The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Freymiller at 3:08 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28, 2017 in the Dakota Ballroom of Davies Center.

1) Approval of the March 14, 2017 University Senate minutes
   - Approved as amended
     - Minutes were amended to reflect that any discussion of implementation of EDI would be ruled out of order

2) Administrator Remarks
   - Campus may look different because work has begun on the Garfield Avenue project
   - Contactor hopes to complete this project ahead of schedule
   - Chancellor Schmidt has been in Washington DC; has spoken with Wisconsin delegation and a few offices in the Minnesota delegation, benefactors and alumni
     - Has been recruiting applicants for Assistance Chancellor for EDI and the Assistant Chancellor for Finance positions
   - Circles of Change
     - Pilot projects end this week; actions will be identified; interested participants should contact Audrey Robinson
   - Compensation issues are being finalized and proposals should be coming forward in early April
     - Hope to have one-time retention/equity payments paid out before end of the fiscal year
   - Professional Development
     - Training sessions for all supervisors have begun

3) Reports
   a) Report from University Senate Chair Freymiller
      - Since the last Senate meeting, Chancellor Schmidt has approved the following Senate actions:
        - To change the name of the Minor: Russia and East European Studies to European Studies in the Department of Languages
        - To establish a multidisciplinary minor in Military Leadership to be housed in the Department of Management and Marketing and with History, Geography/Anthropology, and Communication/Journalism
• To change the FASRP to merge the University Senate Nominating Committee, University Academic Staff Nominating Committee, and University Faculty Nominating Committee into a single University-wide Nominating Committee
• To add language to the FASRP that includes contributions to equity, diversity, and inclusivity to be used in performance evaluations and promotions for Academic Staff

4) Unfinished Business
   a) Second Reading: Motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee

   EDI: Faculty Performance (as amended 3/14/17)

Debate
   • One department has included EDI in its evaluation plan and also provided examples
   • We are creating an expectation, but not being clear about what we are expecting
   • Other areas in the FASRP are clear; this is not clear about what we expect for EDI
   • Definitions vary and there is a reluctance to draw on documents
   • This motion should not be imposed on the entire campus when not all parties may hold that view

MOTION from Senator Mc Ellistrem to amend the language to read:

2) Criteria for Periodic Review of Faculty Performance (US 11/16, 3/17)
   Each periodic review of faculty must include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession, and the public. In addition, all faculty members are expected to contribute to university efforts towards Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity (EDI).

   Equity is defined as the fair and impartial treatment of all individuals. Diversity is defined as the many differences among people, including, for example, differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or economic status. Inclusivity is defined as valuing the perspectives and contributions of all individuals.

   EDI contributions can be included in any of the three primary criteria for periodic review. Contributions to EDI can be demonstrated through teaching and curricular development, scholarly activity, engagement in initiatives that directly serve underrepresented students, underrepresented faculty, and/or underrepresented communities, or professional development, or any other activities as defined in the approved evaluation plan. All periodic faculty reviews shall include an evaluation of the faculty member’s EDI engagement efforts. Many faculty activities may contribute to more than one of these criteria, which are defined as follows: ...., seconded

Debate on the amendment

Motion by Senator Sottile to amend the amendment to read: Equity is defined as the fair and impartial treatment of all individuals. Diversity is defined as the many differences among people, including, for example, differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or economic status, and perspectives. Inclusivity is defined as valuing the perspectives and contributions of all individuals, seconded

Debate on the amendment to the amendment
   • This is not viewpoint perspective anymore
   • Valuing perspective in inclusivity is like a label
   • This amendment seems to weaken this proposal because different perspectives are important
Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be modified to read: Equity is defined as the fair and impartial treatment of all individuals. Diversity is defined as the many differences among people, including, for example, differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or economic status, or perspectives. Inclusivity is defined as valuing the perspectives and contributions of all individuals.

Continued debate on the amendment to the amendment
- Do we mean perspective or viewpoint?

VOTE on AMENDMENT to the AMENDMENT: PASSES

Continued Debate on the Amendment as Amended
- No surprise that senators are trying to amend the second sentence because the statement can include any difference (e.g., height; hair color; et al.) and it doesn’t address race, ethnicity, etc.
- Anytime you propose a list, something gets excluded
- Don’t like that we are asked to vote on this new language today

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth Lawton to amend the amendment language to read: Equity is defined as the fair and impartial treatment of all individuals. Diversity is defined as the structural and power many differences among people, including, but not limited to for example, differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or economic status, or perspectives. Inclusivity is defined as valuing the perspectives and contributions of all individuals, seconded

Continued Debate on the Amendment as Amended
- Concern that definitions should be aligned with our disciplines

VOTE on the AMENDMENT as AMENDED: PASSES

Continued debate on motion as amended
- Statement from a concerned colleague:
  - I think that increasing our awareness of issues around the EDI mission is a truly important and significant effort – one that is vital to the growth of the institution
  - However, including this as a component of our review process seems to be a tricky proposition and one potentially wrought with conflict and divisiveness
  - Who will determine if a faculty member has ‘met’ this component?
  - What determines an acceptable EDI contribution?
  - Who makes those determinations and from what viewpoint?
  - How might these change with a new cadre of faculty deciding these issues?
  - It seems to me that mandating that faculty to be more inclusive in their approach to their work is incredibly counterintuitive
  - How will I be judged for my contributions to this area; are we now regulating ideology?
  - These are important initiatives that I support, but what I don’t support is the regulation of inclusivity as a determining factor for a person’s financial success and career trajectory
  - Could someone be denied advancement because s/he did not adequately address EDI, which seems incredibly open-ended, vague, and subject to interpretation?
  - In short, if we cannot define something, how can we hold people accountable for outcomes?
  - Are we regulating ideology and is this the goal of a public institution?
  - A more viable approach would be in-service to specifically address teaching competency
  - Linking inclusivity to financials is bothersome
  - Definitions can be established by departments/programs
  - We are moving forward with this, but it has not been promoted enough and there hasn’t been enough dialogue
  - Students agreed with this
  - Faculty do not feel comfortable talking about this
  - We have a good intentions, but it will backfire and silence people
MOTION by Senator Sottile to amend the language to read: Each periodic review of faculty must include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession, and the public. In addition, all faculty members are expected encouraged to contribute to university efforts towards Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity (EDI), seconded

Debate on the amendment
- All of our students deserve our best
  - Inclusive pedagogy supports all student learning
  - We are here to teach, research, and do service
- This is baseline competence
- We are not here for ourselves
  - We are here for our students so we need to learn more
- If we do not stand up for this policy, then we allow people to continue to be rolled over
- We are a public institution and our students deserve this
- Students have said that they haven’t seen anything done
- This weakens the language
- We need more training and more opportunities

MOTION by Senator Pratt to MOVE the PREVIOUS QUESTION, seconded

VOTE to MOVE the PREVIOUS QUESTION: PASSED

VOTE on AMENDMENT: FAILED

Continued debate on motion as amended
- Personnel decisions on moral values, like equity, is not appropriate in personnel matters

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton to MOVE the PREVIOUS QUESTION, seconded

VOTE to MOVE the PREVIOUS QUESTION: PASSED

VOTE on the MOTION as AMENDED: PASSED

5) New Business
- None

6) Announcements
- The next meeting of the University Senate is scheduled for April 11th, 2017 in the Dakota Ballroom of the Davies Center

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate