Minutes for the Faculty Senate Meeting

12:30 – Call to Order; Approval of Minutes; Voting Results; Updates on Policies to be discussed at Faculty Meeting

- Dan Kim is visiting the Senate today to introduce himself and talk about his mission
- The bulk of the day will be on the dignity at work proposal.
- I also hope to discuss the draft of the by-laws. I’d like to post them online as a draft with your permission to get feedback from faculty. I want it to be a transparent process.
- Updates before we go on.
  - Lisa will be talking at the faculty meeting - two policy issues that we won’t vote on. The IP policy and the internship for credit proposal that will be brought to the whole faculty for voting for the next meeting. By Friday I should be able to send out the language for you.
  - At the next faculty meeting, 20 minutes will be taken up by Lisa and then Joshua Manfredo will talk about our preparation on campus for incidents. I’d like Senators to come to ask some questions.
  - We will also have the second reading of the DEISJ proposal. Future meetings of the faculty meetings should have the dignity at work proposal.
  - Governance changes: the task force approved the by-laws but we want to further review establishing a Term Limit for the senate chair to two consecutive terms and how to adjust elections to make them more fair and open. We are also still discussing representation for the Union. Further, the task force wants to limit the full faculty meetings down to four from the current six meetings and the senate will have open meetings to make up the other two meetings. We are discussing scheduling to figure out how to invite more people to the meetings/make
them more accessible and we are looking for feedback/question portal. We also need to meet with the Board of Trustee Reps to discuss divestment from fossil fuels.

12:40 – Dan Kim, VP Communications

- Before coming here I was at the College of Holy Cross and before that I was at the University of Michigan. In terms of the goal and mission for the Communication Office, our goal is to enhance the reputation and elevate the name recognition of Brandeis. There is a defensive role in this to protect the reputation of the University. We also use the faculty to help in our mission, showcasing their work and having them help the public. In terms of enhancing the reputation of Brandeis, we are working towards what we want to be known for specifically, not a general/overall reputation. We do this through our brand narrative and brand strategy. We are trying to be known for the following: founded to be inclusive, drive to improve the world, leveraging vertical and horizontal connectivity. This set of characteristics is what we are putting forward in our marketing. One great example of something that I brought forward to enhance reputation and brand is “The Conversation,” which was started by a group of folks who saw a change in journalism and wanted to use academics’ knowledge to help the general public better understand complicated issues. Basically, we are asking faculty members to write on different issues and “The Conversation” has a group of editors who are considering what issues/topics are of interest to the general public. Faculty can pitch ideas but the editors provide a list of topics to write on as well. The editors want to work with the faculty to publish pieces on “The Conversation” which get picked up by all kinds of news outlets. The real value is that the public gets the benefit of experts who know what they’re talking about.

Question: Not sure what you meant by horizontal and vertical connectivity. And for branding are you thinking about different customer groups?

Answer: Horizontal and vertical connectivity is a concept that the President is discussing in the Framework for the Future. Horizontal refers to different faculty members across the university working together and vertical is about the opportunities for undergraduates to work with faculty, graduate students, post-docs. The brand narrative has to do with these concepts, it's not all about faculty work and research, it also is about inclusivity. Elsewhere diversity and inclusivity is important but at Brandeis it is our founding ethos which is an important distinction. Our marketing should be supporting this combination of brand narrative concepts.
• With respect to the “The Conversation,” our office and “The Conversation” want to provide trainings and talks. We are also discussing the Framework for the Future and developing a communication plan for anticipated campaigns. Also we are working with Admissions to recruit top students and working with Advancement for alumni engagement and to support fundraising. For Admissions, the high school population is shrinking and we have less students to recruit. We are working on being more competitive especially with a study that predicts a steep dropoff in student population who will be going to college within the next five years.

Discussion on demographics and population decline.

• Within my own office I am working on some culture changes to be more focused on strategic goals as well as using analytics and metrics. We are working on a marketing plan overall for the University and working with Admissions much more. There is a plan for targeting and are working on the messaging. We did research among alumni, prospective students, friends of the University and we have a lot of data to help be more strategic in how we market the University. Additionally in my office, beyond culture change, we want to think more strategically, act more creatively, and work more collaboratively.

Question: Since you are so new here, can you tell us more about what you are doing to get to know us better?

Answer: Meeting with you and getting to know Brandeis is something I have been doing. Additionally, I’ve been working on understanding what Brandeis is and there is also the research we’ve been doing to understand how Brandeis is being perceived.

Question: Have you been to a class?

Answer: I have not attended a class but I’ve met with members of clubs, come to meetings like this.

Question: I don’t think an external review is really us.

Answer: How we are perceived is real and it is important for me to understand. Part of the marketing and communication challenge relates to alumni but it also really relates to prospective students. It is a combination of these two perspectives.
Discussion on the difference of how we are perceived and how we want to be perceived. Question: Are we going to create more visibility for the less seen aspects of the university, such as creative arts?

Answer: I’m more focused on the higher level narrative, less so focused on the individual programs and academic departments. But these smaller areas can create stories that can build out into the larger narrative.

