

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, September 24, 2018
Minutes

Present: Uchenna Baker, Kris Bartanen, Nick Brody, Gwynne Brown, Sara Freeman, Andrew Gardner, Megan Gessel, Alison Tracy Hale, Robin Jacobson, Kelly Johnson, Kristin Johnson, Chris Kendall, Andrew Monaco, Collin Noble, Heather White, Kirsten Wilbur

- I. Chair Freeman called the meeting to order
- II. Announcements:
 1. Race and Pedagogy conference is this weekend, as well as two evening performances. Priority for performances will be given to people with tickets but there will likely be room for other attendees.
 2. Noble discussed meeting about volunteer coordination and that there will be a last-minute push for faculty and staff volunteers.
- III. **M/S/P** approval of the minutes from the meeting for September 17th
- IV. Updates from Student and Staff representatives:
 1. Noble noted that ASUPS is preparing to run the social media campaign for Race and Pedagogy. Following the conference ASUPS will begin discussing input into strategic plan. No updates from staff senate as they did not meet since last Faculty Senate meeting.
- V. Reports from Standing Committees
 1. All committees have received charges and convened their first meetings.
- VI. COD/CC adjudication from Senate: issues at stake question 6, other modes of review
 1. The COD and CC asked the Senate to consider overlaps in jurisdiction and concerns about dealing with accountability regarding departmental review question #6 (Q6): *In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?* Wilbur (Chair of COD) introduced the committee's thoughts concerning next steps. Their current goal is to get information from previous department reviews and how they address the question #6 in curriculum reviews. The plan to send a survey to department chairs to get a sense of how that question was answered in previous reviews. Wilbur mentioned that the move from five to seven-year review cycles make it more difficult to address Q6. Perhaps a similar question can be added to yearly department reviews. Freeman mentioned that some work has been done previously to address how Q6 has been answered, although the question has changed in recent years. Freeman also noted that there are concerns regarding what we do with the responses, not just how the question is answered. COD chair Wilbur reiterated the COD is willing and able to move forward in addressing those issues. Bartanen

mentioned that each chair provides an assessment every June and analyzes one of their department's student learning outcomes. Adding a question similar to Q6 would be a change, although it is a possibility. The current yearly reports are more curricular in nature.

Freeman summarized the discussion by noting that CC feels it is outside of their purview to assess some components of Q6, especially as they relate to hiring, without a faculty mandate to do so. Freeman reviewed a list of potential options moving forward – both committees want more clarity in whether and how they should address this question. Who gets to say to a department that they need to do more in the area of hiring, in particular? CC liaison Kendall discussed the seven-year review cycle and potential future options, including a two-year review timeline (vs. one-year). The committee is considering alternative options, but the main concern is that more follow-ups will face resistance given that we just moved to the seven-year cycle. Bartanen reviewed some of the broader issues related to Q6 – both concerning the general rationale for the question and whether the CC would even need to consider questions related to hiring in the first place. The presumed goal for Q6 should be to analyze whether our teaching matches our broader institutional goals related to inclusivity and the general campus climate.

Jacobson asked how the data relating to hiring is shared with various departments and whether the report reflects the entire campus or individual departments. The report currently reflects the campus as a whole since not every department hires every year. Freeman asked for discussion on whether Q6 should still be asked in the CC reviews. Jacobson thinks it should. Kelly Johnson reported that, as an attendee at CC meetings, it seems that the concerns were not related to the question itself, but whether CC had jurisdiction over answers related to hiring. Brown noted that one benefit of bringing it to the full faculty is to get buy-in. Kendall agreed and said that some departments don't feel they can/should answer the question, and the CC would like the faculty to decide as a whole that the question is worth answering in order to promote faculty ownership over issues of diversity.

Freeman read the COD's 2017 recommendation for the wording of Q6 aloud (wording that draws on the Threshold 2022 report and not adopted by CC) and mentioned that the question could be too in-depth and specific for some departments to answer every seven years. For some departments answering a question framed in terms of "redress" is clear, but for other disciplines it can be more difficult. Hale questioned whether a single question in a curriculum review is the right mechanism for addressing the broader issues that the question is targeting. Gessel mentioned that many departments still want and need feedback on how to address these issues. Jacobson noted that this discussion likely corresponds with the Legacies component of the strategic plan. Brown referred to Gessel's comments

and noted that reports are not always the best mechanism for accurately reflecting on these issues. Rather, a process that encourages departments to seek assistance might be a better option. Monaco suggested an additional reflective piece from the COD for departments to consider how to better address these issues/questions. White noted that the incentive structure can be improved/addressed, as well. Freeman summarized the discussion – Q6 should remain but should be limited to a curricular focus. The COD should be further empowered to ensure that the departments can meet the standards from the strategic plan. In addition, the Senate should further consider how the Legacies component of the strategic plan connects to decisions connected to Q6. Monaco agreed and reiterated that there should be a way to empower the COD to ask departments to reflect. Hale and Baker provided potential additional challenges and questions related to the potential reflection. Freeman asked how we might better communicate this discussion to committees and departments. Kendall noted that the CC was not charged this year with addressing this issue. Freeman will write a formal response to the resolutions to be sent to liaisons and committees.

VII. Continue discussion of next steps with strategic plan

Freeman encouraged Senators to gather viewpoints and feedback leading up to October meeting with President Crawford concerning feedback on the strategic plan. The Senate will meet with president Crawford at the Faculty Club on the evening of October 10th (time TBD). The meeting is open to all faculty members.

Bartanen asked for feedback on how to best disseminate compiled data from the August faculty workshop – there are summaries of breakout sessions, a compilation of reflection sheets, and results of a Qualtrics survey following the workshop. Bartanen offered options for sharing – included posting the data on SoundNet, including it in her report to the faculty for the October 3rd faculty meeting. Overall the feedback seemed positive, with some concerns relating to faculty labor and how to go about implementing Pathways, as well as some ambiguity about other initiatives outlined on the plan. Freeman mentioned that a key decision for the faculty is about how to take action on curriculum initiatives. Hale also mentioned that it could be sent out over facultycoms.

Relating to implementation, Bartanen offered that the current committee structure is not set up to propose and design proposals. Discussion turned to options for how to best implement elements of the strategic plan should the faculty choose to take action. For instance, should such committees be elected or appointed? Noble asked whether the Senate might be the appropriate representative group for doing such work. Monaco asked how strategic plan working groups were formed. Many members were invited, some faculty were elected. The cabinet distilled working group proposals. Senators discussed the importance of representation across departments, disciplines, and rank, while maintaining a workable size. Johnson suggested that perhaps the Senate itself was not elected to address the strategic

plan, and will also turnover in the course of the review. Monaco mentioned that the Senate bylaws might encompass such work.

Freeman turned discussion to the question of how to change and structure workload for faculty, and offered that this question will be key for any committee that addresses the plan. Kristin Johnson mentioned that this question will be considered at the Senate meeting with President Crawford.

VIII. Additional discussion

The common hour may have made some other meetings more difficult. The Senate will continue to consider potential options, such as standing meeting times for committees.

M/S/P to adjourn the meeting at 1:10pm

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Brody