

Faculty Senate Meeting  
February 10, 2020  
Minutes

**Senators Present:** Heather Bailey, Bill Beardsley, Laura Behling, Sara Freeman (Chair), Megan Gessel (Vice Chair), Chris Kendall (Secretary), Jung Kim, Mushawn Knowles (ASUPS), Julia Looper, Rebecca Lumbantobing (ASUPS), Tiffany MacBain, Andrew Monaco, Sarah Moore, Heather White

**Guests Present:** Uchenna Baker, Justin Canny, Liz Collins, Steven Neshyba, Mike Pohl, Amy Ryken

**1. The Senate Chair called the meeting to order at 12:01.**

**2. Announcements**

Justin Canny, Associate Director of New Student Orientation, invites faculty and staff proposals for new immersive experiences for 2020 Orientation. An invitation for proposals is forthcoming via facultycoms.

**3. M/S/P approval of minutes from January 27, 2020 Senate Meeting.**

**4. Updates from ASUPS and Staff Senate**

Knowles highlighted the continued development of The Den, a space located next to the cellar, as an ASUPS-supported space for new programming and fostering community. Applications are due on 2/21 for the upcoming ASUPS elections. Bailey shares staff involvement in the continued examination of staff compensation and benefits.

Freeman shares a friendly reminder to Senate liaisons to work with standing committees on recording meeting minutes and ensuring they are posted online.

**5. Updates from Liaisons to the Standing Committees; request from FAC for a Senate liaison**

- Looper (CC liaison) updates that the Curriculum Committee is preparing to consider a proposal for a Legal Studies Emphasis. The proposal comes from the chair of the CC. Currently there is no policy which requires recusal of a committee chair regarding discussion of his/her own proposal. Senate discusses that there is little precedent for this situation. In some circumstances, a committee member or chair may choose to participate in a non-voting capacity on such proposals; however, there is no prior practice of necessary recusal. As a point of comparison, a non-CC member with a curriculum proposal can sometimes attend CC to address questions regarding the proposal.

Provost Behling reminds that proposals at this level, such as new minors or emphases, may not necessarily come before the full faculty for discussion or debate. Upon the posting of the minutes which enact a new emphasis, the Senate or a member of the faculty can act within 30 days of the posting to bring the proposal up for discussion; without any action within 30 days, the action would take effect.

- Neshyba brings a request for a Senate liaison to the Faculty Advancement Committee. Though this role has not traditionally been assigned, this may be a needless exception, as FAC is a standing committee. Neshyba shares that while many FAC duties are confidential, there are instances where the code or other policy needs interpreting, and a liaison to act as conduit to the Senate could help navigate these questions. Moreover, a Senate liaison can help address FAC concerns to the faculty in a better way than in, say, a faculty meeting, where questions regarding files currently under review would be sensitive.

Freeman asks why this responsibility of policy interpretation doesn't fall to the Professional Standards Committee. Neshyba responds that while the PSC does provide clarification when requested, the FAC more seeks an avenue for communicating such interpretation questions to the faculty at large. Behling suggests the FAC end of year report should be shared with the incoming PSC chair to facilitate this communication between FAC and PSC.

Due to the nature of confidentiality around the work of the FAC work, it is likely that ongoing attendance at FAC meetings would not be necessary for the individual in this role. If an FAC liaison assignment may not be particularly onerous, it could be paired with another liaison assignment, or, as MacBain suggests, using the PSC Senate liaison as the FAC's point of contact. Moore suggests that if such a position were created, it may be beneficial to use a word other than liaison to address any potential confusion about a FAC Senate liaison being privy to confidential discussions. Gessel volunteers to pilot this role for Spring 2020.

- MacBain will substitute in place of Suzanne Holland as the faculty representative at the Development and Alumni Relations Committee meeting, as part of the Board of Trustees meetings next week.

## **6. IRB change to standing charges**

Pohl, on behalf of the IRB, brings a request to the Faculty Senate to include an additional standing charge to the Institutional Review Board addressing compliance with federal programs and regulations. The proposed added charge:

“To monitor requirements of relevant Federal programs, such as the Federal Wide Assurance program, and to ensure that IRB policies and procedures are in compliance and remain current.”

Pohl requests bringing this proposal to the faculty, as it would require an amendment of the Faculty Bylaws. Kendall asks why the Federal Wide Assurance program is emphasized. Pohl and others confirm that this is a broad overarching federal program which covers most IRB compliance issues. Moreover, the “such as” language captures both that this is the primary program of concern while also leaving space to consider future compliance programs. Freeman confirms this request will move to the full faculty.

## **7. Language Requirement Proposal**

An ad hoc group of the faculty has developed a proposal to reform the language requirement. The proposal includes changes to the name of the requirement, swapping any instance of the phrase “foreign language” to simply “language,” as well as recommended objectives for a language requirement which would be university-wide, and changes to how the requirement would work logistically.

While under the purview of the CC, the CC seeks guidance on moving forward. The Senate discussed how such a proposal should be integrated into ongoing curriculum reform. The name of the requirement, for example, could be changed without more substantive changes to the Bulletin. Beardsley suggests that Bulletin changes might best be done all at once, linking any potential language requirement change to broader curriculum reform.

Proposal language is intended to create a rubric for the foreign language requirement at large, while objectives vary widely across languages. Looper shares the CC’s concern in interpreting such a rubric. Freeman suggests the language requirement objectives could feasibly be changed without a change to how the requirement itself is fulfilled. There is a need to evaluate the many different ways in which foreign language proficiency can be demonstrated. The Senate agrees this proposal should come back for more discussion, and Senate will continue to offer guidance to both CC and the proposing ad hoc committee as consideration progresses.

## **8. Discussion of Process for VPDI search committee with Amy Ryken and Uchenna Baker**

Baker confirms the search process for Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion will be equitable and transparent, including meetings with the Race and Pedagogy Institute and other individuals doing this work around campus, and an emphasis on ensuring the VPDI’s duties and position are properly resourced. The separation of Title IX responsibilities helps in this effort. Baker emphasizes the need for more inclusive training and development of staff and students around these issues. This is likely to include a workshop in early March to bring together perspectives on what the VPDI should look like. Student and staff names have been submitted to co-chairs Baker and Ryken for the search committee. Ryken stresses the importance of a presence with knowledge of the university’s history around the position on the search committee. Ryken affirms that while lots of this work is happening around campus, it seems to lack synergy. Ryken also expresses the importance of a thoughtful process which builds consensus across the University.

The Senate takes up the question of how faculty names for participation in the search process will come forward. The Senate discusses the need to balance broad faculty representation and deep immersion in this work on the search committee. Freeman confirms that President Crawford has invited six faculty members to serve on the Committee. The Senate will provide a list of five faculty members from which the President will choose three. President Crawford will select an additional three from the faculty at large.

The Faculty Senate will distribute a call for nominations and self-nominations this week, for discussion at the Feb. 24 Senate meeting. The Senate discussed that nomination acceptance should include a brief statement from the nominee, which would serve as an expression of interest.

**9. There is no other business**

**10. M/S/P to adjourn the meeting at 1:30.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Andrew Monaco