



#659

MINUTES FOR THE MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026
FACULTY SENATE MEETING AT 4:00 P.M. IN UC COUNCIL ROOM

Present: Brown, Brownhill, Castro, Chapin, Cieminski, Dietz, Fleming, Gershwin, Haddad, Han, Henderson, Humphrey, Karlin, Leatherman, Lee, Leonard, Levin, Newman, Paytoe Gbayee, Schuttler, Senbet, Shafie, Trask, Wieben

Zoom: Borum, Garrett, Kang, Landry, Mannello, Manshad, McDuffie, Morse, Roberts, Tian, Wood

Absent: Alcantar, DeKrey, Elkins, Feinstein, Fischer, Lunariss

Guest: Nancy Sileo

1. Call to Order 4:00PM
2. Approval of the March 23, 2026 Agenda approved with the addition of the 3/2/26 minutes to the agenda seconded by Schuttler
3. Approval of the March 2, 2026 Faculty Senate Minutes approved without objection
4. Chair's Report (Newman) – Senate elections have concluded, and congratulations to all newly elected members. Senate officer nominations will take place at the next meeting, and committee chairs keep committee chair nominations in mind as well. The Faculty Trustee election is upcoming, with an informational email to be sent soon. The provost search is moving forward, with over 60 applicants received, and a update email will be distributed this week. The College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM) building tour will be on Friday, April 24th, 2pm-3pm. An email invitation will be sent out shortly, with space limited and available on a first-come, first-served basis. A listening session with MCB senators is scheduled for Wednesday and the remaining session will be UL. The FPAC survey was sent out today, and faculty are encouraged to complete it. A Phase IV Town Hall will be held this Thursday to discuss strategies for moving forward. Three candidates for the AVP position will be on campus this week. A fireside chat with Commissioner Scott James is scheduled for next week. The Women's Walk will take place on April 11, and the All-Faculty Meeting is scheduled for April 16 from 2:00–3:30 p.m.
5. Administrative Reports
 - President** (Feinstein) – No report
 - Provost** (Fleming) – Committees continue to be highly productive, engaging in difficult but important discussions, and there is appreciation for the Senate's collaborative work in advancing these efforts. Newman, Fischer, and Senbet have played a critical role in moving several of these items forward, also with General Counsel English making significant progress on the budget priority guidelines. The Faculty Senate Officer Workload Reassignment and Compensation proposal was paused, as the Faculty Trustee is not a senator. However, Matchett and Kyle worked together to assess workload considerations and determined that the LAC Chair should receive reassigned time. Further discussion on Phase IV will take place at the April 6 Senate meeting. Academic

Affairs will have a team participating in the Women's Walk on April 11th. This time of year is particularly challenging, and current pressures have been exacerbated by several factors; however, it is important to recognize the substantial progress that has been made. While there are ongoing issues across groups, Academic Affairs is actively working on ways to address and mitigate these concerns.

Dean's Representative (Haddad) – No report

Board of Trustees (Fischer) – No report

6. Staff Council Reports

Classified Staff Council (Henderson) – The annual Staff Recognition Luncheon and Award Ceremony had a great turnout. Jenn Beck was awarded Classified Staff of the Year.

Professional Administrative Staff Council (Castro) – Lindsey Stobaugh was awarded Professional Staff of the year. Nominations for the PASC award are distributed to the nominees.

7. Standing Committee Reports

Academic Policies (Gershwin) – Academic Policies met and reviewed COM policies and Grad council items. Academic Policies has an item under new business.

Codification (Schuttler) – Codification returned the COM policies to Academic Policies and Administrators Moving to or Returning to Faculty policy to Salary Equity

Elections (Schuttler) – The Boards, Councils, and Committees call for nomination will go out this week.

Faculty Welfare (Brown) – Faculty Welfare reviewed Board Policy 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluations and will send it to Codification.

Salary Equity (Senbet) – Salary Equity has two items under business.

8. Student Government Association Report (Brownhill) – A few senators attended Greeley day. SGA is still taking vendors for their event on April 16th.

9. Special Orders

10. Unfinished Business

- AI Syllabus Statement (Gershwin)
 - i. Dietz stated he will not support the proposal, expressing concern that it would force faculty to adopt practices they may not agree with and could represent a step toward limiting academic freedom.
 - ii. Fleming emphasized the student perspective, noting that students are experiencing anxiety due to unclear expectations and, at times, false accusations of cheating. While a formal policy may not be the best solution, clearer guidance on how and when AI can be used in each class is needed.
 - iii. Several members raised concerns about the use of “every,” suggesting it may be too rigid.
 1. Landry suggested using “encouraged” instead of “every.”
 - iv. Senbet questioned who would determine what is considered student-friendly, accessible, and clear, especially given that units have differing views on AI.

He noted that having some form of statement outlining permitted and prohibited uses could be beneficial.

