

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agendas
and Minutes

Faculty Senate

11-28-2022

FSEC Minutes November 28, 2022

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_execcom

Recommended Citation

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate, "FSEC Minutes November 28, 2022" (2022). *Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agendas and Minutes*. Paper 349.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_execcom/349

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC)

November 28, 2022

8:30 - 10:30 AM

MINUTES

**In person - Pastore Conference Room RM224
(remote option via ZOOM)**

1. Call to order - FS President Rice called the meeting to order at 8:32 AM. FS VP Nassersharif and Senators Maier-Sperdelozzi; Echevarria, Gindy and Forrester were present.
2. Announcements
 - a. There was a meeting of the Administrative Policy Council (APC) on November 22 - under discussion and for consideration were two draft policies: a) the Draft Policy on COVID-19 and Campus Health and Safety, and b) the Draft Policy on Collection and Use of COVID-19 Related Health Screening and Safety Information. Update from VP Nassersharif: The intent behind these drafts was represented as an attempt to move beyond the COVID emergency. The policies are being revised to give flexibility and usefulness in other health-related scenarios. Several questions arose, especially as pertains to the data collection policy. VP Nassersharif had raised questions in the APC meeting about what oversight structures or protocols would be in place to govern use of the data and whether time limits would be imposed on maintenance of the data. Additional faculty members, especially those with expertise in the handling of data on human subjects, would likely have additional questions and concerns, especially about Federal HIPAA compliance and the need to guarantee that personally identifiable data would not be shared. The APC expects to have this item back on their agenda in early January and faculty should provide comments by then. A motion was made, seconded and unanimously supported to forward the draft policies to the Service and Community Life Committee for review and comment.

- b. President's Stewardship Council (PSC) update - VP Nassersharif attended the meeting and reported that three items had been on the agenda but a presentation on cyber-security by the CIO consumed the vast majority of the time allotted. He noted the existence of a number of non-compliant computing systems in use in various departments and these apparently present some risk to the University. FSEC members expressed frustration with the recently rolled-out mandatory cybersecurity training and it was questioned whether or not the true cost of requiring all faculty, staff and administration members to take the training was considered. Cybersecurity insurance requirements are often offered as justification for new policies and requirements but the burden on human resources is significant and faculty are unsure if any real cost-benefit analysis has been done. It was agreed that the FS President and VP will discuss this concern in their next meeting with the University President.

Also discussed at the Stewardship Council meeting was the restructuring of the parking and safety committee, currently configured as a Presidential joint committee. The proposal will be discussed in detail at the next PSC meeting but VP Nassersharif asked that the FSEC review and comment prior to that. Several concerns were highlighted, including the fact that the new draft would reduce faculty, staff, and student representation on the committee. FSEC members agreed to provide comments to be assembled in time for the December PSC meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. FSEC minutes of October 31, November 14, 2022, and November 21, 2022. The 10/31 minutes were approved following editing; the 11/14 minutes were approved as written; the 11/21 minutes were tabled to the 12/5 FSEC meeting.

4. For action - Administrator Evaluation Committees

- a. Finalize AEC membership for Deans Riley and Bontempi (See UMAN 5.76.11) - Several candidates were presented for each committee. Three members were selected to serve on Dean Bontempi's AEC and two members were selected to

serve on Dean Riley's AEC. The names will be provided to the Provost. Senator Echevarria will attempt to recruit a third member from a short list of candidates.

- b. Proposed change to 10.90.16, administrator evaluation of the president. Approved by FSEC and BOT; pending CBUM review - CBUM to report back following their 11/30 meeting.

5. Discussion Items

- a. Setting agenda for December 8 Faculty Senate Meeting - the agenda was reviewed and a couple of additional reports were mentioned. Reports should be provided roughly one week in advance and the agenda will be finalized at the next meeting.
- b. Ongoing - Updates on Manual Revisions & Policy Development - It was noted that since a large number of new policies was presented at the September Senate meeting, the sole committee that has responded to President Rice's call for review is CBUM. It was noted that FSEC had decided to present the policies in September to enlist the assistance of more Senators and more Senate committees in the work of administrative policy review because the burden is too great for FSEC to manage alone. The burden is also too great for CBUM to manage alone. FSEC reiterated its endorsement of the recommendations formulated by CBUM and that were shared with Interim Provost Beauvais and Vice President Rider, noting that implementation of these basic and very simple best practices could alleviate many of the problems that are arising. The idea of scheduling a joint meeting with the University President and Provost to suggest a more effective, efficient, and collaborative administrative policy development process was discussed. Those involved in such a meeting should advocate for a more methodical process that carefully considers appropriate stakeholders and meaningfully incorporates input from faculty and other members of the university community. It was agreed that a meeting should be set soon since the current Provost is leaving office at the end of the year. Every effort should be made to resolve this matter before that time as it seems egregious to allow such

a significant shared governance controversy to impact a new Provost's early days in the role. If progress cannot be made before the end of the year, a meeting with the new Provost should be set early in January so she is not caught unaware.

In terms of desired outcomes, it was agreed that two main issues need to be resolved and these pertain to definitions and timelines. The APC has failed to realize that many of their policies are not purely administrative in nature and have either a direct academic component or an indirect impact on some facet of academics. The existence of the Administrative Policies webpage frames the policies it houses in misleading terms ("University policies"), downplays both the existence and importance of the University Manual as the University's primary policy clearinghouse, and sets up a false dichotomy by suggesting that all administrative policies reside on that website and that solely academic policies belong in the Manual. In reality, very few policies can be categorized as exclusively administrative. Further, the approved Policy on Policies attempts to provide some definitions but seems to come up short.

Regarding timelines, Faculty Senate leaders have previously asked for at least 10 days to review draft policies but this request has not been honored. In many cases, the FSEC receives a draft the day before it is docketed for action. This is unacceptable as it does not allow time for any meaningful review. Ideally, even more time should be allotted so that relevant Committees could be assigned to review and formulate comprehensive comments.

There was a discussion about Appendix G and the need to make editorial revisions to it to address the fact that the University Manual remains the primary clearinghouse not only for academics but also for governance policies and numerous administrative policies relating to academics and governance. This should probably be a priority along with calling for clarifications and revisions to the Policy on Policies. The need for these updates should be a focal point of any conversation with the President and Provost.

- c. Draft Policy on Contract Approval and Signatory Authority (for 12/6/22 APC consideration) - Continued from 11/21 - The draft policy would seem to have some troubling implications for both faculty and students. As written, the draft would unnecessarily complicate simple and free transactions, like the download of educational software on university computers, as an example. Other issues include a lack of clarity about the role of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, which is not specifically addressed in the same way that the VP's of Administration and Research are. It also creates ambiguity about how research functions central to the university's land- and sea-grant mission will be treated, specifically where international extension projects are not run through the VP of Research's office. FS President Rice will take these and other concerns to the APC's December meeting.
 - d. Inquiry from Committee on Technology and Infrastructure - continued from 11/21 - The Committee Chair proposed expanding the scope of the Committee beyond technology infrastructure. Following some discussion, the group agreed the Committee should not change its scope at this time but there should perhaps be a future joint committee that addresses facilities and other systems infrastructure.
 - e. Ongoing issue of OTL and outcomes assessments - continued from 11/21 - Tabled.
 - f. Advance planning -
 - Transition plan for Joanne Lawrence 's retirement
 - Other Administrators for visits?
6. Call for New Business - None.
 7. Adjournment - the meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.