Question/follow-up: There is a certain amount of self-perpetuation in that. I know students who are interested in the arts but are unaware of our offerings especially with our recent focus into areas like international relations. This will lead to us getting fewer students in the arts.

Answer: I hear what you are saying. With the web and social meeting it is possible for us to connect directly to the students and alumni we are working with and targeting. My goal and role is to get their foot in the door and then the academic departments should take it from there for example to make sure they have stories on their websites.

Question: Is there going to be dedicated staff at Brandeis to help facilitate interacting with “The Conversation?”

Answer: There are folks who are working to get “The Conversation” out to the faculty. We are working more and more to get the word out there.

Question/Comment: I’m not sure how rigid these narrative concepts are but I’m surprised by the fact that we are the smallest AAC university.

Answer: That is an aspect of our marketing/narrative but I boiled it down into the three central concepts.

Motion to approve past two meeting’s minutes
- Motion approved.

1:00 – Update and Discussion, Dignity at Work Proposal

- There are three points that we want to discuss so we can get to a vote. Let me situate everyone one. Three years ago we were running into issues regarding workplace bullying so they created a taskforce, which Carol and Larry had been chairing. We’ve done extensive research on the literature, what is workplace bullying, and what to do about it.
We’ve created a grievance procedure which we want to include in the handbook. Workplace bullying has been made illegal in most developed countries and in developing our own policies we’ve been guided by what has been done elsewhere. The faculty senate does not have the power to do everything needed to be done but we have been educating people on this. It is very important that those in authority are held accountable on workplace bullying which the faculty senate cannot do and there has to be a loud, consistent message from the top levels of the university that workplace bullying is unacceptable. There is a hole around the faculty senate and faculty bullying so we want to close that hole.

- Looking at section 4 in the summary, we propose a new committee, the Dignity at Work Committee. Going to a formal grievance procedure is a last ditch effort. Committee is responsible for handling the formal grievance procedure.
- Reading of Committee Procedure language.
- This is the key language we are proposing, the two areas highlighted are the only changes we’ve made since this was previously proposed.

Question: is this committee the final adjudicator on this?

Answer: The ultimate judgement would be made by us but there are other pathways to resolve these disputes. There should be other processes that they go through before coming to us. This committee’s process is not mandatory.

Question: This committee is a creation of the senate but the senate has no role in the committee’s ruling?

Ans. The Senate should be evaluating the work of the committee. There has been some discussion on where this committee should sit/live. Lisa made the suggestion that it should be under the senate. Also, confidentiality is very important.

Question: A few minor points that might have objections. Strike “of the faculty senate” and have it “of the faculty” makes it sound like it is composed by the faculty senate when it is selected by the faculty senate. Also there is no chair for this committee, perhaps add it to section “e”. Also if something is a legal issue or title nine it cannot come to this committee, so we should have something added to the handbook.

Answer: Does anyone object to the change of striking “senate.”
Question: Is the faculty senate responsible for the resolution of complaints and is just passing this off to a committee?

Ans: Yes, we don’t have the expertise for this

Discussion: People should have multiple avenues for conflict resolution. Faculty Senate has oversight of the committee. We have made changes around the appeals section.

Question: we need to make clear that it does not limit the aggrieved party to seek out other avenues of resolution/airing their grievances.

Discussion: On the nature of this committee as a forum for collaborative, restorative answers. We have two background documents. In document two, it stresses that the grievance process should start as informal. We are providing another option for resolution.

Question: Language should say “they” rather than “he or she” to be more gender inclusive.

Question: Will this committee have the same status as other standing faculty committees (CFRR and DEIS)? Is it enough to say “standing committee?”

Discussion on if this is a handbook issue. The Senate can create its own committee and if this should be its own standing committee. Should we add language that the committee reports to the Senate? The provost thought that it should function under the senate. Concern about the logistics on resolutions. Include language on term limits. Include a line that this committee reports annually to the Senate. Staggered three year terms and language on the committee appointing its own chair. More language on anonymity.

- Reading updated language on Section E (consensus to approve change)
- Change the bullet points to numbers/roman numerals.
- Updating Section A (consensus to approve change).

Discussion of the best place to strengthen the idea that there are other options/paths/avenues to resolutions and what the language should be. How do we articulate that we cannot resolve title nine and legal issues.

- Editing language in section 2.b.
(Two senators [zimmerman and fellman] left but gave their approval before leaving.)

Discussion on Section E and the oversight and role of the chief legal officer in this - want to make sure there is consistency between sections e and b.

- Vote to approve these changes and move to continue on the next meeting: consensus approved.

  We can follow up and have an electronic vote to get the exact numbers. This has to be seen by the university as a standing committee - this is a proposal to add a standing committee. Changing “Functions” section in the handbook.

ACTION ITEM: Clean up the document to send to the faculty for the February Faculty meeting.

Attendance: Gordon Fellman, Carol Osler, Sarah Mead, Joel Christensen, Laruence Simon, Danielle Igra, Joel Cutcher-Gershenfeld, Sabine von Mering, Jennifer Cleary, Jane Ebert, Sue Lancer, Rajesh Sampath, A.K. Nandakumar, Grace Zimmerman, Dmitry Kleinbock

Absent: William Flesch, Pu Wang, Liuba Shira, Susan Dibble