

UNIVERSITY SENATE

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, **17 February 2016**, in Maxwell Auditorium.

Present were: Senators Abramovsky, Adam, Albring, Bahl, Bartlett, Bartolovich, Bhatia, Brann, Brown (A.), Brown (L.), Burak, Burstyn, Carter, Chin, Coggiola, Colon, Conover, D'Amico, Dannenhoffer, David, Day, Dean, DeLara, Doctor, Dong, Duah-Agyeman, Easton, Erdman, Ford, Franklin, Gallagher, Garcia-Murillo, Gonzalez, Goode, Gorovitz, Gouldin, Hasenwinkel, Himley, Hollenback, Isik, Jasper, Kallander, Kumar, Labonoski, Leathers, Lewis-Frenay, Liddy, Lovely, Lutz, MacInnes, Marrero, McCracken, McReynolds, Mohanty, Molta, Monmonier, Morton, Mosher, Munly, Murphy, Nabatchi, Neary, Negussey, Nicholson, O'Rourke, Osborne, Paris, Parks, Pellow, Perreault, Powers, Raina, Reed (K.), Reed (L.), Riley, Rolling, Rubinstein, Ruhlandt, Rupert, Ryan, Schell, Seedat, Sherman, Solice, Stoke-Rees, Stripling, Syverud, Tapia, True-Frost, Tucker, Van Gulick, Vanable, Vitharana, Wadley, Wasylenko, Wilcoxen, Wildrick, Zacharia.

Presiding officer: Prof. Can Isik

The Chairman called the meeting to order, and proposed that the minutes of the January 20th meeting be approved, as written, and the body concurred.

Prof. Isik began the report of the Agenda Committee with a motion to amend the day's agenda, adding reports from the Chancellor and the Provost to follow his report, as well as a presentatin by Terra Peckskamp, from Fast Forward Working Group 1: The Student Experience. The motion carried. Prof. Isik then announced that the results of the ballot for membership on the Provost's advisory committee on promotion and tenure had been submitted to the Provost on February 10th. Isik thanked all 21 nominees for their participation, said that the ballot response had been 48%, that they'd received considerable feedback during the voting, and that an evaluation survey would be sent to all tenured and tenure-track faculty members on March 1st.

The Chairman then asked that all non-senators exit the auditorium while the body discussed and voted on nominees for honorary degrees. He called Prof. Christian Day to present the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, which included motions to approve two nominees to receive honorary degrees at SU Commencement. Both motions carried.

Prof. Isik then called the Chancellor, who began by acknowledging the recent death of sophomore Britny Kabic, and thanked all who had helped the family in dealing with their loss while on campus. He then reported briefly on SU's new research rating, the Physics Dept. announcement about recent observation of gravitational waves from a cataclysmic event in a distant universe arriving on earth, which had confirmed a prediction of Albert Einstein's general theory of relativity. Syverud then responded to

a request at the January Senate meeting for information re: the voluntary separation incentive program (VSIP) for staff, the work on developing a 10-year budget forecast, the various leadership searches in progress, and progress on the Campus Framework. He finished by urging senators to complete the climate survey, and told them they had until March 11th. Full text of the chancellor's remarks can be found at : <http://news.syr.edu/chancellor-syverud-addresses-february-meeting-of-university-senate-60249/>.

In response, a member asked whether there was a role for the Budget committee in the development of a 10-year budget forecast. The Chancellor said that there would be. Another member rose to express his appreciation of the Chancellor's remarks.

Prof. Isik called the Provost, who reported the results of the election of the following faculty members to a Provost advisory committee on promotion and tenure:

Humanities: Robert Van Gulick (Philosophy)
 Social Sciences: Carol Faulkner (History)
 STEM: Shobha Bhatia (Civil & Env'l Engrg.); Sandra Hewett (Biology)
 Arts and Design: Ralph Zito (Visual and Performing Arts, Drama)
 Professional and Applied: Kelly Chandler-Olcott (Education, Reading & Language Arts); Rochelle Ford (Public Communications)

A senator asked where a faculty member would go to appeal a decision, and the Provost replied that appeals would be made to the Provost. Prof. Isik said that the conflict of interest would be resolved at a meeting with the Promotions committee.

