

**Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the December 7, 2015 Meeting**

Senate Members Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Derek Buescher, Rachel DeMotts, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Nakisha Renee Jones, Brendan Lanctot, Emelie Peine, Maria Sampen, Shirley Skeel, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Jennifer Utrata, John Wesley

1. Call to Order

Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:03pm.

2. Announcements

No announcements

3. Approval of the minutes of November 16, 2015

Stockdale moved to approve, Sampen seconded

Discussion: Wesley indicated there was an incomplete phrase on page 4 that has been corrected. Tubert further amended the language to suggest that the Senate's vote is not to speak for the entire faculty. Buescher corrected the phrasing of his question about the impact of divestment.

M/S/P Approval of minutes from November 16 as amended

4. Updates from Standing Committee Liaisons

- a. Utrata raised a proposed charge from the LMIS Committee (about the future of physical collections in the library) that had been circulated in advance of this meeting. She indicated that she was not sure if it was necessary to charge LMIS with something that they are already discussing; it appears that it is emerging based on work they are already doing. The first sentence of the charge appears to be more of a rationale. Tubert asked if the Senate wanted to consider charging them or if Utrata should just tell the LMIS Committee they are welcome to work on any issue that falls within the committees standing charges. Gardner indicated that the latter sounds ideal, as a charge seems to be unnecessary. Peine added that she had a proposed modification to a different charge for another committee and she and Tubert came to a similar conclusion, in that committees should do the work they find appropriate without necessitating further charges. At the same time, Tubert said it is not substantively wasted for the Senate to know that LMIS is working on this; it seems that perhaps they were looking for endorsement of

what they are doing. Utrata indicated that the survey mentioned in the charge is going forward and so there will be an opportunity for input on the physical collections in the future.

- b. Gardner said that the IRB had a lot of turnover in its membership. The committee has been in correspondence with him more as a faculty member than a senator, as he refused to submit a project to them based on larger process concerns about what kind of research is appropriate for an IRB review. He has been asked to discuss these concerns with them this coming spring in order to further consider ways to protect non-clinical research from IRB evaluation.
- c. Sampen said that the UEC is moving forward with its charges. The committee recently met with ASUPS representatives to work on streamlining or creating a framework for giving funds to students. The UEC is also working on a template for a faculty research rubric, which will have a test run in the spring. The UEC has also worked through the early bird research applications and have just received the fall applications.
- d. Lanctot said that the ASC is meeting at this moment, continuing their consideration of a common hour. The last meeting produced three different models, all of which would create a common hour on Wednesdays. Peter Sullivan has drawn up spreadsheets that would identify conflicts with classes, and possible models are being discussed.
- e. Haltom said that the PSC responded, in November, to whether faculty-student sexual relationships should be prohibited (language: "Would you support a prohibition of faculty sexual relationships with students?"). The vote was 5 in favor, 2 against, 0 abstaining. As yet it is uncertain what this represents in procedural terms. Tubert added that the PSC has asked to discuss this with the Senate in the spring. Stockdale asked where this decision would be located or recorded if made official; Haltom indicated it is a policy and Bartanen further clarified that it is not an ad hoc policy. Tubert added that the current policy discourages but does not prohibit such relationships. Bartanen said that the PSC took up this issue in its review of interpretations of the Faculty Code that are related to Title IX. The campus Policy Prohibiting Harassment and Sexual Misconduct prohibits consensual sexual relationships between a faculty or staff member and a student when the faculty member is in a position of professional responsibility with respect to the student. The discussion sought to clarify the meaning of a possible prohibition. Any proposed change would need to go to the Cabinet. If recommended the Senate would need to decide if it would take up the PSC's recommendation for further discussion.
- f. Stockdale reported that the question of whether a first year seminar can count as a KNOW course was sent to the Curriculum Coordination Committee, and that they

thought double counting would be a good idea. This recommendation was forwarded to the Curriculum Committee but the language is still a bit unclear. Tubert asked if the CC would ultimately decide, and Stockdale said maybe, but this may require adjustment of other language prohibiting double counting.

