

Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2022

<https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>

The 7th Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2022-2023 was held on December 7, 2022, at 12:12 p.m. via Zoom.

Attendance

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	TERM ENDS (SPRING)	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
					7
Lisa	Haylon	Accounting	2025		4
Kenneth	McGill	Anthropology	2023	X	4
Melanie	Uribe	Art	2024	X	7
Kevin	Siedlecki	Athletics	2023	X	7
Elizabeth	Roberts	Biology	2023	X	7
Kate	Toskin	Business Information Systems	2025	X	6
Jeff	Webb	Chemistry	2023	X	7
Richard	Zipoli	Communication Disorders	2024	X	5
Melanie	Savelli	Communication, Media & Screen Studies	2025	X	7
Shafaeat	Hossain	Computer Science	2025	X	7
Matthew	Ouimet	Counseling	2024	X	7
VACANT		Counseling & School Psychology	2023		
Helen	Marx	Curriculum & Learning	2024	X	6
Maria	Diamantis	Curriculum & Learning	2024	X	4
Dushmantha	Jayawickreme	Earth Science	2025	X	7
Jia	Yu	Economics	2024	X	7
Peter	Madonia	Educational Leadership	2023	X	5
Paul	Petrie	English	2023	X	7
Mike	Shea	English	2024	X	7
Miriah	Kelly	Environment, Geography, & Marine Sciences	2025	X	6
Sandip	Dutta	Finance & Real Estate	2025		5
Kyle	O'Brien	Healthcare Systems & Innovation	2025		6
Robert	Knipe	Health & Movement Sciences	2025	X	7
Daniel	Swartz	Health & Movement Sciences	2025	X	7
Carmen	Coury	History	2023	X	7
Troy	Paddock	History	2023	X	7
Yan	Liu	Information & Library Sciences	2024	X	On Leave Fall 2022
Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2024	X	6
Patrick	Crowley	Library Services	2023	X	7
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2025	X	7

Alison	Wall	Management & International Business	2025	X	6
Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2023	X	6
Sebastian	Perumbilly	Marriage & Family Therapy	2025	X	3
Klay	Kruczek	Mathematics	2025	X	7
Raymond	Mugno	Mathematics	2025	X	7
Jonathan	Irving	Music	2023	X	3
Krista	Prendergast	Nursing	2023	X	1
Andrea	Adimando	Nursing	2024	X	7
Obigaeli	Okwuka	Part-Time Faculty	2023		On Leave Fall 2022
Virginia	Metaxas	Part-Time Faculty	2023	X	5
Michael	Sormrude	Part-Time Faculty	2024	X	7
Michele	Delucia	Part-Time Faculty	2024	X	7
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2023	X	7
Elliott	Horch	Physics	2024	X	1
Jonathan	O'Hara	Political Science	2025	X	4
Kate	Marsland	Psychology	2025	X	6
Chris	Budnick	Psychology	2024	X	7
Jon	Nwangwu	Public Health	2024	X	6
Michael	Dodge	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2023	X	7
Carmela	Smith	Social Work	2023	X	5
Stephen	Monroe Tomczak	Social Work	2025	X	6
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2023	X	7
Angela	Lopez-Velasquez	Special Education	2024		On Leave Fall 2022
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2024	X	6
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2025	X	6
Luke	Eilderts	World Languages & Literatures	2023	X	7
Natalie	Starling	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2023	X	7
Joe	Bertolino	SCSU President		X	5
Barbara	Cook	Chair, Graduate Council		X	6
Meredith	Sinclair	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form			5
Trevor	Boczer	SGA			4

GUESTS

Audrey Kerr
 Craig Hlavac
 Jess Gregory
 Julie Edstrom

Kathleen Skoczen
 Steve Larocco
 Terri Bennett

The following senators are empowered by the Faculty Senate to represent the Faculty Senate and thereby represent the faculty body in their role and contributions to the respective committee/group in which shared governance of business is being conducted with a duty to report back to the Faculty Senate minimally once per semester (additional reports determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate). It is recommended representatives also seek the Faculty Senate’s support and endorsement for matters determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate.

Early College Experience	Christine Broadbridge (fall) Michele DeLucia (spring)
Faculty Development Advisory Committee (FDAC)	(1 representative – unfilled)
Committee on Reassigned Time	Troy Paddock
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) liaison	Cindy Simoneau
University Library Committee (ULC)	(2 representative – unfilled)

Faculty Senate President N. Starling called the 7th meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:13 p.m. via Zoom.

