

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Meeting Minutes
September 09, 2024

The University Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m., in 111 Harrison Hall on Monday, September 09, 2024. Members absent: Lee Biggerstaff, Olga Brezhneva, Rodney Coates, John Forren, Chip Hahn, Yingbin Hu, Sam Morris, David Motta, Ganiva Reyes

Two Minute Speeches: [Boehme 2 Minute Speech 09.09.2024](#) - (Attachment/pg. 13)

1. **Call to Order and Announcements and Remarks** – Rosemary Pennington, Chair of University Senate Executive Committee
 - a. Passed at the end of last year Senator Attendance Policy:
 - i. After a 3 absences Senate Executive will meet with the senate representative to see what is going on.
 - ii. After 4 absences we will notify your constituents, this is meant to ensure you have the support you need and that your constituents have a representative present in Senate. To ensure that their voices are heard too.
 - iii. This policy should be updated on our webpage soon.
 - b. We also passed a policy to allow our 2 Minute speeches to be appended to the minutes as an attachment. The process to have your 2 minute speeches included:
 - i. You have to alert me or someone on SEC if you want to have the speech appended to the minutes at least 1 hour before Senate with your typed up comments attached. We want to make sure we preserve these statements over time
 - ii. We will follow your transcript as you are giving your speech and make notations if you said something that was not in the transcript.
 - iii. If they are related to University Business they will be added. This way we can preserve this for time in Senate.
 - c. We had a request to charge the committee of CTE to examine alternative forms of teaching evaluations for the institution. As there are issues with evaluations; so CTE is going to spend a year examining what is out there. Eventually maybe we can replace what we currently use or improve what we use to evaluate teaching.
2. **Approval of University Senate Minutes**
 - a. University Senate Full Meeting Minutes_05.06.2024 (Results: 50-Yes, 00-No, 01-Abstain)
3. **Consent Calendar:** The following items were received and accepted on the Consent Calendar:
 - a. Curricular Items _08.28.2024
 - b. Graduate Council Minutes_05.07.2024
 - c. Graduate Council Minutes_08.29.2024
 - d. LEC Meeting Minutes_04.16.2024

- e. LEC Meeting Minutes_08.27.2024
- f. Academic Policy Committee Annual Report_2023-2024
- g. Academic Policy Committee Minutes_05.03.2024
- h. UCI Minutes_04.26.2024
 - i. Pulled UCI Minutes from consent calendar

4. **Old Business**

- a. Mission Statement, Gwen Fears, Assistant Vice President for Student Life; Mission Statement Committee Co-Chair, - (Results: 51-Yes, 00-No, 00-Abstain)
 - i. The Process
 - 1. University committee established
 - 2. Survey to University and external stakeholders; focus groups
 - 3. Analysis of survey data
 - 4. Key concepts vetted by committee
 - 5. University town halls to refine key concepts
 - 6. Writing the statement
 - a. University Senate
 - b. Board of Trustees approval
 - ii. Committee - Gwen Fears, Amy Bergerson, Anna Abey, M.Cristina Alcalde, Michael Bailey-Van Kuren, Adam Beissel, Kasie Bowman, Edgar Caraballo, Amy Cooper, Jason Ezell, Cathy Heinz, Nicole Hoyer, Jack Isphording, Jeff Kuznekoff, Emily Legg, Kevin Marks, Lindsay Marnell, Marina Mendes, Alicia Miller, Amity Noltemeyer, Sofia Olaya, Kirsten Osteboe, Carrie Powell, Darryl Rice, Cassandra Scott, Dawn Tsirelis, Robin Vealey, Katie Wilson, Chauncey Winbush, Brian Woodruff
 - iii. Input from the Community
 - 1. Survey
 - a. All students, faculty, and staff on all campuses
 - b. Open for several weeks end of October - end of November, 2023
 - c. Almost 1,000 responses
 - 2. Focus Groups
 - a. Parents, Alums, Advisory board members
 - b. 100+ participants
 - 3. Town Halls
 - a. Presentation of key concepts
 - b. 9 sessions over three weeks end of February - mid March, 2024
 - c. Verbal and written feedback
 - iv. Key Concepts - Five key concepts derived from the survey and focus group data
 - 1. Character
 - a. Values
 - b. Navigating communities