5. Report from ASUPS

Jones indicated that there is a new director of marketing and outreach for ASUPS. Advocates for Institutional Change continues and ASUPS is working with them on how to proceed after making a list of demands. Work will happen on this over winter break. She noted that the MLK celebration is coming up on January 19; nominations for the Keep Living the Dream Award are open until December 20. Jones also indicated that she has finished her work on the presidential search committee and a process email is forthcoming. The ASUPS Finance Committee meets tonight to review the new finance form as previously mentioned in the UEC report. Tomorrow is Town Hall Tuesday and the subject is mental health awareness, featuring passive activities to help with stress relief (coloring books, puzzles). ASUPS will continue working over break.

6. Report from Staff Senate

Skeel reported that the issue of a 10-1 ratio in pay has come to the attention of the Staff Senate, but members have questions about the issues involved. Anderson-Connolly is expected to present the resolution and Stockdale will explain the issues and discussion the faculty was having. The Staff Senate also wants to look at divestment and will be looking for someone to explain that as well. Tubert added that updates have been requested more generally. Skeel added that more nominations for employee recognition are coming up and encouraged participation. The Budget Task Force will recommend a 2.5% increase in the salary pool but how that will be distributed remains to be decided.

7. Divestment

Tubert indicated that this is meant to be a discussion of the statement Peine drafted and circulated in advance of the meeting. Previous discussion indicated that Senate wished to append something to the language being forwarded by students and this is a first attempt. Buescher and Stockdale expressed support. Tubert asked for a point by point summary. Peine indicated that the first point is that it is understood that there will likely be a financial impact but that our students' future depends on divestment. The second point is that this could prove to be a prescient economic move, such as in the recent Gates-Zuckerberg coalition on energy. The university could be on the forefront of such a move. The last point recognizes that the Senate does not consist of financial experts but wants to speak out when it is a matter of protecting our mission. The discussion of the draft statement centered on the organization of the ideas and choice of language. Any further thoughts or suggestions can be sent to Peine before the next meeting, when an updated draft will be considered.

8. Faculty Compensation Task Force

Tubert said that the task force had a feedback forum with very low attendance last week. They have one more meeting and are preparing to present their findings. She is asking for any further feedback to share with them. The compensation policy as distributed is new but the principles have been revised (minor). Gardner has been talking with the members of the task force, and said that equal salary scale across disciplines and by level is the lynchpin in collegiality, which means this equity is valuable – but the references to market forces are contrary to this. Furthermore, two of the three departments that receive more pay feel at odds with the liberal arts mission. The clinical pay scale also confounds this. Buescher raised another concern, namely that the result may be an increase in salaries to make it commensurate with peers, but that such an increase may occur at the expense of other benefits like retirement; consequently some language about protecting existing benefits would be good. He added that it is hard to trust the process given past alterations to the education benefits.

Peine raised a question about the implications of some professional development resources being considered merit based pay: What is the significance of this language and what is included or excluded? Tubert said that Burlington Northern would show up there because it is professional development and that the task force is just trying to outline ways in which the scale may already be exceeded. Stockdale raised the possibility that there is a distinction between competitive resources and those that are universally available. It was generally agreed that this sentence is unclear.

Tubert said she raised the issue of why the 50th percentile is the goal and the task force replied that they felt it is an attainable goal though more difficult than it may appear. The idea is that it could be revised down the line, every six years. They did discuss other possibilities but settled on this goal for the near future. FCTF is also considering how to make the policies and principles clearer. Stockdale asked about mentioning the 50th percentile without means to arrive there, other than details about what not to do. How might trustees receive this, without a way to do it? Tubert said that her understanding is that this would be a goal for faculty salaries; having the goal will help the salary committee make its proposal on an annual basis. It doesn't mean it is an immediate commitment. Bartanen added that the faculty salary committee wanted a clearly articulated goal to come out of this work, and it has now been suggested. A process is also suggested for revisiting this goal every six years.

9. M/S/P to adjourn the meeting

Meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.
Minutes prepared by Rachel DeMotts.
Respectfully submitted,

Pierre Ly, Secretary of the Faculty Senate