

Faculty Senate Meeting

March 2, 2016, 2:30 PM to 5:00 PM

LOCATION CHANGE: Claudia Grossman Hall WCL

- 1) Chair's Report – Larry Engel (2:30)
 - a) Claudio Grossman Welcome
 - b) Faculty Senate February 10, 2016 minutes
 - c) Executive Committee Feb 17, 2016 Agenda and Minutes
 - d) Vice Chair Elections
 - e) Visitors/agenda items for the remaining Senate sessions
 - f) Update on ad-hoc committee and working group
- 2) Provost Report – Scott Bass (3:15)
- 3) Ombuds Report and Assistant Dean Position – Mary Clark, Stacey Marien & Caron Martinez (3:30)
- 4) Library and Librarians Report – Nancy Davenport (4:00)
- 5) By-Laws – Lacey Wootton (4:20)

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 10, 2016

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

Present: Professors: Larry Engel, Todd Eisenstadt, Lacey Wootton, Karen Baehler, Kyle Brannon, Rachel Borchardt, Chris Edelson, Maria Gomez, Olivia Ivey, Kelly Joyner, Billie Jo Kaufman, Iris Krasnow, Gwanhoo Lee, Jun Lu, Mary Mintz, John Nolan, Arturo Porzecanski, Andrea Pearson, Steve Silvia, Chris Simpson, Kate Wilson, Brian Yates, Provost Scott Bass, DAA Mary L. Clark.

Professor Engel called the meeting to order at 2:33 PM.

Chair's Report – Larry Engel

January 13, 2016 Minutes Approval – Professor Engel opened the floor for discussion and approval of the January 13, 2016 minutes. The Senate **VOTED** and the minutes were approved 20-0-1.

Spring Emeriti Luncheon Speaker – Professor Engel informed the Senate that Professor Terry Davidson will be the guest speaker for the Spring Emeriti Luncheon on March 22, 2016.

Diversity and Inclusion Working group – Professor Engel stated that there had been several recommendations from senators for membership. The group so far includes Angie Chuang, SOC, Derrick Jefferson, University Library, Lily Wong, CAS, Noemi Enchautegui-de-Jesus, CAS, Keith Leonard, CAS, and Fanta Aw, Assistant VP of Campus Life. Fanta Aw and Mary Clark will serve as advisors. An invitation was extended to Tiffany Speaks, Senior Director for the Center for Diversity and Inclusion, to also act as an advisor, and a final confirmation was expected from Student Council with two students to participate.

Professor Engel stated that he had received an email from the University Registrar Doug McKenna that began opening discussion on a replacement name for the SET's. Input on Teaching by Students (ITS) has been suggested and was agreed by the senators to be a better option.

Professor Engel stated that the OUR email also included discussion about a pilot using the new questions that were approved by the Senate over the summer of 2016. However, concern was expressed that the audience during the summer is different and it would be better to change the pilot to the fall of 2016 rolling out the new questions in the fall of 2017.

Provost's Report – Scott Bass

- AU has been reclassified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education from the lowest tier, "Doctoral Research University" to the middle tier, "Doctoral: Higher Research Activity." This is a significant milestone and something to be proud of.

- The Washington College of Law ribbon-cutting ceremony will be held , February 12, 2016 and is expected to have a large turnout of 2000 people.
- The Dean of the School of Education search is still underway and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies search had a delay due to personal reasons for one candidate but the search will resume in the next few weeks. WCL & KSB are also still interviewing.
- The early stages of planning for the Maryland Eastern Shore Faculty Retreat has begun. Because the theme for the retreat will revolve around student support, the invitation to this event will be extended to staff. DAA Mary L. Clark and Dean Barbara Romzek are the co-chairs. The event will be in October, 2016.
- Great appreciation was expressed for the involvement and willingness to participate by the Faculty Senate in some sensitive and difficult discussions on race. The president is also is aware and also grateful.
- The RiSE project has completed the assessment phase and is now moving into the next stage on how to support the AU students' needs and to involve all members of the institution to make it a more inclusive community.
- Enrollment numbers are outstanding at the undergraduate level. The university has received 19,208 applications for undergraduates. Early decision is up over 100 applications from last year. This is going to make it a difficult decision process but is a great accomplishment.

New Position in DAA's Office -DAA Mary L. Clark

Dean Clark stated that she is looking to establish a new position in her office titled "Associate Dean for Academic Affairs." This person will be specifically focused on working on term faculty initiatives such as satisfaction, equity and compensation. This would be a part-time position for a current multi-year contract term faculty member. Further information will be sent out to the community soon.