- c. Responsibility for greater good
- 2. Community
 - a. Local, regional, global
 - b. Collaborative, care-informed
 - c. Exceptional experiences
 - d. Shared decision-making
- 3. Diversity and Inclusion
 - a. Reflects respect
 - b. All voices
 - c. Continual improvement
- 4. Expertise and Content
 - a. Teacher-Scholar
 - b. Co-created knowledge
 - c. Experiential learning and holistic preparation
- 5. Future
 - a. Lifelong learners
 - b. Shaping the future
 - c. Guided by history
- v. Post Town Halls
 1. Reviewed data - surveys, focus groups, town hall notes, town hall written comments
 2. Drafted statements related to key concepts
 3. Created draft of mission statement from these statements
 4. Revised draft statement and gathered committee input
 5. Present to University Senate - May and August
 6. Present to Board of Trustees - May
 7. University Senate Retreat - August 2024
 8. Votes for approval - September 2024
- vi. Proposed Mission Statement - Fall 2024
 1. Miami University is a student-centered, public university, guided by the principles of [Love and Honor](#). Leading with integrity, compassion, and respect, we pursue growth and excellence in a transformative learning environment. We embrace a holistic and personalized approach to education, infused with the humanities and liberal arts, to empower lifelong learners who use leadership, creativity, and innovation to shape the future. Our [teacher-scholars](#) and highly engaged staff inspire curiosity, intellectual depth, and career preparation across our communities through instruction, research, scholarship, experiential learning, co-curricular experiences, and civic engagement. We foster a diverse, inclusive, and welcoming community where each individual is valued, respected, and appreciated. Our students, faculty, staff, and alumni develop the skills and knowledge to lead with confidence and

courage and to provide solutions for local and global challenges now and in the future.

vii. Senator Question and Comments

1. Senator: I feel that in the line “lifelong learners who use leadership, creativity, and innovation” creativity and innovation overlaps. Is there a reason why that is?(A) It came back in the data very differently, so as the committee reviewed and thought about it we felt that they were separate concepts.
2. Senator: Another thing that I was thinking about is ethics?(A) That shows up in the lead with integrity as we thought that was an important phrase that would also capture the ethics part of it too. The task of writing a mission statement is very hard as there are lots of words and phrases that we could have used. We also looked at our previous mission statement and leading with integrity is a part of that.
3. Senator: I feel that this is kinda rating people on their leadership standards along with keeping them to a high ethical standard. (A) I don’t disagree and I hope that those concepts are felt within this new mission statement.
4. Senator: I just want to thank you for coming back again to address our comments that we had during our senate retreat. Also, to your committee for all the work that you have put into this as I know this took a lot of time and effort. (A) You guys provided great feedback and we appreciate that. The committee is filled with really great individuals that have worked really hard on this and it was kind of fun to come together one more time to discuss this.
5. Senator: Great work my only concern is timing as it relates to THRIVE work that is being concluded. Last week during the President's presentation there was a lot of excitement about the culture of the new term they called The Miami Way. If this gets approved as the mission statement does that embrace The Miami Way?(A)There are a number of members on both so we have been engaged in this entire process this whole time. Brent has a copy of the proposed Mission Statement, so it could be a guiding piece as THRIVE continues to go.
6. Senator: I can say as a co-chair of one THRIVE subcommittee that we have had this in mind the whole time. It is hard to get my work done with THRIVE without the new mission statement being completed. There has been enough overlap between the members of THRIVE and the mission statement that I am pretty confident that enough has been included in the mission statement.
7. Senator: I think the mission statement is so hard and complex to do. You had me at “Miami University is a student-centered, public university” I think it is really inspirational and that it is really good.

