

Senate Minutes
Tuesday, April 5th , 2022
3-5pm, ZOOM

PRESENT: Ball, Barger, Bergerson (sub for Adegoke), Bethman, Bhat, Boots, Chatterjee, DeSimone, Fields, Gottman, Grieco, Grimes, Hiatt, Hunt, Kador, Keeton, Kilway, Leiter, Mardikes, Olsen, Patterson, Riggers-Piehl, Shiu, Thompson, Torres, Turla, Van Horn, Wellemeyer, Wooten, and Zhu
ABSENT: Ferguson and Lynch.
GUESTS: Newby, Popoola, and Hankins

1. OPENING BUSINESS:

- a. Call to Order & Approval of March 15 st, 2022 minutes – Grieco

- b. Approval of Agenda – Grieco
 - i. Motion passes

2. ELECTION RESULTS - Grieco

- a. Chair Faculty Senate (for 2 years) - Tom Mardikes
- b. Chair Elect - Anthony Shiu
- c. IFC - Shannon Jackson
- d. Senate will need to decide how to complete Anthony Shiu's term as representative to the IFC after his election to the Chair Elect position

3. DISCUSSION. CHANGES TO FACULTY BYLAWS AND SENATE SOP:

- a. Proposal by Anthony Shiu, David Van Horn, and Karl Kador (10 minutes; 3:10 – 3:20)
 - i. The senators proposed the 2+ Model. They suggested changes to Article 2 Section A, Article 2 Section B of the Faculty senate SOP along with CRR 300.020.E.1. They proposed changing the names of the schools in the CRR and updated the language to allow for more than two senators per unit. Kador stressed the importance of adding a nonvoting senator for staff council, student government association, and clinical faculty. Van Horn noted that other units wanting to adopt more senators would need to adjust their bylaws to reflect that.

- b. Proposal by Bill Keeton (10 minutes; 3:20 – 3:30)
 - i. Keeton suggested avoiding listing units in the CRR to avoid further changes to it. He proposed one senator per 24 voting faculty with a minimum of two and max of six senators per unit. Each spring, the FSEC would figure out the number of voting faculty in each unit and then determine the number of senators. He suggested a minimum number of 25 senators with a maximum of 30. All NTT voting faculty are eligible to serve as senators for their unit and to vote in the

election of their unit's senators. And one additional at-large NTT senator would be chosen by NTT voting faculty in a campus-wide election.

c. Proposal by Dani Wellemeyer and Brenda Bethman (10 minutes; 3:30 – 3:40)

i. Bethman proposed faculty representation by type. Wellemeyer pitched two proposals. The 1st one was a common minimum where we put into the CRR or SOP that the normal elections should produce the same minimum number of NTT and tenure track senators. That number would be dependent on the size of the senate. A special election would be held if those numbers aren't achieved through normal elections. The 2nd being a minimum for units. Where units that employ both NTT and T/TT faculty must elect at least one senator of each type.

d. Open discussion (40 minutes; 3:40 – 4:20)

Comment: The University Libraries are an academic unit, so you may be able to simplify the language on the first guideline to just "each listed AU" - Wellemeyer

Q: Do clinical faculty have a service component? -Hunt

Comment: A point to note: In the numbers today and the prior faculty numbers, the Bloch School is missing. Does anyone know those numbers? -Wooten

Comment: The School of Medicine does this as well Danni!!! -Wooten

Q: It is there as a School of Management. -Bethman

Comment: I agree with Karl. Our concern is electing someone who can attend and handle the workload. Finding the appropriate person in that situation would be a challenge. -Wooten

Comment: I was looking at the number for the school of education. I think you're including adjunct faculty in your numbers. We don't have anywhere near 55 full time faculty. Perhaps those numbers are accurate. - Barger

Comment: Our point was that given that how high our number of NTT faculty are employed that they should be represented. -Bethman

Comment: I don't have a problem with that. But those numbers aren't right and I'm concerned it might affect your proportions. -Barger

Q: What percentage of senators are NTT vs T/TT? Also, in relation to the data, I think that your third column is usually referred to as part time. There's a standard formula to use those as an estimate. You're comparing full time vs part time faculty. -Olsen

A: About 30% NTT. -Grieco

Comment: That NTT number includes adjuncts. There are about 50 full time unranked NTT faculty. The proportion is a lot less than those figures suggest. I have concerns about adjusting the SOP instead of the CRR. I don't think changes to the SOP will make it to the curator. -Wooten

Comment: I wanted to echo Dr. Wooten's concern about NTT clinical faculty having time / incentive to serve as Senators; at school of pharmacy, clinical NTT faculty may not have time to serve given their clinical responsibilities off site at their clinics. -Patterson

