



Faculty Senate 2017–2018

MINUTES: September 20, 2017

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

K. Hall, Chair; K. Bailey, recording sect'y

Present: K. Bailey, S. Badenas, A. Baltazar, S. Bell, S. Brown-Fraser, A. Coria-Navia, D. Davis, C. Gane, B. Gibson, K. Hall, J. Lim, G. Lovhoiden, B. Maguad, S. Moncrieff, M. Murray, T. Newkirk, R. Perez-Schulz, D. Randall, R. Siebold, C. Sigua, J. Sigvartsen, D. Taylor, R. Wells, R. Zdor, C. Arthur.

Regrets/absent: D. Fortin, O. Glanz, N. Nosworthy, A. Solis, D. Village, A. Luxton.

Guests: L. Ahlberg, A. Bosman, D. Hamstra, D. Murray, B. Panigot, L. Schalk, L. Weldon.

Votes & Actions taken (numbers [n] represent items on original agenda)

[2] Minutes of August 30, 2017 Senate Meeting. MOTION: Move to approve minutes as presented (K. Bailey).
Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

[4] Senate Education

K. Bailey

We reviewed the shared governance principles and operational plan that is a key guiding document for the Senate. The document lays out principles for faculty accountability and responsibility, administrative accountability and responsibility, and shared accountability and responsibility. There are 5 principles that shape shared governance: transparency, engagement, clear path of action, assignment of responsibility, and respect. We then reviewed the types of decisions that fall under faculty accountability and responsibility.

[5] Committee Reports

K. Bailey

Undergraduate Council: L. Ahlberg, UGC Chair, reported that on September 11, 2017, the UGC voted to receive a report from PDRC on the ACE Program Review. Specifically, the UGC voted:

1. to record the report from PDRC.
2. to send the ACE review and its recommendations to the ACE committee
3. voted to request Provost to put together an ACE committee with balanced distribution of ACE distributors and consumers (b/c discussion not balanced)

Dr. Arthur has since invited 16-17 individuals to form a new ACE Committee co-chaired by D. May and K. Bailey. He presented the make-up of the new committee with greater representation from the professional programs. He also presented the mandate sent to potential committee members along with the request to serve on the committee for a year during the ACE revision.

Senators had several questions about the make-up of the committee. In particular, there were concerns about decreased inclusion from faculty directly involved in teaching ACE courses and departments involved in designing and implementing those courses. In particular, mathematics and religion were identified as departments and faculty under-represented on the new committee. The Provost noted that he preferred a smaller committee, and that the absence of individuals from departments did not preclude their engagement with the committee or the process.

Faculty Policy and Development Council: There were three policies read at the most recent meeting (Academic and Theological Freedom and Responsibility, Tuition Assistance Policy, and Sexual Misconduct and Sexual Discrimination Policy). The academic freedom policy will be sent to Senators in order to receive comments back for the Provost to pass on to the GC within a week.

Senators had some concerns about the degree to which faculty might unwittingly protect the institution instead of victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault under the current policy and US Department of Education requirements.

[6] Recent Parking Permit and Citation Changes: Updates and Questions

K. Bailey, B. Panigot, L. Schalk

In response to the vote taken on August 30, 2017, the Senate Officers met with the Provost on September 5. The Provost recommended that the Senate officers contact the Risk Management and Campus Safety Committee directly and consider meeting with them at their September 12 meeting. Emails were exchanged

with Ben Panigot over the weekend of September 9 and 10 requesting clarifying information so that the Senate could have an accurate picture of changes made to parking and citation policy.

Three Senate officers (Bailey, Badenas, and Newkirk) met with the Risk Management and Campus Safety Committee on September 12 and asked questions collected from Senators and other faculty.

