

## **Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting 10/18/19**

### **Welcome**

Laura calls meeting to order at 12:48.

Minutes from September meeting approved.

### **Presidential Task Force on Gender Violence Update and Discussion**

The President's office would like us to make some charges and for us to suggest names for co-chair and membership on the Task Force. Please email the names of people you would like to include. Please check with anyone you are naming, making sure that they are willing to serve. Email names by Monday.

Ideas for charges for the Task Force:

C: I've been on the Task Force. We have looked at other schools that are doing a better job than we are. We are hoping to put together a website this year. We also hope to get approval for an external audit so we can learn what we are doing and what we can do better. We would also like to look at the Culture of Respect initiative, looking into the extent to which this is a catch-all or aimed specifically toward gender violence.

C: I have talked with the Provost and they are looking into hiring someone to specifically address issues related to this when hiring.

C: I would like to see some policy measures based on evidence.

### **Visas for Faculty: Yulong "Helen" Gu (see Powerpoint)**

I am on a temporary worker visa and would like to discuss what international faculty members have been struggling with. Stockton has a number of international faculty, most on a H-1B visa, which expires after six years. So most people choose to apply for the permanent visa. This process is long and laborious. Many of us feel like Stockton does not provide enough support for faculty during this process – both the H1-B process and the permanent visa. There have been problems with mishandling of paper work and misunderstanding the process among administration. There are no policies guiding this process. A survey of international faculty and staff highlighted the extent of disappointment with the current process. Other institutions publish their procedures. The consensus is that international faculty would like more guidance during this process. We would like more help with the costs and a clear policy.

C: What do our sister institutions that are not R1 universities do?

Helen: I don't have this information. But related to financing, the institution first pays for the H1 visa, and if the faculty member then leaves because of frustration with the lack of process, then that initial investment is lost. So there is incentive to improve the process.

C: If you would demonstrate that other similar universities do it one way or another, then that would be helpful. Or maybe the Association of State Colleges may have information on this. Have you looked?

Helen: No, we don't have data on those institutions. Stockton provides partial support for the legal fee, but faculty pay at least \$7000 out of pocket. There are a number of other financial costs as well. There is also no help with the paperwork. But I don't have information on what every other institution does.

C: As Helen pointed out, many non-R1 institutions have clear policies and provide much greater support. Part of Stockton's mission is to increase diversity, so greater help with this is consistent with our mission. Another issue is that we are forced to use a specific legal service, which is more expensive than others and we are forced to pay out of pocket for this. We should be able to choose the legal help.

C: I agree that we need some policies, some transparency regarding what faculty can expect when they are hired. Other institutions I have been at provide much greater transparency related to this. Potential faculty should know where they will have help and where they will not. I hope that we can streamline the current process and I support whatever we can do to move this forward.

C: It would also be helpful if the Deans have the same policies.

C: Search committees should know how the integration of candidates from other countries will happen so they can communicate this with candidates.

C: I would like to express my support for this effort. When I was applying for a Green Card, it was very difficult and the whole process – working with HR – is very frustrating. Without a Green Card, international faculty can lose opportunities for research.

C: I was told that Stockton supports international faculty in this process, but they were not clear on how much. I have also had trouble with grants because I do not have a Green Card. So Stockton is losing money because of their lack of support for this process.

C: I would encourage you to include someone in HR and part of the legal team in any team looking into this. Any attorney used in these processes needs to be an approved vendor, so you will need to keep that in mind.

C: Regarding the current vendor, they are very good. However, they are expensive and we are forced to pay these high prices. If Stockton paid for it, that would be fine. But since we are paying, we should have choice.

C: We will look into creating a task force to look into this.

C: We can move to create a task force now, if someone wants to make such a motion.

C: I think we should move to ask our President to create such a task force.

Motion to create Senate Task Force.

Motion passes.

