

MINUTES OF  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
May 3, 2016

The fifth Faculty Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year was called to order by Prof. Fernando Guzman at 11:48 am.

1. Announcement  
Prof. Guzman notified Senators that an additional Senate meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 17.
2. Minutes  
After no discussion, the minutes of the March 8, 2016 meeting were approved as submitted.
3. Obituary Notices Prof. Guzman notified the body that Prof. Sue Ann Park, Theatre, Prof. Thomas Africa, History, and Prof. Akbar Muhammad, History and Africana Studies, passed away. Prof. Guzman asked for a moment of silence to remember these colleagues. As is established practice, notes of condolence have been sent to the families on behalf of the Senate.
4. Approval of degree candidates  
3,409 graduates have filed an application for degree (550 graduate students; 2,859 undergraduate students). Motion was made and seconded to approve. List was approved by a unanimous hand vote.
5. New Business
  - a. Faculty Bylaws – Changes in Article I, III, IV, VI  

Prof. Sandra Michael, Biological Sciences and Chair of the Bylaws Review Committee, reviewed the proposed changes to the Bylaws.

    - Article I and III -- If there are faculty only attached to the Graduate School, having no other berth in another department or unit, the Graduate School would then be considered an academic unit.
    - Article IV and VI -- Search committees for senior level administrators -- Since 1989, for any senior level searches, we have been referring to a 1989 memo issued by James Votruba, who was acting provost at the time. This change takes the spirit and essence of this memo and incorporates it into the Bylaws. This insures that the faculty membership of the search committee is more than 50%. There is also a consultation process to discuss with the administrator directing the search about the type of search, shape of the committee, and the number of search committee members. Hearing no questions or discussion, the proposed Bylaws changes were approved by a majority vote with 1 abstention. The changes now move to a vote of the full faculty, then to President Stenger for approval.
    - Prof. Michael also noted that whenever a change in an individual's title appears in the Bylaws, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) has suggested that pro-forma changes can be changed without going through the full Bylaws change process. These pro-forma changes to the Bylaws can be approved by FSEC only. Motion was made and seconded. After no discussion, this was approved by a majority vote with 2 abstentions.

b. Diversity Committee

Prof. Guzman noted that the Senate charged an ad-hoc committee to establish a charge and composition of the Diversity Committee and asked for discussion.

Prof. Thomas Sinclair, Public Administration, thanked the committee for its work. He noted that the FSEC had discussion on this and they did not approve or disapprove. This document has been sent to the Senate directly. Prof. Sinclair noted that there is one concern regarding the fourth paragraph under "Charge". This is not something that is done for any other Senate committee, so this creates a new policy and procedure. We already have a procedure in the Senate for people to have a voice and this creates a different kind of procedure that no other committee has.

Prof. Sinclair suggested an amendment to the first sentence of the fourth paragraph as follows:

*"Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee motions pertaining to the purview of the Diversity Committee may be reviewed and commented upon."*

Motion was made and seconded to accept this amendment.

Prof. Michael said it seems that this purview is too broad for its purpose. We should not have to take motions in the Senate to this committee again.

One Senator noted that members of the committee will have familiarity with diversity and inclusion. This purview is not limited to that.

Prof. Ricardo Laremont, Political Science and Sociology, noted that the mandate of the Diversity Committee is too broad. It would be recruitment, retention and curriculum matters with concern about recruitment and retention. This committee, as it is set up now, would be reviewing applications. Prof. Guzman explained that all policies related to diversity and inclusion would include policies related to retention, admission, but not personnel cases. This committee will only review policies and will not review admission and personnel cases. Prof. Laremont agreed that the committee needs to look at incentives and supports the amendment.

Prof. Jeff Barker, Geological Sciences, said that the word "may" is too weak and perhaps "should be" is better. Prof. Sinclair agreed to this change.

Prof. Leslie Gates, Sociology, asked how this committee is formed and how the membership changes? Prof. Guzman noted that this is shown in the document under "Composition." Members are suggested by the Committee on Committees and approved by the FSEC.

