Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 20, 2023 Meeting 2, Fall 2023

3:00-4:30 p.m.

## ATTENDEES

L. Atchley A. Kramer S. Grausinghe R. Clark A. Gantt S. Csaki M. Zhu J. Greenwood M. Cotter-Lynch K. Lincoln J. Anderson S. Morrison I. Gerg K. Shannon S. Alluisi

## Guest: S. Petty

**Executive Committee Vacancies** 

- a. Vacancy for Recorder
  - i. Kyle C. Lincoln nominated
    - 1. Post filled without objection, but with candidate hesitancy
- b. Vacancy for Parliamentarian
  - i. Serious nominations were open
  - ii. Christopher Moretti was nominated by Kate Shannon
    - 1. Post filled without objection, but with candidate hesistancy
- c. Vacancy for Treasurer
  - i. Senator Csaki offers renomination to "make amends" for last year's flaws
    - 1. Notion of flaws rejected
    - 2. Post filled without objection
- d. \*Chair Elect must be nominated at large, but voted upon by faculty at large
  - i. Position of shadow incumbency for a two ramp-up, then they occupy the Chair post in the term thereafter
  - ii. Closes 27 September 2023 for nominations; votes 29 September 2023
- 2. Treasurer's Report
  - a. Csaki reports
    - i. Payments for faculty senate award were paid from the wrong year, which is still being cleared up. Finance office work still ongoing, but money moving around still raising considerable questions about the difference between recent custom and appropriate practice. Skepticism about the prognosis of that process moving forward expressed generally, Treasurer refers the matter to the budget chair.
    - Faculty were not informed about how these payments were processed and that "dropped balls" in the process need some explication. Treasuerer seeking clarification on those fronts
- 3. Committee Reports
  - a. Budget Committee Report

- i. No meeting yet, calling when senators appointed to ctte
- b. Committee on Committees
  - i. No report.
- c. Executive Committee
  - i. Met with VPAA Golden and Newsom on 29 August. VPAA mentioned that the revisions of the APPM to add Deans back to the core manual will be in progress. The update to these descriptions and contents are ongoing, Faculty Senate has been asked to review a draft of the new 23/24 APPM that includes references to Deans.
    - Chair Shannon requests that the faculty check out the Deans sections of the new APPM draft, and hopes for clarification on this front. Ideally, this would be before HLC arrives, so that these changes might be effective by that period.
      - a. QQ: Deans over colleges specific to programs or over colleges?
        - i. AA: Just adding the description because of JMSCB needs
      - b. QQ: Does that include all deans?
        - i. AA: right now, just JMCSB, not A&S, but it's still a WIP
    - 2. Chair Shannon refers questions either to VPAA or to SENCHAR, with the hope that the questions can be collated and provided with a view toward providing meaningful feedback in advance of HLC
- d. Personal and Policies
  - i. No report or progress.
- e. Planning CTE
  - i. No meeting yet
  - University Affairs CTE
    - i. No meeting yet
- 4. Old Business

f.

- a. Outstanding concerns or questions about the upcoming HLC visit?
  - i. Chair Shannon shared interest in an HLC facing website about the criteria that are included in the assurance report and the ways that those drafts might be disseminated.
  - ii. Some draft information about scheduling and planning for HLC
  - iii. HLC meeting appears standard, based on feedback from Cotter-Lynch
- 5. New Business
  - a. Fall Meetings Schedule: 10/4, 10/18, 11/1, 11/15, 11/29
    - i. SENCHAR moves to approve; Recorder seconds
      - 1. No discussion.
      - 2. APPROVED by registered vote
  - b. Shared Governance forum 17 October 2023
    - i. Topic about the HLC Visit and the Assurance Document
    - ii. Including the draft Assurance Report
  - c. Faculty Survey, Spring 2023
    - i. Chair Shannon has categorized the data from multiple choices, but given open responses individual documents

- 1. Chair Shannon reports that previous instances have had the password protected results for the data that were posted on a website
- 2. Discussion about the feasibility of making the results visible but also protected from regular public viewing
- ii. Moretti suggests that a general commentary or analysis is made more publicfacing with the more protected set of data that would accurately represent the results
  - 1. QQ: Do all faculty have the data as on the Canvas site?
    - a. AA: No, only senate have the Canvas site
- iii. Moretti volunteers to help write the survey analysis to run from the data. Chair Shannon volunteers the spreadsheet to Moretti, who accepts
- d. Faculty sub-committee preferences need to be completed by 9/29, so that sub-committees can be seated in advance of 4 October.
  - i. Updated APPM does include the sub-commitees in its descriptions
  - ii. Charge letters issued that address their key priorities
- e. "Dead Time" Conversation
  - i. Chair Shannon notes that there is no officially open time, where faculty can collaborate or serve on committees. No blocked off time exists to satisfy those needs, either as a day or a block of time that vacate the space to give "thought time"
    - 1. If that needs to be a thing, it would require advocacy with chairs and schedules are a wild frontier.
    - 2. Course times standardization exists but it is not enforced or practicable.
  - ii. Cotter-Lynch suggest that there is officially a dead time from 1400-1700 on Friday, but this is risible.
  - iii. General discussion ensues about the complexities of departmental political alignments, course freedom, and similar concerns.
  - iv. Some discussion about course time standardization making an impact on the dead time question, since it may be a means to provide that opening for discussion
  - v. Multi-lateral questions and answers between Cotter-Lynch and Moretti about the tradition of courses and time-slots from the Senate
    - 1. Lack of universality brings academic freedom, but the drawback is that it creates competing models and agenda
  - vi. Chair Shannon notes that this has a student-ready impact. Perhaps it deserves study to determine whether there is a real challenge or whether it needs more dynamic consideration.
    - 1. Moretti notes that Academic Council might know how much the standards are applied.
- f. Sensitive Information Policies
  - i. Chair Shannon asks an open question about whether there should be a policy about printing documents that contain sensitive information. Suggests that this might be a Policy on Policies issue. Referred for consent to refer to the Policy on Policies.

- 1. Anderson suggests her hesitancy about the handling of documents that manage some sensitive information is rooted in respecting student privacy. Shredders and secure storage for information might be too many tools without some guidance.
- 2. Some back and forth results in a potential recommendation that faculty, staff and students engage in responsible disposal of sensitive or protectice information
- 3. Kramer suggests that a FERPA training or something to handle sensitive information to cultivate a best practices for committees going forward
- g. Announcements
- 6. Adjournment motion at 1553 from Chair Shannon; Seconded by Lincoln; Adjournment by acclamation at 1554.