5. New Business

- a. Ad Hoc Committee on Athletic Attendance Policy, Nathan French, Associate Professor and Lead Departmental Advisor, Comparative Religion - **Presentation only; Discussion and Anticipated Vote on September 23, 2024**
 - i. Draft - Description & Charge
 1. The University Senate convenes this Ad Hoc Committee on the Athletic Attendance Policy to review the drafted policy as voted by the Athletic Policy Committee in Spring 2024 and make recommendations on:
 - a. Any recommended adjustments to the policy as voted and advanced by the Athletic Policy Committee in Spring 2024. Specific attention should be paid to language involving varsity sport student-athletes.
 - b. Any necessary adjustments to the extant University attendance policy, on matters related to student athlete absence and accommodation
 - c. Best practices for Miami University to adopt – in terms of policy, institutional matters, or other strategies for academic success – following review of other universities in the Mid-American Conference and other near-peers deemed appropriate by the Ad Hoc committee
 - ii. Committee Structure
 1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Athletic Attendance Policy will be co-chaired by one (1) representative from the Academic Policy Committee and one (1) representative from the Athletic Policy Committee as selected from the membership of those committees. The remaining membership of the committee should include at least:
 - a. Two UG student members, who shall be selected from Miami University intercollegiate athletic teams, including one (1) competing as a female and one (1) competing as a male
 - b. One (1) UG student member, chosen by the Associated Student Government, who is not formally involved with intercollegiate athletics
 - c. Two (2) G student members, who shall be selected from Miami University intercollegiate athletic teams, including one (1) competing as a female and one (1) competing as a male
 - d. One (1) G student member, chosen by the Graduate Student Association, who is not formally involved with intercollegiate athletics.
 - e. One (1) representative from the Miami University Athletics Office, drawn from either senior administration or academic

compliance

- f. One (1) Academic, Associate, or Assistant Dean with expertise in Academic Policy
- g. Two (2) faculty members, each one from a different division, and both will be from a different college than the Dean noted in #4 above.

- 2. Remaining members of the committee shall be at the discretion and agreement of the co-chairs. However, the University Senate requests that the committee seat intercollegiate student athletes on the committee from the regional campuses, where appropriate.

iii. Initial and Reporting Date

- 1. The Ad Hoc Committee on Athletic Attendance Policy will sit for its first meeting no later than Monday, October 7, 2024 and will submit its final report and recommendations to University Senate no later than December 2, 2024

iv. Senator Question and Comments

- 1. Senator: I think we were sent an older draft of this and not the newer draft?(A) Yes, the agenda was circulated before the final draft came through and that is because the chairs of both the Academic and Athletic attendance Policy vetted this draft and gave us recommendations late Friday afternoon.
- 2. Senator: We don't have all the points or who the chairs?(A) One rep from Academic and one from Athletic Policy.
- 3. Senator: Just to clarify this is not a new policy, just a revision to the current attendance policy regarding athletes?(A) Yes, that is my understanding as well.
- 4. Senator: This request is in response to a policy draft that was developed by committee, shared with another committee then it got tabled. If the chairs are available or if other people from those committees are here that know about what happened with this process can we get backstory on why it was tabled? It seems odd to me that we don't have a policy for our student athletics?(A) I can give some backstory. It started last spring and it was made aware that there wasn't anything in there for the athletes. There have been some issues with them not being excused or having difficulty with some classes, but there have been some push back with faculty regarding this. So, 2 things: The Academic Policy Committee actually came to the Midterm Policy Committee first and we passed it to the Academic Policy Committee as we thought it needed to be brought to the Senate for review and an adhoc was needed.
- 5. Senator: Yes, there were issues of students not being excused for classes. Last year I was a member of the Athletic Policy Committee and we did have a conversation about this regarding including all students

that were representing the university on official business. I was much more in favor of a more expansive definition, however I was not able to attend the meeting that this was voted on so I don't have the latest details that were discussed.

