

Faculty Welfare and Professional Responsibilities

Faculty Senate Committee Monthly Report | September 2026

Members Present: Andrew Rosa (Chair); Pinky Rusli, Aaron Wichman, Kaylee ben Yosef, Xingang Fan, Eric Moore, Miranda Peterson, Sebastian Themelis, Mindy Waldrop.

Members Absent Kate Hudepohl

Guests Brooke Gross

Agenda & Notes | Friday, 18 September 2026 | Virtual Conferencing

1. Meeting began around [3pm] PM CT.
 - a. Approval of minutes from previous meeting ([link from official senate agenda webpage]). [SEC Minutes August 2026](#)
 - b.
2. **Old Business**
 - a. Andrew (Andrew Rosa) introduction as new committee chair and ran the meeting despite technical issues at start.
 - b. Committee approved previous minutes. Rolling agenda will be used and members may add items before the next meeting.
 - c. Main substantive topic: use of AI (Anthropic) to analyze last year's faculty welfare survey open-ended responses — committee explained process, privacy mitigations, and surfaced concerns about disclosure and opt-out.
 - i. Past process: open-ended textual responses were exported and a paid, closed Anthropic model was used to summarize/organize themes and generate frequency tables; the model used was closed and the data was not used to train the underlying model.
 - ii. A disclosure sentence noting that AI assisted analysis was included in prior reports; however, no explicit checkbox/opt-out was provided to respondents in last year's survey.
 - iii. Reasons for using AI: large volume of qualitative responses and limited manpower/time for manual coding; AI created word-clouds / theme summaries and frequency tables which were then spot-checked manually.
 - iv. Sensitive content handling: human review isolated a small number of self-disclosing / high-risk responses (e.g., suicidal statements) which were escalated to appropriate people (Brooke reported these items were forwarded).
3. **New Business**
 - a. Concerns raised (privacy, disclosure, downstream use)
 - i. Faculty raised data privacy and consent concerns about feeding open-ended responses into AI tools; some faculty urged that those portions of the report be dismissed if consent was lacking.

- ii. Committee clarified the survey is anonymous and only textual responses (no identifying metadata) were uploaded; transcripts indicated effort to reassure faculty that identifying info was not provided to model.
 - iii. Operational concerns about “closed vs open” models and legal/resilience issues were discussed: even if a vendor says data is not used to train, court orders or model changes can change access/use policies.
 - iv.
- b. Approaches & tradeoff
 - i. Suggested hybrid approach: use AI to summarize bulk / quantitative elements and then perform manual review of qualitative / sensitive responses to validate and catch problematic items.
 - ii. Options discussed for respondent consent: (a) include a clear disclosure statement in the survey; (b) add an explicit opt-out checkbox so respondents can refuse AI analysis of their text; (c) make opt-out default (or opt-in) — tradeoff: an opt-out may reduce usable response volume and potentially bias participation rates.
 - iii. Suggested thresholds and middle grounds mentioned: examples discussed included 75%/25% splits (e.g., analyze with AI when majority allow) or doing AI on quantitative items only while manually coding qualitative ones; committee acknowledged this is a nuanced, “messy” problem and recommended honesty/transparency with respondents.
- c. Data sharing & dissemination
 - i. Past practice: open-ended responses (or their summaries) were forwarded to relevant campus units (deans, parking, childcare, cafeteria, etc.); Dean Terrence Brown provided a formal response which the chair will share with the committee.
 - ii. Committee noted the survey text / Qualtrics export can be downloaded and shared for internal review; keeping multiple years’ survey data aligned was recommended to support trend analysis.

d. Survey timeline & next steps (discussion points)

- i. Historical rhythm: the faculty welfare survey is typically released in the spring, but many members recommended starting question formation and edits this fall to avoid time pressure.
- ii. Committee discussed retaining some longitudinal questions for trend analysis while allowing targeted revisions to address new issues (AI, Gen Ed revisions, campus anxieties, etc.).
- iii. Manual coding capacity vs AI assistance: if a substantial minority opt out (examples discussed: ~30%), manual review for those responses may be required; committee discussed thresholds for when to perform additional manual analysis.

4. Other discussions

a. Action items

- i. Aaron will circulate prior survey text/exports; Andrew will share Dean Brown's email response, post materials for committee review, call for agenda items, and distribute the Zoom link for the Oct 30 meeting—our next meeting.
- ii. Mindy will follow up with concerned faculty member. Contact the faculty member who raised privacy concerns about AI use, clarify what was done with the survey data, and coordinate any required follow-up or communication with SEC/administration.
- iii. Ensure last year's survey text and the Qualtrics Word export are available to the committee (post in chat/shared folder) so members can review and propose edits for the upcoming survey.
- iv. Members were asked to send agenda items to the chair; rolling agenda access and shared document editing were noted.

5. Adjournment around [4:05]

Next meeting is Friday, [October 30] at 3 PM C via [Zoom].

Report prepared by [Andrew Rosa] ([9/24]).