

**Faculty Senate Meeting
November 24, 2014
McCormick Room, Library**

Senate Members Present

Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Bill Haltom, Zaixin Hong, Judith Kay, Brendan Lanctot, Paige Maney, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese

Guests

Austin Brittenham, Kyle Chong, Liz Collins, Sara Freeman, C.J. Queirolo

Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Announcements

Tubert asked the Senate if it preferred receiving information via email attachments or by posting on SoundNet. The Senate agreed that they preferred email as a more convenient way of receiving information.

Approval of Minutes from November 10, 2014

Haltom moved to postpone approval of minutes until all Senators had had the opportunity to view the revised minutes. Bartanen seconded the motion. Stockdale stated that he felt that the changes were small enough to be discussed and subsequently approved during today's meeting. Tubert stated that she would like to allow discussion of minutes. A short discussion ensued after which Tubert called for a vote to postpone approval of the minutes until the next meeting. The motion was approved with 12 in favor, one against.

Updates from Liaisons to Standing Committees

Buescher reported on the Professional Standards Committee. He relayed that the PSC chair, Tiffany MacBain, contacted him regarding the Senate's charges to the committee. MacBain, on behalf of the PSC, asked for clarification on the following Senate charge:

Review the PSC "Unified interpretation of Chapter III, Sections 4, a (1) and 4, a (c). Letters of Evaluation from Persons Outside the Department" to determine if the language on outside letters should be updated for: (a) distinctions of submission process for different types of letters (e.g., letters from co-authors, mentors, reviewers); (b) processes of solicitation of letter writers; (c) dates of submission of outside letters for departmental review; (d) expectations of outside letters; and (e) any additional questions raised in PSC conversations.

Buescher stated that he interprets the language “different types of letters” as referring to letters coming from on-campus but outside the reviewee’s department versus letters coming from off-campus. Bartanen said that external (off-campus) letters have to come to the head officer ten working days in advance of when the file is due; on- campus letters from faculty can be delivered to the head officer ten days in advance of the due date of the file or directly to the FAC at any time until the file is due. Buescher asked if there was a uniform manner for all departments to solicit and incorporate all external letters into the files. He added that timing is an issue, stating that ten days prior to the deadline can be insufficient for departments to evaluate a candidate. Buescher also noted that not every department follows a similar process—in some departments, head office solicit the letters; in other departments, head officers ask candidates for a list of possible recommenders; in other departments, the candidate asks reviewers directly. Buescher also asked if letters outside the department are even required.

Haltom asked if the Senate could pull back this charge because he felt that the members of Senate were not distinguishing between what external and internal meant in terms of the faculty code; he suggested that before Buescher answers the PSC, we should clarify internally what we mean.

Buescher said he didn’t believe that that was fully necessary but Tubert suggested that it would be good to ask for clarification. Segawa said that if the Senate was getting into the issue of whether departments should have variance, then it needed more than a few minutes to discuss; he added that there was a lot more embedded in this and that the Senate might need more time to adequately discuss this issue.

Buescher moved to amend the charge to read “consider a timeline for submission of outside/external letters to the department with consideration to moving up the due date (with the goal of giving more time to departments for meaningful deliberation of the letters).” Segawa seconded the motion.

Buescher asked that the Senate return to the other parts of the charge later this year. Tubert said that the Senate could return to this in the spring.

The motion was approved with one against and two abstentions.

Wiese reported that the Student Life Committee wanted to know the status of the charge regarding Freedom of Expression. She asked that discussion of this be included in the Senate’s agenda for the December 8 meeting. Tubert said we needed to delay this to the spring with discussion most likely occurring during the first meeting in January.

Hong stated that LMIS would be discussing the recent issue of library fines in their next meeting (December 2).

Haltom stated that the ASC would be forwarding a recommendation for changes in transfer credit policy, summer sanctions, and modifications to Handbook language to accommodate parental leave/leaves of absence.

Maney reported that the recent ASUPS sponsored event, Speak Up, was much better attended than the first one. She noted that it was interesting to watch students look at the conduct policy and “to see things from their perspective.” ASUPS collected all comments and will compile a list of all comments and suggestions. Maney stated that ASUPS endorsed the gender-neutral bathrooms letter.

Hong asked if ASUPS had anything in place to help students from abroad who may not have anywhere to go during Thanksgiving. Segawa said that residence life has resources that are available to students who remain on campus over the holiday.

Discussion of recommendations from the Honorary Degree Committee.

Closed session was enacted.

Discussion of the ASUPS Letter regarding gender-neutral bathrooms.

Kyle Chong stated that the letter called for a building code change to allow for ADA compliant, communal, gender-neutral bathrooms in public buildings on campus. He explained that Bob Kief is submitting a formal appeal to the A.P.P.A. and that ASUPS’ letter is designed to add student perspective to the cause. At the time of the meeting the ASUPS letter had been endorsed by 50 alumni, the ASUPS Senate. Greek Life was scheduled to vote on the letter later that week. Chong stated that the letter asks that our campus become more accessible and more inclusive for people of every gender identity. He added that multi-use, gender-neutral bathroom can be used by any person and would remove the barrier of access, allowing for individuals to access facilities that are convenient and close.

Buescher moved to endorse letter. This was seconded. Tubert called to vote. The Senate voted to endorse the letter with no objections/abstentions.

Haltom moved to extend Senate meeting to allow the Senate to speak with Sara Freeman, Curriculum Committee chair. Seconded. Motion passed with no objections.

Discussion of the 2013-2014 Curriculum Committee End of Year Report

Chair of Curriculum Committee, Sara Freeman joined the Senate for questions. Buescher asked for additional information regarding the CC’s discussion of and decision on the Senate’s charge “Evaluate the relevance of the 9-course limit for courses required in the major and make recommendations about potential changes to this policy.” Freeman noted that she was still gathering information regarding the CC’s complete discussion of this charge. She stated that the CC had decided that the 9-course limit was still relevant. Freeman stated that the CC spent a small amount of

time discussing the option of making it a “hard 10-unit limit” but that the CC found there was too much variance from major to major and being too prescriptive might be detrimental to specific departments.

Haltom called for a vote to receive the report. Seconded. Senate voted to receive the 2013-14 Curriculum Committee Report with no objections.

Meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Prepared by Maria Sampen

Submitted by Brendan Lanctot, Secretary of the Faculty Senate