

Faculty Senate Minutes  
April 22, 2008

Senators present: Kris Bartanen, Terry Beck, Nancy Bristow, Douglas Cannon, Robin Foster, John Hanson, Rob Hutchinson, Jim McCullough, Ana O'Neil, Hans Ostrom, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Ross Singleton.

Visitors present: Charlie Bevis, Kim Bobby, Alyce DeMaris, Brad Dillman, Lilah Gliksohn, Sara Jackson, David Lupher, Caitlin Shea

Chair Cannon called the meeting to order at 4 p.m. and introduced visitors. It was noted that all visitors are welcome to observe and speak but not vote on matters before the Senate.

**I. Approval of minutes of April 7, 2008**

The minutes of April 7, 2008 were approved as distributed.

**II. Announcements**

It was announced that there were no end of the year reports received yet and that all such reports are due May 1. These reports will be presented at the next Senate meeting which may be long.

It was announced that elections are being prepared by Senator Hanson. These will be done electronically. There were 37 nominations for Senate positions and 15 candidates have accepted nomination. There were 20 nominations for the Faculty Advancement Committee and 4 have accepted nomination. This number is the minimum allowed for the positions available. Declinations of nomination to the FAC resulted most commonly from the workload requirements.

It was announced that concern had been expressed about a previous Senate motion supporting diversity training for faculty. The term "training" was deemed inappropriate and should be changed to refer to faculty "development."

It was announced the form for faculty committee preference will be distributed soon. This will be electronic and will include a directory.

**III. Special Orders**

There were no special orders.

**IV. Reports of Committee Liaisons**

Hutchinson reported that Curriculum Committee is looking into the inclusion of diversity issues in freshman seminars. The committee is also looking at the calendar for grade submission as grade availability is a concern for students with academic difficulties and their advisors.

Saucedo reported that Diversity is looking into diversity training for first year advisors.

**V. University Diversity Statement. Proposal to endorse additional clauses and forward for Diversity Committee consideration**

Bristow moved the following statement:

**The Faculty Senate endorses the request to revise the university's Diversity Statement. The Senate refers this matter to the Diversity Committee and forwards the following language for their timely consideration.**

Below is the Diversity Statement, with the proposed revisions included in **BOLD** :

DIVERSITY STATEMENT

*We Acknowledge*

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- that education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

*We Aspire*

- to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- to increase the diversity of all parts of our University community through commitment to diversity in our recruitment and retention efforts.
- to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.
- **to have diversity in terms of race, socioeconomic status, gender identity, ethnicity, ability, sexuality, and religious affiliation within our student, faculty, and staff community.**
- **to deepen our understanding of the distinct yet intersecting histories that have shaped our identities and the associated forms of oppression.**
- **to provide full access to those groups to which it has been historically denied**

*We Act*

- to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- to ensure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn here.

- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.
- **to confront racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of oppression in a manner that effects change**

Ostrom seconded the motion.

Bristow stated that the intention of this motion is to focus on the need for changes in the diversity statement rather than to endorse specific wording. Ostrom state they were not asking the Senate to debate the wording put forth in the current motion, but they wish to initiate a process that will start at Diversity and go through the process of review by the Faculty Senate and other bodies.

Foster asked about the use of the diversity statement. Bobby said it is on posters, web sites, and in publications. Bartanen said it is linked to job postings. Cannon asked about the Diversity Strategic Plan. Bartanen said it was drafted by a committee and is currently being studied and discussed. Beck asked about the use of the word “ability” in the presented wording. It was suggested that ability referred to disability and a comment was made that there might be misunderstandings of the use of ability in an academic context. A visitor clarified that the term was expected to relate to both physical disabilities and learning disabilities. Lupher questioned the scope and meaning of “diversity”. Is one individual enough to represent diversity? What does the diversity statement seek? Ostrom and Bristow suggested ability and diversity were elements that should be discussed by Diversity committee.

Hanson asked what oppression and its effects mean. In this context Saucedo asked whether representatives from the Coalition Against Injustice and Racism (CAIR) should be invited to meet with Diversity to discuss and interpret the wording suggested. Saucedo was asked to tell Diversity to involve CAIR in their discussion.

Cannon encouraged further discussion of the motion. Dillman asked about the role of the Campus Diversity Forum in relation to this motion.

It was noted that sending language to Diversity as this motion does may indicate Senate support for the language. Ostrom said they are not asking for Senate endorsement of the language.

Foster said perhaps we should consider what outcomes of the university plans and actions for diversity are sought. Bevis asked about the role of the fora in this discussion of diversity. Foster commented that the language supplied may not be a good thing to send to Diversity committee for discussion. A visitor suggested that unless the Senate forwards something it may not get a hearing. Bristow suggested there will be many opportunities for discussion. Hanson said maybe we don’t need to change specific language in the motion. Cannon asked about the relationship between the diversity strategic plan and the diversity statement. McCullough asked how you can send words to the Diversity committee without asking them for their approval or rejection. Hanson said

he did not think this was an “up or down” question on the words. Bristow said it was not the intent of the motion to endorse the words forwarded.

Singleton asked for inclusion that the working came from CAIR. Bristow noted that was stated in the document under consideration. Luper asked whether we weren't endorsing the words and why the Senate was involved. Hanson answered that because Diversity was a standing committee of the Senate we give direction to the committee. It could have gone directly to Diversity but in this case action was encouraged by the Senate. O'Neil said the sentiment is that we like this idea and endorse the general tone of the wording. It was asked if it was necessary the Senate say we do not endorse the actual words. The exact wording of the motion was restated by Cannon. A friendly amendment was made to the motion to add the words “suggested by CAIR” after the reference to the language forwarded.