6. Senator: Do we need someone from the registration office on this Ad Hoc Committee?(A) Ted Peters is on the Academic Policy Committee, and he is also here in Senate.
7. Senator: How have students expressed their need for this policy? How did we know about this?(A) I saw a few examples where students had communicated to someone in the athletic department. I am not sure if it was their coach or athletic advisors that they were having difficulty being allowed to make things. That is what I heard, but there may be more.
8. Senator: Quick summary: Just that students are excused and can make up work. Is that what is being proposed? (A) It was brought up that we mandate that all faculty excuse athletes from missed exams, but in the discussion it was decided that could be problematic. However, we didn't like the mandated language. Then there comes a question of how do you make things up, as it may not be doable for all faculty. So, we started looking at other universities in the regions that have less restrictions to accommodate athletes and faculty.
9. Senator: Mike Crowder is the Faculty Athletic representative who liaison with all the MAC institutions. In some preliminary discussion, we found out that some universities have a policy and some do not. I think this committee should find out what those best practices are then bring it back to Miami and see which ones would fit our university.
10. Senator: For the other student populations, are there plans in the future to talk about them in the future? (A) Just to re-point out this would not be a separate policy, this is just a revision to our current attendance policy in regards to athletes. At this time we are just focusing on this situation as it relates to athletics. That doesn't mean later we can't look at it for other student populations too.
11. Senator: In this charge to the committee is there room for the committee to make specific recommendations to the policy groups for adoption? (A) Yes, that would be the case. If it isn't obvious we can make sure that it is written in more clearly.

6. Special Reports

- a. CAS Curriculum Preview, Renee Baernstein, College of Arts and Science Dean
 - i. Why change our major offerings?
 1. Student demand is shifting quickly. We need to evolve our portfolio of offerings to respond to it, in order to remain competitive. This involves

- creating new programs, updating some existing programs, and sunseting some existing programs.
- 2. The goal is to maintain a varied, attractive, and sustainable set of offerings across the various fields of the CAS.
- 3. Today's presentation: demand trends, goals and outline of curricular proposals, support structures
- ii. Miami follows national trends - declines most pronounced in humanities - H11=11 humanities majors remaining after proposed changes (graph showing each year from 2018-2023 is provided in slide presentation)
- iii. Background:
 - 1. The APEIP process (2019-2024) identified programs with low enrollment and set benchmarks for increased enrollment. While many program faculty worked intensively to achieve these goals, some programs could not overcome the broader trends of declining student interest.
 - 2. In light of the low numbers, continued declining trends, and the minimum enrollments that have been set for viability (35 enrolled) the faculty involved in these programs have voted to move forward with the proposed changes.
- iv. Faculty and staff involvement
 - 1. Faculty have been working hard to respond to shifts in demand.
 - 2. The new proposals (major, co major) have been faculty designed and proposed.
 - 3. All continuing faculty will remain. They will continue to teach in their fields, whether in the relevant minor or in other areas they have chosen to develop.
 - 4. Office staff may possibly be reassigned to other units if needs shift, though there are no such changes currently scheduled.
- v. Dept of Global and Intercultural Studies.
 - 1. Deleting majors, retaining minors in:
 - a. Latin American Studies
 - b. Critical Race and Ethnic Studies
 - c. American Studies
 - d. Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies
 - 2. Creating comajors in:
 - a. Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies
- vi. World Languages and Cultures (new major)
 - 1. Consolidates these existing majors. All minors retained.
 - a. French, Italian Studies, Classical Studies, German, Russian, Eastern European, and Eurasian Cultures (REEES), East Asian Languages and Culture, and No department mergers are planned

