# Vice Chair Report

Monday, September 14th, 2026

## Update: Faculty Senate Rosters

### Senate Standing Committees

Committee Rosters by College 26-27 – We are officially all full on all standing committees! Thanks for all your work on this. Please reach out to me with any questions or corrections.

### At-Large and Departmental Senators

Faculty Senators by College 26-27 – We've had a few changes to these lists as a result of faculty moving into new roles and/or being unable to serve, but the only one I'm still missing is a Departmental Senator for Political Science. Please reach out to me with any questions or corrections.

### Miscellaneous Updates

The following edits have been submitted to Jessica Steenburgen to be posted on the Faculty Senate website, in accordance with personnel and department changes.

- Matt Pruitt — Department: Society, Crime, Culture, and Justice Studies (previously Department of Sociology and Criminology)
- Kate Hudepohl — Department: Society, Crime, Culture, and Justice Studies (previously Department of Folk Studies and Anthropology)
- Andrew Rosa — Rank: Professor
- Davy Bell — Name: David L. Bell; Rank: Associate Professor

## Committee Representation for Part-Time Faculty

### Context

This semester, it was brought to our attention that previous calls for Faculty Handbook volunteers specifying tenure as an eligibility requirement were actually not in line with the committee by-laws. While the by-laws state that college representatives must be tenured, at-large members may or may not be tenure-eligible. After some conversations with Rob Hale, we suspect this was done to ensure that most members had the experience and/or

institutional knowledge to make informed handbook decisions while still incorporating non-tenure perspectives and encouraging more participation. The call for this cycle was corrected – though some initial volunteers immediately reclaimed their seats, we do now have an instructor on the committee.

During the updated call for volunteers, however, a part-time faculty member asked if they were eligible to serve. There is currently only one dedicated part-time representative across all standing committees, on Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities.

### Proposed Discussion

The Senate Executive Committee should consider reviewing the by-laws of other standing committees and exploring ways in which non-tenured, part-time, and/or other underrepresented faculty groups may participate in Faculty Senate. With some colleges having a large percentage of adjunct instructors, there could be interesting perspectives on issues of academic quality, artificial intelligence, university spending, etc.

Last year, it was briefly suggested that SEC reevaluate Student Government Association seats on senate standing committees, so perhaps these conversations can be lumped together if that's still something we want to address.

## Faculty Regent Election

### Where We Are

Rob has given me and Dan a draft of the eligibility list, which indicates which faculty may be nominated as candidates as well as which may only vote in the election. Dan and I are reviewing the initial draft to ensure faculty are sorted by department – this should make it easier for faculty to identify and report any eligibility errors.

### What Comes Next

On September 15th, the eligibility list will be sent to faculty for review. At this time, we'll also be providing a Qualtrics form through which faculty can anonymously pose questions for candidates to answer during their open forums.

On September 29th, eligibility issues are due and nominations for Faculty Regent will close. A final reminder will be sent on September 25th. All nominees must submit a signed statement of consent to serve in order to appear on the ballot.

On September 30th, candidates and voters who have been added to or removed from eligibility will be notified of their changes, and they will have until October 2nd to appeal.

On October 1st, the Senate Executive Committee will meet to confirm and randomize the initial ballot, which will be sent to the TopNet team on October 2nd. We will then begin scheduling virtual forums for candidates and resending the Qualtrics link.

On October 15th, the Faculty Regent election will be held from 8am-4pm. Results will be sent to SEC for review, and arrangements for subsequent elections (to take place sometime between October 22nd and October 29th) will be made if needed.

# Use of AI in Faculty Welfare Survey Report

## Context

At the August Faculty Senate meeting, the alternate for a Departmental Senator raised a significant concern about the use of generative artificial intelligence to compile part of the Faculty Welfare Survey report that was approved during the May Senate meeting. The former chair of the Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities Committee is currently on Family and Medical Leave, therefore she is unreachable for clarification or discussion until after Thanksgiving. The faculty member in question was opposed to AI being used to summarize the qualitative survey responses, asserting that their data had been fed to the tool without consent and demanding that those summaries be disregarded as a result. At the first FWPR meeting on September 18th, returning members will hopefully help clarify the process by which this report was compiled so that the new committee chair can work with senate leadership to begin discussing how best to move forward.

Link to Report – It's my understanding that the faculty member's concerns are specifically targeted at the Overall Consolidated Thematic Structure and the Details given by the chair.

## Current Concerns and Future Considerations

This incident is indicative of a few areas in which faculty may benefit from clarification and consensus moving forward, and the Senate Executive Committee should be prepared to lead/guide these discussions.

1. Use of AI by the Faculty Senate – How can faculty expect to see artificial intelligence used and/or regulated in official senate documents? How should the use of artificial intelligence be disclosed? In what situations should it be avoided altogether?
2. Validity of AI-Generated Content – Should colleagues, supervisors, stakeholders, etc. be able to dismiss faculty or senate output because artificial intelligence was used? How is this determined? What additional factors should be considered?

3. AI Disclosure in Administrative Contexts – If it is determined that the Faculty Senate should not use artificial intelligence in any official documentation or capacity, should those restrictions apply to other members of campus governance?

# Announcement: Vice Chair Treats

## October 12th Senate Executive Committee Meeting

I'm bringing fall goodies for us next time, so let me know if you have any allergies.