

MINUTES OF
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
May 3, 2016

The fifth Faculty Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year was called to order by Prof. Fernando Guzman at 11:

b. Diversity Committee

Prof. Guzman noted that the Senate charged an ad-hoc committee to establish a charge and composition of the Diversity Committee and asked for discussion.

Prof. Thomas Sinclair, Public Administration, thanked the committee for its work. He noted that the FSEC had discussion on this and they did not approve or disapprove. This document has been sent to the Senate directly. Prof. Sinclair noted that there is one concern regarding the fourth paragraph under "Charge". This is not something that is done for any other Senate committee, so this creates a new policy and procedure. We already have a procedure in the Senate for people to have a voice and this creates a different kind of procedure that no other committee has.

Prof. Sinclair suggested an amendment to the first sentence of the fourth paragraph as follows:

"Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee motions pertaining to the purview of the Diversity Committee may be reviewed and commented upon."

Motion was made and seconded to accept this amendment.

Prof. Michael said it seems that this purview is too broad for its purpose. We should not have to take motions in the Senate to this committee again.

One Senator noted that members of the committee will have familiarity with diversity and inclusion. This purview is not limited to that.

Prof. Ricardo Laremont, Political Science and Sociology, noted that the mandate of the Diversity Committee is too broad. It would be recruitment, retention and curriculum matters with concern about recruitment and retention. This committee, as it is set up now, would be reviewing applications. Prof. Guzman explained that all policies related to diversity and inclusion would include policies related to retention, admission, but not personnel cases. This committee will only review policies and will not review admission and personnel cases. Prof. Laremont agreed that the committee needs to look at incentives and supports the amendment.

Prof. Jeff Barker, Geological Sciences, said that the word "may" is too weak and perhaps "should be" is better. Prof. Sinclair agreed to this change.

Prof. Leslie Gates, Sociology, asked how this committee is formed and how the membership changes? Prof. Guzman noted that this is shown in the document under "Composition." Members are suggested by the Committee on Committees and approved by the FSEC.

Prof. Howard Brown, History, noted that Prof. Sinclair's suggested amendment is an improvement to this document. The focus needs to be on policy and procedures. If there are concerns with diversity and inclusion, one should look to become a member of this committee. It is possible that this committee will be the only committee that looks at diversity. It is also possible that there could be problems with diversity on other Senate committees. The Diversity Committee could bring this out in the open. Prof. Brown supports this amendment and hopes that we can redirect our efforts on diversity in membership of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Prof. Lisa Tessman, Philosophy, noted that the charge does discuss advising administration, working with other divisions, and reviewing policies and their effectiveness. We do keep an eye on administration and different areas around campus. Prof. Tessman suggested keeping the first sentence as originally stated and strike the sentence that follows and all bullet points.

Prof. Guzman reiterated that the charge of this committee is to review policies as pointed out to Prof. Laremont. Secondly, the first part of the "Charge" refers to advising the administration. Prof. Guzman commented on the diversity of the Senate. The demographic composition of the FSEC compared with the entire faculty is in line, although it is very far from the demographic of society at large. If we believe that faculty should be more diverse, then the FSEC should be more diverse.

Prof. Brown commented that the focus should be on the diversity issue and not on approval of motions. Discussing issues here or at the FSEC level is essential to appreciate the rationale before policies are made. The amendment captures its purpose relative to diversity.

After no more discussion, a vote was taken on the first amendment:

"Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee motions pertaining to the purview of the Diversity Committee should be reviewed and commented upon".

This ~~PTi0051600B41001100030003~~

