Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the September 16, 2019 meeting

NAME	DATE/TIME of review and/or edits
Chris Kendall	9/17/2019 1:30pm
Sarah Moore	9/17/19 2:51 pm
Megan Gessel	9/17/19 4:26 pm
Julia Looper	9/25/19 3:02 pm
Sara Freeman	9/25/19 3:10pm
Tiffany MacBain	9/29/19 10:10 am
Heather Bailey	9/30/19 7:47am
Jairo Hoyos	9/30/19 10:04 am
Regina Duthely	9/30/19 11:30am

Senate Members:
Sara Freeman, Tiffany MacBain, Regina Duthely, Sarah Moore, Jairo Hoyos, Allison Tracy
Hale, Julia Looper, Chris Kendall, Laura Behling, Mushawn Knowles, Rebecca Lumbantobing,
Heather Bailey, Heather White, Sara Freeman, Jung Kim, Bill Beardsley, Megan Gessel

I.   The meeting was called to order at 12:02 pm

II.   Announcements

None

III.   M/S/P to approve the minutes of September 9, 2019

Some points of concern from a procedural perspective on minutes related to senate charge #1 to
the curriculum committee (CC) regarding the summer bridge program – where did this charge
originate and does this charge need to be discussed further? Looper, CC liaison, shared that there
were some concerns during her first meeting with the committee on the nature and origin of
charge (additional discussions on this below under section V)

Reminder that senators reading through minutes need to log in name, date, and time of the
review at the top of the minutes document; google docs does not log this information
automatically when file is opened

White asked for help on clarification on some sections of the 9/9/19 minutes such as the name of
the new ASUPS student representative (Rebecca Lumbantobing), who was introduced by

Knowles during this time, and the reasons why the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) should be changed to a standing committee – because it is federally mandated similar to IRB

IV. Updates from ASUPS and Staff Senate

ASUPS:
Knowles introduced and welcomed Lumbantobing as the new ASUPS student representative

Continued work on the rendezvous room that included securing funding and meeting with facilities

Report to the Board is ongoing with a particular focus on what students on campus are experiencing and what Knowles experienced during the summer as ASUPS president

Staff Senate:
First meeting of the year took place last week

Implementation of the new animal policy that went into effect today (9/16) was met with many questions that will be addressed in the next meeting

Anna Coy, the current chair of staff senate, is taking a new position and will be leaving the university in 2 weeks. As such a new chair is being sought to fill the position. There are currently 12 staff senate seats that need to be filled

V. Finish Senate charges to Standing Committees

SLC
The committee has not had its first meeting, but plan to do so soon. There is a general concern from members that the tasks of the committee are not clear. There are 2 self-charges from the end-of-year report. Faculty senate liaison Kendall shared an additional charge asking the committee members to "Evaluate the possibility of an alternative SLC committee structure in which the committee would incorporate ASUPS liaisons, media program Advisors, and Bookend/Orientation Committee members. Based on this evaluation, propose an alternative committee structure and any necessary changes to the Bylaws" (see Appendix A)

Charges to SLC were approved

LMIS
The committee will hold its first meeting tomorrow (9/17)

In addition to the self-charges from the end-of-year report senate charges include changing the bylaws to increase membership of the committee by one faculty member and one library representative (see Appendix A)

Discussion on another charge originally in the document asked that the committee bring motion to faculty meeting to change Bylaw to reflect change in title of one of the members from chief technology officer (currently in Bylaw) to chief information officer (CIO) (new title of position). Given that titles continue to be updated for this position, Beardsley asked whether there was a way to keep the language in the Bylaws flexible so each time titles change there does not need to be a motion on the faculty meeting floor to keep changing and updating titles – is there a way to include "notes" in the document to reflect this? Is there a possibility for using a functional descriptor instead, such as how we currently use the term "dean"? Another option might be to simplify the title of the head person of technology/information to make process simpler; Freeman will discuss this with the committee and ask the committee to consider how the language of representation on the LMIS could be modified. As a reminder, the library director and CIO are required members of LMIS, but using some generic language or functional description for these positions might simplify not having to change the Bylaws regularly

Kendall raised question on structural flow chart of how administration is set up – how often do these changes occur? This information can be found on the University website; Kendall will look into this and report back to senate on how this information might help questions related to personnel titles

One last question on the representation of LMIS – does the library representative need to be a librarian or can it be someone who represents the library? It was decided that there is some flexibility to the terminology as our librarians currently wear many hats. The key point is that whomever is on LMIS in that capacity has voting privileges

Charges to LMIS were approved

IEC
The committee had its first meeting on 9/11
Most of the charges for the academic year are self charges from the end-of-year report (see Appendix A). Most of the self-charges is work that is continuing from work started last year. For example, charge 1 will continue to be fleshed out as curricular reform continues in the next few years

