****

**College of Engineering and Computing**

**Faculty Council on Governance**

**Meeting: September 25, 2023 (ZOOM)**

**Minutes**

**Committee members:**

**In Attendance**: Anamika Prasad (BME), Walter Tang (CEE), Xia Jin (CEE), Mohammad Rahman (ECE), Vladimir Pozdin (ECE), Bogdan Carbunar (KFSCIS), Janki Bhimani (KFSCIS), Lufan Wang (MDCM), Wallied Orabi (MDCM), Norman Munroe (MME), Stephen Secules (SUCCEED), Bruk Berhane (SUCCEED),

**Absent:** Pezhman Mardanpour (MME), BME 2nd year representative

**Guests**: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 PM by Dr. Norman Munroe.

**1.** **Approval of meeting agenda and minutes**

The meeting agenda was approved with no changes.

**2.**  **Updates and Remarks from 2022-2023 Council Chair**

October 9th is the annual faculty convocation and faculty are encouraged to attend to recognize our colleagues. The new council chair will make remarks at the ceremony.

**3.** **Council Elections**

1. Walter Tang – Chair
2. Vladimir Pozdin – Vice-Chair
3. Lufan Wang – Secretary
4. Anamika Prasad – Parliamentarian

**4.** **Old Business**

1. Set-up, response, discuss, and recommend based upon the results from the “Administration Evaluation and Survey” in each academic year.
2. Subcommittee reporting: T&P, Awards, IT, Budget Committees need to meet and submit a report for each academic year.
3. Assignment of Space in New Engineering Building: The absence of comprehensive plans for the engineering building has exacerbated uncertainty and a lack of clarity among faculty members, adversely affecting morale. It is acknowledged that limited funding and ORED's control over space prevent the Dean's Office from sharing these plans with the faculty. Nevertheless, the dearth of information conveys a negative message. It was proposed that having a renovation plan in place could boost morale among faculty members who will continue working in the old building.
4. Post-Tenure Review Criteria and Guidelines: Ensuring that our faculty members have clear and fair criteria for post-tenure review is vital. It is a testament to our commitment to academic excellence.
	1. The criteria for post-tenure review evaluations have been communicated differently to various departments. Some departments received an ultimatum regarding post-tenure target metrics, while the Faculty Senate has asserted that these discussions should be more collaborative. Faculty members have expressed concerns about the lack of consistency and transparency in the process.
	2. It was suggested that departments collaborate internally to address this issue and collectively voice their concerns. Another idea proposed seeking clarification from Mark Weiss regarding the rationale behind the metrics presented to certain departments.

**5.** **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.