- I. Announcements
 - A. B. Cook encouraged Senators to attend the FYRE student presentations.
 - B. C. Simoneau shared that the next edition of *Crescent* had been published.
 - C. N. Starling shared that results from the Faculty Referendum would be distributed via email to the campus after the close of the Senate meeting and after the results could be verified. *(For recordkeeping purposes, the announcement of the results will be included in these minutes; see “Documents to Accompany Minutes for December 7, 2022” below. --lle)*

- II. Minutes of the previous (Special) meeting held on November 16, 2022, were accepted as distributed. <https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>

- III. Faculty Senate President’s Report <https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>
 - A. T. Paddock congratulated N. Starling for her leadership of the Faculty Senate. This sentiment was echoed by T. Lin as well as several more Senators.

- IV. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees
 - A. Reports received.
 - B. N. Starling encouraged Senators to share the work underway at the Standing Committees with their departments since there may be a number of items coming forward in the Spring.

- V. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees
 - A. UCF: Report received.
 - B. Graduate Council: Report Received.

- VI. New Business
 - A. R. Gilliland **moved to approve** the Formation of an Ad-hoc Committee for Non-credit, Continuing Education & Micro-credentialing (see “Documents to Accompany Minutes for December 7, 2022” below). **Seconded.**
 - i. Motion **approved unanimously.**
 - B. H. Marx **moved to approve** the resolution regarding Revisions to the Incomplete Grade Policy (see “Documents to Accompany Minutes for December 7, 2022” below).
 - i. J. Webb **moved to strike** “attended” and **insert** “participated in” in the following passage of the resolution: “A student must have **attended participated in** at least 60% of the term in order to have a temporary Incomplete ‘I’ grade assigned by the instructor.” **Seconded.**
 - 1. L. Eilderts **moved to call the previous question. Seconded.**
 - a. Motion to call the previous question **approved by unanimous consent.**
 - b. Vote tally
 - i. Yes21
 - ii. No18
 - 1. Motion to amend the resolution **approved.**
 - ii. P. Petrie **moved to call the previous question. Seconded.**
 - 1. Motion to call the previous question **approved by unanimous consent.**
 - a. Vote tally
 - i. Yes37
 - ii. No3
 - 1. Resolution regarding Revisions to the Incomplete Grade Policy **approved as amended.**

- C. Presentation by guest J. Gregory on the proposed department name change from “Educational Leadership” to “Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.”
 - i. J. Webb **moved to endorse** the proposed name change from “Educational Leadership” to “Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.” **Seconded.**
 - 1. Vote tally
 - a. Yes.....37
 - b. No0
 - i. Motion to **endorse** the name change **approved unanimously.**
- D. J. Webb **moved to endorse** the proposed department name change from “Chemistry” to “Chemistry and Biochemistry.” **Seconded.**
 - i. Vote tally
 - 1. Yes36
 - 2. No2
 - a. Motion to endorse the proposed name change **approved.**

VII. Guests

- A. A. Kerr and S. Larocco, University Ombudspersons, presented information on their office as well as on the topic of aggressive speech (see “Documents to Accompany Minutes for December 7, 2022” below).
 - i. After the presentation, discussion included
 - 1. creating an ad hoc committee that would explore drafting “norms;” concern was raised about the creation of a committee and suggested instead exploring the spaces we currently have.
 - 2. Exploring resources available like “Mediators Beyond Borders,” the “Human Library.”
 - ii. In closing, the Ombuds shared their willingness to return to the Faculty Senate.

VIII. Semester Closing Remarks

- A. N. Starling shared closing remarks regarding the Fall 2022 semester and its challenges, as well as the optimism she feels for the future.

IX. Adjournment

- A. J. Webb **moved to adjourn. Seconded.**
- B. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

L. Eilderts
Secretary

Formation of an Ad-hoc Committee for Non-credit, Continuing Education & Micro-credentialing

On the formation of:

Ad-hoc Committee for Non-credit, Continuing Education & Micro-credentialing

Rationale: (1) collaborative effort to support policy pertaining to academic matters and faculty purview over curriculum matters by uniting representatives of the community, of the autonomous standing committees of the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate within one committee and (2) to address the potential policy gap for non-credit that does not fall under undergraduate or graduate curricula

Chair of ad-hoc committee: according to a majority vote of the ad-hoc committee during the first meeting

Membership invitations:

- two (2) senators and at least one (1) of the two (2) Academic Policy Committee (APC) co-chairs (faculty)
- chair of UCF or designee (faculty)
- chair of Grad Council or designee (faculty)
- at least one (1) and no more two (2) AAUP representatives
- at least one (1) and possibly additional members of the faculty (faculty). The number and selection process to be recommended by the ad hoc committee during the first meeting.
- at least one (1) member invitation offered to Academic Affairs representative (admin)
- member invitation to be extended to new Director of Continuing Education (admin)
- at least one (1) member invitation offered to Registrar representative (admin/staff)
- at least one (1) member invitation offered to Director of Online Learning or designee (admin/staff)
- One (1) graduate and one (1) undergraduate SGA representative (student)
- and other members as recommended by the ad hoc committee (committee may find it beneficial to refer to the 2+2 ad hoc committee membership as a possible guide for roles/titles of possible interested parties)

Meeting Schedule:

- The meeting schedule and duration to be determined by the ad hoc committee during the first meeting.

