Minutes of Faculty Council  
October 7, 2011  

Present: A. Azadegan, C. Chavez, M. de Boyrie, M. Downes, C. Erickson, K. Melendrez, M. Niculescu, H. Sankaran, P. Tunnell  
Absent: G. Hampton  

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 am.  
The agenda for the meeting was approved as amended.  
The inclusion of the request made by Dean K. Brook regarding the change of the name of one of the faculty awards was noted.  
The following new business items were included:  
• How to choose items to be included in the FC agenda, and  
• Faculty member request to find out why the CoB Dean received a salary raise when there has been low overall raise in faculty salary.  

1. The Policy to Encourage and Reward Production of Peer Reviewed Journal Articles by Faculty in the College of Business was reviewed. The committee was charged with approving or rejecting the proposal. (The proposal is attached for reference.)  
Outcome:  
• The policy was approved with one abstention.  
• It was suggested that Dean K. Brook consider clarifying the following issues in the policy as presented:  
  • Does each of the co-authors (within the CoB) receive the $500 award?  
  • Is this a one-time reward?  

2. Reviewed Faculty Funding applications. There was one application for the Salopek funds and four for the Dean’s discretionary fund (money made available by the CoB Dean for International travel for research/Travel to academic board meetings/Professional leadership participation).  
Outcome:  
• The request made by G. A. Rosile was approved for $400. The funds awarded are from the Salopek funds.  
• The first request made by W. Lee for $500 was approved. The funds awarded are from the Dean’s discretionary funds. The second request made by W. Lee was not approved at this time. See rationale below.  
• The request by A. Azadegan for $500 was approved. The funds awarded are from the Dean’s discretionary funds.  
• The request by B. Gould for $500 was not approved at this time. See rationale below.  
Rationale:  
• W. Lee’s second request was denied because her paper is not yet accepted for presentation in the conference. W. Lee will be able to reapply if funds are available once the paper is accepted, but preference will be given to requests made by faculty members who have not received funds within the academic year.  
• In the case of B. Gould the committee felt that priority should be given to travel for international event (e.g., conferences), something that his proposal did not include. B. Gould may reapply next semester with more detailed explanation of the research activity.
Note: Please remember that all faculty members traveling internationally must fill out (1) the International Travel: Faculty/Staff Authorization Form as well as (2) the International Travel: Waiver, Release, and Hold Harmless Agreement and obtain the appropriate signatures and submit these documents to the appropriate departments/program.

3. Feedback on the progress in implementing the teaching evaluation proposal put forth by the Faculty Council was presented.
   • The Finance Department reported that its faculty members compared its current evaluation process with the department’s P&T document and agreed that the evaluation form is consistent with the P&T document.
   • The Management Department members will meet on October 17, 2011 to discuss this issue.
   • There was no feedback from other departments.
   • The goal is to have each department's evaluation of teaching be consistent with existing P&T policies (department, college, and university). This is particularly important when a new department head is elected.

4. On October 4, 2011 Dean K. Brook sent an e-mail to H. Sankaran requesting a name change for the two awards: “Professional service” and for “Service to the College.” Department heads this summer suggested that Faculty Council systematize the service awards, making one for “Service to NMSU” and one for “Discipline-related external service.”

   Outcome:
   • The FC agreed to change the name of the “Service to the College” to “Service to NMSU” award.
   • The FC found the title “Professional service” adequate and suggested that the following description would help to clarify:
     “The Professional Service award is for external service involving discipline-based expertise that furthers the mission of the University.”

   Rationale:
   • Service to the CoB is service to the NMSU.
   • It is not appropriate to use the word discipline-based since a faculty member in one discipline may contribute to the profession by doing something that is outside of his/her discipline. The description mentioned above serves to clarify the meaning of the title “Professional.”

New Business
1. The question of which items should be included in the agenda or discussed in the regular Faculty Council meetings was brought up.

   Outcome:
   • The agenda will now have two sections: Old Business and New Business. Old Business will include any item that the FC members need to discuss and which are part of the responsibilities assigned to the committee. New Business will include any issues for which the committee needs to find out more information.
   • The following motion was made and was unanimously approved as amended: “Any Faculty Council member can bring forth an item to be included in the FC agenda under the category of New Business (which could be added at the time of the meeting or be excluded from the agenda if appropriate) and faculty members in the CoB are welcome to provide feedback, formally or informally, through their FC representative.”
• These items will be included in the meetings’ minutes with a request for faculty to share any concerns directly with their representative to the FC.

2. The fact that a faculty member brought forward to a FC member the issue of the salary raise that the CoB Dean received was discussed at length.

   **Outcome:**
   The committee members discussed the idea of such a concern and made the following recommendation: “In the spirit of shared governance the members of the Faculty Council and the faculty members in the CoB would like to discuss with the CoB Dean why there exist an inequity between faculty raises and the Dean’s recent raise.”

   **Rationale:**
   After spending some time discussing whether asking this question was within the committee’s purview it was determined that as a liaison between the faculty and the administration, the FC has the responsibility to voice the concerns of faculty members. The FC chose to inform the Dean about the concern and request an explanation.”

   A motion to adjourn was made. The FC committee adjourned at 11:10 am.

Next meeting: TBA