

***** The complete Recording for this meeting can be found at <http://www.american.edu/facultysenate/agendas-minutes.cfm>**

Present: Professors Andrea Pearson, Elizabeth Worden, Todd Eisenstadt, Tony Ahrens, Karen Baehler, Kyle Brannon, Stefano Costanzi, Chuck Cox, John Douglass, Chris Edelson, Doug Fox, Max Friedman, Nikhat Ghouse, Maria Gomez, John Heywood, Derrick Jefferson, David Kearns, Ken Knight, Emily Lindsey, Mohamed Nimer, Zehra Peynircioglu, Jim Quirk, Naoko Wowsugi, Provost Scott Bass, DAA Mary L. Clark.

Chair's Report – Andrea Pearson

Minutes Approval – Professor Pearson opened the floor for discussion of the March 7, 2018 minutes. The Senate **VOTED** 21-0-1 in favor.

Provost's Search Update – Professor Pearson updated the senate from a statement she received from the presidential Chief of Staff Seth Grossman, which stated that information will be shared with the AU faculty and community via an email as well as a website specific to the search. The search committee has not yet been seated. Nominations for provost candidates can be sent to Seth Grossman. Once the Search firm is in place a dedicated email address will be used for candidate nominations. Silvia Burwell will provide additional information later at this meeting during her address.

Proposal from Student Government to Collaborate on Curriculum

Professor Pearson stated that she had been contacted by the Student Government (SG) who had requested to collaborate with faculty on undergraduate curriculum. The SG representative proposed that a committee be formed to increase communication between the student and faculty regarding curriculum. A proposed resolution responds to this request and will be discussed at length later in the meeting.

2018 At-Large Senator Election Results – Professor Pearson welcomed and congratulated the two newly elected at-large senators for AY 2018-2020, Zehra Peynircioglu and Emily Lindsey.

President Burwell's Annual Address and Discussion of Strategic Plan – Sylvia Burwell

President Burwell stated the following:

- KSB Accreditations have been completed and WCL is in the middle of this process,
- The new science building has been approved and construction will begin this summer. Funding was pushed by development.
- The Inclusive Excellence plan is out and, in the works.
- The dean search for is underway for SPA and SPExS will begin soon.
- The New General Council Trevina Bird will be starting next week. She will be visiting around campus.
- The Provost Search has begun. Spencer Stewart (SS) will be the search firm and will begin reaching out to faculty and the deans before commencement to receive input on the

description and needs. Over the summer SS will be in contact with staff. A dedicated website should be available by mid-April. An interim Provost will be appointed, and the goal will be to have a new provost in office by January.

President Burwell continued with conversations and questions about the strategic plan and highlighted how it would be implemented. She outlined discussions on economics, enrollment, excellence, partnerships, research & teaching/learning and future citizens.

Academic Regulation (8.1 & 8.11 Core and 8 & 9) – Jessica Waters

VP Waters stated that regulations 8 & 9 have very few changes to keep things as they are for students who are completing their Gen Eds under the current regulations. The changes include:

- **8.12 College Writing Requirements** – Clarifies that College Writing only applies to students matriculating before AY 2018-2019, makes clear that transfer students can satisfy requirements by taking courses in residence and eliminates the 'Transfers' Writing Proficiency Exam. The Senate **VOTED** 22-0-0 in favor.
- **8.13 University Mathematics Requirement** – Clarifies that University Mathematics applies only to students who matriculated before AY 2018-2019 and remembers regulations for consistency.
- **8.4 (8.14). General Education** – Clarifies that General Education requirements apply only to students who matriculated before AY 2018-2019, defines minimum grades for satisfying Gen Ed requirements based on year of matriculation, and to remember the sequential consistency. The Senate **VOTED** 17-0-2 in favor.
- **9. Major Requirements, Minor Requirements, and Dual Degrees** – Change heading title to include Major, Minor and Dual Degree. Renumber for sequential consistency. Make clear the P/F grades cannot be used for major and minor requirements, clarify title: Dean of Undergraduate Education. The Senate **VOTED** 19-0-2 in favor.

AU Core Curriculum

- **8.1 – 8.11** – These regulations are majority new to follow the new AU Core curriculum requirements. The Senate **VOTED** 19-0-3 in favor of the new AU core regulations.