Jim McCabe Resolution – Larry Engel and Todd Eisenstadt

Professor Engel stated that based on the discussion at the last Senate meeting, a resolution was drafted and is being brought back to the floor for discussion and approval. Professor Engel read the motion as follows:

"The arrest of former AU staff member Jim McCabe while pamphleting in October 2015 at the Terrace Dining Room, and his presentation in January 2016 before the Senate, brought attention to adverse working conditions faced by Aramark's contract workers in housing and dining facilities. The Social Responsibility Project team is reviewing these issues. The Faculty Senate would like to be updated on contract discussions and negotiations between these workers' union, Aramark, and the university, and we support the workers' rights to more reasonable

wages, benefits, and working conditions. We also would ask the university to consider offering AU scholarships or tuition remission for dependents of contract workers.”

Lengthy discussion on content and wording of the presented resolution was had by the senators to tighten the draft for a vote. The Senate **VOTED** based on the amendments and the resolution was passed 23-0-0.

Students Carlos Vero, Martin Maldonado and Jake Schmitt thanked the Senate for passing the amended resolution and stated that they would like for AU to make sure that these workers are treated fairly and with respect. It should be AU's responsibility to be sure that the values and rules of AU are implemented in the contracts. Carlos provided the Senate with a handout of two resolutions from the Residence Hall Association for the record. Many other student visitors attended the meeting to show their support.

Anna Evans, an Aramark Worker, stated to the Senate that she had come from her country where she was a public defender. She asked if this body could find a way to help her attend classes here to further her career because currently the tuition is too expensive for her.

Senate Vice Chair Elections – Larry Engel

Professor Engel stated that the handout provided is a list of eligible faculty who have served on the Senate in the past five years. The timeline is tight and the following dates were provided:

- February 17, 2016, nominees
- February 20, 2016, short statement of interest
- March 2, 2016, election at the Senate meeting

Professor Chris Simpson addressed the issue of lack of minority representation. Discussion was had that encouraging minority colleagues to run for this body would be the best way to change this issue.

Senate By-Law Changes – Lacey Wootton

Professor Wootton began discussion on the following changes to the by-laws:

- **Article II, Membership** – Changing language to reflect practice to say, “The university faculty shall elect, annually, in the spring, **senators to fill the vacancies** in...”
- **IX. A. Executive Committee, Paragraph one** – Change to reflect standard practice to include, “**Nominations may also be submitted from the floor of the Senate.**”
- **Paragraph 3** – Current language is not practiced so the change would be to have the Executive Committee meet with university administrators **“as needed.”**
- **Bullet 3** – Language is added to follow practice. “Voting on changes in the by-laws and academic regulations that are editorial corrections, or matters of consistency and reporting these changes **in writing** to the Senate.”

- **Paragraph 4, bullet 3 & 4** – Suggested changes to language to omit providing the Executive Committee agenda and minutes where suggested but it was agreed to keep the language as is and provide both.
- **The five changes above were VOTED on a passed 19-0-1 in favor.**
- **1X.B, 1 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Bullet 1** – The process of what curriculum would be reviewed by the UCC and it was decided to return this language to the committee for further review and clarity.
- **IX.B, 3. – Committee on Faculty Actions, Bullet 1**– Deletion of “and part-time faculty” because of union contract.
- **Bullet 6** – Adding after dean, “and the file of a library faculty member on a continuing appointment.” was added due to the changes in the library manual.
- **These two changes were VOTED on 18-0-2 in favor.**
- **5. Bullets, 2, 3, 4** – Added Washington Research Library Consortium in bullet 2, “to maintain a liaison with the Office of Information Technology.....”. and “to maintain a liaison with CTRL” language was added to bullet 3 & 4 for clarity.
- **The Senate VOTED and the changes were approved 18-0-0.**

RiSE Update – “How to Engage Faculty” – Larry Engel

Professor Engel gave an update on the progress of the RiSE initiative and stated that he is trying to find ways to engage faculty in this process. He said that change is only going to work with the involvement of the faculty and he is asking for input.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM

Executive Committee Meeting

February 17, 2016, 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Senate Conference Room