Looper raised a question that given CC is charged with coordinating with IEC on streamlining applications for study abroad/away, should this be included in IEC charges? This charge has now been added (charge 6)

Behling asked what the role of faculty is in charge 3? Duthely clarified that the intent in this charge was focused on the development of an exchange program. Draft charges 3 and 4 were discussed and modified to reflect best practices to advance the recruitment and retention of

international students working in collaboration with various offices and groups across campus, and exploration of potential exchange programs (see Appendix A)

Charges to IEC were approved

VI.   Standing Committee Updates since last senate meeting – report from liaisons

ASC
Two members of the ASC requested a meeting with MacBain to update the Senate on the status of the two ASC self charges

Update on how the Credit/No Credit policy went into effect without faculty wide knowledge
According to ASC minutes from 2/21/19, ASC voted on policy. Upon posting of the ASC's minutes, faculty had 30 days to provide feedback. There was no objection to the policy and thus, the policy went into effect and is reflected in the current bulletin. There seems to be general confusion as to how this happened as there appeared to be no explicit statement or announcement of the policy. Senators agreed that, in general, when policies are modified or enacted faculty should be made aware. Senate has charged the ASC with creating a mechanism for alerting faculty to recent policy changes, including the location of the academic handbook, which is now in the bulletin. The ASC will include word of the C/NC change on this document.

As this discussion continued, senate reviewed the process of how minutes from all standing committees are distributed. Faculty taking minutes from standing committees need to send final approved minutes to Jimmy McMichael at which point he will distribute through facultycoms. It is not clear all committees are doing this and/or are aware of procedures – all liaisons will remind committees of this process. Further, when policy is changed by committees this information should be sent to the senate liaison for further consideration/discussion, and the liaison will make note of policy changes during the regular committee liaison report to the Senate.

Staff Senate
Gessel shared that staff senate is appreciative of Alisa and Dexter from CTF for sharing information on potential changes to the Core and its impact on them

IRB
Moore shared that the committee would like to add a charge - obtaining federal wide assurance for federal funding. This should not be too difficult as most pieces required for the assurance have been completed. Freeman noted that this can be added as a charge, but stressed that IRB should be free to pursue this on their own.

Some of the policy for faculty on IRB applications need to be updated to state that all faculty submitting IRB protocols must complete CITI training before approval is granted. Students know this because it is on the IRB website, but this information is not clear for faculty. Behling suggested that the IRB send a yearly reminder to faculty that CITI training documentation is

required when submitting an IRB application. Another concern was the need to make all documents similar across departments and how this can be accomplished.

UEC

Hoyos would like clarification on questions raised by UEC at the first meeting

Is there a written policy regarding junior faculty serving as committee chairs? While there is no written policy in the bylaws, but there has always been a general understanding that junior faculty should not be asked to do this. As such, junior faculty who are enthusiastic and past their 3rd year review, and want to chair should have the option to do so

Clarification on Senate charge 1: To collaborate with the Provost's Office with respect to the development of a Program for Faculty Development. As part of this work, the UEC might also propose a revision to its standing charges to include a link to a Program for Faculty Development. What is the charge? Behling clarified that this charge requires coordination with Associate Dean Julie Christoph. Specifically, the committee is being asked to identify and gather information where faculty development is happening across campus. In addition, the committee is tasked with developing a vision of what a program for faculty development is, and what faculty would like/need in order to do the things they are doing across campus

IACUC update from Freeman

Alexa Tullis has reached out to Freeman asking that IACUC be considered as standing committee. Alexa has been asked to develop standing charges and to present this to senate in the upcoming months (Feb, 2020). If senate is in agreement, then, upon approval by the faculty, IACUC will be added to the bylaws. As IACUC is federally mandated as is IRB, not sure there is an alternative? If passed, this committee will need to be staffed yearly like other standing committees

CC

Looper shared that the committee is having difficulty electing chair (not able to elect chair) and is looking for suggestions on how to proceed. Freeman noted that as former chair of CC a calendar is available that lists when deadlines are for specific tasks; therefore, maybe a clearer understanding of the role of chair might help get someone to volunteer. There is concern that the chair will have too much responsibility and work – yes, the CC in general is a lot of work, but the chair's role is no more work than members as the chair is not required to be on a working group – the chair is tasked with coordinating the subgroup. Kendall states that nothing in the bylaws precludes the Senate from appointing a chair if the committee is unable to do so. Looper will let members know at the next meeting that members will be asked to stay until a chair is elected. Behling asked whether the addition of charge 1 to CC regarding development of the summer bridge program factored into not being able to elect a chair; Looper says that most of the faculty were interested in the charge/work and this did not appear to be the case.