Prof. Howard Brown, History, noted that Prof. Sinclair's suggested amendment is an improvement to this document. The focus needs to be on policy and procedures. If there are concerns with diversity and inclusion, one should look to become a member of this committee. It is possible that this committee will be the only committee that looks at diversity. It is also possible that there could be problems with diversity on other Senate committees. The Diversity Committee could bring this out in the open. Prof. Brown supports this amendment and hopes that we can redirect our efforts on diversity in membership of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Prof. Lisa Tessman, Philosophy, noted that the charge does discuss advising administration, working with other divisions, and reviewing policies and their effectiveness. We do keep an eye on administration and different areas around campus. Prof. Tessman suggested keeping the first sentence as originally stated and strike the sentence that follows and all bullet points.

Prof. Guzman reiterated that the charge of this committee is to review policies as pointed out to Prof. Laremont. Secondly, the first part of the "Charge" refers to advising the administration. Prof. Guzman commented on the diversity of the Senate. The demographic composition of the FSEC compared with the entire faculty is in line, although it is very far from the demographic of society at large. If we believe that faculty should be more diverse, then the FSEC should be more diverse.

Prof. Brown commented that the focus should be on the diversity issue and not on approval of motions. Discussing issues here or at the FSEC level is essential to appreciate the rationale before policies are made. The amendment captures its purpose relative to diversity.

After no more discussion, a vote was taken on the first amendment:

*"Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee motions pertaining to the purview of the Diversity Committee should be reviewed and commented upon".*  
This amendment was approved by a vote of 34 approved, 5 opposed, 1 abstention.

The motion by Prof. Tessman was seconded.

*"All motions going from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to the Faculty Senate will pass through the Diversity Committee for comment on their suitability regarding diversity and inclusion."* and removing the remainder of the paragraph.

Prof. Guzman asked if there is an issue with this being a filter from the FSEC to the full Senate? It is clear that this would be the case. There is an opportunity for everyone to read and review proposals going to the Senate and commenting in advance of a Senate meeting. The Diversity Committee does not have veto power; that is why these points are shown in the document. This is no special privilege of the committee but rather outlines what the Diversity Committee must do. It is the responsibility of the Diversity Committee to do their job.

Prof. Sinclair asked Prof. Tessman for a clarification on her motion. Prof. Tessman noted that the motion restores the original first sentence and strikes the second sentence and the bullet points.

Prof. Johnathan Karp, Judaic Studies, noted that if this committee will not have any special privileges and that any faculty member can comment on motions, why do we need a special statement in this charge? It seems reductant and not necessary. Prof. Guzman said that the statement does not give them any permission; it simply shows what the Diversity Committee should be doing.

Prof. Brown noted that the proposal shows that all motions from the FSEC and the Faculty Senate go to the Diversity Committee. This does appear to be a filter and an extra burden for the FSEC. Prof. Guzman said that resolutions going to the Senate are sent to all faculty when the agenda is issued. There is no extra duty on the FSEC to send to any extra people.

Mr. Ed Shephard, Libraries, said that it may be interpreted that the words “pass through” give the impression that everything has to go through this committee which is a different function of a normal committee and any other faculty. He suggested that this be left out and left to the normal functioning.

Prof. Brown noted that this is an important issue.

Prof. Tessman suggested that we change “pass through” to “be reviewed by”. Prof. Guzman said that the ad-hoc committee considered “reviewed by” to be stronger than “passed through”, and the committee wanted the weaker version. Prof. Guzman asked for some language weaker than “pass through.” There was no response.

After no more discussion, the second amendment to the Diversity Committee composition and charge motion was put to a vote.

*“All motions going from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to the Faculty Senate will pass through the Diversity Committee for comment on their suitability regarding diversity and inclusion.”* and removing the remainder of the paragraph. Amendment was not approved by a vote of 7 in favor, 21 opposed, 11 abstentions.

Prof. David Jenkins, Geological Sciences, asked if, as referenced in the third sentence under “Charge”, the Senate can override the vote for someone to become a Senator. Prof. Guzman answered that if the Diversity Committee sees an area or committee that it feels has an issue with diversity, it will work with that Senate committee.

Prof. John Starks, Classical and Near Eastern Studies, asked what the definition of the diversity charge will be over time. Do we consider elements of diversity to be essentially where we’d be for some time? As an appointed body, there is a question about their representation and their comments. What are procedural elements that might be established for that committee? How do they present their materials, how often does the committee meet, for example. These are worth discussing and thinking about while we are looking at the charge. Prof. Benita Roth, Sociology, noted that we do not know how often the committee will meet; it will most likely meet as often as needed to do their job. Prof. Guzman noted that the ad-hoc committee realized how the term “diversity” has been changing rapidly over time; hence the opening paragraph preceding the charge is broad enough to allow for further changes.