- 1) Chair's Report – Larry Engel (10:00)
 - a) Report on Grade Inflation, Term Faculty Manual Language, Diversity and Inclusion, and Faculty Conduct Code Guideline Committees
 - b) Schedule of guests for remaining Senate meetings
 - c) Agenda for March and April Senate meetings
 - d) Entering submissions from Student Government into the Senate minutes/records
- 2) Provost's Report – Scott Bass (10:20)
- 3) Revisions to Gen Ed and Senate Discussion (10:40)
- 4) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Honors Advisory Committee Language in Senate by-laws – Lyn Stallings and Maria Gomez* (11:00)
- 5) McCabe Resolution on Freedom of Expression – Chris Simpson* (11:15)

Due to availability remotely handouts will follow tomorrow*

Executive Committee Draft Minutes

February 17, 2016

Present: Professors: Larry Engel, Lacey Wootton, Todd Eisenstadt, Jun Lu, Maria Gomez, Olivia Ivey, John Nolan, Jun Lu, Provost Scott Bass

Professor Engel called the meeting to order at 10:05 AM.

Chair's Report – Larry Engel

Professor Engel stated the following:

- The Committee on Term Faculty Language in the Faculty Manual will be extending their work over the summer to have time to clarify current unit language.
- The Grade Inflation Committee will also continue work over the summer.
- The Faculty Conduct Code will be having town halls soon
- The Working Group on Diversity and Inclusion will be meeting next week
- The remaining meeting agendas for March, April and May will be full with election information; guests to include President Kerwin, Doug Kudravetz and Billy Walker; and the annual Senate committee reports.
- Discussion was had on how to handle handouts provided by visitors. It was decided to include a hard copy in the records kept in the Senate office as a point of reference.

These items will be discussed at the March Senate meeting.

Provost Report – Scott Bass

Provost Bass stated that he did not have a report for this meeting. He did extend an invitation to the Executive Committee members to the upcoming Department Chairs and Division/Program Quarterly Meeting on March 18, 2016 to discuss shared governance and for transparency.

Professor Engel stated that at this time the meeting would go into Executive Session.

Revisions to the General Education Proposal and Senate Discussion – Todd Eisenstadt

Professor Eisenstadt stated that he has some concerns that he would like to bring forward from SPA, specifically from the Department of Government. He would like to receive input from the Senate on the following topics:

- Concerns about allowing staff to teach the AU Experience classes
- Revise how the AU Experience classes are framed
- Where will the budget allocations come from for these changes

The Gen Ed questions from SPA will be addressed at the April Meeting with the Gen Ed Chairs.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and Honors Advisory Committee Current Language in the Senate By-Laws – Lacey Wootton, Lyn Stallings and Maria Gomez

Professor Wootton stated that the current language under the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) has been requested to be changed to include following highlighted sentence:

- the existing undergraduate curriculum and course offerings, including those in General Education and the Honors Program, and the living-learning programs of the University, including University College and AU Scholars,

After discussion it was determined that this language is not accurate so the current language will remain.

The outcome from this discussion will be presented to the Senate during the by-law review.

McCabe Resolution on Freedom of Expression – Chris Simpson

Professor Simpson expressed his concern that there are restrictions with freedom of expression across campus with many constituencies to include term faculty, Aramark employees, staff and students. It was stated that there is a difference between academic freedom for faculty as stated in the Faculty Manual versus others who are protected by freedom of speech. After discussion of Prof. Simpson's resolution regarding freedom of expression, the Executive Committee felt that the resolution, as currently written, would not accomplish the intended purpose of improving freedom of expression for AU employees other than faculty, but the committee recommended continued discussion of this issue.

This resolution will not be brought to the Senate in March.

Professor Engel dismissed the meeting at 11:59 AM

IX.B Standing Committees

1. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) is an elected body of the university faculty. The UCC is composed of eight full-time faculty members: two from CAS, and one from each of KSB, SIS, SOC, SPA, SPExS, and the University Library; all to be elected by secret ballot within each unit. UCC members serve staggered three-year terms. The membership will also include one undergraduate student designated by the Student Government. The chair of the Committee on General Education and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies will serve as *ex officio* non-voting members of the committee, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies will provide staff assistance for the committee. The chair, elected by the faculty representatives of the committee, receives one course release and is a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The chair or his designee will serve as an *ex officio* non-voting member of the Committee on General Education and the Honors Advisory Committee.

The committee makes recommendations to the appropriate unit(s) and/or administrator(s) regarding:

- the existing undergraduate curriculum and course offerings, including those in General Education and the Honors Program,
- new programs and major curricular changes,
- new courses for academic quality, redundancy of material across teaching units/academic units, and outcomes assessment,
- all changes and terminations in courses or programs that affect more than one teaching unit, and
- general curricular policies affecting undergraduate academic programs.

