

Faculty Senate Agenda – December 4, 2018

In Attendance: Amal Dass, April Holm, Beth Ann Fennelly, Brad Jones, Caecilia Parks, Cole Stevens, Corina Petrescu, Cristie Ellis, Dennis Bunch, Evangeline W. Robinson, Fei Lan, Jeff Pickerd, Jennifer Gifford, Jeremy Clark, John Berns, John Schuesselin, Kathleen Fuller, KoFan Lee, Kristin Rogers, Kyle Fritz, Laura Prior, Marilyn Mendolia, Mary Roseman, Matt Bondurant, Meagen Rosenthal, Michael Barnett, Nancy Wicker, Phillis George, René Pulliam, Robert Van Ness, Simone Delerme, Stacey Lantagne, Stuart Haines, Sumali Conlon, Andy Cheng, Tejas Pandya, Tess Lefmann, Thomas Peattie, Vivian Ibrahim, Kimberly Kaiser, Ana Velitchkova, Le'Trice Donaldson, Lei Cao, Laura Prior, Chalet Tan, Breese Quinn, Susan Allen, Roy Thurston

Substitutions: (Brenda Prager), (Saim Kashmiri)

Absent: Aileen Ajootian, Carolyn Higdon, Zachary Kagan Guthrie, Tamara Warhol, Stephen Monroe

Call Meeting to Order

- 6:01 called to order
- **Approval of November 13, 2018 Minutes**
 - Motion: Brad Jones
 - Second: Kristin Rogers
 - Vote: All in favor
- **Dr. Katrina Caldwell (Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Community Engagement):**
Dr. Caldwell will provide an update on the work of her office (new personnel, initiatives, etc.)
 - Personnel
 - Four new hires
 - Cadence Pentheny
 - Coordinator, inclusion, and cross-cultural engagement.
 - Tamika Ingrom
 - MOST program for outreach and retention for AA students from within state
 - Cade Smith - AVC Community engagement
 - Shawnboda Mead - AVC university's strategic plan
 - Three key components diversity, equity, and inclusion
 - "Inclusion"
 - Partly in response to several incidents on campus this past semester and the Microaggression Report related to campus climate

- Better explanation to University community about how we attend to microaggressions
 - Identify microaggressions and help students learn what they are
 - Identify spaces where microaggressions happen more often and address those spaces
- Road map diversity, civility, respect
 - Nationally normed climate survey
 - Anticipated to start in the Spring
 - Will be seeking student and faculty feedback in the development of the survey
 - External organization will administer and analyze the survey
 - Will develop a campus working group of 15-20 well placed people
- Met with sensitivity and respect committee
 - Charge committee to work with group on civility and civil discourse group
- Host professional development activities related to campus climate
- Generate models to encourage these principles around campus
- Raise awareness across campus around cultural intelligence
- Met with authors of microaggression report to repeat the study every three years to track progress
- Questions:
 - Q: Speak to the conversations had at the ASB and “family” talk?
 - A: We’re using the notes from those meetings to guide the work of the civility committee
 - Q: The events that are coming up next semester, will you have them posted on the website for people to look for them?
 - A: Yes, that’s the short answer.
 - Q: Will there be work to increase the number of faculty of color on campus?
 - A: Yes, we are having conversations with all units on campus about this issue, as well as recruitment and retention. Liaisons for

each unit will be hired to gather information and assess needs to address this issue.

- **Cecilia Botero (Dean of Libraries):** Dean Botero will provide the Senate with an update on the effects of the rising costs of journal access and plans for access moving forward.
 - Collections budget:
 - Projections are working towards a deficit
 - Actions:
 - Establish position with collections strategists to assess opportunities
 - Assess removal of some collections
 - Ex. Wiley
 - A new business model negotiated cancel 54 titles, retain 254, token will give access to ~1700 titles (the application of tokens will be noticeable to users for now)
 - Questions:
 - Q: We anticipate that this deficit will continue?
 - A: We will be able to cover the costs for this year as it stands now, but the deficit next year will be ~\$60,000. But faculty will not suffer with lack of access.
 - Q: You are targeting journals will very high cost/use?
 - A: Yes
 - Q: Have there been discussions about how to maintain your budget?
 - A: Yes, there always are, but this current business model is not sustainable. And many other universities are having the same kinds of discussions.
 - Q: You also established an open access fund?
 - A: Yes, we have gotten some monies for that each semester (~\$2000)
- Discussion of draft resolution on Academic Freedom
 - Motion to discuss resolution - April Holm
 - Second - Vivian Ibrahim

