UNIVERSITY SENATE

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, **23 March 2016**, in Maxwell Auditorium.

Present were: Senators Adam, Agnew, Artuso, Bahl, Bartlett, Bartolovich, Bartosh, Boroujerdi, Brann, Brown (A.), Brown (H.), Brown (L.), Bulman, Burak, Burstyn, Carter, Chandler-Olcott, Clarke, Coggiola, Cook, Davis, Day, Dean, DeLara, DeNevers, Doctor, Dolak, Dong, Duah-Aygeman, Duke, Elin, Erdman, Fitzgerald, Ford, Gallagher, Garcia-Murillo, Gauri, Giannini, Gitner, Goode, Gorovitz, Hasenwinkel, Himley, Hollenback, Isik, Jasper, Kallendar, Keck, Kumar, Labonoski, Lewis-Frenay, Liddy, Lim, London, Lovely, Lutz, MacInnes, Marrero, McCracken, McReynolds, Mehrotra, Mohanty, Monmonier, Morton, Mulvaney, Munly, Murphy, Nabatchi, Newton, Nicholson, Nugent, Osborne, Paris, Pellow, Powers, Quinn, Raina, Reed (K.), Reed (L.), Riley, Rolling, Rubinstein, Ruhlandt, Rupert, Ryan, Schell, Sherman, Smith (A.), Staniec, Stoke-Rees, Stripling, Syverud, Tapia, Thompson, Tucker, Van Gulick, Van Hollen, Vanable, Vidali, Vitharana, Wasylenko, Wilcoxen, Wildrick, Winders.

Presiding officer: Prof. Can Isik

Prof. Isik called the meeting to order and proposed that the minutes of the February 17th Senate meeting be approved, and the body concurred. He then told senators that because of the importance and likelihood of extended discussion of items from the Academic Affairs committee on the agenda, there would be a meeting on the 30th of March, at 4:00 in the Maxwell auditorium

He then reported for the Agenda Committee, including a motion to approve the following calendar of meetings for 2016-17:

14 September 2016
12 October 2016
9 November 2016
7 December 2016
18 January 2017
15 February 2017
22 March 2017
29 March 2017 (if needed)
19 April 2017

The motion carried. Prof. Isik continued with a report on the Agenda Committee's response to the Committee on Instruction's February resolution about an official role for the Senate in development and implementation of the Academic Strategic Plan. Isik said that the Agenda Committee had decided to schedule a meeting of all committee chairs for Wednesday, April 6th at 4:00 o'clock. Finally, Prof. Isik reminded committee

(more)

members to nominate 1-2 members to work on one of the Middle States Self-study teams: Mission and Goals; Ethics and Integrity; Design and Delivery of of the Student Learning Experience; Support of the Student Experience; Educational Effectiveness Assessment; Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement; Governance, Leadership, and Administration; Compliance Self-study Team.

Prof. Isik called Chancellor Syverud, who gave an update on the appointment of new Vice Chancellor and Provost Michele Wheatly, the report of the Working Group on Diversity and Inclusion, thanking committee members for their 33 recommendations; thanked Prof. Lovely for her work on the report about the Professor of Practice, saying it was an important issue requiring careful study. [http://news.syr.edu/chancellor-syverud-addresses-march-23-university-senate-meeting/67404/] Interim Provost Liddy then gave a brief report on the follow-up to the Committee on Instruction motion about Senate role in development of the Academic Strategic Plan, reporting that there were 23 senators on the various working groups, 19 of them faculty.

Prof. Isik then asked that all non-senators wait outside the auditorium while the Senate discussed and voted on the report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees. The chairman called Prof. Day who presented the committee report, which included a motion to approve a nominee for honorary degree, and the motion carried.

Prof. Isik called Prof. Gallagher to present the report of the Committee on Curricula. The report included a motion to approve courses and changes (Arts and Sciences, Engineering and Computer Science, Visual and Performing Arts, Education, Sport and Human Dynamics) in the report. The motion carried.

The chairman called Prof. Lori Brown to present the report of the Committee on Women's Concerns, which included a resolution, as follows:

WHEREAS, Ombuds programs provide neutral, independent, informal and confidential assistance in conflict resolution, problem-solving, upward feedback, and trend-tracking to universities, private industry, and government, and Ombuds programs act as an informal and independent mechanism to facilitate confidential inquiry and provide additional expert advice on working to achieve fair solutions to a wide range of issues and concerns; and

WHEREAS, Ombuds programs have operated at U.S. institutions of higher learning since the 1960s and, recognizing the benefits to their campus communities, over 300 universities across the country have established Ombuds programs, including 67% of ACC schools; and

WHEREAS, recent events at Syracuse University, including high turnover in leadership roles, the implementation of a Voluntary Separation Incentive Program, as well as much discussion on the future trajectory of the University in strategic planning and operations, have all resulted in widespread feelings of uncertainty and stress; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 "Diagnostic Employee Survey" by Bain & Co. report highlighted the need for enhanced feedback mechanisms and increased transparency, communication, and collaboration, while a report from the Fast Forward Working Group 6 recommended improving morale an campus climate by developing an ombudsperson position; and

WHEREAS, an Ombuds program gathers data on trends to help identify possible systemic issues requiring attention for university leaders; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Women's Concerns, composed of staff, faculty, and students, have after extensive research developed a "Proposal to Establish an Ombuds Office at Syracuse University" detailing the need for and benefits of such an office;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Syracuse University Senate endorses the Committee's "Proposal to Establish an Ombuds Office at Syracuse University" and recommends to the Chancellor that such an Ombuds Office be established, answering directly to the Chancellor, serving Syracuse University students, staff members, faculty members, and administrators, and annually reporting to the University Senate.