Comment: I'm thinking all of the Unranked numbers are non-voting adjuncts. If these are to be factored in then the 1000 Clinical would need to be added from Med School. -Mardikes

Comment: it feels to me like we're getting lost in the 3rd column. And the first two bear more discussion. We could potentially table the third column and recognize that there's a discrepancy between the 1st and 3rd. -Riggers-Piehl

Comment: We could request HR convert shoe numbers to FTE as well - Grieco

Comment: The system doesn't seem to be broken. I don't think we need to push for more unless people feel differently. I don't think we should vote one NTT to the senate. That very thought process communicates that other NTT senators are representing their interests in the faculty senate. I would like to focus on how many members should come from each unit. -Bhat

Comment: These kinds of changes could be folded into the CRRs. We don't have a cap on senators and I think that means that we're not going to overburden an extra senator. -Shiu

Comment: Requiring Pharmacy NNT to serve as senators would not fly very well -Patterson

Comment: About 1/3 of Senate is NTT right now. Two years ago, we changed rules to modify SOP to make it easier, and the CRR is more difficult with faculty vote, so I agree with Bill about defining membership in Senate in the CRR. -Mardikes

Comment: Messing with the CRRs to me is fraught with hazard. Too much complexity could be a problem. Changing the SOPs keeps things flexible and doesn't unnecessarily bind the movement of the senate. -Kador

Comment: We like the common minimum because it formalizes what is already happening in a way that is equitable and protect both types of faculty-Wellemeyer

Comment: Were unranked part time faculty to organize, senate could certainly include a member from their group as an ex officio member to the senate. -Mardikes

Comment: A practical concern for the school of pharmacy. I'm concerned with having a required minimum of NTT senators, logistically. NTT in our unit feels well represented and don't think we need a required NTT representative. -Patterson

Comment: The NTT in our school all have different jobs with widely different needs and viewpoints. -Kador

Comment: Just because it's working now doesn't mean it will continue to work. -Bethman

Q: Concerning at large positions for NTTs. There's a really interesting conversation going on in terms of representation. What are the advantages to the at large position, if there are any? -Shiu

A: Historically, senators have been voted in by their unit. Coming up with a way to keep elections in the unit but have a mechanism to up representation if needed was meant to boost communication. Senate needs to consider that

faculty governance can affect our work in different ways. That's a benefit I could see to at large representation. -Wellemeier

Comment: We want to encourage NTT participation. NTT is a broad definition. Asking too much would be unsustainable. We need to create a more sustainable NTT population that can participate in the schools and the senate. Can we ask NTT faculty to serve if their contracts spell time of employment shorter than the time would serve? Those are my concerns about asking too much of this representation. The question is, can we have it both ways? Can we create a system before we create a long-term commitment to support our faculty with year to-year-contracts? -Grieco

Comment: Sounds like about 1/3 of us serving right now have a longer Senate commitment than we do a contract of employment -Wellemeier

Comment: Several years ago, we went through the process of engaging the NTTs in the vote. I think they're represented fairly adequately. If there's inadequacies we should address them. The issue of contracts is a different fight. It's important but separate. -Van Horn

Comment: My fear is with these unstable job situations, what happens if we commit to a model of representation and then those contracts don't carry on? That would destabilize our system. I'd like to see a commitment to longer-term contracts before we hardwire the NTT representation to senate. -Grieco

Comment: Kind of true, and Jamie's question about service requirements for Clinical and/or NTT is a legit question. -Mardikes

Comment: The proposal to have 2 or 3 or 4 NTT senators isn't going to grind the senate to a halt. I think it's important that we ensure some minimum representation for NTT faculty. -Bethman

Comment: Our teaching NTTs are 80% teaching, 20% service - Hunt

Comment: Some units already have specifications for NTT representation already. -Van Horn

Comment: We are already guaranteed 3 NTT (SONHS, SOM, Libraries) right now under current unit rules. -Grimes

Q: Should we present all three proposals to our colleagues or do we need to consolidate? -Grieco

Comment: I think this is a senate deliberation issue, not a vote for all of faculty. - Van Horn

Q: Can the leaders of these three proposals come together to build a consensus to present to the senate? -Bhat

Q: Could we pick out some big issues for the senate to vote on? Perhaps should we have an at-large NTT senator? Or hold a special election if we don't get the numbers? Should we list units in the CRR or be more general? - Keeton

A: We need to have final documents before we circulate them. We also need to hold a secret vote. -Grieco

Comment: From CRR: Ratification of amendments

a. Amendments must have two readings in the Senate and be passed by secret ballot after the second reading.

