UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES
December 7, 2016
Maxwell Auditorium, 4:00 PM

The Chair, Can Isik called the meeting to order. The Chair welcomed everyone to the Senate meeting and stated that the first order of business was to accept the November meeting's minutes with one noted correction. The Chair asked for further corrections from the floor. As there were none, the November minutes were accepted as amended.

The Chair then asked to take the updated bylaws amendment from the table - no second was required. A voice vote in favor of the motion was taken and the issue is taken from the table. Michael Morrison, from Academic Applications and Service Centers (AASC), was a guest at the meeting to give a demonstration of the clicker technology being proposed for adoption in Senate voting. The Chair asked for a show of hands of how many senators had experience with clickers in the past. There was a show of hands. Mr. Morrison gave his presentation of the clicker technology.

A test issue/vote were put on the overhead auditorium screens to demonstrate how a vote would take place. The test showed the Senate body how the voting worked and how the results would appear. Mr. Morrison added that there can be a countdown to close a vote. He also demonstrated how to conduct a re-vote is necessary. Voting issues could be prepared ahead of time. Votes could also set up during Senate meetings if issues were raised that required votes. The system can also include abstentions.

Senator Bruce Carter asked if the votes can still be collected anonymously. Another question was asked if the system will record or know how people voted. Mr. Morrison explained that all votes will be anonymous. He also gave a brief overview of the pick-up and drop off process.

It was suggested that such language should be added to the bylaws. A voice vote in favor of the amendment to the bylaws to include electronic voting was taken. There was one "nay" vote, and the motion passed.

An amendment was requested regarding the term "electronic". It was noted that the term has a host of meanings, including that people can vote by email or electronically if they aren't in attendance. It was suggested that the language should be clarified to include "Through the use of electronic clickers that requires attendance."

There was a brief discussion of Roberts' Rules, which state all voting has to be in person. Senator Bruce Carter stated that it can be interpreted in other ways and he made a motion to adjust the language of the bylaw accordingly. The Chair asked for a second for the motion. The motion was seconded. The Chair reiterated that the language should adjust the terminology to say exactly what is meant. In the bylaw language, the terminology should state "electronic voting by those in attendance".

Senator Bob Van Gulick asked for clarification as to the actual amendment in its revised form.

The Chair stated that the updated phrase in the bylaws should now include "only by those present. Senator Tom Sherman asked a follow up question regarding who will be maintaining this process and how will they be organized. The Chair indicated that there will be a work study student who will be responsible for coordinating the distribution of the clickers prior to each Senate meeting.

Senator Deborah Pellow asked who will be paying for the technology. The Chair indicated that the Registrar's Office will be paying for this and the cost will be about $2,000. He noted that in the past, no one wanted to pay for it. Senator Bruce Carter raised an issue with the reporting line for the Senate being through the Registrar's Office. He noted that the it used to be through the Provost's Office. The notion that the Registrar's Office is the conduit for the Senate, that's mostly made up of faculty, would seem to be an issue. He gave a brief overview of how the Senate ended up under the reporting line of the Registrar's Office. Senator Carter stated that he thinks that the Senate needs to reevaluate this issue.

The Chair asked for more questions on the proposed main motion as amended. After a final clarification, a voice vote was taken regarding the amendment to the bylaw language to incorporate electronic voting. The vote was unanimous and was passed.

The next item on the agenda - the Humanities Council resolution – Senator Kathryn Everly to present. The senator introduced herself to the Senate body. Senator Everly presented a resolution from the Humanities Council regarding the University's Climate Survey. Senator Everly stated that the Council feels its urgent to bring their concerns to the administration. [See full resolution files provided by the Humanities Council prior to Senate meeting.]

The concerns are as follows:

- Concerns with the information presentation
- Concerns with the choosing of the firm that conducted the survey
- Concerns about the lack of information about sexual assault
- Concerns of the council and the use of the word "climate" and how that potentially impacts the bias and the response rate
- The overall nomenclature used in the reporting
- Discrepancies in the numbers of responses
- Level of diversity in the focus groups is not spelled out
- Pg 6 of the report talks about the lack of comfort on campus and other issues, these should be at the beginning of the report.