The committee does not review temporary or experimental courses offered by any unit, though it continues to exercise jurisdiction through its *ex officio* presence on the General Education and Honors Advisory Committees.

While all proposals require the support of the relevant teaching unit(s) and/or academic unit(s), the committee is directly responsible for the Faculty Senate's commitment to academic excellence as reflected by curriculum and course offerings; therefore, every effort must be made to address the committee's recommendations. [After the unit has responded to the committee's recommendations, the committee forwards its recommendations to approve, modify, or reject the proposal to the next level of review.](#)

Commented [LW1]: New change, based on discussion in Nov. Senate meeting.

In order for the committee to have time to complete its review, all changes targeted for approval by the Board of Trustees for the next academic year must be submitted to the Faculty Senate by the first Monday in March of the current academic year. The committee's work will continue over the summer months if necessary.

2. Graduate Curriculum Committee

While all proposals require the support of the relevant teaching unit(s) and/or academic unit(s), the committee is directly responsible for the Faculty Senate's commitment to academic excellence as reflected by curriculum and course offerings; therefore, every effort must be made to address the committee's recommendations. After the unit has responded to the committee's recommendations, [the committee forwards its recommendations to approve, modify, or reject the proposal to the next level of review.](#)

Commented [A2]: New change, based on discussion at Nov. Senate meeting.

6. Committee on Learning Assessment

The committee has the following responsibilities:

- to provide guidance and assistance to the colleges and schools in developing and implementing academic program assessment plans;
- to analyze and interpret assessment results, which are reported to the appropriate unit leader;
- to interact with other stakeholders, such as the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies; Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice Provost for Research; Center for Teaching, Research, and Learning; and Campus Life; and
- to submit a written report to the Faculty Senate each December.

Commented [A3]: New change: to reflect practice.

C. Special and Advisory Committees

1. The Committee on Faculty Grievances is an elected body of the university faculty. Its function, as stipulated in the *Faculty Manual*, is to investigate and evaluate all formal grievances filed by members of the faculty and to issue a report specifying its conclusions and recommendations, which is then sent to the grievant and to either the university president or provost. ~~Its function is to hear and make a determination concerning all grievances filed by members of the faculty.~~ As appropriate, the committee shall report to the Executive Committee if matters need Senate action ~~or oversight attention~~. The committee is also charged with overseeing university policies and programs to make certain that all faculty are accorded equitable treatment and allocated resources equitably within the university in accordance with the university's statement on non-discrimination. The committee shall propose Senate action, as needed, and recommend oversight review, as needed, to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

The committee is composed of seven tenured members of the university faculty, one from each of the following academic units: KSB, SOC, SIS, SPA, and the University Library; and two from the College of Arts and Sciences. Tenure-line faculty and term faculty on multi-year contracts from each academic unit elect the unit's member(s) of this committee for staggered three-year terms, with no more than three to be elected in any one year, except to fill vacancies in unexpired terms. The chair is to be elected by and from the membership of the committee.

Its function, as stipulated in the *Faculty Manual*, is to investigate and evaluate all formal grievances filed by members of the faculty and to issue a report specifying its conclusions and recommendations, which is then sent to the grievant and to either the university president or provost.

Formatted: Normal, Right: 0"

Commented [LW4]: Clarification from CFG and deletion of unnecessary phrase.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

2. The Faculty Hearing Committee is an elected body of the university faculty. Its function is to hear cases referred to it by the Provost ~~involving termination of continuous tenure appointments or probationary or special term~~ full-time faculty appointments before the end of the specified term due to incompetence, misconduct, or other cases involving major disciplinary sanctions against a faculty member. It reviews cases presented to it and makes recommendations in accordance with the procedures specified in the section on “Disciplinary Actions, Investigations, and Formal Faculty Hearings” in the *Faculty Manual*. ~~The Senate Executive Committee draws individual hearing panels from the elected members of the Committee to hear cases. Individual panels are drawn from the elected members of the Committee to hear cases.~~ The committee will meet on an as-needed basis, including during the summer break.

The committee is composed of 15 tenured members of the teaching faculty elected by the full-time university faculty, including term faculty on multi-year contracts. Members of the Hearing Committee shall be elected for staggered three-year terms.

Commented [LW5]: New change for clarity and accuracy.

Commented [A6]: New change for accuracy (Mary Mintz).