**Institute for Faculty Development: Presentation from Provost's Office**

Michelle McDonald: This is not just a question about the IFD, but about what kind of administrative roles that faculty have been playing and what role they want to play. We want to take a comprehensive look at all of these roles, including the IFD. The local agreement, which includes directors of IFD, are being reconsidered because the current agreement sunsets in June of 2020. The term of the IFD director was on a different term. But we can't extend the contract beyond the current agreement. The coordinator agreement governs the directors but does not govern the centers and institutes. There is a whole range of centers and institutes that we are looking at. The current system is very large and complex, so we are looking to rethink faculty roles in these administrative positions. I also want to strongly emphasize the important work that these centers do, including the IFD, are not imbedded within one center and will continue to be supported. But I cannot tell you how they will be managed as of July 1, 2020. But I assure you they will not be eliminated.

C: This is the first time I'm hearing this and I appreciate the importance of the IFD Center. Will the IFD go away?

A: I do not know how the Center will be managed, but what it does will not go away.

C: I'm uncomfortable with the uncertainty related to how the services will continue without the IFD. It would be nice if there had been some preparation for what will replace it.

A: I didn't say the Center will go away. All of these administrative positions are being reconsidered and renegotiated. And I simply can't say what this position will look like in the future.

C: It seems like this all came out of the blue. I was blind-sided by the email that came out a couple weeks ago from the Provost. Why is this just coming up now and in this way?

C: The Senate was not consulted about this. I went to the Provost office after learning about the change to IFD and, after hearing concern from faculty about it. The Provost's email came after my meeting with her.

C: So will there be some restructuring of IFD? And will there be faculty representation in that process?

A: Absolutely. Any changes will include the Union and faculty.

IDF director: I want to clarify that I did not know this was happening until very recently.

C: I'm concerned about the process by which this happened. If I was a second-year faculty member, I would have been terrified getting that email, because the email just told us there would be lots of changes including to the IFD. There should be more complete and more consistent communication.

C: I agree with everyone and I was shocked when I got that email. There was not a lot of clarity in the email. Two thirds of our faculty in my School are not tenured, so the IFD is very important to our school. The IFD is faculty-led and driven and I am hoping that does not change because it is helpful to have faculty helping faculty.

A: There is a different agreement governing faculty fellow and is valid until 2021 or 2022. We agree that faculty should be those helping other faculty.

## Closed Session

The Provost has promised that some positions will still be run by faculty. What I would like to do now is to discuss what we want in place.

C: What worries me is, one, that the administration will say that they can undercut our structures whenever they want. I would like to see something about the process about when things can be created and destroyed. Second, I am nervous about where these positions are going to go. They are taking something away without any indication of what is going to take the place.

C: So this is part of our negotiation, right? Nothing is going away, right? I think they are just saying that we are renegotiating the position. Or am I missing something?

C: This is actually an interesting technicality. In order to get out of the contract that went beyond 2020, the IFD had to be dissolved. Otherwise, they would have on contract that went beyond 2020, which they could not do.

C: This really goes to the core of what we do. So I have grave concerns about this. I'm also concerned this is a money-saving tactic and a tactic to move power to the administration.

C: The former director was exemplary and he took a position elsewhere because they were creating something similar. Maybe we can reach out to him to get advice.

Presentation about IFD (see pdf): Discussion of the statistics on how many faculty have been served and how.

C: I'm concerned about whether new faculty will have a course release.

C: This should be looked into because I have never seen this included in a contract.

C: There are some things tied to the IFD that are under other contracts regardless of the IFD existing.

C: We need to decide what we want under faculty control.

C: We do seminars, we have speakers, summer institutes, mid-term evaluations, and many other things.

C: So do we want all this under faculty control?

Presentation continues: Why are we talking about changing a structure that works? [More discussion about all that the IFD has done; see pdf for statistics.] Whatever this turns into, it needs to be for faculty by faculty. I don't see the shared governance in this.

C: I agree it is important that this is run by a faculty member.

C: Can we focus on what we want to keep control of as faculty?

C: I am concerned about what will happen to the secretary.

C: The secretary has a contract that makes her not at risk.

C: Is there a reason why this is occurring? Why are we trying to fix something that isn't broken? Why are we debating what faculty should be doing? Why not just redo it the way is it now?

C: I think this has to do with course releases. The IFD direct has five course releases that they have to take. So I think it has to do with money.

C: We need some facts and information about issue related to this. We have been speculating a lot.

C: The Center for Learning Design may be a key piece to this. How are these two things going to work together?

C: So far, the IFD and CLD have been working together well.

Meeting adjourned at 2:02.