CFA/DAA Instructions and Proposed Faculty Manual Changes – Steve Silvia and Max Friedman

Professor Friedman stated that most of the changes to the instructions were to clarify language and process. He reviewed the substantial changes as follows:

- **Pg. 2. Paragraph 2** - Scholarly Appendix. If a work in progress is significant for the case, the CFA encourages the candidate to include it in the Scholarly Appendix, so it can be evaluated by reviewers.
- **Pg. 2, Paragraph 3** - The CFA may add unredacted memos from previous reviews to the file. No one may remove or replace any part of a file, except to make minor non-substantive grammatical or typographical corrections. Candidates may add new information to the File for Action at any stage of the review process. A candidate wishing to update a narrative or curriculum vitae, once submitted, shall submit a new version of it with "revision 1" written at the top of the first page. The electronic copy should have "_revision1" added to the end

of the file name. For subsequent revisions, the candidate should use the same procedure, and label the element “revision2,” “revision3,” etc.

- **Pg. 4, V.** – This section’s heading been changed to “Comprehensive Narrative.”
- **Pg. 7, Paragraph 6,** - Internal letter writers should briefly describe in the opening paragraph any conflict of interest that goes beyond the customary cooperation expected among unit colleagues and why the conflict of interest does not prevent an objective assessment or warrant recusal. As section 11(a) of the Faculty Manual states: “Faculty members should always avoid conflicts of interest involving the evaluation of individual faculty members for appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The university expects the provost, deans, members of the Committee on Faculty Actions, teaching unit chairs, and all other internal faculty reviewers to acknowledge such conflicts openly and to abstain from participation whenever such conflicts arise.”
- **Pg. 8 Paragraph 7** - Members of reviewing bodies may vote yes, no, abstain or recuse.
- **Pg. 9 Paragraph 1** - Soliciting more than five is prudent because of possible disqualification. We recommend soliciting external letters by the end of the spring semester, for submission at the beginning of the subsequent academic year, when the candidate will submit a file for action. This ensures ample time to find willing reviewers (and gives them the summer to do the review) while allowing sufficient time for internal levels of review that begin only after all external letters have been received....

The candidate may also provide names of persons whom the unit should not contact as potential reviewers because they are inappropriate given insufficient arm’s length or other reasons.

The Senate **VOTED** 21-0-1 in favor of all changes.

CFA Proposed *Faculty Manual* Changes – Max Friedman and Steve Silvia

Professor Friedman began review of the *Faculty Manual* changes highlighted in yellow as follows:

Pg. 17, section 5. iii, Committee on Faculty Actions (bullet 6) - to evaluate and review the file of a term-faculty member in the event of a disagreement **at previous levels of review** and make a recommendation to the dean of academic affairs regarding the personnel action. This responsibility applies only when the disagreement does not involve financial resources or unit needs and enrollments

Pg. 40, Section 11, d. Paragraph 3, Internal Review - Each eligible faculty member will provide a separate positive, negative, **abstaining, or recusing** vote on each of the criteria of teaching/primary responsibilities, scholarship, and service, and on the overall recommendation.

Pg. 41, Section 11, f. Committee on Faculty Actions - Each eligible CFA member will provide a separate positive, negative, abstaining, **or recusing** vote on each of the criteria of teaching/primary responsibilities, scholarship, and service, and on the overall recommendation. If a member of the CFA is eligible to vote on a faculty action at the unit level of review, the CFA member will vote at the unit level of review and will not vote at the CFA level of review. **When a file is before the CFA, CFA members will recuse themselves from voting on candidates from their own teaching units.** In that case, the CFA member will serve as an informational resource for the CFA **regarding the field or unit (not the candidate).**

The Senate **VOTED** 20-0-1 in favor of all changes.

Proposed Resolution on Faculty Curricular Authority – Andrea Pearson

Professor Pearson reviewed the concern from the Student Government representative to create a joint standing committee of students and faculty senators to begin a dialogue on curriculum. Additional concerns from the students were expressed about a diverse faculty body across units. As a result, the following resolution was drafted and was brought forward for discussion. After discussion, the following resolution was **VOTED** on with friendly amendments 16-0-2 in favor.