Faculty Senate By-laws, proposed revisions to selected sections (~~Dec-2015~~Spring 2016)

3. Committee on General Education

The committee is composed of sixteen voting members: three faculty members from each of the five general education areas of study and a chair. All members and the chair are selected by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies in collaboration with the current or outgoing Chair of the General Education Committee.

Selection of the members and the chair will be made from a list of nominees presented by the Associate Deans. All nominees will confirm their willingness to serve the three-year term.

~~Serving as *ex officio* non-voting members will be the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the chair (or designee) of the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the General Education Librarian. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies serves as an *ex officio* non-voting member of the committee. The committee will communicate with the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee through its *ex officio* member on that committee.~~

Commented [A1]: New change: Reflects practice (Mary Mintz)

Faculty Senate By-laws, proposed revisions to selected sections (~~Dec. 2015~~Spring 2016)

4. **The Honors Advisory Committee** is charged with developing guidelines and procedures for all honors programs at AU; recommending to the Provost to accept, alter, or reject proposals for new ~~honors~~ Honors in the Major or Field programs at AU; ~~engaging with students;~~ and overseeing and monitoring ~~all honors programs at AU~~ the AU Honors Program. The committee ~~consults with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Enrollment on applications to the AU~~ evaluates student applications to the University Honors Program, ~~monitors students' progress,~~ ~~participates in annual assessment of the program,~~ ~~conducts annual assessment,~~ and provides support and advice as needed.

Commented [LW2]: Already discussed at Nov. Senate meeting; not voted on.

In curricular review, the committee reviews and approves all temporary honors courses, including courses offered on a three-year basis in the ~~University~~ AU Honors Program. Temporary honors courses do not require full university-wide review. Proposals for all permanent honors courses require full university-wide review, and the proposals must include the Honors Advisory Committee recommendation to accept, alter, or reject such courses as permanent honors courses. When a proposal for a permanent honors course originates from the ~~Office of AU~~ Honors Programs, the Honors Advisory Committee serves as the academic EPC before going to university-wide review. When a proposal for a permanent honors course originates from the academic unit, the academic unit will use its own EPC before going to university-wide review.

The committee is composed of eight voting members: one faculty member each from Kogod, SIS, SOC, and SPA; one faculty member from each of the three clusters in CAS; and a student representative from ~~an~~ the AU Honors Program. All faculty members of the Honors Advisory Committee will be selected by the Senate Executive Committee and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, in collaboration with the current or outgoing chair of the Honors Advisory Committee. Selections will be made from a list of nominees presented by the Associate Deans. All nominees will confirm their willingness to serve the full three-year term. The student representative, who will serve a one-year term, will be designated by the ~~students in the AU Honors Program~~ Student Honors Board, ~~an elected body that represents students in all honors programs.~~ Serving as *ex officio* non-voting members will be the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, ~~the Director of the Office of Honors Programs,~~ the chair (or designee) of the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Honors Librarian. ~~The Faculty Director of the AU Honors Program will serve as~~ ~~The committee elects a chair from among its members, and it will communicate with the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee through its *ex officio* member on that committee~~ of the Honors Advisory Committee.

Commented [LW3]: Already discussed in Nov. Senate meeting; not voted on.

Nominees for the Faculty Director of the AU Honors Program will be submitted by the associate deans. The Senate Executive Committee and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies will review the nominees and make their recommendations to the Provost, who will make the final selection. The Faculty Director serves for a three-year term beginning June 1.

Commented [LW4]: New change, based on discussion at Nov. Senate meeting.

Faculty Senate By-laws, proposed revisions to selected sections ([Dec. 2015](#)[Spring 2016](#))

D. Board of Trustees Representatives of the Faculty Senate

The Immediate Past Chair and the Chair of the Faculty Senate serve as non-voting Faculty Trustees of the Board of Trustees. The Vice Chair provides a report of the Senate for each meeting of the Board of Trustees and attends its general meeting as the Faculty Senate representative. The Chair serves on the Trusteeship Committee and ~~selects one other committee~~ [the Academic Affairs Committee](#) on which to serve as a Faculty Trustee. The Past Chair of the Faculty Senate selects two other committees of the Board of Trustees on which to serve as a Faculty Trustee. The Vice Chair of the Senate serves on the Trusteeship Committee as the faculty representative on that committee. At the beginning of each academic year, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will nominate faculty to serve as faculty representatives on the remaining committees of the Board of Trustees:

Commented [A5]: New change to reflect practice.

