Faculty Senate Executive Committee

April 16, 2015

In attendance:

17 people

(Secretary's note: as per the request of the Faculty Senate membership and because of the sensitive nature of material discussed at this meeting, for these minutes the names of commenters and most conversation subjects have been redacted and replaced with 💬 symbols for today's meeting only. In addition, a few comments have been altered slightly to remove potentially identifying information.)

💬: We're going to do a little discussion before getting to one of our more actionable items. We'll start with some background on the Constitution and Bylaws and Faculty Rights: the Constitution and Bylaws was approved Mar. 5 by Academic Council contingent on, at the time, not having full two-thirds faculty ratification. Erin O'Brien made the motion to approve it, Becky Smith seconded; it was briefly discussed, and then approved contingent on us getting those votes. We reported back when we had those votes. This last Academic Council meeting, after a University Council meeting that is normally held *after* Academic Council, we were informed that it had stalled because some of the deans had concerns about representation, which we dealt with, have talked about, understand both sides of it, and have agreed to, and we'll deal with any potential changes that need to come from that later, we've tried to stress to them—that affects a couple of divisions, there was some discussion about that, and we came to the conclusion that we thought was in the best interest after several meetings. The other issue that came up was the concept of ownership of and administration over committees—they didn't like the terminology about "administering" the committees. Basically, the intent of the addenda was to show where we have representation and the committees that we help populate and that we have governance in. As long as we change term from "administer," we should be fine. One thing that came up that really shocked me was the fact that the University Curriculum Committee—we proposed that we be the chair of the committee, replacing David Wade as the chair but letting him continue as support staff. He's done a phenomenal job keeping the organization of it, etc. We got a bit of feedback from the deans, who said "We weren't fully understanding that this is what you wanted." I said, directly, "You've had this since January 12, and I talked about it to you in November!" In the end, I said "Listen, we're trying to put these policies through just as you are, and if you don't read them, and don't have questions and talk to us about them...? This is not fair at the last hour to raise these concerns. January 12th it was 30 days; February 13th that time was up. We were systematic in how we did it. You voted on it March 5; now it's April 5, and how in the world can we go back and undo it because *now* you decided to read it?!?" That didn't make them too happy. I pointed out the fact that we have to be better, in that meeting and all of our meetings, at being accountable for what we do, and we maybe need to have more follow-up. That meeting I made some comments to them, and hopefully that will help them make some adjustments to how we're handling those meetings. We're not going to change what we've done; maybe just make some clarification to the terminology in the policy, and we'll get the Board of Trustees to vote.

💬: That was covered quite well. With regards to the Constitution and Bylaws, I presented it as it had been posted; we had discussed a voluntary consolidation of units that would, under our Constitution, qualify for individual representation if they could share the load. So our two faculty programs over in Health Sciences wouldn't among them both have to be program coordinators—they have another label than chair—and an assessment coordinator, and then to add on to that that among those two individuals to also fit in Faculty Senate representation. And Dean Grady wanted that specifically in writing. Since we'd already discussed it, it wasn't really an issue, and I assume that everyone's OK adding that in as is. The other issue raised is the wording in the addendum regarding the Faculty Senate committees, as we've been referring to them. I'm suggesting we change the wording from "populating and administering," or something close to that, to stating that members and chairs of the committees will be approved by both Faculty Senate and the Academic Vice-President, and that the committees cannot be disbanded without a vote by the Faculty Senate (what is currently the Executive Committee)—the senate of elected representatives.

💬: Holding a vote is insufficient—the Faculty Senate has to approve.

💬: Yes...approval by a vote, or by a majority vote by the Faculty Senate. I'll work on the wording.

💬: So in your original statement about changing "administer" to "the chair and the members are chosen by," that doesn't state the intention that it will be a faculty member chairing it, does it?

💬: It does not.

💬: But that was the intention.