How Academic Freedom Supports Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

American University Faculty Senate

April 4, 2018

As the politics of our nation polarize citizens, and as divisive rhetoric and actions victimize individuals for their identities and associations, the American University Faculty Senate pledges to the university community our best effort to be part of the solution. We see universities as places where faculty, staff, and students can model the best of human nature. The curriculum is in many regards the centerpiece of universities' efforts to help advance the pursuit of knowledge and wisdom.

We welcome student input into curricular design processes through established university channels where students have voice and vote, including the Faculty Senate's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Graduate Curriculum Committee, AU Core Committee, and Honors Advisory Committee, and as well the Community-Based Research Scholars Advisory Council. Additionally, students should seek participation opportunities in helping plan curriculum at the university's departments and teaching units, where most of that planning occurs and where they also can have direct input. The Faculty Senate remains committed to initiatives being developed, to provide more mentors from diverse groups, sensitize colleagues to the needs of our campus' communities, cultivate empathy and civility across our community, and reinforce the strengths we all gain from the broadest exposure to the human experience. These goals are fundamental to our mission of preparing students to be productive citizens in an increasingly dynamic global economy and society.

On the eve of the much-anticipated inauguration of our university's new president, we applaud President Burwell's embrace of these challenges as among our most important. The faculty joins our voice with that of the trustees, administration, staff, students, and others in the community to affirm that we can – and will – do better to meet these challenges.

At the same time, increased attention to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion need not come at the expense of academic freedom. In fact, a central purpose of academic freedom is precisely to support diversity, equity, and inclusion. The right to dissent – in a civil and respectful manner – must remain sacrosanct in the classroom.

The Faculty Senate has a clear statement on Freedom of Expression/Academic Freedom: <http://www.american.edu/facultysenate/upload/AU-FACULTY-SENATE-RESOLUTION-ON-FREEDOM-OF-ACADEMIC-EXPRESSION-FINALv3.pdf>. Academic freedom and freedom of expression are central to the academic enterprise, and faculty autonomy in the classroom must accompany these. For that reason, we defend the dual principles of professorial responsibility for syllabi content and professorial obligation to engage students in dialogue about competing ideas.

We understand the concern of students and other community members that more plural voices and broader perspectives should be incorporated in our curricula, and we share that goal. The Faculty Senate believes there are multiple strategies for achieving diversification, including classroom activities and assignments that offer choices for students and value their diverse voices. However, some of the seemingly inclusive strategies may lead unintentionally to the opposite result. For example, dictating syllabi content through majority vote—either of the whole faculty or the student body or some combination—could lead to greater uniformity of content rather than greater pluralism. At the other end of the spectrum, expecting student leaders to vet syllabi concentrates too much power in a small number of hands. Equally dangerous, in our view, would be a system in which syllabi content is dictated by a university’s administrators or trustees, no matter how wise and enlightened the individuals might be.

Universities have thrived partly because they have dispersed the rights and duties associated with choosing educational content to highly qualified, individual faculty members, on a course by course basis, with the professional expectation that faculty members will introduce students to multiple schools of thought. For this power-distribution system to work, each faculty member must be granted control of their courses, and their courses only. Indeed, the suspension of academic freedom and faculty autonomy has corresponded with some of history’s darkest hours.

The Faculty Senate pledges cooperation with the AU community in embracing efforts to sensitize and fortify us all, together, as one body composed of many strong and diverse groups. In 2016 we approved guidelines for faculty conduct that explicitly affirm this responsibility: <http://www.american.edu/facultysenate/upload/Expectations-and-Guidelines-for-Faculty-Conduct-at-AU.pdf>.

We look forward to working with AU constituencies to make our campus more inclusive and hence stronger, while protecting academic freedom. Inclusion and academic freedom go hand in hand at institutions of higher learning in free societies aspiring to generate knowledge and wisdom.

Pedagogical Innovation Waiver – Scott Bass

Professor Pearson stated that due to lack of time she requested that the Senators look at the provided draft on the Pedagogical Innovation Waiver prepared by Provost Bass. There will be a two-year pilot to see how this process works so this will be revisited once the pilot has been completed.

Faculty Senate Bylaw Revisions – Andrea Pearson

Professor Pearson stated that due to lack of time the second and final part of the Faculty Senate bylaw revisions will be presented for review at the May meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 PM