K. Bailey reported on the findings from that conversation which were as follows:

1. There were two major policy modifications that were voted on July 11, 2017. These modifications have been under consideration for a lengthy period prior to the vote. First, the University previously operated under implied consent, and scratch that, but because of concerns specifically raised by faculty, the University shifted to expressed consent.
2. Second, there was change in appeals practice, such that appeals could only be made if new information was provided. It was not available the time citation was issued that would have significantly impacted the decision to issue the citation.
3. In addition to the above changes, a change in the citation fine schedule was made in December 2016 to better reflect the relative importance of various citations to public safety on campus. The changes made on June 21, 2017 to move to a tiered schedule for some fines. This led to lowering the fines for those citations for a first and second offense. One of the fines that was changed to a tiered schedule was the fine for failure to stop the stop sign.
4. Because the University is private property, Campus Safety cannot pull vehicles over to ticket. The local police cannot ticket on campus. Cameras had been installed on campus in order to help solve crimes. Campus Safety is now using those cameras to enforce driving rules on campus in order to promote safety.
5. The committee also clarified some possible misconceptions that had arisen on campus. Campus Safety does not ticket cars parked near PMC on Sabbath. The citations that are placed on individual accounts are not automatically deducted from paychecks. Fines are not sent to the Campus Safety budget—they go to general funds.
6. If cars are not registered but are parked on campus, they receive a welcome note with a daily parking pass and encouragement to register. After three citations, the car can be immobilized in order to get the owner to contact Campus Safety. In most cases, the owner has a relationship with the university and should have registered the vehicle.
7. There is an online guest permitting system so that visitors to campus can be given a parking pass to print before coming to campus.
8. Citations can be attached to individuals. The owner is initially issued the citation, but if the driver admits to the violation, the fine will be attached to them.
9. Vehicles and drivers can be banned from campus. This happens at a rate of ~1 per every two years.
10. There are over 3000 permits at any given time. 21% receive citations in a year. Half of those are non-registered (citation for not registering). 68% of permitted vehicles that receive citations receive multiple citations.
11. Of 211 full-time faculty, 87% re-registered their cars prior to the August 31 deadline. Of the remaining faculty, Campus Safety estimates that 8% of the total faculty have not registered the vehicle that might reasonably have been expected to have registered.

Senators and guests had a number of questions and comments about possible ways to improve particular campus safety issues on campus. With respect to the recent changes in policy, questions were raised about the issue of active consent being required in order to park near one's workplace. It was noted that any distinction between different groups of people on campus (e.g. employees versus residential students) would require a change in a different policy; the recent changes were in keeping with a policy that seeks to promote safety among all individuals who are regularly on campus.

The Senate took no further actions on this issue at this meeting.

[7] Senate Elections

Per the February 15, 2017 vote of the Senate to elect six senators to serve on a committee with the academic deans in order to review the Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization documents, the Senate nominated a slate of Senators. There were eight Senators nominated in order to ensure that the Provost had sufficient senators to select from when constituting the committee in the case of time conflicts between the meeting time and faculty teaching schedules.

MOTION: "To nominate D. Davis, S. Badenas, R. Zdor, B> Maguad, S. Brown-Fraser, D. Taylor, R. Siebold, and S. Moncrieff as potential members of a committee to review Academic Program Improvement and Prioritization documents." (J. Lim). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

The Senate elected Rahel Wells to serve as Communications Officer.

[8] Change Day Discussion

Senators reported on their perceptions and the perceptions of their colleagues and students regarding the first Change Day. Among the issues raised were:

1. Should Change Day be a full day instead of resuming classes at 2:00 pm? Faculty and students were tired after physical labor, and returning to class was not always a welcome prospect.
2. Some students were moved by the program that followed, while others felt that it was unnessecarily long given a short time on site for locations at a distance from campus.
3. Individuals on campus (particularly students) wished that they knew more about the event in advance.
4. Some students reported their experience to be life changing and inspiring.
5. The reflection component of the day was critical.
6. The continental breakfast was reported by multiple senators to be insubstantial given the physical labor at many sites.
7. There was good camaraderie among people serving together even when they had not met previously.
8. Some senators reported that people would have like to sign up ahead of time.
9. Senators note that it would be good if the university structured continued engagement with the community and recognized the substantial on-going efforts already underway.

MOTION: "To RECOMMEND to the Provost that Change Day be a full day of activities." (C. Gane). Seconded, **TABLED.**

Senate Discussion & Announcements

[1] Worship & Prayer

K. Hall

Dr. Hall discussed the importance of taking care in how we communicate with each other when discussing difficult issues.

[3] ETLC/CTALE Updates

A. Coria-Navia

No report.

[9] Imagining the Future

Senators were asked to consider the following questions in preparation for the next meeting:

1. What future do I see for my school/program (and/or Andrews University)?
2. What role do I see myself playing to bring about that future?
3. What steps do I (we) need to take today to make that future possible?
4. What changes (infrastructure, process, planning etc.) do I (we) need to start making today to bring about that future?

Next Faculty Senate meeting: September 20, 2017.