Prof. Isik called Prof. Koszalka to present the report of the Curriculum committee, which included a motion to approve the new courses and changes (Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Computer Science, Sport and Human Dynamics, Visual and Performing Arts) listed in the report. The motion carried.

Prof. Isik called Prof. Bob Van Gulick to present the report of the Committee on Instruction. Van Gulick highlighted the report, and concluded by saying that the committee had met with the Working Group on the Student Experience, and was glad to see that working group chair Terra Peckskamp would make a presentation following his report. He then made a motion that the Senate concur in the following resolution:

Whereas, many aspects of the Academic Strategic Plan concern matters that fall within the oversight areas of the University Senate and its standing committees, and in some cases fall within the authority of the University Senate and its committees, such as matters of curriculum and the requirements of academic programs, and

whereas, the University Senate is the only elected body that officially represents all the diverse segments of the University community – faculty, students, staff, and administration (notwithstanding the existence of other diverse but non-elected groups),

therefore, the University Senate formally expresses its sense:

- that the University Senate and the relevant committees of the Senate should have an explicit and official role in the future development and implementation of the Academic Strategic Plan, and
- that the role should include an opportunity for the University Senate to consider, discuss, and possibly make official recommendations on any future official statements or drafts of the plan before they are put before the University Trustees for action.

The University Senate calls on the University Administration to meet with the Senate Agenda Committee soon to determine specific means by which the University Senate and its committees shall be officially incorporated into the Academic Strategic Plan process.

In the discussion, observations made and question raised included:

-a member commented that in previous years, the Senate received an annual report of student-athlete graduation rates and other aspects of their academics, and member wondered if there was any way to reinstate this report on the academic progress of athletes; commented that the data given by Assistant Provost for Student-Athlete Academics were pretty high marked, but that this was not the same as graduation rates; member asked that the Committee on Athletic Policy include this information in its report to the Senate;

-a member referred to the second bullet of the resolution, about the opportunity of the Senate to consider, discuss, and possibly make official recommendations on future official drafts of the Academic Strategic Plan (ASP), and said that the statement was weak, and that such responsibilities were the charge of the Senate;

-the committee chair said that the intense work done on the ASP could not be done by Senate committees;

-another member agreed that the above statement was weak, and suggested that '... that the Senate have a role in naming people to working groups' be added to the resolution, so that working groups did not become a way of working around the Senate;

-a senator pointed out the distinction between Senate committees and senators involved in working groups, and said that the Agenda Committee could charge the Senate committees to designate committee members to serve on working groups.

The vote on the motion was affirmative.

Prof. Isik called Ms. Terra Peckskamp, Director of Residence Life, to the podium who told the body that the group had been charged with identifying and developing a set of core competencies for undergraduates and a set of core proficiencies for graduate students. She said that the committee's recommendations for University-wide learning outcomes included: creative reasoning; critical reasoning; quantitative reasoning; scientific reasoning; applied and collaborative learning competency; civic and global competency; communicative competency; and information and technological competency. [Materials handed out at the meeting have been distributed to Senate members by e.mail.]

In the discussion, a member asked about the proportion of faculty to others on the committee, and Ms. Peckskamp said that there were 9 faculty members, 10 staff members, and 4 students. Another member asked at what level the competencies would be assessed, and Peckskamp said that the committee would hand off their recommendations to the colleges/schools. A member raised the question of how to build a curriculum for oral performance and discussion, what tasks college curriculum committees would have; and asked, as an example, how 5000 Arts and Sciences students could be assessed. Ms. Peckskamp said that next steps would include feedback from Senate members, and said that they could communicate with either Prof. Rochelle Ford at the Newhouse School, rlford@syr.edu or Ms. Terra Peckskamp at tlpecksk@syr.edu.

Prior to adjournment, Prof. Mary Lovely brought the Senate's attention to the survey about the learning, living, and working environment on campus, and urged senators to fill out the survey before March 11th. She said that the survey was 100% anonymous, and would take about 20 minutes to complete.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Teresa Gilman

Teresa Gilman
University Senate Recorder