- v. Brown emphasized that the proposal could raise ADA concerns, does not address unpredictability, and remains too vague, particularly given varying expectations across courses.
- vi. Chapin countered that some level of vagueness is intentional, allowing faculty flexibility while acknowledging evolving real-world contexts and reflecting institutional values.
- vii. Newman noted that including guidance in syllabi could reduce the burden on students needing to ask for clarification.
- viii. As the student representative, Brownhill added that students typically look to the syllabus first before asking the instructor for clarification. She noted that a written statement is more beneficial than verbal confirmation.
- ix. Haddad emphasized that clear syllabus language is especially important for first-generation students who may be less likely to approach faculty directly and including guidance in the syllabus is taking the students first approach.
- x. Levin noted that not all courses require an AI statement and, although including one in syllabi may be beneficial, it should not be mandated through formal policy. He shared that there are existing mechanisms that allow faculty to adopt such language.
- xi. As someone who regularly checks syllabi for mandates, Paytoe Gbayee shared syllabi requirements and emphasized the level of clarity such policy will be mandated.
- xii. Morse expressed support for including an AI statement in course syllabi, while emphasizing that each professor should retain the flexibility to determine their own approach based on the specific course and its content.
- xiii. Senbet suggested resolution rather than a formal policy, allowing deans and unit leaders to encourage faculty to include AI-related language in their syllabi without mandating it.
- xiv. Cieminski noted a broader shift in perspective from prioritizing faculty autonomy toward a more student-centered approach, highlighting concerns that the current perception of “whatever the professor says goes” may not best support students and suggesting a need for clearer, more consistent guidance.
- xv. Manshad noted that he is generally against mandating this because the onus should already fall on faculty. If a professor doesn't explain how AI should or shouldn't be used in their course, they have no standing to complain when a student uses it. The syllabus has always been the contract, and any responsible instructor should be addressing AI right now. Not because a policy tells them to, but because it's 2026.
He does not want to infringe on faculty freedom, but faculty need to be expected to teach and use AI in their classrooms. Industry is not waiting for us. Employers are expecting AI literacy from graduates right now. If we're going to spend any energy on this, it should be on supporting faculty to use AI in their classrooms, not hiding behind a policy to catch students cheating
- xvi. Shafie noted that the second point seems to be restrictive and needs clarification.

- xvii. Newman mentioned that that deans are expected to communicate that each department should establish its own perspective on AI, aligned with broader policy guidance.
- xviii. Leatherman asked where this policy would be placed, emphasizing that its placement is significant.
- xix. Karlin highlighted that this situation differs from policies such as the inclement weather police and questioned the consequences of not including an AI statement.
- xx. Chapin noted that policies can remain flexible and evolve over time.
- xxi. Levin expressed concern that if included in the BPM, having no AI statement in a syllabus could give students justification for AI use.
- xxii. A motion to end discussion was approved.
- xxiii. **MOTION:** It was moved to keep “must” in the proposed language and include the policy in Board Policy Manual
- xxiv. **VOTE:** Motion does not carry, with 10 in favor and 15 opposed.
- xxv. **MOTION:** Levin moves to move this item to the next meeting for further discussion, seconded by Dietz.
- xxvi. **VOTE:** Motin approved unanimously

11. New Business

- Stipend Proposal (Senbet)
 - i. Senbet shared that administration proposed base amounts of \$3,000, for lecturer to senior lecture, \$5,000, for assistant professor to associate professor, and \$8,000, for associate professor to full professor while SEC proposed \$3,325, \$5,000, and \$8,300 which is the item on the agenda.
 - 1. Salary Equity also considered a hybrid model, based on whichever is higher between a 10% percent increase and a base amount.
 - ii. Levin asked how many faculty will fall under the 10% model versus the fixed amount.
 - 1. Senbet shared that an estimates of 15 faculty at \$8,300, 23 at \$5,000, and 20 at \$3,325.
 - iii. Fleming noted that the administration would not approve a 10% model and that their proposed model was based on another institution aimed at recognizing incentives and awards for full professors.
 - 1. With the model it was found that there were small base salary increases that went with successful pot-tenure reviews, which Faculty Welfare has been asked to review.
 - iv. She clarified that the rational around the 10% was around the COM which has separate funding and is not included in the analysis.
 - v. Newman added that maintaining support would allow faculty to achieve salary promotion through a successful comprehensive review every five years.
 - vi. Levin expressed concern about the 10% model, noting that it could benefit certain individuals, he favored a consistent percentage approach, while acknowledging that the policy is reviewed every three years.
 - vii. Levin proposed an amendment to remove the 10% model and duplicative sentences, seconded by Cieminski. The amendment passed with a vote of 19 in favor and 4 opposed.
 - viii. **MOTION:** Adopt the revisions to Faculty Promotion Stipend
 - ix. **VOTE:** Motion passed with 21 in favor and 2 opposed

- Budget Priority Guidelines (Senbet)
 - i. Further discussion and a vote will take place at next meeting.

12. Special Reports

13. Comments to the Good of the Order

Bears give back is coming back!

14. Adjournment 5:30pm