- 💬: The reason we had the word "administer" there was because the chairs of these committees will be faculty members.
- 💬: If that's the intention, we need to word it in there.
- 💬: We definitely can. We will get kickback on the University Curriculum Committee for that.
- 💬: My term is up, but I'm having a very direct meeting with David Wade, who currently chairs the University Curriculum Committee, about his role in the new form of the committee. I would be the new chair of it—I don't want to do it, but David Wade does. But I want faculty to have ownership over the curriculum—we should have ownership over it, and somehow that's been taken away from us. Now that doesn't mean that he'll change what he's doing. I think by "administer" they thought "You're going to do what David is doing?" No. David will still do what he does. It's clear in there; they freaked out when they thought faculty were trying to "steal" all these committees and run the university.
- 💬: It's particularly an issue because, in their minds, "administer" also means that for the budgets of those various committees that have budgets, it comes out of the deans' budgets, and they're wondering how they'd be covered if they're under the purview of Faculty Senate. We never intended to be the administrative supervisors over these committees—merely that we had some control over who's in them, their agendas, etc. And also have the ability to ask them to report to us. We discussed the fact that we don't know what's happening on a lot of these committees and they are directly relevant for faculty. So we want to institute a change where the chairs are asked, at least on an annual basis, to come to these meetings and report to us as a group about what they're doing, what their priorities are, what they're hoping to accomplish, etc. so everyone is kept apprised.
- 💬: The intent of what we did before won't change, just some verbiage.
- 💬: Ideally, we want the Constitution and Bylaws to go through before the end of the semester—in my mind, that's priority #1. Because I don't want to be sitting there mid-year with a shift in the Constitution that changes representation and suddenly changes an individual's workload mid-semester. Those of us in strategic planning that had our workload unexpectedly change mid-semester would agree that it makes scheduling and meeting one's obligations challenging. So we don't want to do that to anyone. This is a priority for me, so my only concern with that wording is ensuring that we don't get it hung up because of that specific wording because of the University Curriculum Committee even though the faculty, by definition, should have ownership over the curriculum.
- 💬: David won't have an issue with that. He's been given this assignment by the Academic Vice-President, and that assignment can be changed. His assignment won't be different; just his title—he won't be "chair"; a faculty member will be the chair. David's concern is great about if we chair it, are we going to be able to get all its stuff done? Yes we will because he's going to continue doing what he's doing. One more side note: there's been committees that have been faculty staffed—there's a 1997 policy that says we should be doing that anyway, and we're not. I lot of this process of what we're doing—someone asked me "Are we doing any good? Because now we're having all these things come to light." Yes, we're doing good because we're bringing it to the surface. Our successors will be able to take that and run with it.
- 💬: The other thing that came up was that they recommended that our Bylaws and/or addenda not be treated as policy—their suggestion is that it gives us more flexibility in changing it because it won't have to go through the approval process. My response was that it also takes away some of the teeth. If it goes through the policy process, it functions to some extent as policy. The argument made was that the workload model wasn't, until I showed them that it was a policy. So even though it makes it harder to change things, in my opinion—and I'm open to other people's thoughts on this--it's a good idea at this point.
- 💬: I'd agree with that because there are some things not in policy that people think are, and some of those things are actually in the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. Other things are in the Faculty Handbook.
- 💬: It was all voted on and accepted by Academic Council previously. So it can't go back to them. We just have to make sure that University Council is OK with it.
- 💬: I don't know if this will impact it or not, but I know there's a policy movement to have less in policy and more in procedures that get updated every year. I see that point; when policy becomes much more concrete. But hopefully that won't impact it.
- 💬: I think the Constitution and Bylaws is more on the policy side than on the procedure side—it specifies what we are, not just what we do.
- 💬: Good work!
- 💬: So I get it in the minutes, everyone is comfortable with allowing me to make these modifications as I've described them, and taking it as fast as possible to University Council so it can then go to the Board of Trustees for their final meeting this semester? (💬 moves, 💬 seconds). All in favor? (All ayes.)
- 💬: Thank you. I'll e-mail it out to everyone so you can see the exact wording. Let's assume that I get it close to what we've discussed, enough to get this through at this point. That way we can move ahead with getting representatives in place.
- 💬: We have about 35 minutes to get done what we need to do next. Please keep your comments to a minimum and short and to the point. We had meeting yesterday with the Academic Vice-President (AVP) to discuss the process going on in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee right now. We assured him that this was *not* a vote of no confidence, but purely just to see if it was something we want to turn over to the general faculty. So the discussion today is not whether or not

we're going to vote no confidence; it's whether or not we want to allow it to go to the general faculty. The AVP issued a statement from his office regarding some of the concerns we had, and asked that we read that to you. I would like to read that to you.