The senator provided a list of five proposed actions that should be undertaken by the University. Senator Everly then asked for questions or comments from the Senate body. Because the resolution was initiated from an outside body, it requires two people to bring it to the Senate for consideration. Senator Bruce Carter seconded the motion to open the issue up for discussion in the Senate.

Once seconded, the issue was then opened for discussion. Senator Mary Lovely, one of two faculty on the committee looking at the climate survey, (the other faculty member is Senator Andrew London.) Senator Lovely thanked the Council for their work. She acknowledged that some of the issues raised by the Council bear discussion. Senators Lovely and London share some of the

concerns about the findings, however, Senator Lovely wanted to make several points regarding the survey and the resolution.

Senator Lovely noted that the full report provides details on all the questions asked and provides much more detail about all the parts of the report. The Climate report is 350 pages long. While the unwanted sexual assault is 30 pages long, the executive summary is much smaller.

Regarding the nomenclature within the reporting, the concern is based on the misconception that anyone at the University wrote any part of the report. It was understood that the report would be written independently and without any SU interference. The senator pointed out that some resolutions have already been passed and to try to repass other proposals is ignoring the important work of our colleagues or to ignore the information.

Senator Lovely mentioned all the training that's taking place in various areas.

Educating faculty – training is already taking place
If we want to be helpful be part of the pilot rather than pass another resolution
Lastly, investment in new department chairs, this is already being working on

Senator Lovely urged the Senate to reject the resolution.

Senator Everly wanted to note the discontinuity between sexual assault and unwanted sexual experiences. Another point she wanted to raise, specifically with new faculty coming to campus. The concern is that new faculty are not being properly trained. The Senator noted that she has been at the University for 16 years and she hasn't ever been informed. Senator Everly feels these issues should fall to the Senate to make sure they're being addressed.

Provost Michele Wheatly noted she had first–hand knowledge regarding individuals with disabilities training in which an intense meeting took place just six weeks ago. A senator noted that after hearing Senator Lovely speak, it illuminated the fact that the Humanities Council should have talked to Senators Lovely and London prior to bringing a resolution to the Senate.
Another senator pointed out that part time faculty fly under the radar for much of the training and discussion.

An additional issue was raised regarding addressing international students' needs directly, as their enrollment increases every year. At some basic level, we're not acting on what we say.
Senator Crystal Bartolovich stated that she respects and applauds both Senators Lovely and Everly. Their comments highlight different things. Most people have only read the executive summary. There are also a lot of things going on that people don't know about. It shouldn't require that people laisse with the committees. This is the Humanities Council, who put a lot of time into the University. Both things can be applicable and true. A lot of amazing work could have gone into the full report. There should be more communication.

Senator Bea Gonzales noted that the data behind the report is owned by the University and the council will continue its research.
Senator Bruce Carter added that the intent of the motion is good. One problem is that the faculty most in need of training, resist efforts to train them. He would also argue, that despite good

intentions, bringing the resolution to the Senate is asking them to mandate something that they don't have the power to do. The Agenda Committee should assign some of the issues to various committees and ask that they report back to the Senate.

Regarding the current resolution, it will either have to be amended or it should be removed entirely. Senator Kathryn Newton noted that she is overjoyed about the Chancellor's recommendations on the Diversity and Inclusion Council. Senator Newton added that she understands many issues the Humanities Council raised, however, there have been reports that have gone to committees and are supposed to come back to the Senate. She's unclear as to when they'll come back. The Senate is still expecting other further reports to come back at some point.

Senator Nancy McCracken stated that she appreciates the intense look at the executive summary of the Climate Survey, but the Humanities Council doesn't have standing in the Senate. How do we talk to each other? How do we continue to work on these issues that have been going on for years? Senator McCracken knows that part time faculty are left out of the loop and she remembers going across campus and talking to people about sexual harassment. Why can't we go back to the working groups working on the issues. Why did the Humanities Council do this in this way?

The Chair indicated that the Humanities Council report is part of the Agenda Committee's report to the Senate. Senator Everly added that the Humanities Council created this document and asked where it should be sent to bring it out to the community and they were asked to send it to the Agenda Committee. The Senate should decide what to do with the issues raised, and whether the resolution/issues should be deferred to Senate committees. The Chair noted that the Humanities Council consists of a large portion of the faculty.

A motion is made to table the resolution. The motion was seconded. The vote was called, with 2 votes against. The motion to table the resolution passes.

