


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

[2] Minutes of Prior Faculty Senate Meeting
MOTION: VOTE passed [15 yes]. To approve the minutes as presented (J. Lim)


- b. Graduate Council: No minutes.
- c. Faculty Policy & Development Council: Did not meet.
- d. Academic Operations Council: No minutes.

MOTION to accept the council minutes passed [14].

Senate Discussion & Announcements


[5] Follow Up on President-Elect Town Hall. (K. Hall) Review of the process to set up the town hall and the various questions asked. Executive officers had dinner with Dr. Taylor afterwards, an opportunity to give further insight and share perspectives. Discussion of
how tenure and academic freedom are threatened across the country. How important it is for all ends of the spectrum to be able to do research. Some questions seemed difficult to ask, for example the salary issue and how difficult it is to recruit faculty. Challenges of increased workload. Issues of enrollment and customer service as top priority for administration. Adjunct faculty pay as well. We do not always get around to faculty pay. Discussion of the housing issues, we are losing students due to the quality of Lamson and grad apartments. Questions of what diversity, equity and inclusion will look like going forward. Concerns about marketing and recruiting as well. Items to continue to bring up with administration.

K. Hall shared some items of interest from the Gallup Survey report to administration. Discussion: Concerns about the workload this will add for department chairs. It has been articulated via executive deans council; that the burden is supposed to rest on the deans; shouldn’t be falling on chairs. Perhaps all deans haven’t communicated this. Regarding the numbers, our sample is smaller than what Gallup typically does, so are the differences statistically significant? What is the process? Who will listen to the action plans and how will it be listened to? How is the institution responding? Particularly on items that are beyond the control of chairs and even deans. What about the focus groups that were described at the beginning? When and where will those be? K. Hall will follow up and report back. Concerns that being not engaged means that someone is not committed to the university; instead it seems to show that faculty lack support. We need to be careful how this narrative develops. The questions are not whether someone is committed to the mission of the university or doing their job well. Can we have a clear written message from the HR Director on what chairs are expected to do. What will happen to the expectation of the action plan inside the site if deans are taking care of it? Training resources and modules are within the site, but there is the challenge of time pressure to be able to avail ourselves of it.

[7] Committee Protocols K. Hall shared a new document from administration regarding committee decorum, confidentiality, and shared respect. The document is not for Faculty Senate vote, per our shared governance. However, this opportunity is provided to give feedback or share thoughts. Discussion of whether the confidentiality statement is too strong for certain types of committees, such as the Faculty Senate which is open; minutes are open to all faculty. In many other committees, we want faculty to share perspectives from the committee with colleagues or to recruit feedback. Feedback included questions on how this policy relates to transparency.

[8] Faculty Senate Elections & Officer Elections (J. Lim) Update on the process of Faculty Senate Elections. Names from each College are due April 28.