💬: How many people were here last time and aren't aware of the motion?

💬: We're proposing that the following statement be put to the general faculty for a vote. (Reads statement.) That would be presented to full faculty for a vote. Last time, it was mentioned that this is *not* a reflection of the AVP as a person—we'd happily welcome him back to campus as a faculty if he chose to do that. We have precedent for that with former President Huddleston.

💬: Just to be clear on the record, I don't believe there was a vote on him.

💬: But someone from a higher position coming back to faculty—that's the precedent. If the AVP wanted to do that, it would be perfectly appropriate and he'd be welcome—this is *not* about expelling him from the institution; merely a reflection of his position as Academic Vice-President. One thing happened yesterday in a meeting with him. He made a very important point: he said that if he understood that half of faculty were displeased with him, he'd step down—he wouldn't want to function if he knew that. Even if one-third were dissatisfied, he'd want to step down. I asked "How would you know that without a faculty vote?" Part of the purpose of this is to find out. Two things: first, there are probably a number of these issues that faculty don't know about, so by making this public, it's partly informing faculty of what he's doing in his job; and second, it would give them a chance to vote on whether they are happy with his tenure or not.

💬: What exactly has the AVP done?

💬: Here's a summary. I want to emphasize that this is *not* a disagreement on outcomes, but this is about how he approaches making decisions and how he applies policy, or doesn't, regarding the decisions he makes. For example, some of the things in here have to deal with what may be considered mistakes that have had significant consequences. I'll give you two examples. One was a personnel issue that involved others. This was expressed to the AVP and he responded, in addition to that faculty member, he cc'd the person in the concern who was involved—this was a gross violation of that person's privacy because they wanted it kept confidential—I'm convinced this was an accident because the cc was to someone with a similar name as the one he intended to send the e-mail to. But it reflected the sharing of highly sensitive, confidential information. Another mistake that I only found out since our last meeting was that the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) at the end of last Spring contacted the AVP about reconstituting the committee that oversees athletics. There were a couple members of the committee that she expressed concerns about because there were possible NCAA violations that they were involved in. She requested that he remove them from the committee. By the next Fall, it had been forgotten: he hadn't done that. Those were mistakes, but had fairly significant consequences—one of those people was fired. The concern was legitimate, and it was something he was supposed to attend to, and he didn't. That's one set. Another set is that he seems to have an approach of ignoring policy and taking things upon himself because he has a personal interest or a desire to do some things. Examples are the bell schedule change in School of Business—the School proposed to eliminate Friday classes to free up time for a number of activities, including meetings. In the process, it violated the bell schedule—we have a very clear bell policy regarding Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedules which we have to ensure that final exams are scheduled consistently—there aren't overlaps to ensure that there's maximum use of classroom space. In deciding to make that decision, and accepting that proposal without votes by any of the appropriate committees that he chairs, he's caused a number of problems, because he chose to violate or ignore policy. He's hired at least two people outside the normal hiring process where their terminal degree credentials were controversial and they didn't go through a full search—even for visiting professor positions, it's quite common to at least have some kind of national search. Especially on our campus where faculty positions are really valuable right now...! One person was hired for a position that didn't really exist and that he made up; the other was hired for a position where their highest degree didn't qualify them for it. The third issue that was similar to that was an academic integrity issue that he overturned. He has since, after hearing about this proposal, he has apologized and said he made a mistake on that one. But my impression is that until this proposal arose, he's claimed that we've never addressed the issues with him, though Faculty Senate leadership have done so repeatedly. I don't think he realized the gravity of these issues until this happened. That's my concern: without a constant threat over his head, I think we'll see the same pattern continue. There are other issues. His approach to resolving controversial issues is sometimes clumsy and heavy-handed, and he's done some things that have been intimidating to members of my department. Part of the hope in bringing this public, we might find out other things that we don't know about, other departments that have been affected. The FAR thing came up only because this happened to get mentioned in a phone call about something else. I personally see a pattern that's a combination of ignoring policy and a lack of care for things that are very important.