Reporting rate to the Faculty Senate: at least monthly or at greater intervals as determined by the ad hoc committee or the Faculty Senate

Initial Charges (committee may find it beneficial review input from Grad Council and UCF)

Charge 1: to gather and receive recommendations and information from constituents and other groups across the university community

Charge 2: establish definitions for non-credit, continuing education and micro-credentialing terminology and offerings

Charge 3: establish recommendations for curricular review of for non-credit, continuing education and micro-credentialing offerings

Charge 4/other: upon presentation to the Faculty Senate, consideration to be given to the ad hoc committee's recommendation for additional charge(s)

Resolution Regarding Revisions to the Incomplete Grade Policy

Connecticut State University (SCSU) exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, Periodic review and revision to the Incomplete Grade Policy provides clarity for students and faculty; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the existing Incomplete Grade Policy for Undergraduate and Graduate students be revised according to the changes indicated below:

Incomplete Revision Catalog Language:

<https://catalog.southernct.edu/undergraduate/grades-honors-standing.html>

<https://catalog.southernct.edu/undergraduate/grades-honors-standing.html>

A temporary Incomplete (I) grade is recorded when an instructor grants a student's request for an extension prior to the end of the semester. An Incomplete grade may impact satisfactory academic progress for financial aid and future registration if the incomplete course is a prerequisite. A student must have participated in at least 60% of the term in order to have a temporary Incomplete 'I' grade assigned by the instructor.

The instructor and the student must complete and sign an Incomplete Grade Contract to be submitted to the department chairperson for the course. The instructor will make all course materials available to the student for the duration of the incomplete period. (Note: Instructors should not give an "I" unless the Incomplete has been requested by the student and a contract has been completed.)

The Incomplete Grade Contract shall specify the following:

1. The remaining coursework to be completed by the student.
2. The student submission deadline for the remaining coursework, set in consultation with the student.
3. The Incomplete Final Grade (i.e. the default final grade earned if the remaining coursework is not completed).
4. The Extension Deadline, if earlier than the default 30 days **following the end** of term as indicated by the academic calendar.

When submitting end of semester grades, the instructor shall enter a grade of "I", the Incomplete Final Grade, and the Extension Deadline from the contract.

Prior to the Extension Deadline, the instructor must enter a final grade based on completed work, or an additional extension (I+), by using the Banner Faculty Grade Change form. If no action is taken prior to the deadline, the student will automatically receive the Incomplete Final Grade.

Academic Freedom, Symbolic Violence, and Reasoned Argument: a response to trends and an attempt to clarify definitions

Context: One of the trends the Ombuds office has witnessed over two plus years of work is that forms of overly aggressive speech (bullying and otherwise) tend to disproportionately impact (and, at times, silence) women, untenured people (whether tenure-track or part-time), people of color and others who feel less empowered in relation to their public standing. In a social justice university, this effect seems to be a problem. *This presentation is not an argument for a particular policy*; if any policy resulting from this presentation is desired, that needs to be crafted through the processes of shared governance. The following are notes from a presentation to the Senate Executive Committee. They are being shared to allow people time to formulate responses and to start a dialogue about this, if the Senate thinks such a conversation would be wise.

From the CBA: Article 4.2.1 All members of the bargaining unit are **entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties.** Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. **Members are also entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their assigned subjects.** Members participate as **representatives of a learned profession, of an educational institution and of society at large.** **When they speak or write as members of society, they are free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations.** As persons of learning and educational leaders, they should remember that *the public may judge their profession and their institution* by their utterances. Hence, they should exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort, where appropriate, to indicate that they do not speak for Connecticut State University. (my emphasis).

It is *not* one's privilege under academic freedom, at least according to a pretty straightforward reading of the definitions highlighted above from the CBA, to simply vent at or insult people one disagrees with; such behavior is often disturbing or toxic enough that it **intimidates** and thereby, in an informal sense, can and does *censor others*. Such discourse can easily be or become a form of bullying. And it works not by trying to convince in a reasoned way. Rather, such discourse too often attempts to nullify the speech of others through emotionally charged statements of offense and contempt. Its implicit purpose is to end or short-circuit dialogue rather than to participate in it. Such discourse, of course, can't be fully stopped or eradicated, but creating a culture/ethos that disavows its use would create substantially enhanced space for more fully inclusive, reasoned, participatory dialogue.