b. Amendments, passed by the Senate, must be circulated to the voting Faculty for an electronic election with two weeks allowed for voting.

c. Amendments are approved by a majority of the faculty who vote, as defined in B.1 of these bylaws. -Mardikes

Comment: I think we're bogged down by these proposals. I think people need to start making motions and have senators begin to support or rule them out. My concern is putting together a meeting of the leaders of these proposals seems convoluted. I'm concerned we've drifted into different directions. -Mardikes

Comment: Reorganization can give us to opportunities to find changes for the better. -Grieco

Q: So, motions are more about "components" versus a motion for "proposal 1 as it stands", etc.? -Patterson

A: Yes. Grieco

Q: Should we decide if we want to make any changes first? -Wooten

A: You would need to rewrite a lot of language to keep us from changing anything. -Shiu

Comment: Motion not to require minimum NTT clinical representation. -Patterson

Comment: I second that motion. -Bhat

Comment: That's not the language of the 2+ proposal. - Shiu

Comment: for units with clinical faculty... -Van Horn

Comment: Can I rephrase the motion not to require every department to have NTT representation unless they want it. -Patterson

Comment: I think Dr. Patterson is talking about Proposal 3, option B (minimum for unit). -Riggers-Piehl

Comment: Yes, that's correct. -Patterson

Comment: Motion not to require each unit to have minimum NTT representation. -Grieco

Comment: Seconded. -Bhat

Comment: Motion passes. -Grieco

Comment: I move that senate move forward with the 2+ model for senate membership. -Wellemeyer

Comment: FSEC and the Senate."1. At least two senators for each listed academic school/unit and two from the libraries. 2. If an academic school's/unit's number of voting faculty exceeds fifty members, an additional senator may be added for each". -Wellemeyer

Comment: I second the motion. -Desimone

Q: Is the senate model where everyone gets 2 still on the table? - Hunt

Q: What does motion to continue with the model mean? -Patterson

A: We're getting a feel for support of the issue. -Wellemeyer

Comment: The motion should be to discuss this more. -Bhat

Comment: "continue with" --- is meant to say "continue deliberating" - patterson

Comment: I understood that those specific points shared by wellemeyer are the ones we are discussing. -Grieco

Comment: I still second the motion. -Desimone

Comment: I move to continue with discussing the U.S. Senate model with each unit having two members. -Hunt

Comment: Seconded. -Grimes

Comment: 10 for, 10 against, 3 abstentions- Mardikes

Comment: At the meeting where groups moved forward, none of the groups adopted the 2-senator model. -Van Horn

Comment: That's not what they were tasked to do. -Hunt

Comment: We didn't vote on them. Now we're voting -Grieco

Comment: My unit has been vocally supportive of the senate model. -Riggers-Piehl

Comment: I'm conflicted, but I still voted yes. -Van Horn

Comment: That status quo is not the US senate model. Technically, the motion did not pass. -Keeton

Comment: I agree - the motion didn't pass. -Riggers- Piehl

Q: Have groups felt underrepresented? Has five senators swayed a vote? I think growing the senate adds more confusion. I think two senators is ample representation for any school. -Grimes

Comment: Smaller schools will think 2 is enough but larger schools might disagree. In this reorganization we'd be losing three reps from education, from chemical, biology and arts and sciences. One of the big things we tackled last semester was the involvement of indirects. Eliminating their voices would be a mistake. -Kador

Comment: The chair can break the tie. -Bhat

Comment: The chair will not break the tie unless we call for another vote. -Grieco

Comment: I would suggest calling them the 2 model and the 2+ model. Part of why we haven't had discussion on the 2 model is that it's simple enough not to require much discussion. We haven't given it the conversation it deserves today. -Leiter

Motion to continue with 2+ model:

"1. At least two senators for each listed academic school/unit and two from the libraries.

2. If an academic school's/unit's number of voting faculty exceeds fifty members, an additional senator may be added for each increment of twenty-five voting faculty over a baseline of fifty voting faculty (i.e. a school/unit with seventy-five voting faculty would qualify for one additional senator). Schools/Units must make a formal request for additional senators.

3. Each academic school/unit and the FSEC will review the school/unit voting faculty numbers and number of senators every three years and invite or propose increases/decreases as needed.

4. The addition or subtraction of representatives greater than two in number is determined jointly by the FSEC and the Senate."

1. At least two senators for each listed academic school/unit and two from the libraries.

2. If an academic school's/unit's number of voting faculty exceeds fifty members, an additional senator may be added for each" **Passed**

Motion: I move to continue with discussing the U.S. Senate model with each unit has two members. **Did not pass**

4. ADJOURNMENT

- i. Motion passes