- Discussion:
 - Comment: Please note this is an open meeting and there are members of the administration here
 - Comment: Soc/Anthro rep thanks the senate. Motion – Ana Velitchkova: to add “and senior leadership”
 - Second – [not able to capture]
 - Vote: All in favor
 - Comment: I support the values being outlined here, I have some concerns about the substantive comment and the perceptions to consider. The substantive concern is that senior leadership should never question research is not appropriate. An example case of that is the “rogue” research of the “crispr babies”. A chancellor should absolutely be able to say something in that case. Further the report calls into question the chancellor and his policies, and the supposition that they should not be able to comment is not appropriate. There is also concern about the perception of the language and the context that this is coming from intellectual elites trying to protect themselves from criticism. As such I would encourage that the senate revisit the Chicago principles for freedom of expression that is brought forward in a strong and ...
 - F/u: the point about the recent gene-editing situation is well taken. The second substantive point is also well taken.
 - Motion – Breese Quinn: to replace this resolution with the Chicago principles, which focused on freedom of expression. Senate discussed in 2015.
 - Second - Stuart Haines
 - Discussion:
 - Q: Can you tell us about open critiques to the Chicago principles?
 - A: I can tell that there was some concern from this body about extending speech issues to non-faculty members (including outside speakers and potential students)
 - F/U: I do not recall it that way.
 - f/u: I had faculty members tell me that directly.

- FU: We discussed this over several meetings and many senators were very uncomfortable with this statement
 - F/U: when we first discussed this document three universities had approved that document, an additional 50 or so institutions have bought into this document.
- The department of pharmacy practice had some discussions about this issue, and it seems to them to be reactionary, and removes the rights of academics from weighing in (as fellow academicians)
 - Comment: the Chicago principles strip the use of trigger warnings, which are important to vulnerable populations.
 - Comment: There is a difference between questioning the ethics of a study, than the methodology employed. Saying that we will discourage the leadership to question the credibility of research is important.
 - Comment: That is the primary concern of the faculty involved, that the chancellor questioned the legitimacy of the methods employed.
 - F/U: Yes with the crispr issue there were ethical issues, but it is also possible that the credibility also needs to be questioned.
 - Comment: I would suggest that this could be facilitated by discussion of the third paragraph of the resolution that discussion the IRB approval process.
 - Comment: There will be some additional changes needed to the document to make it come into line with current.
 - Comment: I had time to process the first document, but I have not had an opportunity to consider this document. Can we table this document for future discussion, and vote on the first document tonight?
 - Comment: Does this document directly address the specific and most recent situations?

- A: This is a very generic statement
 - Comment: I have not read the new document before.
 - Comment: Do we want to extract the language about when a university can restrict expression and enter it into the current document?
 - F/U: that is possible
 - Q: How do you juxtapose this statement with the 1940s statement about academic freedom?
 - A: The Chicago principles are very much informed by the 1940s statement.
 - F/u – I don't feel that I am informed about this substitute resolution to make a decision right now
 - VOTE:
 - In favor – 3
 - Opposed – 37
- F/U: The EC considered the narrowness of this statement in relation to past events.
- Comment: The fourth paragraph clearly states that the authors have gone through a specific process recognized by this institution, addresses the previous discussion.
 - Q: It was my understanding from the last meeting that this statement would be more forward looking. It seems as if that shifted since that last meeting.
 - R: It is my understanding that what the governance committee was asked to do was to do both things (i.e. address this specific incident and be forward looking)
 - Motion – Breese Quinn: delete discourages senior leadership's use of their position to make statements that question the credibility ...research and "the chancellor:
 - Second – Stuart Haines
 - Discussion:
 - Comment: The deletion doesn't address the calling into question credibility of the research