Looper asked on behalf of CC for clarification of the summer bridge program – where did this originate? In discussion with Lynette Claire, Looper shared that this work had already been started previously and some parts of it are available. Senate would like to know if this is true, what is the history of the charge? Where did this work request come from? Did faculty ask for this? Looper will inquire with Lynette and report back to senate.

In the meantime Behling asked that those interested on charge 1 are welcome to consult with her. MacBain raised some concerns that procedural questions might arise at some point as to the origins of charge 1 and that the Senate may wish to have a full-group conversation about the bridge program.

Update on chairs of standing committees
IEC – Matt Warning, Gareth Barkin
UEC – Luc Boisvert
PSC – not yet met
SLC – not yet met
LMIS – not yet met
COD – Steven Zopfi
IRB – Mark Reinitz, Wendell Nakamura
ASC – Richard Anderson-Connelly

VI.   Discussion of process related to CTF and curriculum deliberation

What happens next?

In general, faculty meeting discussion Wednesday (9/18) should focus on what we, as faculty, foresee and/or hope, our values and the best direction for the curriculum (and university). Beardsley shared that at some point (soon) the faculty will need to take ownership of the proposals and decide the next steps. Freeman shared that as of Wednesday (9/18) proposals will belong to faculty.

Given this, the priority for the Wednesday meeting should be the direction faculty want to move the curriculum conversation. How might this look? Faculty may decide that certain elements of the proposals could work together. If so, decisions need to be made as to what direction faculty want to move towards so that some ideas can be eliminated.

Senate also discussed the survey (motion from May faculty meeting) - what is on the survey and how will the results be interpreted? In general, survey results can be viewed as informational or action based. Moore shared that colleagues she has heard from still feel unsure on how to proceed as key information on what resources are needed/available and general logistical issues remain unanswered and unknown. Freeman reiterated that perhaps for those reasons starting to narrow the field, as well as determining the direction will help address some of those concerns. Therefore, some key questions to faculty to help in the decision-making might include "what qualities are faculty excited about and what do faculty value?"

VII.   Discussion of Process related to evaluation of potential new graduate programs

As the meeting ran over, this discussion was moved to the next senate meeting (Sept 30)

VIII.   Other Business

None

IX.   Meeting adjourned at 1:34 pm

Respectfully submitted by Jung Kim

Appendix A

Senate Charges to Standing Committees, as approved September 16, 2019
Listed in order of approval by Faculty Senate

SLC
Senate Charges
- Seek ways to engage and collaborate more effectively with relevant student bodies and populations, namely ASUPS, and underrepresented and graduate students.
- Continue assisting and advising the DSA as it continues its process of formulation and implementation of a new strategic plan and organizational structure.
- Evaluate the possibility of an alternative SLC committee structure in which the committee would incorporate ASUPS liaisons, media program Advisors, and Bookend/Orientation Committee members. Based on this evaluation, propose an alternative committee structure and any necessary changes to the Bylaws.

LMIS
Senate Charges
- Share and discuss the Best Practices document with the Faculty as a whole.
- Interface with Associate Deans Office to form a plan for Faculty Orientation to use Best Practices document starting in August 2020.
- Host a conversation about Elsevier, journal bundler, and faculty priorities library access to journals with the full faculty.
- With Senate, bring a motion to the faculty meeting floor to change the bylaws such that the membership of LMIS increases by one faculty member and one library representative.

IEC
Senate Charges
- 1A) Develop a set of preferred guidelines for any potential international component of the new curriculum reform, including the integration of ePortfolio into international programs.
- 1B) Develop ways to support faculty development of international programs, including communication efforts and workshop invitations for faculty, and criteria for distribution of funds for faculty development. Explore alternative models for faculty-led short-term study abroad, including full-unit summer courses.
- 1C) Coordinate and support faculty and administrative development of curricular reform to help plan and facilitate any proposed increases or other changes to international education.
- 2) Finalize evaluation criteria for reviewing sexual assault response and evaluation programs, in coordination with the Deputy Title IX Coordinator.
- 3) Develop resources to support retention of international students including collaborating with campus and community partners.

- 4) Continue to work with the Office of Admissions to recommend (and establish if possible) an IEC liaison to the Office of Admissions and an Office of Admissions liaison to the IEC, including exploration of potential exchange programs
- 5) Work with the OIP to develop a proposal for how study abroad application criteria apply to students with Running Start credit. (as needed)
- 6) Coordinate with the CC to create a streamlined process for faculty proposing Study Abroad/Study Away classes that addresses both committees