



## Faculty Senate 2018–2019

**MINUTES: December 12, 2018**

Whirlpool Room, Chan Shun Hall

6:00-8:00 pm

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

**Present:** S. Badenas, K. Bailey, A. Coria-Navia, D. Davis, B. Dent, H. Ferguson, D. Fortin, C. Gane, T. Goodwin, D. Habenicht, K. Hall, J. Lim, P. Lyons, M. Murray, N. Nosworthy, R. Perez-Schulz, D. Randall, D. Taylor, R. Wells

**Regrets/absent:** B. Ade-Oshifogun, A. Baltazar, S. Bell, S. Brown-Fraser, B. Gibson, O. Glanz, G. Gregorutti, B. Maguad, R. Orrison, A. Solis, C. Stuart, C. Arthur, A. Luxton.

**Guests:** A. Bosman, A. Moushon, A. Weldon.

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

**[2] Minutes of November 14, 2018 Senate Meeting. MOTION:** Move to approve minutes as presented (K. Bailey).  
Seconded; **VOTE PASSED.**

### **[4] Committee Reports (K. Bailey)**

**Undergraduate Council (report on 12/3; minutes not yet received)**—Although the minutes of the December UGC meeting were not sent to the senate as of this meeting, the acting senate representative on the UGC (Bailey) reported on the change in BA/BS definition (from the 2003 UGC Policy Manual) that was voted by the UGC at that meeting. The goal of this report was to ensure that the senate had a clear understanding of the current status of the ongoing undergraduate experience changes—no senate action will be taken until minutes are officially received. The updated definition reads as follows:

The Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees promote a liberal arts education that fosters distinct methodologies and intellectual capacities. Both degrees require focused study of the human experience and scientific inquiry.

- **The Bachelor of Arts** is a liberal arts degree that explores the human experience and its meaning across a variety of disciplines. The degree includes second language proficiency at the intermediate level and often provides opportunities for a minor.
- **The Bachelor of Science** is a liberal arts degree allowing for concentrated study in a particular field.

**Graduate Council (10/3)**—The AU Unified Framework of Outcome Steering Committee and the Graduate Council have begun working together on university-level outcomes for graduate programs.

**Faculty Policy and Development Council (report on 11/19; minutes not yet received)**—Although minutes from the November FPDC meeting have not yet been submitted to the faculty senate, the senate representative (Ferguson) to the FPDC noted that special disciplinary accommodations for teaching loads were being reviewed by the FPDC and that departments with current or departments that need to create accommodations should contact the FPDC committee member assigned to their department. Those assignments were reviewed for the senators.

Senators briefly discussed the possibility of meeting the recent request to the Effective Teaching and Learning Council to identify ways to account for pedagogy in teaching load by making use of the special accommodation policy.

**Graduate Faith Integration (final report)**—As planned, the Graduate Faith Integration committee (chaired by Duane Covrig) has been closed, but its function have been placed within the Center for Teaching and Learning, Faculty Institute, Distance Learning and Informational Technology, and James White Library, as well as the AU Teaching and Learning Conference. Committee members continue to work with the Director of the CTL, among others, to continue to develop faith integration faculty development opportunities. There are four ways that faith integration has been placed within the institution. (1) There is a faith integration strand in Faculty Institute, (2) committee members are working with the library to create a faith integration library guide, (3) faculty are encouraged to submit faith integration papers to the annual AU Teaching and Learning Conference, and (4) DLIT and CLT offer faith integration faculty development throughout the year.

**MOTION:** “To THANK the chair of the ad hoc Faculty Senate Graduate Faith Integration Committee, Duane Covrig, and committee members for work well done.” (Habenicht). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

**Academic Operations Council, Race and Justice, AU UFO Steering Committee.** No report.

**[5] Faculty Vision for Undergraduate Experience (Town Hall and Survey Report)**

Senate officers reviewed the context of the recent (November 19 & 20) faculty town halls on revisions to the undergraduate experience. The request for the town hall came from an *ad hoc* group of leaders (Christon Arthur (provost), Lisa Ahlberg (UGC chair), Don May (ACE director), Anneris Coria-Navia (CTL director and ETLC chair), Kenley Hall (senate chair), and Vanessa Corredera (chair of the BA definition working group). The Senate met with about 35 people at townhalls, and received more than 30 written responses to the same questions. The raw data and a qualitative content analysis were sent to the group of leaders, and will be sent to senators. The goal of these town halls on the faculty vision for the undergraduate experience is to give the senate a better understanding of the faculty vision in preparation for deliberation on these changes in the Spring.

**[6] Course Schedule Change Proposal**

A proposal for changing the course schedule was introduced to the faculty at the November 2018 General Faculty Meeting. Follow-up meetings were held with faculty chairs the next week. A revised proposal has been circulated to the faculty chairs, but the Senate has not received the revised proposal for discussion—the administration considers this change to be administrative (and not academic or faculty-related) in nature. The senate officers have articulated to the Provost that there needs to be a single clear line of reporting from faculty to the administrative decision-makers overseeing this change in order to deal with problems faced by advisors, departments, teachers, and students in a timely and responsive manner. The senators suggested the difficulties with the transition in bookstore operations and ownership as a helpful analogue for the importance of including many faculty in discussions about changes that affect students, advisors, and teachers, even when the issue is perceived to be wholly administrative.