- F/U: the statement is too broad
- Comment: But I think that the issue is the chancellor was speaking about issue that he was not qualified to discuss. But I think there is a way to moderate the language...I don't know what the language is right now.
- Comment: I think that the specific incident is addressed earlier in the document but removing this discussion in the end makes the statement more positive and forward looking.
- Comment: I think that we could add language to the last statement that qualifies this particular situation...something to effect of "discourages...from make statement about approved research..."
- Comment: For pharmacy practice the previous language was too strong in questioning credibility. I think that the admonishment is above.
 - F/U – I can't see a situation wherein we would want to senior leadership to publicly question the credibility of research.
 - F/U – I think that it is important that we recognize that we are not against questioning credibility but given the power differential between senior leadership and a faculty member I think that the situation is different.
 - R: As I have said I think that there are certain situations when the chancellor has the responsibility to say something.
 - F/U – Reading the entire resolution is it referring to the chancellor taking the discussion of the research to media platforms
 - R: that is the way I intended the draft to be interpreted

- Q: What is the Chancellor's recourse if he cannot question the research?
 - A: I don't think that was the intention
 - VOTE:
 - In favor – 16
 - Opposed – 25
- Motion - Cole Stevens: “credibility of faculty research that has been vetted and approved...” If the process has been followed and the research approved, then we are good.
- Second – Le'Trice Donaldson
- Discussion:
 - Comment: not all disciplines have their work vetted and approved.
 - f/u: In terms of methodology there is an approval process.
 - Comment: IRB does not approve methodology, only if you are going to hurt people.
 - f/u: For clarification your department has to sign off on IRB, which they should have the ability to make that determined
 - Comment: The statement only speaks to the approval, not how the research was executed
 - Vote:
 - In favor: 0
 - Opposed: All opposed
- Motion - Cristie Ellis: Encourages senior leadership to use their positions of authority judiciously by generally refraining from discrediting faculty scholarship
- Second - Breese Quinn
- Discussion:
 - Comment – I agree that the sentence is much more positive, but I think that the “generally” seems too wishy washy. What does that mean?

- Comment – I think that there are cases when it is senior leaderships responsibility
 - Comment – I think it is important to keep the two separated
 - Vote
 - In favor – 40
 - Opposed – 3
 - Motion – Chris – “...and encourages senior leadership to use their positions of authors judiciously, to generally refrain from questioning the credibility of faculty scholarship, and to recognize ...
 - Second Brad
 - Discussion:
 - Vote
 - In favor – All in favor
 - Opposed – 0
 - Motion Stuart remove – that can arise from any media platform belonging to senior leadership
 - Second Breese
 - Discussion
 - Comment: I like those changes.
 - Vote: All in favor
 - Q: Does this statement apply to teaching when the professor says something in class that is not agreed by with the students?
 - A: I think that this does apply to classroom statements through the reference to the 1940s statement
 - Vote to approve resolution:
 - In favor – 43
 - Oppose - 0
- **Committee Reports**
 - Academic Instructional Affairs (Corina Petrescu)
 - Nothing to report
 - Academic Conduct (Vivian Ibrahim)
 - Nothing to report
 - Finance & Benefits (Phillis George)

- Nothing to report
- Development & Planning (Mary Roseman)
 - Nothing to report
- Governance (April Holm)
 - Nothing to report
- Research & Creative Achievement (Thomas Peattie)
 - Nothing to report
- University Services (Brad Jones)
 - Nothing to report
- Executive Committee (Brice Noonan)
 - The EC will be present to the Senate their findings with respect to the ASB request for the addition of an A+ to the grading scale in Spring 2019.
- **Old Business - NONE**
- **New Business - NONE**
- **Adjournment**
 - Motion to adjourn - Brad Jones
 - Second - Vivian Ibrahim
 - Passed