

Planning for the General Senate Meeting and Gender Equity Committee Resolution

- McNie shared the draft resolution for dissolving the Gender Equity ad hoc committee, commending Julie Simons for her leadership, and detailing where the future work in this area will be happening.
- Tsai offered some feedback that McNie will implement. Fairbanks [accidentally] reiterated the request for more specificity in where this work would continue on campus - DEI Council, etc.

Academic Integrity Committee Grade Appeal Procedures

- McNie shared the request for change in grade procedures.
- EO 1037: Assignment of Grade and Grade Appeals Policy was briefly reviewed.
- Some language in the current policy was highlighted as being problematic in its subjective nature (among other concerns). For example, one of the current bases for
- Provost Schroeder added that she was struck by the language in the current grade process policy. She noted that DHR (Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation) issues are at the very least awkward and possibly incurs legal liability for faculty on the AIC who are rendering these decisions.
- Yip had some questions about what the proposed changes would entail. Who would handle the DHR? Answer: Ideally the Title IX/DHR coordinator. Yip thought that AIC members, if properly trained, would handle the issue better than HR. Provost Schroeder noted that potentially opens faculty up to liability if a student were to sue

- Haller noted that the student handbook should contain this information ó who to report to, who handles it, etc. She expanded on this, noting the handbook and what the process is for editing it. It seems like it gets changed when it gets changed on the website without notice.
- McNie ó if we had someone in DHR on campus (trained and hired for that purpose), would that allay some of your concerns? Yip ó yes, they could handle determination of bias and the AIC could then render the decision on the grade change.
- McNie ó this will be a further discussion with the General Senate when we start these revisions.
- Tsai asked where (administratively) we go from here since this is an Academic Affairs (not Senate) policy. Provost Schroeder said it affects faculty directly. Some discussion ó agreement that current AIC members should be consulted early in this revision process. Provost Schroeder asked whether this would be a situation where she should reach out to the University General Counsel for legal advice. There was agreement that this was a good idea.
- McNie ó ok, yes, return to this issue very soon.

Professional Leave Committee

- Senk summarized the current, unfortunate, situation: the IBL member stepped down recently without giving a reason, the former Chair resigned and is
- The old PLC policy actually says there should be one member from each department. MT have turned down their opportunity to have a representative. IBL has two people conflicted out (applying for sabbatical this cycle), Nipoli Kamdar (IBL Chair), and the person who stepped down as possible candidates. Raises the question of what we do when the only eligible department member refuses to serve. Exec recommendation is to allow the department to decide: either convince the one eligible member who stepped down to step up, or forego a representative.
- Senk shared the policy that went through a first reading last year] to try to form a PLC policy.
- Some discussion of the part of the sabbatical application rubric that considers a concern expressed about possible bias and also the ability of the PLC to properly assess the quality of prior work. Senk asserted that this was meant to address whether the
- Senk has added suggestions to the rubric for rating sabbatical. This prior record item appears there as one item among approximately a half dozen, all equally weighted.
- Discussion of the size of the Committee: Should it remain one per department? Or one per School? One per department seems excessive and creates problems when small departments have no eligible members who can serve. Committee should be similar in size to RTP Committee.
-

y gōn'nggr 'y ku'o qxlpg. Senk suggests inviting feedback now, presenting the policy at the November senate meeting, and aiming for approval by January or February.

- After the above, there was a brief discussion of committee representation and service inequity amongst faculty. Relatively few faculty end up doing a very large proportion of ugtxleg."cpf "y gtg'f qgupø'uggo "q'dg"ç'i qqf "b gej cpkuo "hqt"eqo r gmkpi "ugtxleg."gxgp" yj qwi j "kø"eqpvcwcm{ "o gcpv"q"dg"ç"r qt vqp"qh"cp{ "hwn-time tenure-track/tenured facun{ø'y qtmqcf 0

Senate Standing Committee Policies

- We need them! Committees were instructed to have these completed by the end of 2021.

- Isakson ó did Mike Kazek get the numbers of students who need cruise? Answer: yes. Isakson ó cpf 'y gæt'pqr rppkpi "c"ugeqpf "eruse because of dry-dock? Moorhead ó the f qenlr ceg'j cupø' { gv'dggp'tgugt xgf . "dw'k'h'j g"ft {-dock extends into the school year, it will wreak havoc with courses in the fall.
- Some discussion of whether the academic calendar could be adjusted to try to plan around this eventuality. This sounds very difficult to plan around. The calendar is not finalized, but planning has been in progress.
- We should invite the new Captain to visit a future meeting! General consensus immediately achieved.

Meeting Adjourned