Prof. Sinclair commented regarding the Senator election question. The Diversity Committee can help to diversify the composition of the Senate. Committee members can ask faculty to run, serve, etc. He does not see this as a limitation of the role of the Diversity Committee.

The motion that Prof. Sinclair proposed had already been approved and seconded.

*“Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee motions pertaining to the purview of the Diversity Committee should be reviewed and commented upon.”*

Remainder of paragraph stays the same.

After no more discussion, the Diversity Committee composition and charge was approved by a vote of 35 in favor, 5 opposed, 4 abstentions.

Prof. Guzman informed the members that the committee appointments will be done in the early fall 2016 semester by the FSEC.

- c. Standards for use of AP for Gen Ed Lab – Prof. Sara Reiter, School of Management, explained that this proposal from the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is to make improvements in the process of granting Gen Ed credit for AP science courses. The science departments would feel more comfortable to give lab credit on the same basis they waive courses based on AP exams. They would change the AP score of 3 with documentation of proof of labs to 4 (5 for Physics) on the AP exam.

Prof. Jeff Barker noted that in 2003 this was discussed. As a side note, he mentioned that his daughter had experience in high school where labs were taken only in the beginning of the school year and at the very end. The score of the AP exam does not show experimentation but only knowledge of the material. The AP score does not reflect lab experience.

Prof. Tessman asked why this policy does not address IB. Prof. Reiter responded that she did not know what the IB policy is and UUCC was only discussing AP policy.

After no more discussion, this was approved by a majority vote approval with 6 abstentions.

#### 5. Curriculum Issues

- a. Certificate for Advanced Study in Adolescence Special Education – This is a 21-credit certificate for people who need this professional certification because of the expansion of special education. Students who are currently in the program can take courses for this certificate or students can return to get this certificate. This certificate program was approved by a unanimous hand vote.
- b. MA in Statistics – The Mathematics Department has requested this degree instead of the existing track. Students will get a different degree to reflect the fact they have done this work in Statistics. Having this degree does not involve more resources as the course work has already been set up. This degree was approved by a unanimous hand vote.

#### 6. Election of 2016-2017 FS Procedures Committee

The Nomination Committee of the Faculty Senate had submitted the following slate of nominees:

Vice Chair, Sandra Michael Biological Science  
Secretary, Sara Reiter, School of Management

After no discussion, the slate was approved by a unanimous hand vote with 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 12:59 pm.

Present: Manoj Agarwal, Benjamin Andrus, Serdar Atav, Jeffrey Barker, Christopher Bartlette, Cassandra Bransford, Howard Brown, Nicole Cameron, Junghyun Cho, Cynthia Connine, Scott Craver, Magdalena Czubak, Carmen Ferradas, Leslie Gates, Arianna Gerstein, Brandon Gibb, Robert Guay, Fernando Guzman, Colleen Hailey, Courtney Ignarri, Murali Jagannathan, David Jenkins, Hyeyoung Kang, Jonathan Karp, Hoe Kyeung Kim, Immanuel Kim, Ricardo Laremont, Gretchen Mahler, Marla Mallette, Sandra Michael, Natalija Mijatovic, Jay Newberry, Neil Christian Pages, Carolyn Pierce, Florenz Plassmann, Mark Poliks, Dmitry Ponomarev, Xingye Qiao, Sara Reiter, Benita Roth, Edward Shephard, Thomas Sinclair, Pamela Smart, John Starks, Jennifer Stoever, Masatsugu Suzuki, Lisa Tessman, Ruth VanDyke, Stan Whittingham, Sara Wozniak, Bogum Yoon, Lei Yu, Stephen Zahorian

Excused: Rosemary Arrojo, Anne Brady, Frank Cardullo, Kenneth Chiu, David Clark, Heather DeHaan, Leslie Heywood, Donald Nieman, Titilayo Okoror, Hiroki Sayama, Harvey Stenger

Absent: Anne Bailey, John Baust, John Cheng, Christopher Hanes, Sharon Holmes, Dennis Lasser, Tongshu Ma, Robert Micklus, Gregory Robinson, Sandro Sticca, Cyma VanPetten, Zachary Vigliani, Joseph Weil, Bruce White, David Wilson, Chaun Zhong, Shengsheng Zhou