Article X. Eligibility for and Nominations and Elections to the Senate and Its Committees

A. Eligibility

All full-time faculty are eligible to be elected to the Senate and its committees except for the Committee on Faculty Actions, [the Faculty Hearing Committee](#), and the Committee on Faculty Grievances, all of whose members must be tenured faculty and elected by tenured and tenure-track faculty and term faculty on multi-year contracts. Emeriti faculty are eligible to be elected to the Benefits Subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Budget and Benefits. WCL faculty are not eligible for membership on the Committee on Faculty Actions nor may WCL faculty vote for the membership of that committee. WCL faculty may not have representation on any other Senate committees except for the Committee on Academic Budget and Benefits, the Committee on Information Systems, and the Executive Committee.

Commented [A6]: New change for accuracy.

Faculty Senate By-laws, proposed revisions to selected sections ([Dec. 2015](#)[Spring 2016](#))

B. Nominations and Elections for Campus-Wide Positions

- Self-nominations of eligible faculty willing to serve as at-large members on the Senate, ~~the Committee on Faculty Grievances,~~ or the Faculty Hearing Committee should be sent to the Senate office by the Friday before the spring semester vacation in March. All eligible individuals who are nominated and who agree to run will be placed on the appropriate ballots.
- Balloting to fill at-large vacancies on the Senate and to fill vacancies on ~~the Committee on Faculty Grievances and~~ the Faculty Hearing Committee shall be conducted in the week immediately following the spring semester vacation in March. If such scheduling would not result in a termination of balloting by March 30, the Vice Chair of the Senate will specify a period in March for which balloting would end by the date specified.
- ~~The Senate is empowered to conduct on-line balloting if it is satisfied this can be done in a reasonably secure manner.~~
- Ballots will also be mailed to emeriti faculty and to any other full-time faculty who have requested this in writing. These ballots may be returned by U.S. mail or through campus mail, or may be delivered in person to the Senate office and must be in the Senate office by the termination-of-balloting deadline. ~~If the Senate conducts on-line balloting, it may also authorize the use of this for emeriti faculty and others covered by this paragraph.~~
- Faculty members will be allowed to vote for as many persons as there are vacancies in the membership to be filled, and those receiving the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected according to the regulation on Senate membership.
- ~~Ballots shall be electronically tallied, and the results will be sent to the Senate Chair and Vice Chair. Ballots shall be counted by the Vice Chair of the Senate and by persons designated by the Vice Chair of the Senate on the business day following the termination of the balloting period. If the election is by electronic balloting, the results will be sent to the Vice Chair of the Senate and to at least one other person designated by the Vice Chair on the business day following the termination of the balloting period. No candidate for any of the offices or positions being balloted will be a part of this group.~~
- Ties shall be immediately resolved by ~~the group counting the ballots~~ by lot.
- The results of the election shall be certified by the ~~group counting the ballots~~ Senate Chair and announced to the campus community.

Commented [A7]: New change: CFG now elected by units.

Commented [A8]: New change: CFG now elected by units.

Commented [A9]: New change: balloting now done online.

Commented [LW10]: Query from Mary Mintz: Can we discuss in the Senate? Larger numbers of baby boom faculty are becoming emeriti now, but emeriti can sometimes be less active and engaged with their former units and the campus. With all due respect to them, should they be participating in elections where many of the candidates will be unfamiliar to them?

Commented [A11]: New change: online balloting is now standard.

Commented [A12]: New change to reflect practice.

Commented [A13]: New change to reflect practice.

Commented [A14]: New change to reflect practice.

E. Vacancies

1. In the event of a vacancy in the Senate, the Executive Committee will fill the seat per Article IX.A. of the By-laws. In the event of a vacancy on a committee, the vacant seat shall be filled for the remainder of the vacated term by vote of the faculty of the unit represented, by vote of the members of the committee when appropriate, or, for those on ~~the Committee on Faculty Grievances and~~ the Faculty Hearing Committee, by the eligible person, not a member of the Senate or that committee, who received the greatest number of votes in the most recent general election for the Senate.

Commented [A15]: New change: CFG elected by units.