💬: So, again, what the motion being made is that if the vote in this room approves the motion, we'll then take this statement to the general faculty for a vote of no confidence. What we're voting on here is to put forward a vote of no confidence.

💬: Just to be clear, the ramification of what happens after...let's say that we send this on to the general faculty, and say that the general faculty reply saying that they want to vote "no confidence," what are the ramifications that would then persist?

💬: Either way the vote goes, it goes to President Williams and the AVP so they'd know how faculty feel.

💬: The President said it would instigate an investigation of the issues outlined in the motion and the vote. There's no policy in place to deal with a vote of no confidence—we've asked what would happen *if*, and we've just gotten individual responses.

💬: So one possible outcome is that nothing changes except that he's now aware that he needs to be more aware of what he's doing. That's a potential outcome. Another is in the other direction and we get a new Academic Vice-President. Any range in the middle is my assumption.

💬: In light of that, the AVP has asked that we communicate to you this statement, and he specifically requested that we provide members of this committee with copies of this and read it to you. (Reads.)

💬: There's a lot there, I understand. In 10 minutes, we need to be done with this meeting, but if at the end of 10 minutes we're not done discussing this but that you have adequate information to cast a secret ballot, you can do so. If continued discussion needs to go on before you feel comfortable casting your ballot, we'll stay as long as we need to. We're not going to go to the point of sequestering. This is very sensitive and we need to make sure we give it our fullest attention and our vote.

💬: One clarification: the term originally used was "harassment," but it could be changed to a "personal conduct issue"—the affected faculty member is very sensitive about that.

💬: Quick question: it looked to me like, in #4, is says "multiple students in multiple divisions," but the proposed statement doesn't say that.

💬: the AVP was given a one-page summary version—it was on there, as was the FAR issue. Others know more about this issue, but at least three students were involved because the case of plagiarism included a paper being copied by one student from a paper used by two other students.

💬: One student had written a paper that was then used by two students in different classes and different programs.

💬: That's why they thought they were getting away with it—they weren't in the same class. To say that that's similar to "54% of all students that plagiarize is incorrect—this was the kind of plagiarism that goes far beyond that.

💬: To clarify: what did the AVP do? He removed the fact that cheating was on the transcript?

💬: The faculty members, if I remember correctly, instituted certain sanctions against the students. It went to a faculty review board who made certain decisions and overturned some of those things. One of the students that still had a sanction went to the AVP and asked for it to be overturned, and one of those things was the transcript notation of an academic integrity failure grade. He overturned that.

💬: The concern here is that he overturned a faculty hearing board, institution-wide committee decision. It wasn't even the overturning so much as that he didn't go to the committee and discuss how he might be contrary to their decision.

💬: So that's clearly *not* "one faculty member."

💬: It is not—it was a committee that made the decision.

💬: Is that clear enough?

💬: But his action only affected the one student.

💬: Two things that stuck out to me are #1 and #3—please clarify for me so I can understand: it sounds like he's addressing something different than the complaint. It seems like #1 is a defense of his actions in his viewpoint, of his "experiment." And we're complaining about how it violates policy.

💬: That's been made clear to him. The bell schedule hasn't gone through the process. He's defending his decision, but we're concerned about getting to the heart of the matter.

💬: #3 is similar—we're not really questioning their credentials, but the hiring process—the lack of a normal search process.

💬: Currently, policy allows him to do this.

💬: It does, but with regards to 💬, Criminal Justice didn't ask for this position, nor did any other department. The AVP found the candidate and asked the departments if they could use him. It didn't come out of a need from the programs or the usual process of how we identify faculty that are needed. But realize that in his statement, he asks that we focus on the end result. But regardless of the end result, faculty will almost always disagree about results—they have different opinions. And they will often have different opinions than administration—that's OK. But that's why we have processes—to ensure fairness leading to a decision. This proposal isn't out to ruin the AVP's career; it's just to bring these issues to the general faculty so they can decide whether or not action is warranted. Because there's no policy about this, it could have been brought straight to the general faculty, but this isn't a personal issue, as he has made it.

💬: After this process goes through, my suggestion is that we come up with some sort of a process for a number of senators sponsoring a no confidence vote such as this, or how it gets to full faculty, or something like that, to make sure everyone is protected. I go on record that I'm grateful this has been brought up.