2. Faculty are working with LEC support to build the new major and create new courses
3. The major will have a track for each language, with fewer courses in target language.
 - a. Reduces low-enrolled courses.
 - b. Create shared culture courses taught in English that can reach more students.
 - c. Encourage study abroad for advanced students.
- vii. Graphs showing Natural Science UG, Social Science UG, and Humanities UG provided in slide show presentation.
- viii. Savings - short and long term
 1. Short Term:
 - a. Reduce low-enrolled courses
 - b. Faculty can teach courses of broader interest for non-majors
 - c. If there is reliance on temporary faculty it can be reduced
 2. Long Term:
 - a. Shift faculty lines to growing areas as lines open
 - b. When demand shifts again, we will adjust
- ix. These are critical areas of study
 1. The major isn't the main way students are interacting with this material, as enrollment shows.
 2. Minors, certificates, or other courses will be essential to continue.
- x. Growth areas
 1. We will continue to create new majors where there is likely to be demand, and to shift resources (new hiring) into areas of growth.
- xi. Humanities Innovation and Discussion at Miami today - a glimpse
 1. Humanities Center Altman Program 2024-25: "Humanities Futures"
 2. "Humanities Futures" Initiative
 - a. Goal of stabilizing and increasing enrollment in majors and courses
 - b. Career training and awareness for humanities students
 - c. Enhanced communication to students and parents about the value of humanities degrees
 - d. Explore partnerships with other fields
 - e. Grow interdisciplinary offerings that draw on areas of growing interest (health, environment, business, data)
- xii. Bachelor Hall Humanities Hub: Grand Opening 2026, "Celebrating Humanities at Miami"
 1. A renovated, state-of-the-art teaching and learning facility. Funded by state appropriations and a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.
 2. Home to the Humanities Center and the Department of:

- a. English
 - b. Media, Journalism, and Film
 - c. Philosophy
 - d. History
- 3. Process
 - a. Construction Begins Summer 2024
 - b. Building Opens Summer 2026
 - c. Grand Opening Celebration Fall 2026
- xiii. Question and Comments
 - 1. Senator: Thank you as this is what we were missing last year and this is really helpful.
 - 2. Senator: This gives us the direction that we are moving towards instead of feeling like we're just reacting. I feel like students really want clear certifications so that they know which major gives them access to which jobs. The relabeling may make it harder for students to find what they are needing, which could result in even lower enrollment. How are we going to help students navigate this? (A) That is a concern. We have to work to make it clear for the student, and they will all have minors, so I think that will help. I think the important thing to think about is that the old way wasn't working either, so we have to relook at this.
 - 3. Senator: What about the possibility of having a certificate within world cultures instead of minors?(A) I am sure that the departments will be looking into that. They may also consider for example doing two languages.
 - 4. Senator: You talked about long term saving. With the mission do we have a commitment to preserve Humanities as a subject that students get caught in lower levels, but a commitment that would justify hiring faculty and preserving a knowledge infrastructure long term?(A) In my mind the default answer is yes of course. If you don't have the humanities then you don't have a college of arts and science. However, we can't foresee the future to see the fields where students are going and that is what we have to address. We need to make sure we are meeting student needs and helping them understand that these are valuable fields, but there is no point in having this commitment if there is no one sitting in those seats.
 - 5. Senator: The investment in Bachelor is also something to think about as I don't think that the university would be applying for millions from the state if the plan isn't for humanities to be thriving in the future.
- b. Data Access Policy, Padma Patil, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, & Sue McDowell, Ph.D., Vice President for Research and Innovation
 - i. What we see as the process for utilizing university data for academic research.

1. Issues that we found in this process:
 - a. How university data were being accessed and utilized for research. Especially when it came to protection for human subjects
 - b. If any projects were conducted inappropriately utilizing this data then those projects could not be published and used further down the road.
 2. Process going forward:
 - a. Individuals that will be participating in the research data must sign a consent form. We provide them with documentation to explain to them why they may want to participate in this research along with the consent form.
 - b. If the research project also involves grades, personal identifiable information that the university could access, that individual would also need to sign a FERPA release form too.
 - c. In the past the consent forms were not always collected or required. This is no longer the case and the protection that we have put into place to protect those human subjects.
- ii. Senator Question and Comments
1. Senator: Does that apply to achieved data that is 100 percent anonymous data?(A) I would say send me an email as we don't have anything anonymous that I am aware of. If it was student data of students that were enrolled at Miami we would not release the data.
 2. Senator: If we got the consent and FERPA forms signed by the student then the researcher would be allowed to have this data?(A) The individual would then provide the information themselves as they would be able to provide grades, GPA, sex, etc, not the institution.
 3. Senator: From researchers point of view I could see this being problematic. If you could get the actual data instead of the self reported data as it has high quality value to it. (A) The institution is not releasing that data.
 4. Senator: Are you saying anytime using students here at Miami I would have to use FERPA data even if it is data that is a part of their class?(A) So, FERPA covers student records, if a student is related to the classwork then they would need the FERPA and the Consent form.
 5. Senator: I would change that from student level data then to class generated data through course work because to me that means all the individual level which I think you are saying is different?(A) It depends, I have to see the specific circumstances, if it is protected by FERPA then we need it. But if we have the details it is a lot easier to guide you through the process

