Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

12:30 - Gather/Approve Minutes
* Motion to approve the minutes.
  ○ Approved.

12:35 - Senate Chair's comments, overview of priorities
* Presentation of Faculty Senate Shared Google Drive

12:40 - Update 1: Senate Reform Working Group (Joel Christensen)
* Report from the Chair on the Working Group on the Senate
  ○ Primary goals are by-laws and representation.
  ○ Chair to act as a conduit between the Senate and the Working Group.
    Question: Any way to get more senators? Who decides this?
    No, President selects the committee.
    Question: Senate is the only representative body of the faculty and why not have the faculty vote on the appointments to the Working Group?
    President selects committee which would get around this
  ○ The Org Chart shows that there is very little representation of faculty.
  ○ Division heads have a lot of power.
    Statement: If you are elected Chair, you were told you worked for the administration.
    No longer the case, evidently.
  ○ How do we want to redraw the Org Chart for faculty governance and representation?
    Question: Can we have the Working Group Committee meet with the Senate?
    Chair pushed to have Union representation in working group, push back but ultimately went through.
    Statement: Putting up a parallel to the Faculty Senate undermines the legitimacy of the faculty senate.
    Statement: Administration is adamant for the Faculty to handle workplace bullying, this separates us as an independent part of university.
    Statement: Whatever this committee recommends will have to be a change in the handbook which will require a faculty vote.
Chair’s meeting with the President regarding Work Group

○ President wants to focus on representation first then move to by-laws.
○ Chair feels that the senate should make the by-laws itself.
○ Any by-law that affects the senate will have to have a handbook change.

Statement: Every one of the handbook committees is supposed to report to the Faculty and the Faculty Senate annual. Two reports per committee.

ACTION ITEM - Invite Handbook Committees to give reports.

○ Report to the Senate and to the Faculty at the Faculty meetings.
  ○ Handbook appears to say they (report givers) have to appear before both Faculty and Senate.
    Question: By-laws have specific legal ramifications. Are we better off without them? Get general counsel to comment on this?
  ○ Senate currently doesn’t have procedures - I.E. special elections. Want to make sure we are protected in these circumstances.
    Statement: Reports from committees only need to be reviewed by Senate.

FOR AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING - REVIEW AND REPORT ON COMMITTEES

12:50 - Update 2: Dignity at Work Proposal Strategy (Carol Osler, with discussion)

○ Workplace governance task force
  ○ Larry and Carol are co-chairs of the task force.
  ○ Submitted formal proposal to change the handbook last year.
    ■ Proposal basically said - faculty senate needs to deal with workplace bullying cases.
    ■ Provide some procedures to help the Senate manage these cases.
    ■ Does not lay out a code of conduct (at least not in this specific proposal).
  ○ Upcoming meeting to work out some objections to the proposal/task force.
  ○ Interesting question to if this has to come with a handbook revision as it is a faculty senate creation.
    Discussion: Bring attention to the issue by bringing it to a vote, regardless of success.
    Question: Who owns this process and what about conflicts of interest?
    The committee would have to be selected/voted in to avoid conflicts of interest.

○ President’s first meeting with Taskforce

  ○ Former faculty left due to bullying
  ○ The handbook stipulates the senate should be responsible for faculty disputes (which would include bullying)
Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee is the appeal process to the Faculty Senate’s decision on such disputes.

- This grievance procedure is a last resort. What needs to happen is to educate faculty and create informal methods of resolving these issues.

  Question: Who would educate the committee members/faculty?
  Professionals, maybe through a weekend training/event.

- Two and a half years of work with administration, multiple rounds of feedback with all the stakeholders.

  Question: Troubling details in the report, would make me vote against the proposal - are they in there?
  No

1:20 - Update 3: DEI Proposal Strategy (Rajesh Sampath, with discussion)

- Proposal for a new committee

  - There are instances where people cannot navigate the process. Proposal for a new Committee.
  - Recent Student protests and demands focusing on safety/diversity. New levels of concerns on security, trauma, access, etc being voiced by students and staff.
  - Want a new committee to work directly with Mark’s office.
  - Education around DEI was lead through Center for Teaching and Learning - but now Mark’s office require the full support of the faculty.
  - Getting full faculty by-in can come through this method/proposal.

    Statement: If we think Mark’s office is important, it is important we take this legislation to the floor.
    Wording of the proposal around training:
      - Would it be too much to have the Office of DEI do the training
      - It’s not just getting people to raise their hand and serve on the committee.

    Statement: We talked about representation for the committees, are there other kinds of ways to be talking about compositional representation.
    Statement: Burden shouldn’t be centralized, this is just an attempt to raise the stakes.
    JC - People who are off the tenure track are more representative of population minorities. Difficulty having representation within the existing power structure.
    Statement: Maybe make a point 8 on how the committee will continually review internally. On point 2 who mention hiring but not career development.

- Starting point was retaining faculty from all backgrounds. Wanted the committee to be able to claim space, such as contractors and community cases. I.E. the sodexo contract review - making sure the new contract is in line with our community guidelines/social justice orientation.
Question: What about instead of “social justice” it was “community fairness”?

While “social justice” is an empty signifier, the administration still banks on it. Direction for mission keeping has to come from faculty - turnover for administrators leads to less continuity.

Question: Previous proposal for handbook committee sent to chair, on the composition of the committee - should it just be senior admins and faculty? Should they be elected? Those opposed to the committee may run and use the voting as a soapbox.

All stakeholders (faculty, students, admin) should be represented and we need those voices present.

1:35 - Update 4: Phased Retirement Equity Update (Sarah Mead and Sabine von Mering)

● Developing questions to ask non-tenured faculty on pathways to retirement that are comparable with the tenured faculty retirement options.
  ○ Not many are aware of how many people are not tenured and any governance items are passed that don’t serve all faculty members.
  ○ When the university were not so financially well off we needed a way to encourage retirement for faculty but these retirement paths do not apply to non-tenured professors.
    ■ All faculty should have paths to ease out of their positions.
    ■ A variety of faculty types that fall out of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
    ■ Contract faculty are still not included in retirement pathways. Push-back came from the Provost’s office (and the dean’s office). Senior Faculty (no definition of senior). Everyone was negotiating separately in private. Wanted a transparent plan that would include all long-term faculty.
  ● Contract faculty are worried about not getting renewed if they negotiate.

1:45 - Other issues/Discussions/Suggestions for Faculty meetings

● Setting up our meetings. We will have to follow up on some items from today. Put it on the Senate Priorities in the Google Drive.
  -If you have any strong feelings on the wording of the retirement proposal please sent to SM or Sabine by end of the week.
  -What is the least that the contract faculty would want?

Attendance:
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Absent: A.K. Nadakumar, Liuba Shrira, Raphael Schoenle, Adrianne Krstansky