💬: While we're on #3, the one line where he accuses this action as being because 💬 is Muslim feels highly unprofessional and almost becomes its own complaint. It almost jumps onto the list because to assert that that's why this issue has been raised...!

💬: Regardless of the result of what happens today, one of the highest issues will be to address that point.

🗨: That should be unrelated to whether he got the job or not.

🗨: One of the problems with the process: the AVP also claims he's putting into place better avenues of communication with Faculty Senate—that's already been in place with monthly meetings; we started that last year. But I understand that there have been problems scheduling meetings with him.

🗨: Because he was out of the country for a time and because of strategic planning meetings.

🗨: But that process has been in place. Some of these issues have been raised before; others have been raised by them directly. I don't think he sees the process issues—he focuses on the end product. In a way, the end product might have turned out well—🗨 sounds like he's a good teacher, and that's fine. But without emphasizing one issue over another, I don't think the AVP values following process and policy.

🗨: If my students voted no confidence on me for little things I've done that they were all upset about, I'd probably be out of here by now—I've probably done things to offend people here and there and I've done what I can to deal with it. I think we hire administrators to administer and sometimes, if they don't follow the policy, we need to remind them, but I don't think we need to go as far as putting this out publicly.

🗨: My main concerns with all this is that to me, as it's been presented—I've been unaware of the vast majority of these things until last meeting—from my perspective, it sounds like he *has* been reminded, that he *has* been constantly told where he's messing up, and it's not changing—these things aren't seeming to make an impact on him. If a vote of no confidence is his wake-up call, then it's a wake-up call. Because based on my limited knowledge of these issues, what we have done doesn't seem to be working. That's how I'm seeing it.

🗨: Unfortunately, this (statement) feels like it's not defending him—it reads defensively. If it was more apologetic—if I had a bad evaluation from students, I wouldn't just say "Well, that's just the way I teach!" I'd say "I'm sorry" and find ways to be more effective. Unfortunately, his letter doesn't help my vote. It feels very defensive.

🗨: The motion was previously that we allow or disallow. If it fails, we can talk about other things we can do as a body. But at this point, unless there is more discussion that needs to be had, which we will allow. If nothing else is pressing, I'll call for the motion. But if there's more discussion needed, let me know.

🗨: I understand its defensive, but this action is also a straight attack against him—it's his whole career, and I'd get defensive too in that position—we're about to slash his whole work.

🗨: No, I challenge that—we're only going to present this to the general faculty—we're not deciding no confidence now. If the faculty vote against no confidence, it'll look favorable for him. But if they don't...they need a chance to vote. They need to hear these things and have a vote.

🗨: I disagree—even to have the vote is a negative reflection on him.

🗨: I agree.

🗨: Me, too.

🗨: But the purpose of *this* discussion is to see if *we* all feel that it's warranted to bring this vote forward.

🗨: This is a binary vote—yes or no. If we pass it, it goes to the full faculty; there may be media attention surrounding it, which has been mentioned before. But the faculty will get to see all of these allegations and then vote. If it doesn't go through, as was mentioned there are other options we can explore—can we get a summary of what those are? Maybe there's a consensus that *something* needs to happen even if there's disagreement about *what.*

🗨: I think we have a *general* sense of what some of the other options are, but if vote fails, I'll immediately entertain motions for other courses of action.

🗨: So it's open-ended. OK.

🗨: There are some events that have happened this year already that have already led to some media attention and possibly perceived animosity between faculty members and the administration at this school. It's my feeling that to bring a vote of no confidence to the general faculty will contribute to the negativity and a growing sense of animosity that in fact there *is* some kind of disconnect between faculty and administration here. That's not an image that I'd like to further.

🗨: Point well taken.

🗨: I'd agree—I'm torn. I don't think we need to stoke a fire that is already stoked. But I'm torn because I'm seeing mistakes, and it scares me that if someone in that position consistently makes mistakes and doesn't see it...!

🗨: I don't know how I'm going to vote. I also think we need to keep that somewhat separate—I don't think a decision of this much gravity, for a person with this much authority, whether we should do something or not do something based on what the local media will feel about it—we need to do what's best for the *institution*, and I feel that's the basis of our vote.