6. Senator: What is the difference between pulling from Canvas and trying to get it from another professor? (A) We are more than happy to come out to your class and talk about this and help guide you through this process. I wouldn't even mind coming to your class to talk to the students about this too.
7. Senator: This is research that would need to be done to publish externally, but for our qualitative assessment purposes would we need to pull FERPA?(A) That is not a FERPA issue, just for a student completing a survey not on using their personal information.

7. Provost Update

- a. Thinking about how Universities have changed over the years and it has been 200 years of construction here at Miami. To think about what they would think about how things have changed since 1824.
- b. THRIVE I want to thank the individuals that have been spending so much time with this. Brent explained the process at our retreat, but didn't share specific recommendations but a forum will be held on October 14th sharing recommendations and you can provide them with feedback. We want to encourage all faculty and staff to go to these forums.
- c. In the last 2 years it has become very apparent that workload really varies depending on each department you are in. We are really going to be looking at that this year and we are going to try following our guidelines here at Oxford.
 - i. We have certain policies around pre tenured load and base load which we say 3-2 or 3-3. Then we have a vague differential teaching load, which essentially means if you are a tenure line faculty member and you through your career are doing less research you may teach a little more. So, we will be looking at all those details as they become more apparent
 - ii. Our goal is to try and provide more transparency and provide the most equity as our faculty is our most valuable resource.
- d. Coming through the curricular process this year is a new PHD program in Engineering. This is a desire to recruit faculty in engineering that can be more engaged in sponsored research and receive more support on that front. It will also help our external research portfolio.

8. Adjournment

BOEHME 2-MINUTE SPEECH

University Senate, 09 September 2024

Hello senators. I'm speaking to you today in my role as a member of the Faculty Alliance of Miami Negotiating Team.

We have been diligently working with management's team this summer to get closer to a first contract for represented faculty and librarians. It takes time to bargain a contract from scratch, but we have made progress, including coming closer together on grievance procedures and faculty evaluations, and a ground-breaking agreement that lays the foundation for negotiating on AI's potential effects on our employment.

In several crucial areas, however, there's still daylight between management's and FAM's proposals.

Management continues to offer a proposal FAM is not prepared to accept: Post-Tenure Review. We already have a robust annual review process and the contract will include clear evaluation procedures. Management's proposed Post-Tenure Review process contains extremely opaque evaluation standards, which, if not met, could result in termination of tenured faculty. By contrast, FAM intends to ensure good teacher-scholars can't get fired for flimsy reasons.

Management also differs with FAM on protecting academic freedom in the contract. Especially in these times when faculty around the country are having their speech, teaching, and research silenced by legislatures and boards of trustees, it's essential to the public good that we defend academic freedom through the contract.

Finally, compensation. The difference here is stark. FAM has proposed a 7% average raise for faculty — a reasonable proposal that would just about bring bargaining unit members in line with the increase in the cost of living. Management's proposal is 1 and a quarter percent annual raise with no back pay for the raises they refused to give us over the past two summers.

The differences in these and other proposals amount to separate visions for how the future will look at Miami for faculty and librarians. I encourage each of you to think carefully about these differences and about what you are prepared to do this semester to support the future you would like to see for yourself and your colleagues.