

Faculty Senate Business Meeting
February 22, 2021

Submitted by K. Craven

Members Present:

Stephanie Adams, Douglas Airhart, Dan Allcott, Michael Allen, Jeremy Blair, Troy Brachey, Chris Brown, Debra Bryant, Wei Tsun Chang, Kris Craven, Dennis Duncan, Mary Lou Fornehed, David Hajdik, Tammy Howard, Janet Isbell, Brian Jones, Christy Killman, Nancy Kolodziej, Matt Langford, Emily Lee, Chad Luke, Ann Manginelli, Lori Maxwell, Jennifer Meadows, Mark Melichar, Holly Mills, Lachelle Norris, David Larimore, Linda Null, Brian O'Connor, Joseph Ojo, Anthony Paradis, Sally Pardue, Richard Rand, Jeff Roberts, Mike Rogers, Lee Ann Shipley, Troy Smith, Sandra Smith-Andrews, Barry Stein, Holly Stretz, Daniel Swartling, Lenly Weathers, Robert Wilbanks, Zac Wilcox, Kimberly Winkle, Russ Witcher, Jeannette Wolak

Members Absent:

Yun Ding, Steven Frye, Susan Laningham

1. Call to Order

Senate President Holly Stretz called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Senator Rand made a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Smith-Andrews seconded. There was no discussion. The motion was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes (January 25, 2021 Business Meeting) and Notes (February 8, 2021 Meeting with the President)

Senator Smith-Andrews made a motion to approve. Senator Airhart seconded. Two minor editorial changes were requested. Secretary Craven indicated that these changes have already been made. In item #4 regarding the procedures of the Senate, Senator Airhart asked if there was additional work needed based on the previous discussion about the new BOT Representative. That is, if the person who is elected is not a current Senator, they would be added as a new Senator but would not be placed on either the Academic or the Administrative Council. It was determined that this is correct and that no further action was required. The motion carried and both documents are approved.

4. Nominating Committee for BOT Faculty Representative (Pardue)

Senator Pardue gave an update of the status of the process. There are two candidates who have submitted the proper materials to be considered for the position, Sandi Smith-Andrews and Dan Allcott. Secretary Craven will forward to packets to the Senators prior to the next Business Meeting on March 22. At that meeting the candidates will give a brief presentation and then the Senate will vote to elect the new Board of Trustees Faculty Representative.

5. Nominating Committee formation for President Elect of Faculty Senate

Senate President Stretz asked when the committee should be formed. Voting is scheduled for April 19 at the final Business Meeting of the year. Answer: now. Senate President Elect Wolak indicated that the Senate Procedures indicate that the chair should be the current Senate President Elect and she volunteered. Senators Smith-Andrews and Rand volunteered. The committee is formed.

6. Faculty Senate President update

Senate President Stretz presented that there have been some issues in Prescott Hall resulting from the severe weather event. Therefore, she does not have an update for the Senate at this meeting.

7. Review of After-Action Report

Senate President Stretz has circulated the report to the Senators since the last Business Meeting. It has also been circulated to Terry Saltsman and the Provost's Office. She would like to thank those who participated in this process.

Stephanie Adams
Douglas Airhart
Chris Brown
Debra Bryant
Dennis Duncan
Mary Lou Fornhead
Janet Isbell
Nancy Kolodziej

Matthew Langford
Emily Lee
Chad Luke
Jeanette (Wolak) Luna
Lori Maxwell
Jennifer Meadows
Mark Melichar
Lachelle Norris

Linda Null
Brian O Conner
Richard Rand
Jeff Roberts
Troy Smith
Russ Witcher

8. Review of TUFs Workload Survey and Legislative Update (Smith-Andrews)

Senator Smith-Andrews discussed the importance of this report. We either already have or will soon have access to an Executive Summary and a full report. Senate President Elect Wolak said that she was impressed with some of the points made at the recent meeting. Some concerning issues include the fact that some states are reconsidering the use of tenure, and some potential changes from the open carry bill. Discussion focused on the different interpretation of the existing expectations for carrying a firearm on campus, the use of the classroom to promote an agenda, and issues being considered about tenure. Senator Smith-Andrews reminded the Senators that for a resolution to pass in TUFs it must be voted for by the majority of the Senate representatives from the Senates across the state. These are on the TUFs web site. Senate President Stretz said that TUFs is growing in strength and increasing its attention to these issues, therefore this is an opportune time to talk about the importance of tenure and what it means to us.

9. Old Business

No old business was discussed.

11. Such Other Matters

The issue of the approval of the new student organization “Turning Point” was discussed. Senator Smith-Andrews said that the Administrative Council was required to approve the application and were told that it would be hard to deny the group since they had cleared all of the hurdles of the process. Issues that were discussed include the fact that the presenters of the application seemed to avoid certain questions and possibly misrepresent their connection to the national organization, Turning Point USA. Some of the Administrative Council members were aware of the national organization bylaws and were concerned that the bylaws submitted by the TTU group did not match. They used language that seemed to indicate an openness to all points of view, but some members of the council were not convinced and wished to vote against approval. However, the council members did not approve of the way they were treated and told that they essentially had to vote in favor.

Senator Shipley discussed the situation from the agenda that came from an article in the Herald Citizen. This information is included in the supplemental materials section for this Business Meeting.

There was further discussion about a desire to see the by laws of the group and the formal process for approving new student organizations. What is the role of Student Affairs in the process? If the Administrative Council was essentially required to approve because the students had completed the correct process, then why is there a need for an official vote? There is concern about limiting student organizations from being formed, where is the line between acceptable and unacceptable. If the organization does not abdicate violence and is not participating in hate speech, do we have a right to deny them? Some Senators expressed that the university needs to assure that they will protect other faculty and students if there is a threat in the future.

Senator Paradis presented a project that he is starting and would be interested in collaborating with other Senators to help get it going. It started by working with athletes on campus with their nutrition. Now he is wanting to expand and offer similar consultation to other faculty and students on campus. He has had a hard time getting support and is considering expanding into the community. He indicated that the service would be no cost to the participants and is covered on our Blue Cross Blue Shield insurance. His current goal is to start a grassroots movement.

Returning to the approval of student organizations, who is responsible for doing the evaluation of the organization and whether they are a group we want to have associated with the university. Discussion is healthy, but how do we know if the intention includes ties to offensive practices. What trap doors are we willing to open? Is this a good test case for future approvals? It was stated that the Administrative Council meeting was interesting and it appeared to some that the presenters were not transparent about the groups purpose and not appropriately prepared for the meeting. There was a definite negative tone in regards to voting against approval.

Is it better to have them meeting on campus with a faculty advisor as opposed to off-campus with no mentor? Is it stepping on the rights of some to give privileges to others? There were

additional questions regarding funding. One reason to have a formal and approved student organization is to have access to university funding opportunities. What happens to any money held by the organization if it is dissolved. In this instance, the bylaws say that it will not go to the national organization. The Senators felt this was a positive thing. However, many of them felt they were being reprimanded by the Dean of Students for having reservations about approving the charter. They are requesting that we invite the Dean of Students to attend the next meeting for a discussion of these issues, including (but not necessarily limited to) the process for approving a new student organization, the conditions and process for dechartering an organization, expectations of the faculty advisor in the process, and what (if any) role does a department or dean's office play.

Adjournment

Senator Rand moved to adjourn the meeting. Senator Mills seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Approved: March 22, 2021