Personal attack is *not* protected as such by academic freedom (let me narrow that to ad hominem attack). The aim in asserting this is to try to dispel the confusion or blurring of academic freedom and free speech. Academic freedom, as the CBA states, is meant to allow the uncensored and free pursuit of knowledge; personal attack has no part in that agenda. Ad hominem attacks are rhetorical rather than logical, and aim to assert a form of relational domination rather than the kind of power that comes from the force of a logical argument.

The protection of free speech is different and is meant to preclude *government* censorship, primarily in the public sphere. But even that protection doesn't mean that one can simply say, print or circulate whatever one wants anywhere. Free speech does offer more protection of aggressive speech than academic freedom does. However, developing a culture of civil, well-reasoned argumentation that doesn't include ad hominem attacks does not inhibit or censor the free exchange of ideas or vigorous debate.

*Ad hominem attacks are a form of symbolic violence;*¹ they are not primarily informational, but designed as speech acts in the philosopher J. L. Austin's sense (that is, they are modes of speech that *do things* [intimidate, injure, menace, frighten, distress, demoralize, etc.]); ad hominem attacks don't simply debate things nor are they intended to do so. And like physical forms of violence, ad hominem attacks, especially as they become more angry and targeted, are designed to assert power when and where the attacker thinks dialogue won't work. Their effect is to distort and to some extent, negate the field of dialogue, whether academic or not, not to advance logical discussion or to make logical arguments. *A verbal free-for-all is not free for all.* Ad hominem attacks are not protected by academic freedom; they actually suppress the speech of many and are *designed* to do so. They are a form and claim of privilege, and typically reflect, to some degree, existing *identity-based* relations of power. In such relations of power, some people have much less ability to speak and are much less free than others. In the university system we, as ombuds, have witnessed, that too often means people of color, women and non-tenured faculty (again, whether tenure-track or part time).

It would be useful for the faculty leadership, especially the senate and union leadership, to consider affirming this norm in some form (or perhaps developing policy), so that people who violate it can be asked reasonably to return to academic argument rather than persevere in rhetorical efforts to generate forms of domination and revenge. This is a way of collectively working to address the real problem of bullying, which includes using personal attack in the place of reasoned argument. It seems necessary in this endeavor to make it relatively clear what appropriate speech is and isn't in given contexts, and not to allow insult, ad hominem attacks and forms of bullying to be hidden within a baggy, confused notion of academic freedom. Free speech, as previously noted, offers a considerably broader protection of dissent and expression, but that's because it's supposed to protect protest from government censorship or punishment.

Academic Freedom *does* protect faculty from institutional censorship or punishment for what they say as "members of the public," as participants in political debates and discourse; this is not license to simply attack colleagues. If we as a collective create a norm that says personal attack isn't acceptable, give good reasons why not (and how it isn't part of good academic debate), and then push back as a community against that form of speech when it occurs, it should open up a more positive, more inclusive and less distorted dialogic environment. Dealing with the problem of ad hominem attack and symbolic violence is not easy, especially if one wants to provide a fair amount of latitude in acceptable speech, but if a relatively lucid norm is in place (in the form of a clear, available statement signed on to by faculty leadership), it gives people support in trying to call out when such speech is used and hopefully inhibit it while not affecting *at all* any free exchange of ideas.

¹ I am borrowing the term here from the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu but using it in a different way. He uses the term to capture the violence done on populations due to classifications and categorizations that differentiate the social field in ways that are hierarchical but also normalized by the dominant order. I'm using the term "symbolic violence" to refer to types of discourse that are speech-acts (speech that *does things* rather than predicates arguments or information), which are *meant* to harm (*to punish and cause suffering*) rather than to engage the other in actual dialogue.

Faculty Referendum regarding the Delay of Revisions to the Liberal Education Program (LEP)



DATE: December 8, 2022

TO: Meredith N. Sinclair
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)

CC: Joe Bertolino
President, Southern Connecticut State University

Robert S. Prezant
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Alicia Carroll
Registrar

Luke Eilderts
Secretary, Faculty Senate

FROM: Natalie R. Starling
President, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Faculty Referendum regarding the Delay of Revisions to the Liberal Education Program (LEP)

By this memo, I am certifying the results of the recent ballot conducted by the Faculty Senate for the Faculty Referendum regarding the delay of revisions to the LEP. All referenda require a minimum of 200 faculty votes for results to be considered valid and the results are decided by a simple majority of those voting ([Faculty Senate Constitution](#)).

The ballot opened on November 28, 2022, and concluded on December 7, 2022. A total of 274 votes were cast. This exceeds the minimum number of 200 votes required for results to be considered valid, therefore these results are considered valid. A total of 73 votes were cast in approval and a total of 201 votes were cast in disapproval. **The motion "The University Curriculum Forum shall delay implementation of the recently approved revisions to the Liberal Education Program until academic year 2024-25" has not passed.** Please contact me via email at starlingn1@southernct.edu with any questions.

Thank you,

