<p align="center">*Faculty Senate Minutes*
(approved 3/20/24)
Session 11
Wednesday, March 6, 2024 (In Person)
Student Center (Room 310A)
3:15-5:15 pm</p>

Attendance: Corsianos, Gray, Curran, McCleary, Barton, Brewer, Longworth (guest), Elton, Winning, Marino, Pawlowski, Carpenter, Bruya, Bushinski , Neufeld, Simoes, Welsh, Narayanan, Lee, Millán Serna,   Soltani, Ramsey (guest), Pressley-Sanon, Bruya, Lewis, Ferdousi, Putzu, Foster, Ashur

I. Call to Order   3:20pm

II. Approval of the Agenda 03/06/2024 Moved by Elton, seconded by McCleary. Passed 23 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining.

III. Approval of the Minutes from 02/21/2024 Moved by Barton, seconded by Elton. Passed 22 for, 0 against, 1 abstaining.

IV. Appointments and Elections   (Elton)

   A. Vacancy - Nomination/Sign-Up Form Title IX Hearing Pool seeks volunteers to serve as Advisors or Hearing Panelists.

   i. Detailed position description: The Title IX Hearing Pool is made up of Faculty, lecturers, and Staff who participate in Title IX hearings. The Title IX Coordinator needs five hearing pool members for each formal hearing. Three members serve as the Decision-Makers, and two serve as Advisors to either the Complainant or Respondent. Training is provided to all Title IX hearing pool members before serving. The initial training for all Title IX Hearing Pool members is 2.5 hours, with a 1-hour refresher just before their first hearing. It is anticipated that Title IX Hearing Pool members will be asked to serve no more than twice in an academic year.

   Decision-makers should expect to have approximately 2-3 meetings (1-2 hours maximum) outside of a hearing to discuss the investigative report with the other panelists, create questions to be asked during the hearing, and a decision meeting once the hearing has been completed.

   Advisors are asked to be with their assigned party for every meeting after the investigative report has been completed and to support their party during the hearing.   Typically, there are 3-5 meetings outside of the hearing, which can last 1-2 hours for each meeting.

Hearings, in general, are initially set for 4 hours, with an additional day if needed, but this is rare. They are usually held over Zoom unless otherwise requested. Per current regulations, the hearings must be held live and with the ability for both parties to cross-examine each other, in addition to questions the Decision-Makers may have.

ii. Still accepting volunteers. We have 9 so far but can use more. This is an active pool that will be drawn from as needed.

B. Ongoing vacancy in Faculty Senate Budget and Resource Committee (FSBRC) – 1 faculty member from CAS-Sciences

V. Provost's Update

A. Cluster hire proposals

1. Meeting with the groups from each successful proposal, and will have feedback meetings with the near-misses this year too, and then will meet with those considering submitting but who have not yet.

2. Best part of the process is the strategic vision over more than one year, and the interdisciplinary models being used.

3. We can also talk about centers and teaching arrangements that do not involve hiring, as a way of working around some of our bureaucratic limitations.

Q: When do the searches start?
A: They can begin now if they believe the search will be successful. All of the proposals that made it through year 1 are fundable at some point in the future. This is the goal.

Comment: Some groups think they will never receive a position.
A: We will meet with all the groups; the impression is incorrect

Q: How often are we going to do this?
A: to begin with, we will do this every year. We will see how it pans out in future years.

Comment: This year, summer break was an obstacle to full discussion. Could we have opportunities to discuss these approaches, e.g. at the FDC. E.g. brainstorming sessions, discussion of interdisciplinarity.
A: I like the idea. We have been talking about where incubation spaces might be on campus. Other venues could be the graduate school and ORDA. Looking at summer funding too.

4. The provost likes the longer planning horizon: we can see how disciplines are developing. Would like this to apply to the regular hiring cycle. This seems more oriented towards growth.

B. Pending written response to Academic Issues committee's recommendations on generative artificial intelligence.   The response is not written, but the provost will meet with the Academic   Issues committee soon to discuss the themes.

Q: Could we send an email to students stressing that individual faculty determine the rules re artificial intelligence use in their classes?

A: We would like to update language in the conduct code to clarify this. Will bring in staff to discuss this.

A similar issue is that withdrawal from a class cannot avoid consequences of academic dishonesty. There is a distinction between academic consequences in the course, and academic conduct consequences at the university level. Students need to be clear   about both.

The provost would encourage everyone to play with ChatGPT before writing your next syllabus. We may be able to use this tool in a positive way. There is a chance to improve writing style, for example—and this can be hard to detect.

Less clear how to treat effect on online exams, etc. We aren't ready to write a policy yet, but we need to look at the possibilities.

Comment: We still need to make clear that instructors must set their own policy; instructors and students need to understand this issue is important, and that individual   policies will vary.

A: FDC document does provide guidance for syllabus language. A message to students is   a great idea. Please get your departments to engage with this issue.   Use and ethics are going to evolve. Syllabi are become more important in a legalistic way. Consequences,   of academic dishonesty should be addressed on the syllabus. We have to consider disciplinary differences, for example the use of a.i. in the sales industry is generally   accepted.

C. Academic Issues Committee's [Response to Course Modality Questions from Provost](#)

Please read the response. The provost's only variance from the feedback is related to mandatory exams on campus or at remote locations for online courses. Will try to provide examples of the language we have in mind concerning examination policy by April 3.

D. Next year we will look at definitions of credit hours with respect to online courses.

E. Tomorrow the provost will send out the faculty award-winners announcement. Would like to improve attendance at the week-of-excellence events, especially the faculty awards. Lecturers will also be recognized for the first time.

