

Minutes of Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting

December 2019

Date and time: December 10, 2019, 9:30-11:00 am

Location: Cathedral 826

Present: Chris Bonneau, Lorraine Denman, Irene Frieze, Suzanna Gribble, Sandra Guzman, Laurie Kirsch, Marty Levine, Patrick Loughlin, Tom Songer, Jay Sukits, Amy Tuttle, and Seth Weinberg Frank Wilson

Absent: Yodit Betru, Helen Cahalane, Scott Glaser, Morgan Pierce, Juleen Rodakowski,

Call to Order – The meeting was called to order by L. Denman at 9:37 am.

1. Introductions and announcements. Co-chairs: Lorraine Denman & Irene Frieze. Secretary: Suzanna Gribble.
 - Yodit is officially on maternity leave.
2. Approval of November 12 minutes. *Suzanna Gribble*
Tabled until January until L. Kirsch comments are updated
3. Update on Anti-discrimination policy proposal. *Seth Weinberg*
 - Seth and Irene had meetings with policy office and Pam Connelly and Kathy Humphrey.
 - Their second meeting with committee who drafted the AD policy was a more difficult conversation
 - The *ad hoc* committee to revise the policy was connected with EIDAC committee who was supportive.
 - C. Bonneau summarized his interactions with the policy revision committee. They have conceded the start date but are not necessarily responsive to the mandatory reporting and differential effects on tenure and appointment stream faculty and chilling effects on discussion.
 - S. Weinberg wants to hear from the committee about the checks and balances and faculty/staff protections.
 - C. Bonneau stated the goals of the policy is to have a University free from discrimination and bias, is there a way to achieve the goals of the policy that is different that what is currently drafted.
 - L. Denman stated some policy office representatives wanted to attend a future FASC committee meeting to present and discuss modifications to the current draft of the anti-discrimination and digital accessibility policies.
 - In general, those present supported the idea of continuing to draft our comments and concerns, submit them to appropriate parties and then invite representatives to continue the discussions at future FASC meetings.

- P. Loughlin how is the current policy ineffective? How will the new policy be more effective?

The committee discussed the following items regarding current state of the anti-discrimination policy:

1. The current draft not acceptable, at this time we believe the policy needs to be completely redrafted
 2. New committee needs larger representation and needs to review problems with current policy (C. Bonneau read the list of policy committee members)
 3. New policy needs to be based on data
 - a. How is Title IX working?
 - b. What does research say?
- One suggestion was to invite representatives from the committee who drafted the policy to address the questions related to process of drafting and reviewing comments they have received.

Next steps: Formally send our concerns to the committee and then invite them to respond by sending a few representatives to a meeting with us to address those concerns. Agree on the document via email and then send to T AFC and then send to the committee that drafted with enough time to mull it over.

- T. Songer the year of diversity did much more in a single year to advance anti-discrimination education more than what the policy will ever do.
- Frieze and Weinberg will update the statements and committee can approved via email.

4. Statement on digital accessibility. *Lorraine Denman*

- L. Denman summarized her statement on Proposed Digital Accessibility Policy for the committee. Issue of implementation, resources and oversight.
- Next steps would be to send our statement to the policy office.
- The committee who has drafted the digital accessibility policy said that there are modifications but we don't know what they are as of this meeting.
- L. Kirsch, what is the role of the policy office in this, do they facilitate the process but not contribute to the substance of the policy? The committee isn't sure of the process.
- C. Bonneau, policy office is to come up with the appropriate language for what the committee would want to have done, not to make decisions on substance.

Those present supported sending Lorraine's statement to the policy office and committee members who drafted the policy.

5. Robin Kear – chair of the librarian senate will be invited as a pro temp member, those present supported this invitation
6. Draft guidelines for annual review of faculty performance. *Irene Frieze*

- Provost sends out a letter to the Deans annually stating the review process should be done for full-time faculty on an annual basis. However, the annual review guidelines have not been updated in quite some time. What information needs to be sent out to chairs regarding the process for evaluating faculty performance?
- This process is done very differently in various units and school. The statement needs to encompass all of the various ways that schools accomplish reviews.
- I. Frieze said the goal is to have a one-page updated statement.
- S. Weinberg indicated this would not work in dental school. J. Sukits says the Business school just a letter is written, not much explanation or outlining of expectations and goals of the review.

7. Updates on Provost Office activities. *Laurie Kirsch*

8. Plans for Spring meetings.

- a. Next meeting: January 7? January 14? January 28?
 - i. New schedule information will have to be gathered, committee will then be notified
- b. Suggestions for future meeting topics

Meeting adjourned at 10:53 am