🗨: It needs to be given only the appropriate amount of weight, for sure. I kind of agree and disagree—it needs to carry weight, but not more than it should.

🗨: We've been talking this whole time about policy getting started as far as us being able to evaluate our higher ups—there's no recourse for us to do that. This is a way to throw that out there and say "This is our evaluation of you." We can say "You haven't been doing this and this and several other things"; it's just a scratch of the surface. If you talk to people in your department, there's been other things done that aren't listed here that haven't been brought up. This is a way to

bring up some other things and give him a wake-up call and say "Look, you need to improve and make this a better institution. We need to feel that you know what the policies are," and he's not following those.

💬: That might be some of the answer about what options we have if it doesn't have enough votes to carry. That could be an option. But I think that the motion isn't what our options are, it's yes or no, and if no, we'll immediately entertain other options for things we can do.

💬: These are all phenomenal comments—my tremendous respect for all of you. This shows we're willing to fight for making the institution better by helping people along the way with the right things to do. I guess I commend you for your comments and honesty.

💬: Could we release the minutes of today's meeting without the identifying initials? If these comments are all going to be recorded, I request that we remove the names.

💬: We could leave the entire set of minutes off the record.

💬: Or do we want the minutes to reflect some of the opinions, so that way it is part of what is communicated to the AVP?

💬: I think it's perfectly appropriate for us to maintain confidentiality as much as possible, that we keep the details secret. I think that would be fine. I agree with the sensitivity. As much as this is public, there will be *some* stain on him. I don't think it's as strong as some people, but if we can keep more of it private, if that helps, great. This shouldn't be a public flogging of him.

💬: I don't much care one way or another; I'd just assume people knew what my opinions were.

💬: But some people don't want that.

💬: Among the individuals here, we have some people that have tenure and some that do not. If you feel the decision you want to make based on your opinion of the situation is not one that puts you at risk, then there's a reason to make it public. If you feel that your opinion might put you under threat, then it changes things. So by default we have to be careful about that. We have to protect *all* members of this organization, regardless of individual opinions. We have to protect all of our non-tenured faculty. Those of us with tenure have a little more leeway.

💬: The concerns are very serious about anonymity, but ultimately, a panel of our peers reviews the tenure portfolios—if we're concerned that if we go with no confidence, and the AVP maintains an office, now he's labeled some of us that are or will be going up for tenure—that's a valid concern. However, the process is such that I don't think—

💬: One of my issues casts doubt on that. After the faculty supported tenure, he initiated what he called an "exploration" in which he interviewed everyone in one department about one specific person.

💬: Are we requiring the vote at this point in time?

💬: Ballots will be collected if you're comfortable with your opinion and casting a vote. If it turns out we decide to go to a vote today, your vote will be counted; if not, and if we decide to continue the conversation, fresh ballots will be distributed later.

💬: I understand that ultimately that issue about that faculty member's tenure has been resolved—I know that there was a process that was wrong, but the person has now been put forward for tenure. But the concern is well taken—I don't want to discredit that.

💬: Have we agreed that if the minutes are released, our names are not attached?

💬: I propose that the minutes not be released.

💬: Do we want the notes not released? Is that a general opinion?

💬: As long as there's not names attached, I'm OK with releasing them.

💬: I'd even redact the list of names of people who were in attendance, and just put the number of people that were in attendance.

💬: I think those that are here have had ample discussion.

💬: I second the motion of proceeding with a vote.

💬: Any more discussion?

💬: We're calling for votes. Please mark one of the options on the ballot.

(Much overlapping conversation for a couple of minutes.)

💬: A good point has been raised—in case you were unaware because you were missing meetings, we have brought our concerns to the attention of the President and he's aware that a motion has been made to vote on whether or not to bring the proposal for a vote to the general faculty. Just so everyone is aware that he knows.

(Counts ballots, including one email vote.) *(Secretary's note: the exact tally has been redacted; the outcome of the vote was against bringing the proposal forward to the general faculty.)*

💬: I am wondering if perhaps...can we do this now? I think there's an opportunity to emend the motion...?

💬: No, this motion is done.

💬: OK, then I would like to move, then, that we draft a letter to the AVP expressing our concerns as a body, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, to be named Faculty Senate when Constitution goes through. This would express our concerns about the issues raised in previous motion.

