

## UNIVERSITY SENATE

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, **27 April 2016**, in Maxwell Auditorium.

Present were: Senators Adam, Agnew, Bahl, Bartolovich, Boroujerdi, Burak, Carter, Coggiola, D'Amico, Dannenhoffer, Day, Dean, Dong, Duke, Easton, Ford, Garcia-Murillo, Giannini, Gitner, Gonzalez, Goode, Gorovitz, Hollenback, Isik, Jasper, Kumar, Liddy, Lutz, MacInnes, Marrero, McCracken, McReynolds, Mehrotra, Monmonier, Moran, Negussey, Newton, Nicholson, Nugent, Osborne, Pellow, Quinn, Raina, Rupert, Schell, Seedat, Sherman, Smith (C.), Thompson, Vitharana, Wadley, Wilcoxen, Wildrick, Winders.

Presiding officer: Prof. Can Isik

Prof. Isik called the meeting to order, proposed that minutes of the April 13th Senate meeting be approved, and the body concurred. He then told senators that the would begin with Prof. Dawit Negussey's presentation of the budget committee report, and called Prof. Negussey, who began by thanking all the members of the committee as well as the Senate Recorder. He then read the report of committee work which had focused on: implementation of the Academic Strategic Plan (ASP); issues with the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) system; athletics and dome operations; space use, maintenance, and renovation; the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) for staff; the announcement of tuition and cost increases which had come too late for any Budget committee input; the financial and operational situation of the S.U. libraries. Negussey also reported that neither the committee nor the S.U. Chapter of the AAUP had received faculty salary data (i.e., status of salaries and benefits, by school/college, department, rank, sex, etc.) since AY2013-14. (full report is on file in the Senate office.)

In the discussion, comments made and questions raised included:

- that it was unclear what funds were needed for implementation of the Academic Strategic Plan, whether seed funds or any other monies that could provide for the implementation [Prof. Negussey said that the implementation was not within the committee's purview];
- a member questioned the logic of making colleges pay for ASP mandates;
- a member commented that for years Athletics got subventions, that since joining the ACC theoretically there was more money available, and wondered if any of that could be used for academic programs;
- comment that it was not clear what the budget priorities were, e.g., there seems to be money for the work to be done on the Campus Framework;

-comment that the Chancellor had announced a 10-year budgeting model, but that there was no mention of this in the committee's report, asked if the committee had worked on it [Negussey said that they'd had no luck in scheduling a meeting with the Chancellor about it];

-question of why the academic units themselves were not a priority, rather than the built environment which led one to the embarrassingly low-rated library, for example;

-observation that there were many things we had no information on, e.g., where the money was coming from for the various capital projects on campus, or how S.U. faculty salaries compared with others in the area; that the Senate needed to have a very direct discussion with the Chancellor and the new Provost about the shared governance role of the University Senate in the budget process. Senator emphasized that the Senate was not being given the budget information needed to do its work.

At this point, Prof. Monmonier rose to a point of order, asking when it would be appropriate for the Senate to propose a vote of "no confidence" in the Chancellor re budgetary affairs. He asked if the Agenda Committee could establish a committee to look into the issue. Prof. Isik responded by telling senators that the Agenda Committee intended to schedule meetings of all committee chairs for each month throughout the 2016-17 academic year, and that one of the agenda items would be transparency.

Prof. Monmonier proposed a motion as follows:

That it is the sense of the University Senate that the University central administration is not honoring principles of shared governance and transparency.

The motion was seconded.

In the discussion, the various comments included:

-the interim Provost pointed out that there would be reports coming out from various working groups soon, that dealt with this and other matters, and that she would inform the chancellor of the "no confidence" motion;

-a senator said that reports coming out after the end of the academic year was frustrating and an inappropriate response to legitimate faculty concerns;

-a member commented that when she had chaired the Budget committee a few years previously, relations with the Budget office had been much different;

-a member urged senators to make the administration accountable when officers canceled attendances at meetings or refused to provide necessary information;

-another member said that in recent years the parameters of requested information had changed, and the flow of information had been interrupted.

After some further discussion, a member proposed that the Senate postpone the vote on the motion to the fall semester, and the body agreed.

The Chairman called Committee on Student Life chairman Jose Marrero to present the committee's report, which had focused on student safety, off-campus living, graduate student support & career services, and alcohol consumption and sexual assault. He said that the committee intended to report again in the fall with information about a plan for safety in the neighborhoods.

Prof. Isik then called Prof. Jamie Winders who presented the report of the Committee on Research. Prof. Winders highlighted the report, and then made a motion to endorse the committees recommendations, as follows:

-that there needed to be a greater effort at all levels of the University leadership to align the timelines of committees working on similar issues, that without this aligning, different committees – whether Senate, FastForward, or others – could not engage in any kind of synergistic collaborations, which limited the scope and impact of campus initiatives;

-that since one of the constituent groups above (Senate committees) was also populated by people elected by their peers, not involving standing Senate committees in important cross-campus work limited faculty governance;

-that there needed to be less overlap in the missions and charges of university-wide committees like those associated with FastForward and the Senate, that significant parts of the implementation process of the Academic Strategic Plan (ASP) overlapped with standing Senate committee work, with the end result of wasted effort for staff, students, and faculty members;

-that we needed a greater culture of collaboration on university-wide tasks, such as the ASP, that it was not sufficient to leave the push for collaboration in the hands of committee chairs who themselves faced difficult timelines and their own departmental work.

The motion carried.

Prior to adjournment, Prof. D'Amico told the group that she had sent a proposal for establishment of a new committee to the Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaws Revision, chaired by Prof. Bruce Carter. She also asked that the record show that, while a quorum of senators had been lost at that point, an attempt had been made to have the Senate endorse the designation of the second Monday in October as Indigenous Peoples Day in the Syracuse University Academic Calendar, and that the flag of the Haudensaunee people be flown on campus on that day.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

*Teresa Gilman*

Teresa Gilman  
University Senate Recorder