

Faculty Senate

April 11, 2018

To promote the communication of opposing views and to serve as a free-speech-with-respect model for the rest of the campus, all discussion in the Faculty Senate must be conducted in a civil fashion that is free of any intimidation or personal attacks.

- the University Faculty Committee

Announcements

Charlie Van Loan
Dean of Faculty

Committee on Academic Titleholder Representation

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Adeolu Ademoyo | Africana Studies | Senior Lecturer |
| Stephane Bentolia | Molecular Biology and Genetics | Assistant Research Professor |
| Brenda Dietrich | Operations Research | Professor of the Practice |
| Aliqae Geraci | Cornell University Library | Associate Librarian |
| Roger Gilbert | English | Professor and Chair |
| Kim Kopco | Policy Analysis and Management | Senior Extension Associate |
| Bruce Lauber | Natural Resources | Senior Research Associate |
| Estelle McKee | Law | Clinical Professor |
| Bruce Monger | Earth and Atmospheric Sciences | Senior Lecturer |
| Pilar Thompson | Veterinary Medicine | Employee Assembly |
| Charles Van Loan | Computer Science | Professor Emeritus, DoF |
| Makda Weatherspoon | Near Eastern Studies | Senior Lecturer |

Has started work and will suggest by Oct 1 how the NTT academic titleholders might be represented through the Faculty Senate.

Elections Will Be Staged Soon

Faculty Trustee

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Robert “Bob” Buhrman | Applied Engineering Physics |
| Melissa Hines | Chemistry |
| Shirley Samuels | English |
| Doug Antczak, | Microbiology and Immunology |
| Laurent Saloff-Coste | Mathematics |
| John Hopcroft | Computer Science |

Nominations and Elections

Shorna Allred
Sara Warner

Natural Resources
Performing & Media Arts

University Faculty Committee

Anthony Hay
Katherine “Katie” Kinzler
Mariana Wolfner

Microbiology
Psychology
Molecular Biology and Genetics

Senator-at-Large

Robert Karpman
Scott Coonrod
Chelsea Specht

Life Sciences
Biomedical Sciences
Plant Science

Extra Senate Meeting

Wednesday, April 25, 3:30-5pm, ILR 105

The purpose is to wrap up the consensual relationship policy discussion with a vote.

Extra Senate Meeting: Vote

1. The finished proposed policy will be available April 16.
2. There will be a “roll call vote” at the April 25 meeting.
3. Each senator (or alternate) votes yes or no on the recommended policy AND each senator will have the option of attaching a comment to their vote that explains or qualifies their “yes” or “no”.
4. The Senate can (of course) express itself via the resolution process as well.
5. Dept Chairs and DGS's will be contacted to make sure local discussions take place and that there is full representation at the April 25 meeting.

Outcome will be Part of the CRPC Final Report, E.g.,

| Senator | Dept. | Vote | Comment |
|---------|-------|------|--|
| S1 | D1 | Yes | Our unit is broadly supportive. As one of our graduate students said of the field ban “if a faculty member is no longer simply a superior, but a friend's lover, then it makes it difficult to work with them in a professional manner if grades or critique are involved. “ |
| S2 | D2 | No | We generally support the proposed policy but the field ban is totally unacceptable. As one of our graduate students said, “essentially, this is nobody's business but those involved in the relationship, and people can date who they want to with consent. Let adults be adults. Spend your time with more useful programs, like preventing sexual harassment in the workplace.” |
| etc | etc | etc | etc |
| S100 | D100 | ? | ? |

Social Science Review

Report by the Committee on Organizational Structures

Mike Kotlikoff
Provost

Judy Appleton
Vice Provost and Committee Co-Chair

Ted O'Donoghue
Associate A&S and Committee Co-Chair

A proposal for the Senate to regularly provide feedback

Chris Schaffer, Charlie van Loan
Office of the Dean of Faculty

We need for the Senate to provide **voted-upon sense of the Senate** feedback regularly

- Senate rarely formally weighs in on issues
 - Two resolutions this year
 - This is despite a largely successful shift to discussion over presentation in Senate meetings, where many good ideas are heard
- This has consequences
 - Decreased relevance of Senate for shared governance, as we heard last month
 - Decreased perceived value of presenting to Senate or receiving Senate feedback from administration
 - Decreased engagement of Senators on issues, with focus on “updates” rather than “consultation”

Proposed process for Senate to regularly respond to topics discussed in meetings

1. UFC identifies issues Senate will make formal statements on
2. Capture key threads in comments from Senators during meeting
3. Two weeks of time for Senators to make comments via website
4. UFC distills comments to a series of *sense of the Senate* statements, which are distributed with next agenda
5. At next Senate meeting statements are presented, debated (with opportunity for amendment), and voted upon
6. Communicate statements back to presenting individual or group, sometimes with requested follow up

Regular process and frequent feedback could increase influence of Senate views

- **One month** turnaround for **voted-upon** *sense of the Senate* feedback.
- Time for Senators to consult with constituent groups on issue before submitting comments and before debating and voting on statements.
- Opportunity for increased engagement of Senators with Senate and with their constituents.
- More time per issue (spread over two meetings), so likely fewer topics.
- Does not replace Resolutions, Committee reports, or any other mechanism for the Senate to weigh in. Does not represent the totality of Senate feedback.
- Potential for increased Senate influence due to timing and seriousness of voted-upon feedback.

Pilot

- We propose to pilot this process for the Social Sciences review we just heard about
 - Information on website for submitting additional comments will be sent this week.
 - Draft *sense of the Senate* statements will be available with next agenda
 - We will debate and vote on those statements at the May meeting
- We will ask for feedback on this process after the pilot.
- If there is broad support, we will introduce a Resolution in the Fall to make this process a formal mechanism for *sense of the Senate* feedback.

Questions?