## UNIVERSITY SENATE

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, **13 April 2016**, in Maxwell Auditorium.

Present were: Senators Adam, Agnew, Bahl, Bartlett, Bartolovich, Bartosh, Bhatia (S.), Bhatia (T.), Boroujerdi, Brann, Brown (H.), Bulman, Burak, Carter, Chandler-Olcott, Chin, Conover, Cook, D'Amico, Dannenhoffer, Day, Dean, Doctor, Dolak, Dong, Dotger, Duah-Agyeman, Easton, Elin, Ford, Garcia-Murillo, Gauri, Ghosh, Giannini, Gonzalez, Gorovitz, Hasenwinkel, Hollenback, Isik, Keck, Labonoski, Leathers, Lewis-Frenay, Lim, London, Lovely, Marrero, McCracken, McReynolds, Mehrotra, Mohanty, Monmonier, Mosher, Murphy, Nabatchi, Negussey, Newton, Nicholson, Nugent, Osborne, Parks, Pellow, Perreault, Powers, Raina, Reed (K.), Reed (L.), Rubinstein, Rupert, Scheider, Smith (A.), Smith (C.), Solice, Staniec, Stripling, Syverud, Thompson, True-Frost, Tucker, Van Gulick, Van Hollen, Vanable, Vitharana, Wiklund, Wildrick, Winders.

Presiding officer: Prof. Can Isik

Prof. Isik called the meeting to order and proposed that the minutes of the March 30th Senate meeting be approved, and the body concurred. He then reported for the Agenda Committee, as follows:

-a motion recommending to the Board of Trustees the conferring of appropriate degrees on May 15th and 22nd, 2016 upon those candidates who had qualified by Friday, May 13th, 2016 or May 20th, 2016, at noon, and upon those students who complete requirements for degrees at the end of the various summer terms and at the end of the fall semester of the 2016-17 academic year. Motion carried.

-a motion to approve the report of the Subcommittee on Nominations, which was a list of Senate committees for 2016-17. Prof. Isik mentioned that further changes would be made in the fall. Motion carried.

Prof. Isik then called Chancellor Syverud to report briefly on the Free Speech Working Group, the report of the Working Group on Diversity and Inclusion, administrative searches, as well as his response to the Senate's motion re: the Professor of Practice rank, saying that he intended to work with the new Provost to implement the changes called for in the motion. [http://news.syr.edu/chancellor-syverud-provides-updates-to-campus-community-on-free-speech-diversity-reports-24321/]

Prof. Isik called Prof. Dudczak to the podium to report from the Committee on Appointment and Promotions, which included a motion adding two librarians, Martha J. Hanson and Linda Galloway, to the list of emeritus/emerita faculty. The motion carried.

Prof. Isik called Prof. Koszalka to present the report of the Committee on Curricula, which included a motion to approve the new courses and curriculum changes (Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Arts and Sciences/Management, Maxwell School, Engineering and Computer Science, Visual and Performing Arts) listed in the report. The motion carried.

Prof. Isik then called Prof. Van Gulick, chairman of the Committee on Instruction, who reported on his committee's review and discussion of work on the revision of the Academic Integrity policy in progress in the Academic Integrity Office (AIO). Prof. Van Gulick said that Margaret Usdansky, Director of the AIO, had told the Committee on Instruction that it would receive a proposal for revision from them. Van Gulick told the Senate that the committee endorsed the principle, but that they did not yet have a policy, and thus did not have a resolution to put before the Senate, but that they planned to bring one to the Senate in the fall. He then highlighted the report, listing the major changes, which included:

- -eliminating the distinction between how undergraduates and graduate students are treated (currently there are harsher penalties and higher expectations for graduate students);
- -eliminating the distinction between *non-intentional* violations (negligence) and *intentional* violations in favor of a single charge of violation of the academic integrity policy;
- -introducing 3 levels of violation based on severity, with differing and proportional sanctions;
- -introducing the option of a written-only no-hearing appeal process for students who admit their violation but wish only to appeal the sanction and request its reduction;
- -introducing a procedural step in which all students accused of a violation will meet with some academic integrity representative at the school or college level before deciding how to respond to a charge against them;
- -returning to the main role of adjudicating cases and appeals to the schools and colleges which had historically had that responsibility.