Senator Bruce Carter offered a motion that the report received by the Agenda Committee should be moved on for further committee review. The motion is seconded. The vote was called, with 1 vote against. The motion to move the Humanities Council resolution on to Senate committees passes.

The Chair changed the order of the agenda slightly to accommodate the schedule of the Chancellor. The Chair introduced the Chancellor for his report.

The Chancellor noted that he doesn't consider the Senate as being under the Registrar's Office and he welcomes debate on the subject in the future. The Chancellor also raised the issue of the man changes to come in Washington that will affect budget and planning for everyone, and the University. He stated that there have been many dramatic changes that have affected the University in the past. He will work with Committee on Budget and Fiscal Affairs as we work through these challenges.

Some issues the Chancellor is actively working on include Free Speech, the Campus Posting Policy, and ICT. The Chancellor stated that Campus Posting Policy is not ready and should go to one or more Senate committees for review. The other two initiatives look to be very close and the

Chancellor has asked outside groups to look at the polices and report back so they can be implemented in January.

The Chancellor touched on the implication of changes in the administration, specifically the FLSA, which due to injunction in Texas, was placed on hold. However, with consultation, it was decided that the fair thing to do was to implement the policy as it had been planned and it seemed like the right thing to do as the changes had already been communicated to those who would be affected by the policy.

The Chief Financial Officer search should be completed by green days and the results will be announced shortly thereafter. The Chancellor noted that the administration is meeting with international students regarding recent security issues around campus. He noted that there will be more reporting in the coming semester from Department of Public Safety regarding their continued efforts in this area.

The Chancellor also noted the recent updates regarding arrests relating to the murder of a University student earlier in the semester. The Chancellor thanked the Senate and wished everyone happy holidays. The Chair noted that any further questions could be forwarded to him.

The Chair then moved to the next item on the agenda, the report from the Senate Committee on Curricula. Senator Kira Reed will give Curricula Committee report. Senator Reed made a motion to accept the SCC report for December.

There were several questions regarding some details of the report.
Senator Nancy McCracken noted that the revised Maxwell program for Public Health should be corrected as Maxwell has no PhD in Public Health. Senator Michael Wasylenko, as chair of the Maxwell Curriculum Committee verbally corrected the error, and asked for a motion to accept the correction. The motion was seconded.

Senator McCracken asked to have the program removed from the report regardless of the verbal correction and the initial motion to correct the error did not pass by way of vote. The program will be removed from the December SCC report.
There were two other minor typographical corrections requested to:

CFS 382/crosslisting
IST 647 Network Virtualization to Visualization

Other questions were raised by Senator Robert Rubinstein regarding the prefix MPH for courses in the Maxwell MPH program, which are held at Upstate Hospital. The question was asked “How does it come into SU, rather than Upstate?” Senator Michael Wasylenko noted that the courses are part of a joint degree with the University. The course was offered as a trial course and now the course must be regularized.

Senator Rubinstein noted that SU doesn’t teach the course and therefore the Upstate prefix shouldn’t be put in the SU catalog.

Senator Wasylenko responded that the university has to have a prefix that's an SU prefix to allow for crosslisting with other SU courses. The discussion continued regarding the necessity of having an SU prefix when the MPH courses aren't crosslisted with any other programs. Senator Rubinstein made a motion to remove the MPH prefix course from the report. The motion was seconded.

Senator Kira Reed asked Senator Wasylenko if this issue had already been approved through Maxwell's curriculum committee. Senator Wasylenko indicated that it had been. Senator Rubinstein reiterated that he felt that the appropriate prefix should be PAI – meets with MPH.
Senator Sam Gorovitz noted that he wants to defer to the Maxwell people regarding their courses and is against the motion.

The motion was made again to remove MPH 660 from the report because MPH doesn't exist as a SU prefix, it is exclusively a SUNY course.

The issue was raised that if you remove the course it will effect students' programs. Senator Rubinstein noted that "[Our] students that take the course, they take it at Upstate. Why are we putting it in our catalog?" He wants clarification on the issue and he doesn't want it in the catalog as is.

The Chair called for a voice vote on the motion. The voice vote was too close to determine and a show of hands vote was conducted.
Vote in favor of removing MPH 660 from the SCC December report.