Discussion continued on the motion as amended (see changes in italics):

**The Faculty Senate endorses the request to revise the university's Diversity Statement. The Senate refers this matter to the Diversity Committee and forwards the following language *suggested by CAIR* for their timely consideration.**

Beck asked what timely consideration meant. Bristow said it should be as soon as possible. Segawa asked if the motion endorses the changes as stated. Singleton suggested rewording the motion to focus on forwarding the issue. He suggested that Diversity needs more guidance from the Senate. The Senate wants consideration of CAIR perspectives as they revise the Diversity Statement. Segawa asked what is being forwarded. Cannon clarified that the whole page of the motion is the motion, not just the forwarding portion. Singleton stated that we are asking the Diversity committee to revise the Diversity Statement. He said the motion is endorsing the changes and that they are accepted as shown. Dillman asked why Diversity needs to receive this charge.

Bristow explained that the Diversity Statement is not strong enough and that, for example, the section on “we act” should reflect a need to confront the issues not just talk about them. Gliksohn indicated that students felt oppression on campus. Segawa suggested that there is inadequacy in the statement because of a lack of a specific definition of diversity. Hanson suggested that the Senate charge Diversity with this because they are experts. He feels comfortable sending this to them for consideration. The Senate is not expert. Foster agrees that the Senate role is to forward but we should ask Diversity to examine rather than revise. Bristow clarified that CAIR asked for revision. Beck agreed. O'Neil said the Senate should send something if we feel the Diversity statement needs to be strengthened.

Segawa suggested that the minutes should show the Senate had a sense that the Diversity Statement needs reexamination. Bevis asked about the process of review. Hutchinson said we forward this to Diversity committee for consideration. They will respond and the Senate will take appropriate action. Bartanen stated that many campuses do not have a Diversity Statement. We may want to discuss changes and we may want to consider a

stronger statement. She called for a vote soon. Gliksohn asked if reevaluation could lead to a change. Foster made a friendly amendment to insert reexamine” rather than revise. Jackson asked if a group asked for revision wasn’t that enough to lead to change. Singleton answered that evaluation should precede change. Foster stated that CAIR concerns are what prompted this motion. Without deliberation by the Senate it is hard to recommend changes.

The motion considered is as follows (see change in italics):

**The Faculty Senate endorses the request to *reexamine* the university’s Diversity Statement. The Senate refers this matter to the Diversity Committee and forwards the following language *suggested by CAIR* for their timely consideration.**

Below is the Diversity Statement, with the proposed revisions included in **BOLD** :

## DIVERSITY STATEMENT

### *We Acknowledge*

- the richness of commonalities and differences we share as a university community.
- the intrinsic worth of all who work and study here.
- that education is enhanced by investigation of and reflection upon multiple perspectives.

### *We Aspire*

- to create respect for and appreciation of all persons as a key characteristic of our campus community.
- to increase the diversity of all parts of our University community through commitment to diversity in our recruitment and retention efforts.
- to foster a spirit of openness to active engagement among all members of our campus community.
- **to have diversity in terms of race, socioeconomic status, gender identity, ethnicity, ability, sexuality, and religious affiliation within our student, faculty, and staff community.**
- **to deepen our understanding of the distinct yet intersecting histories that have shaped our identities and the associated forms of oppression.**
- **to provide full access to those groups to which it has been historically denied**

### *We Act*

- to achieve an environment that welcomes and supports diversity.
- to ensure full educational opportunity for all who teach and learn here.
- to prepare effectively citizen-leaders for a pluralistic world.
- **to confront racism, sexism, classism, and other forms of oppression in a manner that effects change**

Cannon called for a vote and the amended motion passed unanimously.

**VI. Benefits for one-semester replacement faculty  
Report from Associate Dean**

DeMarais reported that this topic is being discussed with and by Human Resources but it has not been passed to the Budget Task Force. Cannon clarified that this referred to health benefits.

**VII. Attendance at faculty meetings  
Report on faculty survey**

Foster reported the raw results of the faculty meeting survey. She expressed no desire to be on a committee to deal with this. There is currently no committee. Ostrom suggested we should deal with this in the fall. Foster encouraged the Senate to invite Faculty Secretary David Droge to participate in this discussion. Cannon suggested a possibility of a sub-committee in fall. Foster will send results to Droge.

**VIII. Evaluating faculty with composite appointments  
Initial discussion**

Ostrom raised the issue of evaluation in composite appointments. In these cases evaluation is made by a committee outside of departments. This results in unique problems with evaluation balance. Faculty end up in a power imbalance because they may be evaluated by some faculty, may evaluate others, and there is not equivalence. Singleton asked what was meant by a power imbalance. Isn't this more a question of responsibility and balance? Cases where everyone evaluates everyone are the norm but we now have situations where there is no longer the traditional balance. In some cases we have different standards applied. This raises questions of responsibility and politics. Bristow asked about evaluative responsibility overload. Hanson asked if we should create balance. Is our current system a model? Ostrom asked if we want to maintain the UPS culture in which everyone evaluates everyone. Cannon quoted from the report of the ad hoc committee on evaluation that indicated these appointments may cause problems. Hanson suggested the PSC might look at this. Ostrom added that the code does not adequately address this. Bartanen read how the code applies. She indicated that we had previous examples and that the code allows multiple committees. This may be a possible charge to the PSC to look at this.

Hanson asked when the last meeting of the Senate would be. May 12 is the last meeting. It was noted that we cannot announce new senators on May 5 because of the election timeline. The electronic voting system is something over which we have little control. Foster asked if we could use Survey Monkey for elections. Cannon asked if the Senate was happy with the election process and there was no objection. Hanson and Foster will discuss the process further.

**IX. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:32.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim McCullough