

APARAC Minutes, 3.10.20

Agenda approved

Amended Minutes approved

Chair Report

Deletion of the appendix from UPRS moves on to the senate; some talk of needing the appendix in some form because it includes procedure

Laura asks whether her attendance at senate would be useful; she notes that procedures aren't approved by senate

We may be asked to consider a procedure for reorganizing programs, likely to be part of the committee's work next year.

Priority recommendations from last year are in main APARC folder. Next meeting will be part of discussion.

COVID 19 IRT meeting regularly; trying to be proactive. No talk of campus closure but rather a move to distance instruction as much as possible. In discussion with faculty leadership about continuation of necessary functions for senate committees.

Revisions to the Charge of UPRS

One small change to add the provost as someone who receives

Rheyna moves to approve; Megan seconds; all approve

Moves to ExCom next

General Purpose Classroom Guidelines

Rheyna reviews previous discussions; notes that some of these discussions miss nuance of needs in different size rooms

Sean asks whether the room size and furniture discussions need to be quite so closely linked to one another.

Elias notes that the ultimate deciders will be the Provost and Joyce Lopes about furniture and classroom setup

Elias recommends that we redo a version of the classroom conditions survey with setups to get the best information about what kinds of layouts faculty want in which size rooms

Sean affirms that this approach would allow us to give an overview

Rheyna recommends that we get the information from chairs instead

Elias thinks we could get up to 60% response rate from faculty, which might give us a better sense than even chairs could give us

APARC can then make recommendations directly to Joyce based on the faculty survey

Megan asks whether the survey collects information about departments/faculty so that if there isn't representation from a specific department APRAC could reach out prior to making recommendations from the survey results.

Elias says that we do have access to information about which faculty complete the survey so we could fill in information if necessary.

Rheyna asks to see the layouts before the survey goes live.

Elias notes that the survey modifications/design would happen at APARC with a goal of launching this term.

Elita asks whether we'd continue asking the same condition questions as well as asking about layouts.

Sean asks whether we have time to modify the survey and get it out the week after spring break, which means we likely wouldn't get results until mid-May. Is that soon enough to help support the decision-making on Stevenson.

Rheyna notes that furniture installation is 2 years out.

Elias says we should do this work as we can and not let the Stevenson timeline dictate.

Rheyna worries that the "bowling alley" layout (with narrower, long rows) is showing up in architectural renderings.

Elias says there's more flexibility.

Puspa suggests that we get some more concrete information about what's moveable and what deadlines are.

Sean notes that we should think about our layout drawings and the actual shapes of the room.

Rheyna asks if we can see these drawings again before sending the survey.

Sean notes that the format feedback would give us an overview not necessarily tied to a specific classroom.

Sean notes two hurdles: the pressing issue of Stevenson but also how do we grow efficiently long-term.

Rheyna feels like we haven't seen enough furniture options and wants to be sure pictures accurately represent what we're talking about.

Megan feels like furniture is moveable and moving two-person table

Christina notes that her professors don't teach in the same format every class; that the same class has different layouts.

Rheyna's point is that she'd like to see these options.

Puspa notes that Salazar 2016 is a 60-person room with 2-person tables.

International 105 is a 60-person with two-person tables.

Sean wonders whether we could set up one of these rooms as a visual for folks giving feedback.

Sean notes, on the maintenance side, with clearer setups, we could use student-staff to reset classrooms.

Elita wonders if we're actually helping the maintenance folks if we're resetting the classroom or if leaving furniture pushed to the side.

Rheyna notes that last year's discussion of the survey included some small changes to wording; we need to make sure to revisit those.

Puspa asks about considerations about board placement vis-à-vis screen placement.

Sean notes that boards and screens don't have to be flat on the wall but could be across corners.

Sean will work on getting some visual aids to support the surveying process and our recommendations.

Inclusive Values Resolution

A revised version is in the “Draft Document” folder

Sean notes that Senate Diversity Subcommittee doesn’t need APARC approval but is asking for endorsements, so we could either (1) not take action, (2) forward it themselves with our endorsement, or (3) take it forward to senate as APARC on behalf of the Senate Diversity Subcommittee.

Sean recommends Senate Diversity should take it forward (either with or without our endorsement) since this is firmly in their purview.

The athletic travel discussion has been removed.

Laura says she would be comfortable endorsing this version as it seems to

Puspa asks whether “funding” implies a contract; Laura notes that funding means we receive

Laura does wonder whether mentioning Chick Fil A makes this too narrow.

Puspa notes that we want to support other minorities and wonders if this is too narrow.

Sean wonders if the third “resolved” is redundant given the second one.

Sean asks Christina what the student perspective is.

Christina notes that students don’t want to support organizations that do harm to themselves and to their friends/families/peers.

Laura moves that we endorse it as is and ask Senate Diversity move it forward to senate; Elita second

Sean clarifies that we don’t wish to see any amendments. We agree that we don’t need to see any amendments.

All approve.

Sean asks that we review priority recommendations prior to next meeting. And someone needs to think about chairing next year, with the goal of voting on April 14th or April 28th.