

Faculty Senate Meeting

Monday, November 5, 2018

Present: Andrew Gardner, Kristin Johnson, Sara Freeman, Andrew Monaco, Robin Jacobson, Chris Kendall, Collin Noble, Sarah Shives, Heather White, Kelly Johnson, Sunil Kukreja, Gwynne Brown, Nick Brody, Megan Gessel

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:01 PM.

Announcements:

Student announced March for our Lives, scheduled for tonight in front of the Fieldhouse. Students are hopeful that faculty will show up in solidarity with the students.

Associate Dean Kukreja noted the Register Lecture is scheduled for this Thursday. Professor Doug Sackman will be lecturing.

Chair Freeman notes that there are open fora for faculty this week in regards to the Provost candidates.

Collin Noble provides an ASUPS update. Noble mentions the March for our Lives event scheduled for this evening. Noble also mentions the posters recently found on campus. He describes a “conversation underway” amongst students about a campus response. Collin also notes that he himself will serve on the Provost search committee as the undergraduate representative. Finally, he notes that The Trail is having a conversation about contributors not getting paid.

Sarah Shives provides a Staff Senate update. They had a conversation with new HR director, and visited various concerns about morale and high turnover. There was also some discussion of the forthcoming changes to paid family leave regulations.

There were a total of zero reports from standing committees.

M/S/P approval of the minutes from the meeting October 22.

The remainder of the meeting concerned the formation of the Strategic Planning Curriculum Task Force. Senators considered the specifics in the draft text of a call for nominations. Multiple aspects of the draft were discussed.

In regards to the leadership and the constitution of the committee, White suggests the possibility of modifications to allow or perhaps mandate the inclusion of non-tenure track faculty. There is a long and multifaceted discussion of how voting for faculty to be included in the task force might be designed to produce a resulting set of elected task force members from various ranks.

Chair Freeman notes that she has included language that allows two members of the library staff to serve on the committee. Kendall asks for reasoning behind this. Freeman responds that

she thinks of library as full colleagues with a particular interest in our forthcoming curriculum. Jacobson wonders if this might make the committee too unwieldy, as discussed in a previous Senate meeting. Kristin Johnson notes that librarians on the task force would not be entitled to the stipend, and so service would perhaps comprise an undue burden. Associate Dean Kukreja concurs, and notes that library personnel serve on committees and task forces atop their regular duties. Hale notes that the structure and hierarchy of the library is institutionally unique, and suggests we might want to be specific about who we want represented on the task force. The Senate settles on one position from the library on the task force.

There is discussion of how the new Provost and the task force might interact. This segues into a discussion of whether the chair or chairs of the task force should or shouldn't be voting members. Kukreja suggests we want to signal cooperativeness to the new provost in order to build a healthy partnership. This, Kukreja suggests, might be a reason for the chair of the senate and the Provost to co-lead the committee. Jacobson suggests that we need to ensure that this task force clearly remains in the purview of the faculty.

There is some discussion of framing the provost and the senate chair's role as advisory, perhaps to an elected faculty chair. Kristin Johnson notes that we need to determine whether the chair is elected by the faculty or by the members of the task force. Hale and several others reiterate that with the substantial time commitment involved, compensation is an important issue.

Discussion returns to the arrangement of the Task Force's leadership. This is especially of concern because of the workload involved. And there's an emphatic reassertion of the Task Forces' activities as the purview of faculty. Gwynne Brown and others affirmed their deep appreciation for Kris Bartanen, despite their misgivings about the signal that would be sent by having the provost serve as co-chair of this faculty task force.

This leads to a discussion of voting rights on the task force. While faculty will have voting rights, there is discussion as to whether associate deans and various staff who will likely be working with the committee should vote.

At this point, numerous senators begin to collaboratively line edit the draft language on a google document. Chair Freeman notes that this revised version will be presented to the full faculty on Wednesday.

White returns to the conversation about how to get representation from different ranks of faculty, and notes that in these elections full professors almost always win. There is sustained discussion of how to deal with this, and some speculative suggestions about how to frame a tiered voting system. Gardner wonders if the culture of inclusion on our campus perhaps has overwhelmed our rationality here — is there perhaps not some justification to permanent and tenured faculty serving on committees and task forces of this sort?. Gessel points out that it is the assistant professors who will live with what the Task Force creates the longest. There is some additional discussion of a way to encourage tiered voting. Kukreja points out that there are many different sorts of non-tenured instructors, and we need to be specific with our language. He suggests precision in describing non-tenured and continuing faculty.

Jacobson notes that faculty really want this to be an elected faculty committee rather than one appointed by the senate. Discussion continues about how to obtain representation across ranks from the open vote.

Freeman asks if anything else in the draft was flagged. Monaco notes that equalizing the length of the semesters seems to have been thrown in to this task. Freeman responds that it's in there because it's another thing that needs to get done, and its related to the forthcoming revised curriculum.

M/S/P to approve the draft call for the Curriculum Task Force.

M/S/P to adjourn the meeting at 1:30pm

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Gardner