💬: Seconded.

💬: How will we solicit concerns if the proposal's list is incomplete?

💬: The minutes, with no names, are a great summary of what the concerns are.

💬: I believe that more will come out if a call is made publicly to express concerns to other faculty.

💬: If we make a public call, we'll be doing what we're trying to avoid doing.

💬: Could individual representatives quietly discuss this without necessarily making it about the vote or a letter—just "Hey, some concerns have come up in Faculty Senate—how do you feel, is there anything you're aware of, because we're trying to get a sense of what's been going on...?"

💬: I can solicit input from my constituents just by striking up a conversation and say "Just between you and me and the Senate..."

💬: We can be straight up without being dishonest and say that Faculty Senate has a motion in front of them to draft letter to the Academic Vice-President regarding concerns we would like addressed and how we can be better moving forward. That's legitimate.

💬: Not even "concerns about the AVP."

💬: Correct. Concerns about shared governance, academic program, academic decisions...however we want to put it. At this point, I think we've taken off the table that we're going to say "We don't have confidence in the AVP."

💬: If you type a statement, it'd be nice to have at the next meeting the same statement, and then some kind of a format they can respond.

💬: At the next General Faculty meeting?

💬: We could, yes.

💬: That's typically going to be 30–40 people, so...

💬: The question is confidential on the minutes.

💬: If we do that, will he just send us a copy of this statement again?

💬: I'll suggest that the motion be emended that a copy of this goes into his file—to remain at this institution; it won't travel with him, but it will go to the President; a copy will be shared with the Board of Trustees, and it will be from the Faculty Senate.

💬: I'd also suggest the motion be emended to include some sort of language from the Senate acknowledging this document (the AVP's statement) but maybe expressing our dissatisfaction with the nature of the apologies. That seems to have been a general thing here—that this is not good enough, and this isn't what we want. The deficiencies have been discussed to the point here that I think we can qualify them on paper.

💬: The motion was made, but can we table it until a more specific motion has been crafted that includes some of the concerns that we've had? We can, I think, put that motion through an e-mail vote, rather than convene the body, or have a 5 minute coffee to convene the body to discuss and vote on the motion. I just don't know if the motion will be perfect for what we want today. I don't think it behooves us to wait until the next meeting. Can a motion be put together to distribute by e-mail, and then we'll vote on it at the next meeting?

💬: So people can review it before coming to the next meeting, and discuss changes that might be needed?

💬: It could be pretty informal by e-mail—it doesn't even have to be an official motion. Just to collaborate on it; then we can make a motion and second it and approve it all in one meeting.

💬: Can we do it via Google Docs?

💬: We have to be concerned about anonymity—if I contribute to that document, and then someone shares that document with the AVP, he could see who typed what.

💬: I see. But if I share it as a link, you show up as anonymous.

💬: Unless we put it to our own Google Drives, which Google does automatically.

💬: OK, I'll do it by e-mail then.

💬: Send your concerns to leadership.

💬: But dmail belongs to the university.

💬: It does...

💬: I'm thinking we should just take notes and come prepared to the meeting.

💬: So for all suggestions, what we're doing is that you're going to come back next meeting with a letter addressed to administration, and then a motion will be made that the letter be distributed to the AVP, the President, or whomever, and we'll vote on it at that time.

💬: Yes. The motion was originally made here because it seemed to be the consensus of the group.

💬: In conclusion, the end result of this meeting today was that we, as a collective body, did not feel the support was there to take anything to general faculty. I'm going to request that the results of the vote be redacted. I don't know who would ask; this was a Senate matter.

💬: Will the AVP know the results?

💬: The question is, are you OK with my revealing the results to the AVP?

💬: No. Why?

💬: Because it indicates that concern was more widespread than just one person.

💬: It protects the proposal's sponsor. There was no way to tell where the vote was going to go.

💬: No, you're absolutely right: it sends the message that there is concern, but we respect that perhaps an adversarial relationship is not the way to go.

💬: If you're OK with that, I'll tell the AVP the tally.

💬: Why don't we e-mail everyone *(some people have had to leave by this point in the meeting)* and make sure that everyone that was present is comfortable with that?

💬: OK.

💬: I move the meeting be adjourned. (All approved.)