In favor of removing – 50
Against removing – 28
Motion is passed

Senator Reed made a motion to approve the Senate Committee on Curricula December report as amended. The motion was passed unanimously.

The Chair introduced the next item on the agenda. The Agenda Committee has been working on two motions in parallel: A motion from the Agenda Committee, as well as a resolution from the University's student organizations (GSO), regarding the sanctuary campus issue. The committee is going to continue to work on this issue and will bring a motion to the January Senate meeting. The committee will work with any group or constituency on this issue.

The Chair read the student organization resolution to the Senate body and asked for comments and questions. [Full resolutions distributed prior to Senate meeting]

It was noted that Agenda Committee needs to be aware that this resolution still leaves the University in the same situation right before the inauguration. It was noted that DPS doesn't inquire about immigration status, however, as an arm of law enforcements they are bound by the laws of the land. This would be in direct conflict with the resolution's stated goals.
Senator Guillermo Guasp-Perez also raised the issue of any students who may be deported and asked that the University should allow them to finish their degrees online.

A senator noted that the statement released today is weaker than the administration's statement released earlier in the week. Other universities have stated that they won't comply unless under court order. It's inadequate to state that we have to comply with federal laws.

Senator Bruce Carter noted that he agrees with the resolution and wanted to clarify that this is a very complicated issue, and it should be looked at as a whole, but the Senate should not handle this in a meeting when we don't have all the pertinent information.

We would ask that the Chancellor and the administration also look at the issue as a whole and the impact to the University. A motion was made that we can support the intent of the resolution. We should support the petition, but stop before we commit to the specific details.

The motion was seconded. The motion "Declares collective support for the petition collected November 9th - showing our support for the petition without all the particulars.

Another senator supports the amendment, noting that a similar action was taken in Communication and Rhetorical Studies, supporting the GSO rather than the specifics, while supporting the intent.

A senator asked what will be different in January and noted that we'll be in a position where we'll have a new President who may immediately enact these laws.

Senator Crystal Bartolovich noted that those specific recommendations for DACA – Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, should be kept distinct and since we're going to pass it anyway, why not pass it today?

Senator Bob Van Gulick added that he was dismayed by the election, but the step of the Senate saying we disagree with the last election, as an official body of the university, he's uncomfortable with some of the wording – there are no neutral positions or unbiased positions. This is not about stealing thunder, but this isn't exactly the document the Senate would have crafted.

Senator Linda Milosky stated that while she didn't like the "unsettling" election results, the University is where you can have differing ideas. Tying the resolution to election results is disrespectful to voters.

A student from the Maxwell School asked to be recognized by the Senate and allowed to comment. The student stated that the resolution indicates steps that the GSO would like to see the University take regarding DACA policies, legitimate concrete steps that University can take. If there are legal questions, they should be brought to University Counsel and resolved. The student reiterated Senator Guasp-Perez's comments regarding DPS and degree completion. These are specific things that the University can do.
Senator Crystal Bartolovich noted in reference to first sentence, that she would be happy to have someone rewrite the first sentence so that it supports the students and would pass the Senate body. She also remarked about the serious reasons to be concerned about the current environment, noting the acts of racism and acts of violence because of the election, but the election isn't the only thing causing them.

Senator John Yinger stated that he'd be happy with rewriting the first clause supporting the petition and principles the students raised. A motion was made to make such an amendment – the motion for an amended resolution-removing first clause was seconded.

There was more discussion regarding the exact wording of an amended resolution. Senator Bruce Carter made a motion that the resolution stop after the first paragraph and include a list of the principles. A vote was taken and passed by a majority.

Senator John Yinger made a motion to further amend the resolution by taking out first clause, The motion was seconded. A vote was taken, the motion was passed by majority, with two "No" votes.

The Chair introduced Provost Michele Wheatly for her report to the Senate. The Provost began by introducing a new Center of Academic Achievement, which would provide free tutoring for SU students. The Provost noted that many students have to pay for academic support and that our goal is to move away from a patchwork approach to a more uniform approach.

The initial focus will be on undergrads in DFW courses [courses with grades D, F, or withdrawals]. The goal is to weed out courses, courses in which 25% of students are not succeeding. Bird Library has donated space and will house the initial space that should be ready to open in January.