Q: Plagiarism is usually handled individually. How often do you, at the provost level, deal with plagiarism violations? Does the FDC explain to faculty the consequences for students if a violation goes up the chain of command?

A: We do not see many cases. Sean Wolff in the conduct office is the one to contact about these issues. They try to follow a discipline's and the instructor's expectations.

Q: Is plagiarism mainly about intent?
A: Whether there is plagiarism does not depend on intent, but intent should help us think through the consequences. We should be clear about our expectations at the curricular level on our syllabi.

Comment: There needs to be a way to record or report when we know of student who engaged in dishonest behavior.
A: Some departments have disciplinary reasons for this, e.g. for licensing. This is a faculty issue rather than a provost-level issue; we need to respect disciplinary.

Comment: How do we address personal biases in faculty judgements?
A: This is why we need standards; standards for dishonesty are analogous to grading criteria.

Q: There are reports of non-response from the office of student responsibility concerning student misconduct. Is this being addressed?
A: Yes. Have asked the student affairs office to look at their record keeping. We do seem to be back on track. Please let provost office know if you are not getting responses from staff offices.

Comment: It is important to define what plagiarism is; e.g. what is direct quotation vs. paraphrase. University of Indiana has an online quiz for this. There is a module at EMU's library too.
A: Our librarians are great resource. E.g. see their tools about evaluating quality of a website source.

VI.   Joint Task Force on Student Mental Health and Wellness. Update on progress.
Ron Flowers was unable to attend so will discuss next month. Will be receiving a report in April on faculty well-being as well.

VII. Old Business

A.   Shared Governance Survey (closes March 11 at 11:59pm)
Letter from FS president (3/4/2024).

i. Please respond –it should take 10-15 minutes

ii. Workshop is scheduled for April 15ᵗʰ, tentatively. Would like all senators to attend.
The AAUP message has broken links but look at the taskforce's email for ones that work.

B.   Campus Master Planning Document - Campus Planning Survey - Google Form
Senators asked to submit forms by March 20

Q: Will there be a separate consultation about building accessibility, or should we raise these issues on the survey? It has been unclear in discussing this with other members of the   administration.
A: (provost) EMU distinguishes between maintenance and capital projects, and most accessibility questions fall under the former. However, you should raise these issues: if we are   working systematically, things scale up to capital projects.

Comment: From the EEFC, furniture in classrooms can be systematically exclusive, and this is a capital issue. None of the vendors have thought about inclusive seating.
A: (provost) This should be a strategic issue.

Comment: The provost working on campus-wide closed-captioning system.

Comment: All our classroom furniture faces forward – can we get more community-oriented layouts? And more environmentally-friendly furniture?
A: (provost) Some buildings do have reconfigurable furniture, e.g. Sill. Unfortunately, Pray-Harrold, the largest classroom building, does not. We want to be more sustainable. These issues belong in the master plan.

Comment: we have expertise on GACOT on this.

Comment: It would be helpful to have floor plans so we could mark them up.
A: (provost) Will try to get you access: bear in mind they are often out of date.

VIII. New Business

    A. Committee Reports:

      i. Academic Issues (Gray) - [Unanswered questions to Calvin McFarland](#)

          a. Next meeting is March 12; and meet with provost/associate provost on 26th

          b. We will try resolve questions we have been charged with, but where we have had obstacles –sometimes this is because we lack data (e.g. related to tutoring and KNACK). We are also looking at training of and coordination between faculty and general education advisors.

          Comment: (provost) Colleges and departments have different expectations about the relationship between general advising and faculty advising.

          c. Made requests for data on English language proficiency, and have consulted with World Languages TESOL faculty. Looking at impact of current policies.

      ii. Committee for Action on Intersectionality, AntiRacism, and Equity (Neufeld)
          a. Presented environmental scan at BoR faculty affairs session. BoR is establishing its own subcommittee on these issues.
          b. Final project: course evaluations' impact on marginalized faculty. There was a joint committee whose work we would like to build on. We want to move the process forward.

Comment: (provost) Please contact the provost and Matt Kirkpatrick to request their documents. We can take into account the effects in evaluating faculty, but there is more to think about how to make evaluations contribute further to instructional effectiveness. We have discussed these issues in search committees. Perhaps we could modify our DEDs.

iii.   Student Issues (Brewer)
a. At BoR, the students' presentation focused on getting students more involved on campus. Among other things, student government provides free bus passes.

b. Need faculty to attend the registration blitz in two weeks.

Comment: Biology department was disappointed at last semester's blitz: we didn't have a place to sit for 45 minutes, and there wasn't much opportunity to advise.

Response: (provost) Provost will share this. There is value in being there to signal that students belong.

Comment: (provost) we are trying to centralize information about the 12 different emergency funds.

iv. Budget and Resources and UBC (Carpenter)
a. Working on the charge of the committee based on 10-year review.
b. Jim Carroll will join BRC to discuss budget tomorrow.
c. Would like to codify where our input fits in the budgeting timeline.
d. Will also ask Carroll about disbursement of Centrio funds.
e. UBC – we will be moving forward with subgroup work after a pause.

v. Privacy Committee (Carpenter)
a. Working on privacy primers; e.g. on contract language.

vi. EEFC (Barton)
a. EMU needs to update its hazard mitigation plan, which is required by FEMA.

b. It is not clear how our private partners are subject to plan enforcement.

IX. Announcements:

A.   Next Faculty Senate is scheduled for Wed. March 20 (zoom)

B.   In-Person Faculty Senate meeting is April 3

X. Adjourned 5:18pm