Senators had several questions about why the process for making this change did not involve the Senate—the Senate was included, for example, in discussions about changes to roads and parking, which seem less related to academic and faculty issues than a change in course scheduling. Senators also reported that the College of Arts and Sciences took a vote that expressed unanimous dissatisfaction with the proposal. Senators discussed how best to proceed, given widespread knowledge of this vote. The senate officers made clear that the Provost had not explicitly been requested by the officers to discuss this issue with the faculty senate, and that there was no explicit rejection of dialogue between senate and administration on this issue. Senators also noted that while many schools separate the teaching and advising functions between professional advisors and faculty, that distinction is not present in large portions of the university—thus advising is a faculty concern, and faculty are most qualified to critique the effectiveness of any proposal. Faculty chairs reported that some concerns from faculty (raised by the College of Arts and Sciences, and by the faculty chairs) have been responded to by the administrative group, but other concerns remained. Senators noted that an ineffective schedule is a recruiting and retention issue—if problems with scheduling delay or disrupt student completion of the curriculum, this can quickly become a major frustration that is communicated widely through social networks to prospective students. Senators noted that the current schedule is the result of years of negotiations between departments, and perceived that there has been little consultation with those departments and advisors about whether or not a scheduling change is necessary. Senators also noted that the timeline for revision and implementation of this proposal was very tight, and that the initial introduction of the proposal, and all following discussions were taking place under the time constraints of the end of the semester.

**MOTION:** “Due to the serious academic implications of the scheduling proposal, the Faculty Senate REQUESTS that the Provost meet with the Faculty Senate prior to finalizing or piloting any change in course scheduling processes.” (Goodwin). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

**[7] Proposed Recommendation to FPDC: Reconsidering Faculty/Student Relationship Policy (WP 2:158:1:2)**

The senate has received concerns from multiple faculty about the breadth of the relationships with students policy passed several years ago. That policy reads as follows:

**“Ethics in Relationships (WP 2:158:1): Relationships With Students (WP 2:158:1:2)**

...Non-marital sexual relationships between faculty and students are prohibited. Non-marital romantic relationships between faculty and students are also prohibited because even where such relationships appear to be consensual between the parties, the faculty member’s status may place the student in a disadvantageous position.”

This policy has impacted multiple faculty since its inception and appears to be broader than the policies at some other higher educational institutions. Because of these issues, the senate officers recommended to the senate that the FPDC take a look at the consequences of the policy since its implementation and reconsider the policy in that light.

The senators agreed that the policy should be re-examined by the FPDC.

**MOTION:** “To RECOMMEND to the Faculty Senate that the last paragraph of WP #2:158:1:2 on faculty-student dating relationship be referred back to the Faculty Policy and Development Council for reconsideration within the academic year because the policy as implemented is too broad and has been documented as negatively impacting the personal and family lives of faculty.” (Badenas). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

**[8] Proposed Recommendation to FPDC: Revising Membership Requirements for Rank and Tenure Committee (WP Appendix 2-G)**

The senate officers received a question from a faculty about the criteria for membership on the Rank and Tenure Committee. The current policy does not require faculty to be tenured, even though they will be making decisions about other faculty members’ tenure status. The senate officers recommended to the faculty senate that the membership description of the Rank and Tenure Committee (Appendix 2-G of WP) be referred to the Faculty Policy and Development Council for revision within the academic year in order to answer the following two questions: (1) Should all members of the rank and tenure committee be tenured as well as full professors? (2) Is it reasonable for tenured full professors who are 50% or less administrative appointment with no responsibility for hiring to be appointed to this committee as long as they are full-time employees with at least 50% faculty appointment?

In preparation for the senate meeting, the current co-chairs of the Rank and Tenure Committee made recommendations about changes to the policy based on their years of experience on the committee and the stresses placed on committee by faculty, chairs, and deans. The current policy makes the committee responsible to too many people—the committee wants to be self-sustaining and independent to be as fair as possible when considering applications for promotion in rank and tenure. The recommendations from the current co-chairs were to (1) include the requirement that committee members have tenure, (2) to clarify that the committee only communicate through the existing line to the Provost, and (3) that no faculty with administrative positions (as is currently stipulated in the policy) be placed on the committee. The final recommendation was made because of the concerns that administrators, whether they have teaching responsibility or not may know information that can impact their impartiality in considering applications. The senate reviewed the recommendations with one of the current co-chairs. Senators asked if the stipulation that the only contact with the committee be through the Provost—however, the chair and dean are able (and expected) to communicate with the committee through the chair and dean evaluation letters that accompany the portfolio.

**MOTION:** “To refer the recommended changes to Appendix 2-G of the Working Policy concerning the Rank and Tenure Committee developed in consultation with the co-chairs of the Rank and Tenure Committee to the Faculty Policy and Development Council.” (Goodwin). Seconded, **VOTE PASSED.**

## Senate Discussion & Announcements

### **[1] Worship & Prayer**

Worship (K. Hall). Matthew 1: "He will save His people". Prayer (T. Goodwin).

### **[3] Effective Teaching and Learning Council and Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (K. Bailey)**

Noted that Spring 2019 faculty book club invites have been sent out.

**Next Faculty Senate meeting:** January 23, 2019.