

Faculty Senate Meeting
October 28, 2019
Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 28, 2019

Present: Megan Gessel, Alison Tracy Hale, Sarah Moore, Tiffany MacBain, Jung Kim, Jairo Hoyas, Laura Behling, Julia Looper, Regina Duthely, Heather White, Sara Freeman (Chair), Mushawn Knowles, Rebecca Lumbantobing, Chris Kendall.

Guests: Kristin Johnson

- I. Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m.
- II. Announcements
 - Sara Freeman announced that The Penelopiad opens this Friday
- III. Approval of Minutes from [October 14, 2019](#)
 - The Senate voted to approve the minutes of October 14, 2019.
- IV. Updates from ASUPS or Staff Senate
 - Knowles reported that the refitting work continues on the Den in the lower level of Wheelock
 - Knowles further reported on the status of The Trail, which is not currently publishing but hopes to be up and running next semester with a new editorial infrastructure. Based on the work of the task force, that model proposes two editors-in-chief in order to separate business from content-focused editorial tasks and to make the positions more accessible to students.
 - There was no staff senate representative present to report.
- V. Reports from Liaisons to Standing Committees
 - **Academic Standards Committee:** MacBain reported that ASC Chair Rich Anderson-Connolly was working on an email to faculty outlining recent policy changes per the Senate's previous request. She further noted that Dean Kukreja was interested in pursuing discussion of the ASC's standing charge regarding current standards of admission in relation to discussions about program and curriculum changes. Kendall asked whether there was a particular concern driving this consideration of admission standards? MacBain said that Kukreja connected his interest to significant developments that the university will soon undergo, including new programs and, likely, a new Core

curriculum. Knowles expressed interest in the standards of admission, especially as those impact our work to diversify the student body. It was noted that Admissions does not have a representative on the ASC and that ASC will coordinate with Admissions in its discussions. MacBain will keep the Senate apprised of those conversations.

- Freeman raised a potential future topic for discussion: once the new curriculum is decided/implemented, what role might faculty have in how that curriculum is marketed?

- **Curriculum Committee:** Looper reported on some revisions to the language of the charge regarding the summer bridge program. The revised language reads as follows:

In collaboration with the Summer Bridge Program Committee, establish a framework to review courses for this program. Then, according to that framework, review courses that have been developed for the Summer Bridge Program for implementation in the summer of 2020.

- **Ad Hoc Committee on Contingent Faculty:** Freeman is working on finding a 4th member for the committee; current members have received their charges.

VI. Review of the proposed [Bylaws language to establish IACUC](#) as a standing committee

Bylaws section 6; proposal:

The proposal involves adding a section K for IACUC to the bylaws for a first reading at the Nov. 6 faculty meeting with a vote to establish IACUC as a standing committee of the Senate to be held at the Nov. 20 faculty meeting.

Gessel and Kim have revised the language and modeled it on the IRB section of the bylaws. The idea is to make the section language flexible to allow for possible changes to federal guidelines without requiring future changes to our bylaws. Questions emerged during that process regarding parity between IACUC's guidelines and those of IRB: do we need to change the IRB language to create a more parallel structure between standing committees? Behling noted that the federal process for IRB assurance needs to be completed first. Further discussion considered possible overlap between IRB and IACUC responsibilities. Freeman will check to see that previous changes to IRB charges have been fully recorded. The Senate agreed that the bylaw approval process (faculty approval and approval by the Board of Trustees) allows time for editing to eliminate any remaining overlap. MacBain asked about the impact of the change to our ability to fully staff other standing committees. Freeman responded that both the Student Life Committee and the Curriculum Committee have become smaller (although still within the limits specified by the bylaws). Freeman further mentioned two service commitments--Graduate Fellowships Advisory Committee (GFAC) and Experiential Learning Faculty Advisory Board

(ELFAB)--whose members are not available for additional service appointments. MacBain asked whether we need to make IACUC--or whether IACUC is certain it wants to be made--a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, given that there are already ways for faculty to be recognized for service outside of standing committees. Kim replied that while the issue of recognizing the service of faculty on IACUC is important, the change makes sense more broadly because of the parallels between IRB (which is a standing Senate committee) and IACUC. Behling noted that because the Dean is the person required to verify compliance, it might appear to be a conflict of interest to have them named on the committee. The Senate agreed upon the following sequence of events with respect to establishing IACUC and ensuring that the bylaws concerning IACUC and IRB are consistent: 1) Amend the bylaws; 2) audit and if needed update the IRB guidelines; 3) Present the changes to the Board of Trustees in February for approval.

M/S/P to ask faculty to amend bylaws to establish IACUC as a regular committee of the Senate. See Appendix.

VII. Senate Discussion of [Curriculum Survey](#) and Consideration of Guidance for next steps

The Senate discussed the results of the recent survey and possible directions forward. Questions arose about how to interpret the survey data effectively given that less than 50% of the faculty responded, and that the results did not indicate clear or obvious directions or make specific distinctions among models. The models all address in some manner the priorities faculty expressed regarding the core curriculum. Senators expressed appreciation for the presence of student feedback in the data, and noted that students value interdisciplinarity over team teaching. Knowles asked about transparency: at what point might it be possible to share models with students? Could the powerpoints from the October 4 be shared with students? (Yes, Freeman will request them from the working groups.)

The Senate then discussed ways to move forward with the process that are efficient but that remain transparent and provide opportunities for full deliberation. We must first allow time for faculty to process and discuss the survey. Freeman suggested that by Dec. 6, we need to have a direction to send to the CTF for modeling and development. Because three of the models--Canopy, Peaks, and Mosaic--lay out the most complete vision for the broad core, the first step is to identify a clear direction: the compressed interdisciplinary model of Canopy vs. the thematic structure shared by Peaks and Mosaic. The proposed Core Curriculum model deals primarily with the first year, and can be re-integrated into our discussions once the overall direction of the rest of the curriculum is set. The CIT model's strengths can likely be incorporated as desired into any of the three broader core models once a primary direction is identified. Therefore, the Senate recommends a process whereby the faculty, after discussing the survey results, will proceed in a series of votes to narrow the direction of our curricular work to one core model.

The meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alison Tracy Hale

Appendix

Senate recommended language for faculty vote, as approved October 28, 2019.

To be inserted in the Faculty Bylaws immediately following Section 6.J.:

K. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

- a. The Committee shall consist of no fewer than three appointed members of the faculty. Members may be added or chosen so that the composition of the committee is in compliance with current federal regulations.
- b. The duties of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee shall be:
 1. To assure that all research and activities at the University involving live vertebrate animals is conducted in accord with the highest scientific, humane, and ethical principles, as described in the Public Health Service Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals and the *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*.
 2. To review the University's program for humane care and use of animals at least once every six months.
 3. To inspect all animal facilities at least once every six months.
 4. To ensure compliance with applicable federal regulations and guidance, as well as organizational policies and guidance by reviewing by reporting on the above evaluations to the Provost and making written recommendations regarding any aspect of the University's animal program, facilities, or personnel training.
 5. To review any concerns and make recommendations regarding the care and use of animals.
 6. To review and approve research and teaching protocols for activities related to the care and use of animals and conduct post-approval monitoring of activities involving animals.
 7. Other duties as may be assigned to it.
- c. The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee shall be authorized to suspend any activity involving animals.