Prof. Van Gulick then called on AIO Director Margaret Usdansky, who gave a detailed presentation, outlining goals, framework, and the key changes to the policy (Usdansky's letter with outline and detailed description of the AI Advisory Committee's process and recommendations had been included in the materials sent to senators prior to the meeting).

In the discussion, observations made and questions raised included:

- -comment that the committee had agreed in principle with what the AIO was proposing, but had reservations about endorsement because of there not yet being a policy;
- -comment that some thought needed to be given to the colleges and how they would have to reframe their bylaws, etc.;
- -comment that it was not clear whether the college of the student's course or the student's home college would discipline students in violation of the academic integrity policy; also, the statement that the policy was going to be implemented by the end of August concerned him, as it bypassed the Senate, and he pointed out that that was not shared governance;
- -to a response that the committee had run out of time, but had provided a mechanism for the community to make comments for a period of time, senator said that running out of time was no justification; that either there was shared governnance or there was administrative fiat;
- -senator said that the Senate needed to see the policy as it was drafted, but that thought they needed a motion that gave the Senate's sense of the general approach to the revision, and that senators had been speaking as if violations took place only in courses, but that there were other instances, e.g., selling papers, that occurred while not in a particular course; he also said that we needed to avoid the situation whereby a student was expelled but subsequently accepted at another school, because there was no record of the violation on the transcript;
- -a member pointed out cases of faculty members feeling abused because, e.g., parents got involved, and that because of this had reservations about having to report violations;

Prof. Bartolovich rose to propose a resolution, as follows:

that the University Senate asked that no major changes be implemented in the existing Academic Integrity Policy until the University Senate had had the opportunity to consider, discuss, and express an opinion on the actual statement of any new proposed academic integrity policy.

The motion was seconded, and carried.

Prof. Gorovitz then proposed a motion, as follows:

that it is the sense of the Senate 1. that we favor the general approach to academic integrity that has been presented today, and 2. that this sentiment should be conveyed to and taken into account by those who will draft specific policy language to be presented to the Senate later for formal action. The motion was seconded, and carried.

The chairman then called Prof. Negussey to present the report of the Committee on Budget and Fiscal Affairs. Prof. Negussey began by thanking all the members of the committee for their year-long work, and then highlighted the report, saying that the Agenda Committee had charged them to report on budget aspects of the Academic Strategic Plan implementation, RCM budget information sharing, and the NCAA sanctions. Negussey reported the 2016 budget carryover balance at the beginning of FY2016 at \$112,521 million and projected to be \$98.241 million at year end, the FY2016 budget projected sources at \$1.273 billion, uses of \$1.287 billion resulting in a \$14.280 million planned use of carryover funds. Prof. Negussey reported on the Academic Strategic Plan (ASP) implementation, that beyond planning stage implementation had not been overly active and that specific budget lines to fund implementation costs had not been identified. He said that suggested savings in the Bain Review of \$20 to \$28 million per year through Operational Excellence initiatives could have potentially funded the ASP implementation, but that actual savings to date from Operational Excellence had been lower than estimated by Bain. Negussey said that until additional funds became available through Operational Excellence and a major capital campaign to begin beyond FY2017, other sources might need to be found for ASP implementation.

Because the hour was late and a quorum lost, the Chairman suggested scheduling a special meeting to continue the Budget committee report hear the reports from the Committee on Student Life and the Committee on Research. A senator rose to say that the Budget committee's work was very important and needed a good hearing and discussion, and to express her objection to its placement so far down on the Agenda. She made a motion calling for Budget committee reports in future to be placed at the top of the agenda, and the motion was seconded. She expressed frustration with the paucity of information given to the Senate and with the incomprehensible nature of Budget language. Another member rose to amend the motion by substituting "...that the Senate request the Agenda Committee to allow additional time and place the Budget committee report earlier on the agenda." The motion was seconded, and carried.

Prof. Isik said that the Agenda Committee would schedule a meeting for either the 20th or the 27th of April, and notify the members, and the meeting was adjourned.

Teresa Gilman

Teresa Gilman University Senate Recorder