Margaret Usdansky, longtime Director of Academic Integrity, will direct the staff of the Center while also continuing in her role in Academic Integrity. The Committees on Instruction and Curricula will be asked to help direct the work of the Center to effectively reach as many students as possible. An advisory group is also being formed, with representation from all the schools and colleges, the Senate, and other units that provide academic support, which will assist in the development of the Center.

The Provost touched on the progress of the Faculty Salary Review Committee, who's next meeting is to be held on December 14th to review data. The Provost reiterated the role of the committee as:

- Review trends in faculty salary
- Year-to-year trends
- Average salary by rank (school, and college)
- Average salary by gender (school and college)
- Average salary by underrepresented minorities
- Deans will review and analyze unit-level data
- Committee members to work with their respective Deans and Senior Associate Deans
- The Provost is asking the committee for privacy and confidentiality

The Provost's Office has reviewed the recommendation of the Committee on Women's Concerns proposing the creation of a University Ombudsperson Office. The Provost's Office will continue to work with that committee on this issue.

The Provost and Chancellor approved changes to the Faculty Manual regarding Teaching Professors, Professors of Practice, and emeritus faculty. The Faculty Manual is being updated. The Provost thanked everyone who worked on the project. It was greatly appreciated.

The Provost noted that her office is working on the implementation of the Chancellor's work group on Diversity and Inclusion, especially in the areas of teaching, scholarship, tenure and promotion.

The Provost also echoed the sentiments of the Chancellor regarding the Senate reporting up to the Registrar's office, and reiterated the importance of shared governance. The Provost thanked everyone for their patience during her first six months. She added that after 6 months, she was no longer the "new Provost" and in the new year was just Provost. The Provost closed by wishing everyone a blessed new year.

Due to time constraints, the Chair announced that the Committee on Student life will report in January and will be first on the agenda. He thanked the committee representatives for their flexibility and patience.

Having no other old business or new business, the Chair closed the meeting and wished everyone happy holidays.

Attendees:

Lois Agnew
Suzanne Baldwin
Uday Banerjee
Suzanne Bartlett
Crystal Bartolovich
Paul Bern
Mehrzad Boroujerdi
Amanda Brown
Garrett Bryant
Patricia Burak
John Burdick
Bruce Carter
Linda Carty
Bhiu-Kai Chin
John Coggiola
Todd Conover
Kim Cook
Francine D'Amico
John Dannenhoffer
Lawrence Davis
Chris Day
Susan Dean
Thom deLara
Dimple Dhanani
William Di Cosimo
James Duah-Agyeman
Craig Dudczak
Emily Duke
Fred Easton
Sana'a El-Amir
Patti Ford
Myrna Garcia
Prasanta Ghosh
Stefano Giannini
Seth Gitner
Tula Goenka
Bea Gonzalez
Samuel Gorovitz
Guillermo Guasp-Perez
Roy Gutterman
Marianne Hanley
Julie Hasenwinkel
Margaret Himley
Kevin Hundelt
Thomas Keck
Andrew Kim
Rajesh Kumar
Norman Kutcher
Adam Labonoski
Elissa Leathers
Jackie Lewis-Frenay
Jay Kyoon Lee
Carol Liebler
Joon Soo Lim
Andrew London
Mary Lovely
Amy Lutz
Nancy McCracken
Stephanie McReynolds
Kishan Mehrotra
Suzette Melendez
Alan Middleton
Chandra Mohanty
David Molta
Mark Monmonier
Sharon Moran
Laurel Morton
Diane Murphy
Cathryn Newton
Gabe Nugent
Susan Parks
Deborah Pellow
Thomas Perreault
James Powers
Ramesh Raina
Kira Reed
LaVonda Reed
Jose Marrero Rosado
Robert Rubinstein
Mark Rupert
Eileen Schell
Ralf Schneider
Pooja Shah
Tom Sherman
Yutaka Sho
Diksha Shukla
Jeffrey Stanton

Barbara Stripling
Chancellor Kent Syverud
Maureen Thompson
Robert Van Gulick
Cecilia Van Hollen
Peter Vanable
Padmal Vitharana
Michael Wasylenko
Provost Michele Wheatly
Chris Wildrick
Jamie Winders
Amanda Winkler
Angela Williams
Ruth Yanai
John Yinger
Dan Zacharia