To: Faculty Senate; Committee on Academic Budget and Benefits

From: Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Ombuds Exploratory Committee: Stacey Marien, Library, Chair; Caron Martinez, CAS; Lauren Weis, CAS; John Willoughby, CAS

Re: Proposal for Creation of Faculty Ombuds Position as Budget Priority for 2017-19

Date: December 2015

PROPOSAL

The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Ombuds Exploratory Committee proposes that creation of an ombudsperson to represent American University faculty become a university budget priority for the next cycle (2017-18, 2018-19). We ask the full Senate to endorse the need for an ombudsperson to serve, advise, and support the faculty. Such support is particularly crucial given the rapid changes in the composition of the faculty, including unprecedented growth in the number of full-time faculty on contingent (term) appointments. Faculty are on the frontline of delivering an excellent student experience that is no longer restricted to classroom teaching, but extends to dedicated service, advising, and researching in their fields. An Ombuds position ensures that faculty efficiency is not compromised or diminished. In addition, we ask the Committee on Faculty Budget and Benefits to review the various budget models included in the proposal for possible recommendation to the University Budget Committee.

Overview of an Organizational Ombuds

An organizational Ombuds is a dispute resolution professional whose primary function is to provide confidential, impartial, and informal assistance to employees and other stakeholders of an entity. As an internal employee, the organizational Ombuds carries no other role or duties in order to maintain independence and prevent real or perceived conflict of interest. Using alternative dispute resolution techniques, an organizational Ombuds provides options for stakeholders to safely and effectively discuss and resolve their concerns. Additionally, an organizational Ombuds offers coaching on dispute resolution, provides mediation to facilitate conflict resolution, helps enable safe upward feedback, assists those who feel harassed and discriminated against, and generally helps individuals navigate bureaucracy. Institutions with an effective Ombuds function can expect more harmonious workplaces, less stress among personnel, and more attention to the institution's core mission. These and other positive results, including increased loyalty to the organization, result from their being listened to, advised, and supported.

Here at American University, an Ombuds position would support a key aspect of the Provost's RiSe Initiative, which is AU's version of the "culture of service excellence" idea presented in November by Amy Windover, PhD, of Cleveland Clinic. In order to have a "culture of service excellence," Windover underscores the Clinic's commitment to patients. Here at AU, the RiSe Initiative has the expressed goal of having students, rather than patients, feel they are "engaged" and "cared for." Windover emphasizes that the path to such care is multi-pronged, but that one of the key ingredients is to pay attention to those who are delivering a first rate education: the faculty. Cleveland Clinic prioritizes caring for its patients by caring for all the staff at the Clinic, and by valuing staff extending from doctors to custodians. In the same way, an Ombuds position, with its goal of mediation, listening, validating, and coaching toward peaceful resolutions, is a

way of caring for faculty and showing that the University truly values their well-being. This well-being then translates into “service excellence” where faculty care for students by virtue of being cared for themselves. Strengthening and supporting faculty who are on the frontlines of delivering the best possible education for our students is thus a key way that the Ombuds position would support the RiSE initiative.

Establishing the Office

Reporting Structure

Following best practices at similar institutions, we recommend that the Ombuds report directly to the President of the University.

Location and Hours

The office would need to be convenient and centrally-located, yet discreet for visitors with concerns about confidentiality. The office should provide privacy in a comfortable surrounding, so that visitors feel safe discussing a range of personal and workplace issues. The hours would be determined by who ultimately would be in the position but to accommodate a variety of teaching obligations, a schedule with times available in the morning, afternoon and evening would be ideal.

Written Protocol

The Ombuds and University President would sign a Charter Agreement, which defines the role and scope of Ombuds duties with respect to the University. The Ombuds would prepare a document detailing policies and procedures, which would describe the office’s day-to-day operations. The Ombuds would also be expected to create a database to track general visitor statistics.

Budget

The budget would need to cover the cost of the Ombuds’s salary. One option is to have a senior faculty member in the position and have a course release or two granted to that faculty member. Another possibility is to employ an emeritus faculty. The preferred option is to hire an outside Ombuds, already trained and experienced, to set up the position. The work of the Ombuds will also require some staff administrative support. The average salary nationally for an Ombuds position is approximately \$56,000. Given the cost of living in the Washington, DC Metro area, the federal government compensates employees with an additional locality pay of 24.22%. Given this example, we would expect that a realistic annual budget for total compensation for the position would fall into the range of \$85-\$100,000. This does not include the cost of administrative support.

Promoting the Office

Presentations and Meetings

It is recommended that the President introduce the Ombuds in an email to all faculty. Incorporating the new position into the RiSe Initiative would underscore the Provost’s and President’s commitment to this “culture of service excellence” by supporting those most responsible for implementing such a culture. As a reminder, recall that **90% of the faculty who answered our January 2015 survey (over 500 tenured, tenure-track,**

term, and adjunct faculty) were in favor of establishing the position, stating that to do so would increase communication, trust, advocacy, and employment satisfaction. The Ombuds would make presentations to groups of faculty within the various academic units to alert faculty to the scope and availability of Ombuds support, as well as to field faculty questions. The Ombuds would also meet individually with administrators, deans, and department chairs to promote all that the new position has to offer.