Prof. Brown highlighted the committee report, which included a description of the structure of an Ombuds office. In the discussion, various questions and issues were raised, including:

-whether the lines of access would compete with other offices where grievances and complaints were brought [Prof. Brown said that the Ombudsperson would be independent, the data confidential.];

-query about how to hire such a person; senator wondered whether there was a career pool of such persons;

-senator expressed concern over how data referred to in the 5th paragraph of the resolution would remain confidential if the office was to report to the Chancellor and the University Senate [Brown said that there would be no access to the data; and that it would be destroyed at some point.];

-a senator wondered how the details of such a position and office would be worked out, said that he might be in favor of such a proposal but disappointed in the end result; [Brown said it would depend on the Chancellor's concurrence and willingness to meet with them.];

-senator asked how they intended to report to the Senate when sensitive and confidential data was involved [Brown said that they would report patterns and trends, not specific personal data.];

-a member said that there needed to be more attention to structure and connection to other similar offices on campus, and more work on the details;

-a member said that he thought the Ombudsperson's independence would be compromised by having to report to the Chancellor; also, member asked if the office would be collecting data on kinds of complaints, e.g., [Brown said that an Ombuds office was a place where you could get resolution to a problem, not just a place to complain.];

-another member agreed with the fact that there was a weakness in the proposal in that there was no governance structure, said that it would have to be connected with existing structures, e.g., HR;

-member commented that he had worked for two years with a faculty ombuds office, and said that ombudsperson is a profession, that the purpose of the ombuds office is to defuse issues before they escalate, using talking and listening, that it can work but the details must be worked out carefully.

The motion to approve the resolution carried.

The chairman called Prof. MacInnes to present the report of the Committee on Academic Affairs. Prof. MacInnes told the body that the committee had three separate motions to place on the table, and that each of them would be voted on at the March 30th meeting. In response to an objection by a Senate member, that the motion to change the name of the Child & Family Studies Dept. was a simple matter, Prof. MacInnes deferred to Dean Murphy, who said that the agreement of the deans was needed, that it was a new step in the process recently implemented, and that she would see that it was done before the next meeting. Prof. MacInnes then called Prof. Lovely to present the motion on Non-tenure-track Full-time faculty. Lovely highlighted the report and then gave a detailed response to the comments the committee had received. [Her responses have been sent to all senators separately.] She said that the committee had discussed whether to present two motions or one, and that at the committee meeting where it had been decided, all members agreed that it should be one motion.

In the discussion, questions raised and observations made included:

-that the issue of increasing numbers of Professors of Practice could not be addressed on a unit level only; that it should be addressed on the basis of academic needs—not just budgetary limitations; based on the ratio of numbers of professors of practice to tenured or tenure-track professors;

Academic affairs committee, cont'd

-question of why in the data as of the end of summer 2015 the numbers were lower than the reality;

-senator was unclear on the difference between definition of Professor of Practice and Teaching Faculty;

-concern that there was a larger issue, a sense that units would make pragmatic decisions based on where SU projected itself to be in the future;

-question of what would happen in a situation where a professor of practice wanted at some point to apply for a non-tenure-track full-time faculty position;

-observation that the motion had not evolved out of a desire to accommodate budgets, that it was a concern about quality and treatment of faculty;

-that there needed to be a standard definition of Professor of Practice to show the difference between that and Non-tenure-track Full-time faculty; that she hoped there will also be a standard of expertise for professors of practice;

-senator pointed out the problem of the administrative statement about moving away from tenure by adding Professors of Practice; also, what about the position of unionized part-time faculty;

-that there was no oversight role for the schools and colleges; that there needed to be a motion urging the schools and colleges to oversee the process.

Prof. Van Gulick rose to read an amendment to the proposal that he said he would move at the March 30th meeting:

Acknowledging all the many and diverse contributions made by non-tenure track faculty to the academic mission of Syracuse University; and

acknowledging the need for flexibility in meeting the needs of the University in a changing higher education context;

the Syracuse University Senate reaffirms the essential centrality of full-time tenured and tenure track faculty who play the full range of academic roles in research, teaching, and service in an integrated way, supporting the mission of Syracuse University as an R1 research university committed to excellence in scholarship and teaching,

Van Gulick's motion, cont'd

> the University Senate expresses its sense that the success of the University as a center of integrated research and teaching requires that tenured and tenure track faculty should constitute the overwhelming majority of the full-time faculty.
>
> The University Senate calls upon the University Administration and the University Trustees to affirm that though there is an important role for non-tenure track faculty in particular situations, the success of the University as a center of integrated research and teaching requires that tenured and tenure-track faculty should constitute the overwhelming majority of the full-time faculty.

Prof. Van Gulick said that he would send his amendment to Prof. Lovely and to the Senate Office so that it could be distributed prior to the March 30th meeting.

Prof. Nabatchi came to the podium and presented the draft report on the recommendations from the Working Group on Free Speech. Prof. Nabatchi highlighted the report, pointing out for example the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) which had surveyed 437 colleges and universities about their speech codes—the policies governing student and faculty speech that would, outside the bounds of campus, be protected by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and then rated those colleges and universities as "red light", "yellow light", or "green light" institutions based on how much protected speech their policies restricted. She said that S.U. had been rated "red light" overall. She said the working group had come up with proposals that the committee mainly agreed with but that some of them needed more work on clarification, e.g., of what constituted a threat to the University's education mission or, e.g., definition of speech that is offensive, harassing, bullying, or threatening.

In the discussion, comments and questions included:

-a member requested that the committee consider having a resolution that came out of the Senate, rather than just a report to the Chancellor;

-senator said that the terms "reasonable person" and "significant disruption" needed clarification.

Prof. Isik asked if there was any old or new business and, there being none, the meeting was adjourned.

Teresa Gilman

Teresa Gilman
University Senate Recorder