Comment from Donna: the rollout of this policy may have caused a procedural error in the review of dossiers. There were some departments that had already met when this memo was disseminated.
    - 1. Response from April: please reach out with specific concerns about departments.
  - f. Question: is the memo a recommendation or a requirement? What is the status?
    - 1. Response from April: there is an expectation that it be implemented.
    - 2. Comment from Donna: this is a problem though; this ambiguity is problematic.
    - 3. Response from April: let me know about specific issues, and we will work on it moving forward.
  - g. Ending comment: please reach out to April Trees with any comments or suggestions.
3. MOBIUS Update from Libraries (Jennifer Nutefall & Sarah Pugachev)
- a. MOBIUS started between WashU, SLU, and UM system; it has expanded heavily into public libraries, but started as a university library system.
  - b. Both SLU and WashU have submitted letters of intent to withdraw from MOBIUS by the end of the current fiscal year. We are engaged in conversations about what the future looks like.
  - c. Nothing will change until summer 2026.
  - d. Question: Can you speak to the functionality of MOBIUS right now?
    - 1. Response from Sarah: there are issues with libraries not seeing requests from other libraries; sometimes books and requests get lost. It involves a lot of contacting other libraries to solve problems.
    - 2. There are many public libraries in MOBIUS that have had issues with requests.
  - e. Question: what are the alternatives and their functionality?
    - 1. We do not know what the function will be like in the future with MOBIUS, so we will have to see. Concerning interlibrary loan (ILL): we can set up an ILL for local lenders.
    - 2. There will be staff support for ILL implementation.
  - f. The status of the impact of this change on the Libby app is TBD.

4. CAS Dean's Report ([see slides here](#))

- a. There will be a 3-5 year strategic plan we make as a college. It will be built on previous work.
- b. We have a vision statement with four points:
  - 1. Promoting student achievement
  - 2. Advancing scholarship and creative work
  - 3. Supporting faculty growth
  - 4. Cultivating public engagement
- c. Donna has developed a draft of guiding principles. We are a college of arts and sciences with a catholic, Jesuit lens. We are guided by the Jesuit Apostolic Preferences (delineated in slides linked above).
  - 1. Relatedly, we blew it out of the park at the Research Uncorked event which showcased much of our work. For all the submissions, we mapped it onto these four principles. What we do is aligned with our mission.
- d. Four priorities:
  - 1. Elevate and support student success
    - 1. Inclusive and supportive learning environments and experiences
  - 2. Sustain and amplify our research, scholarship, and creative endeavor
    - 1. Such as research uncorked. We have momentum and need to maintain it.
  - 3. Strengthen faculty development
    - 1. At all levels, no matter what they choose to do
  - 4. Expand opportunities for public scholarship and global engagement
    - 1. We need more community engaged work. This will be a priority.
- e. How do we get there? We will have multiple working groups/teams, up to 50-60 across all working groups.
- f. There will be a dean's strategic plan drafting committee with six members representing all fields from CAS.
- g. FAC, FC, research advisory council, and a DEI committee will all work together on this. We need FC feedback on this process.
- h. There can be many small working groups. Donna can provide a template, and Laurie Russell can provide internal data.

- i. Timeline: entire process completed by May 1. Draft revisions will occur in March and April. Conditions change rapidly in higher education.
  - j. Everyone in the small groups should be free-thinking; don't think about limitations, for that is the job of the overarching committee.
5. CAS Committee Reports:
- a. Faculty Advisory Committee
    - 1. Two charges from Donna: (1) addressing professional development and (2) training in Tableau in collaboration with OIR and Laurie Russell. We will have an eye toward the role data play in departmental review needs.
  - b. Graduate Curriculum Committee
    - 1. [Motion here.](#)
    - 2. Motion passes.
  - c. Nominations Committee
    - 1. No report.
  - d. Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee
    - 1. We've met twice and are hard at work.
  - e. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
    - 1. [Motion here.](#)
    - 2. Motion passes.
  - f. DEI Committee
    - 1. No report.
6. University Committee Reports:
- a. Faculty Senate
    - 1. Kickoff meeting was last month. Nothing specific to CAS.
  - b. UUCC
    - 1. See [summary](#) of the recent meeting. We approved 19 new courses (13 of them from CAS) for the core.
    - 2. We codified our by-laws, and the updated version will be circulated when it is ready.

3. Ahead of next November, there will be a call for directors of the different components of the university core. We are considering adding a new director of assessment. Updates to come.

1. Question: how frequently do you meet?

1. Response: Once a month; directors have additional meetings.

c. UCART

1. No report.

d. GAAC

1. No report.

e. UAAC

1. We discussed edits for policies on microcredentials, priority registration, and incomplete grades. No decisions have been made though.

f. GEAR

1. We have a drafty recommendation on organizational structure for graduate education. It is not centralized or decentralized; we are looking at all possible combinations.

g. Academic Program Review Council

1. No report.

h. Library Advisory Committee

1. No report.

7. New Business

- a. Resources on Jesuit education available at the front table (from Bryan Sokol).

Adjourn at 4:38pm.