

Faculty Senate Meeting
November 11, 2013
McCormick Room, Library

Present: Brad Dillman (chair), Haley Andres, Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Alisa Kessel, Kriszta Kotsis, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Shirley Skeel (staff senate representative), Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

Guests: Nancy Bristow, Doug Cannon, Bill Haltom, Elise Richman, Amy Ryken, Andreas Udbye, Keith Ward, Carolyn Weisz.

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.

Announcements

None.

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of minutes of October 28, 2013 postponed until further clarification from Mark Martin.

Liaison reports

1. **ASC** (Saucedo): The ASC is drafting a letter to more formally express frustrations with PeopleSoft. In their view it has moved beyond just being the inconvenience for the faculty to perhaps becoming a factor in student retention (primarily due to the burden placed on the registrar's and academic advising office in compensating for current deficiencies in PeopleSoft). The ASC also wants to hear back from the Senate about 2 additional self-charges.
2. **Staff Senate** (Kessel): Andrea Keuter, the Social Sciences librarian, is the new liaison.
3. **LMIS** (Kotsis): They are considering the feasibility of a humanities lab in the archives (cost of ~\$300-400K), and have been encouraged to think about short-term solutions. They feel that there has been a breakdown in communication between the Faculty and people working on Optimize. They are requesting a meeting with faculty to address these communication issues. They also are asking the Senate to amend charges due to workload. The Senate discussion of this ended with the charges remaining with LMIS, with additional clarification.
4. **PSC** (Buescher): PSC is working on a definition of and policy document regarding course assistants. PSC is also discussing HR background checks.
5. **COD** (Tubert): They are inviting Ellen Peters from Institutional Research to come to the next faculty meeting. There will be open discussion opportunities of the proposed diversity requirement at Wed at 4 on 12/4, and additional meetings in January, February and March.

Consideration of the Senate's next steps regarding the diversity-in-the-curriculum proposal, to include a potential charge to the Committee on Diversity and the Curriculum Committee, and a potential straw poll of the faculty

Dillman opened the discussion by suggesting that there are a few options for the Senate to consider:

1. Do nothing
2. Charge Committee on Diversity (COD)

3. Charge Curriculum Committee (CC)
4. Administer a straw poll of the faculty

Dillman thought it was important for the Senate to be involved in the discussion of the overlay proposal, or at least be clear to faculty on the Senate's role in the discussion. Kessel noted that the Senate charged COD with making a recommendation, and the COD made a recommendation. She posed the question of how the Senate can support diversity in the curriculum moving forward, and whether the faculty should entertain other proposals.

There was discussion about what the Senate's role in the implementation of the diversity-in-the-curriculum proposal, and a consensus that the Senate should represent the faculty at large. There was some discussion about administering a straw poll to get a sense of faculty opinions. There was some discussion about how the next faculty meeting would work, since there is still a motion on the floor. Faculty parliamentarian Bill Haltom clarified the options available to the faculty according to Alice Sturgis, The Standard Guide for Parliamentary Procedure, 4th edition (shared with faculty on 11/14 via the facultygovernanceforum listserv).

Saucedo suggested that if we want a more active role, maybe we should initiate a straw poll, and that we should have some sort of charge using the info we have from the Burlington Northern Group (BNG)/COD.

More discussion ensued about whether the Senate should administer a straw poll, and the pros and cons of doing so.

Buescher asked if it was the intention of BNG to withdraw the motion on the floor. After some clarification from Haltom about the parliamentary options for doing so, there was some discussion about whether the COD should entertain alternate proposals.

Ryken added that the COD is continuing to collaborate with BNG to move the proposal forward. She urged the faculty to use the expertise of the BN group to move forward in curriculum development, and to think about inclusion and expertise.

Ward suggested that the proposal should do something that engages faculty purposefully, and that a faculty poll could contribute meaningfully to the ongoing discussion.

Cannon added that any effort to gauge the opinions of faculty would be better done outside of faculty meetings.

Kessel added that there is a presumption that the Senate was supportive of the motion based on feedback that the Senate gave to the COD last spring at the end of year report. She suggested the Senate should vote on support of moving forward and initiate an online poll, possibly regarding the Diversity/Pluralism vs. Power/Privilege discussion. This would put the Senate back in the position of guiding the conversation that we started.

Discussion about whether to administer a poll to the faculty continued. Weisz added that the feedback collected over the last two years is qualitative in form, whereas a poll would provide quantitative data. She noted that there is a diverse group of people on BNG, there is a lot of data, and it takes a lot of time to process the qualitative data. She emphasized that there is progress being made with the proposal, such as shifting to a 1-unit requirement. They are moving to less prescriptive language, and are looking to Senate to take a leadership role.

Bristow added that COD/BNG are thinking about how to revise the proposal to reflect the voices they've heard and are hoping to bring a revised proposal to faculty at end of semester.

Dillman said he would like to see multiple proposals for the faculty to consider, and Cannon added that the BNG has devoted an enormous amount of time to putting forward a proposal and it would be a mistake not to use this proposal as a foundation for other proposals.

Buescher did not feel comfortable saying, "let's seek out multiple proposals." He suggested the Senate endorse the work of the Burlington Northern Group that is already on the floor of the faculty meeting. Dillman responded that the Senate would be abandoning any role and giving BNG the power to implement the proposal, and that the Senate can provide the faculty with a better role in shaping the proposal than simply relying on the BNG.

Dillman stepped out of his role as Chair (turned over to Kessel) to make a motion.

Motion (Dillman) to take a straw poll of faculty by electronic means to gain a better understanding of what kind of diversity in the curriculum proposal they favor and whether they favor any requirement at all.

Buescher asked for clarification of "what kind." Dillman responded that the Senate could devise what kind of questions would be asked. Bartanen added that the timeframe of administering the poll would not be completed before the next faculty meeting.

Amended M/S for Senate to devise/develop a straw poll of faculty by electronic means to gain a better understanding of what kind of diversity in the curriculum proposal they favor and whether they favor any requirement at all.

There was some discussion against the motion.

Motion did not pass.

Meeting adjourned at 5:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Amanda Mifflin.