Chair Teal called meeting #23 of the Faculty Senate to order at 3:32. A motion (Anderson/Brown) to approve the minutes from the March 22nd meeting passed without objection.

Chair's Report: Chair Teal reminded Senators that the names of new Senators elected for next year need to be sent to the Office of the Faculty Secretary by April 15th. He also mentioned a request from Alex Roberts from the Dean of Students Office. Mr. Roberts has been asked to do an interview regarding conducting hearings in sexual assault cases as well as the use of transcript notations in cases when a student has been found to have violated our student code. He intends to support both the hearings and the use of transcript notations and hopes to find a faculty member who might present a different perspective.

Provost's Report: Provost Wiencek displayed a draft of the new Strategic Plan which has been submitted. A significant effort was made to reflect the comments received on previous drafts, but obviously not all comments could be incorporated. There are some changes, for instance, the inclusion of sustainability as a principle value. This was on the list, then taken off, and now has been returned because it had significant support. The task force has given the plan a strong endorsement. The Board has a template for all strategic plans. The version presented to the Board will not contain the entire narrative as that which will be made available to the campus community. After the Board approves the plan, a group will be formed to guide the development of the cascading plans.

This process for developing cascading plans probably won’t get started until late summer. The Provost thanked all those who have been involved in the development of the strategic plan.

Provost Wiencek reported on ongoing searches:

- The search for a new Dean of the College of Business and Economics has been completed and Professor Mark Chopin from Northern Arizona University has accepted the position.
- The search for the Dean of the College of Education is underway and finalists for that position will be coming in over the next couple of weeks.
- The search for the Vice President of Research is also underway. The Provost is chairing this search and believes that there is a very strong pool, including candidates from land-grant institutions. On-campus interviews will be conducted before faculty leave campus for the summer.

The Provost also briefly discussed reorganization in the Provost's Office to address enrollment management. He is planning to develop a Strategic Enrollment Management structure. This new entity will be concerned with student recruitment along with retention services and graduation rates. These services are currently scattered in various places around the University, the plan is to combine these into one organizational structure. They will be launching a search for a Vice Provost for Strategic Enrollment Management and hope to hire a person in the next few months for this new position so that this person can start work in August. A Senator asked if this position was additive, or would people be
leaving. The Provost responded that he was trying to keep the Senate informed, but he wasn’t at liberty to provide all the details. He did note that he felt we were all understaffed across the University, including the Provost’s Office. We are at a point where we need to invest in enrollment management to ensure we have a good organization in this area. There will be reallocations within his budget to accomplish this reorganization.

**Blackboard – ASUI Presentation:** Senator Lindsey LaPrath was invited to present the results of the ASUI’s inquiry into encouraging faculty to use Blackboard for grading. Senator Laprath has been part of an ASUI committee seeking to gather information on this subject. A resolution regarding this issue had been presented to the Faculty Senate earlier this academic year. Since then, ASUI has gathered more data from students, faculty and staff, as well as peer institutions. The issue is being brought back to the Senate to request that a Faculty Senate committee look into the issue with the ultimate goal of encouraging more faculty to post grades on Blackboard. She explained that ASUI had explored faculty concerns and desire to work with faculty to obtain greater utilization of Blackboard for grading purposes. Their report suggests that the use of Blackboard for posting grades will allow students to obtain early and consistent feedback on grades, and that this will positively affect retention rates. The data in the report shows that only 62% of faculty use Blackboard and of those approximately 3/4 use it for grading purposes. In contrast, 94% of students surveyed said they would find it useful to have more of their grades posted on Blackboard.

Senators who commented were generally supportive of the use of Blackboard, but noted:

- It would take some time and support to develop their ability to use all the possibilities of Blackboard.
- Perhaps there were some differences between disciplines that might affect how Blackboard could be used.
- *To what extent would the use of Blackboard for grades really enhance student performance?* Senator Laprath suggested that it would allow for more consistent feedback which would help students to be more motivated in meeting with their professors when they were struggling.
- A Senator noted that in his experience, Blackboard did help in making students aware of missing assignments.

After more discussions, it was moved (Brandt/Folwell) that the question of encouraging the use of Blackboard for grading be forwarded to the Teaching and Advising Committee for further consideration. The proposal passed without objection.

**Committee on Committees Fall 2016-19 Appointments:** Vice Chair Brandt presented the list of faculty who have been appointed to Senate committees for next year. The list was approved without objection.

**FSH 2400—Student Disciplinary Process:** Vice Chair Brandt reported on the activities of a task force designed to review and potentially revise student disciplinary procedures. The task force started out looking at revisions of the student code, but has also considered a more complete overhaul of the process. The goal of these revisions is to bring the UI into compliance with U.S. Department of Education expectations regarding Title IX cases. The task force has also sought to eliminate delays and duplicative procedures, provide due process, and enable both accused students and complaining students to navigate the process more easily. The task force has not made a great deal of progress in realizing these goals. Professor Brandt stated that it is now hoped that the UI General Counsel’s Office and the Dean of Students Office would produce a draft of proposed changes during the summer. After receiving such a draft, the task force would be reconvened and bring the proposals to the Senate early in the fall.
While waiting for a more detailed revision, the task force will be bringing forward a set of stopgap revisions to help our existing code function better. These revisions will be brought to the Senate in the near future and will include:

- Remove the role of Faculty Senate Leadership in screening appeals
- Clean up the language for the standard of review
- Clarify the “preponderance of the evidence” standard
- Implement the Student Appeal Committee
- Permit the SDRB to consider cases in panels of three appointed by the Chair of SDRB.

Senators made several comments and raised some questions with regard to this report.

- **Could the task force consider changes to the “preponderance of the evidence” standard and posting of expulsions on student transcripts?** The Faculty Secretary suggested that the University probably had considerable discretion on whether to post expulsions on transcripts, but could not alter the preponderance of the evidence standard since the Office of Civil Rights has stated that this standard must be used.

- **A Senator noted that it would be desirable if the appeals panels had better access to audio accounts of interviews during the investigation process.** Professor Brandt responded noting that the Dean of Student’s Office is already putting in place improvements to the investigation process, including training. The investigator’s written report will be provided to all parties who will be given an opportunity to provide a written response to the report. The report and any responses will be compiled into one final report that will be provided to reviewers.

- **Can the University reconsider the time frame within which a student falls under the disciplinary process? Is it appropriate to hold students accountable for actions that occurred prior to the student arriving on campus?** Professor Brandt noted that the task force could look at this, but Title IX made it clear that the University has an obligation to provide a safe learning environment. A university’s disciplinary procedure might need to consider taking some action on events that occurred before a student arrived on campus. Another Senator stated that if this is the case, the University needed to make sure that students were appropriately notified upon admission to the University.

- **Why is the role of the Senate Leadership in screening appeals being eliminated?** It was thought that this role could be performed by the newly created Student Appeals Committee, without the intervening role of Senate Leadership.

- **A Senator asked if the task force had considered problems related to a non-native speaking student having an advisor to make their case before the SDRB.** Professor Brandt noted that the student could have an advisor. The issue of the role of advisors, or lawyers, in the process might be revisited when the proposals for revision come forward next fall.

**Adjournment:** With no further business on the agenda, a motion (Folwell/Brewick) to adjourn at 4:36 passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Crowley, Faculty Secretary and
Secretary to the Faculty Senate