Electronic and Print Materials

The University should create a webpage for the Ombuds Office that explains how the office operates, what services are offered and to whom, who the Ombuds is, and what other resources are available. The Ombuds should prepare a brochure that is distributed to the faculty and various schools and administrative offices. After developing our initial report and this follow-up report, our committee would be happy to provide the content and research we have assembled to assist in this effort.

This example from Stanford University's Ombuds website is one model of the content and tone that is desirable for educating faculty and establishing expectations:

When is it appropriate to contact the Ombuds Office? Why have an Ombuds?

There are many situations in which you might want to make use of this confidential resource, such as:

- When you need someone to listen
- When an awkward situation or uncomfortable feelings are bothering you
- When you are unsure of Stanford policy or you believe a policy procedure or regulation has been applied unfairly
- When you wish to work through an intermediary
- When you are worried about favoritism or afraid of retaliation
- When you think you have been treated unfairly, harassed or discriminated against
- When you think someone has engaged in misconduct, or there has been an ethical violation”

Mandate for AU's Ombuds

Relevant Professional Standards: The umbrella organization for the profession is the International Ombudsman Association (IOA), which publishes a Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice. Additional guidance for the establishment and operation of an Ombuds office is available from the [American Bar Association](#) (ABA) and [IOA](#). The ethical tenets of practice are:

Confidentiality – The Ombuds does not keep records for the University, and won't disclose the names or concerns of visitors, without permission. (The only exception is when the Ombuds believes there is an imminent risk of physical harm.) The Ombuds Office thus is not an office of notice for the University.

Neutrality – The Ombuds is respectfully impartial with all parties to a conflict. The Ombuds does not take sides in any dispute, but rather advocates for fair process and equitable results.

Informality – The Ombuds listens; offers information about policies, procedures and resources; and presents a range of options for resolving problems. With permission, the Ombuds will

facilitate communication or mediate a dispute. The Ombuds does not arbitrate, adjudicate, or participate in formal procedures.

Independence – To ensure objectivity, the Ombuds is not aligned with any administrative unit or school, and reports directly to the President for administrative, effectiveness, and budgetary purposes. These ethical tenets are absolute and non-negotiable, and belong to the Ombuds Office rather than the visitor.

Charter Agreement

It is a best practice to have a charter agreement that clearly defines the ombudsperson's role, jurisdiction and authority with respect to the organization. Examples of charter agreements can be provided to the University Senate.

Visitor Database

The Ombuds would create a system to track general visitor statistics, such as the reasons to seek the Ombuds' help, the advice or mediation given, and the results. In keeping with best practices, the system should be password-protected and should not contain the names of office visitors.

Conclusion

We encourage those of you reading this memo to refer to our original report for more background information about both the AU survey we conducted, as well as extensive data about best practices at peer institutions. We especially encourage you to review our detailed section on cost-effectiveness, since we do not take lightly the request for a new administrative position and its attendant strain on the University's budget.

In the end though, we strongly encourage you to support this position and send it forward to the Provost for his action. A few final thoughts are listed below:

- An Ombuds is a smart, practical, and morale-building way to establish a mediator who can listen to faculty concerns that might currently go from complaint to grievance, by offering mediation and advocacy before such concerns reach the point of formal hearing or litigation. Though data, due to confidentiality concerns, are not available to support a clear correlation between an Ombuds and fewer legal cases, we can speculate with confidence that an effective Ombuds can diffuse concerns before they escalate.
- An Ombuds acting as a conduit for faculty to find existing University resources provides a cost effective alternative to faculty having to spending time locating and accessing such information.
- The support of an Ombuds position is a best practice among our peer institutions, and therefore a reasonable and customary part of the cost of doing business for an institution of the quality and stature of American University.

- An Ombuds position means a more efficient use of faculty time: faculty who are helped by an Ombuds will spend less time distracted by workplace concerns, be happier and more productive in their professional obligations, and have more time to dedicate to their core mission: educating AU students. Such a position is consistent with developing the Provost's vision of a "culture of service excellence" put forth in the launch of the RiSE Initiative that is dedicated to the unparalleled thriving of our students.