

# Southern Connecticut State University

## FACULTY SENATE

### UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF MARCH 29, 2023

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

The 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2022-2023 was held on March 29, 2023, at 12:12 p.m. via Zoom.

#### Attendance

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	TERM ENDS (SPRING)	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL 10
Lisa	Haylon	Accounting	2025	X	8
Kenneth	McGill	Anthropology	2023	X	9
Melanie	Uribe	Art & Design	2024	X	13
Kevin	Siedlecki	Athletics	2023	0	7
Elizabeth	Roberts	Biology & Biochemistry	2023	X	12
Kate	Toskin	Business Information Systems	2025	X	11
Jeff	Webb	Chemistry	2023	0	11
Richard	Zipoli	Communication Disorders	2024	X	9
Melanie	Savelli	Communication, Media & Screen Studies	2025	X	11
Shafaeat	Hossain	Computer Science	2025	X	12
Matthew	Ouimet	Counseling	2024	X	12
VACANT		Counseling & School Psychology	2023		
Helen	Marx	Curriculum & Learning	2024	X	11
Maria	Diamantis	Curriculum & Learning	2024	X	8
Dushmantha	Jayawickreme	Earth Science	2025	X	12
Jia	Yu	Economics	2024	0	11
Peter	Madonia	Educational Leadership & Policy Studies	2023	X	9
Paul	Petrie	English	2023	X	12
Mike	Shea	English	2024	0	11
Miriah	Kelly	Environment, Geography, & Marine Sciences	2025	X	11
Sandip	Dutta	Finance & Real Estate	2025	X	8
Kyle	O'Brien	Healthcare Systems & Innovation	2025	X	11
Robert	Knipe	Health & Movement Sciences	2025	0	11
Daniel	Swartz	Health & Movement Sciences	2025	X	11
Carmen	Coury	History	2023	X	12
Troy	Paddock	History	2023	X	11
Yan	Liu	Information & Library Sciences	2024	X	4
Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2024	X	11
Patrick	Crowley	Library Services	2023	X	12
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2025	X	12
Alison	Wall	Management & International Business	2025	X	11

Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2023	0	8
Sebastian	Perumbilly	Marriage & Family Therapy	2025	0	6
Klay	Kruczek	Mathematics	2025	X	12
Raymond	Mugno	Mathematics	2025	X	12
Jonathan	Irving	Music	2023	X	6
Krista	Prendergast	School of Nursing	2023	X	6
Andrea	Adimando	School of Nursing	2024	0	11
Obigaeli	Okwuka	Part-Time Faculty	2023	X	5
Virginia	Metaxas	Part-Time Faculty	2023	X	10
Michael	Sormrude	Part-Time Faculty	2024	X	12
Michele	Delucia	Part-Time Faculty	2024	X	12
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2023	X	12
Elliott	Horch	Physics	2024	X	5
Jonathan	O'Hara	Political Science	2025	X	8
Kate	Marsland	Psychology	2025	X	11
Chris	Budnick	Psychology	2024	X	11
Jon	Nwangwu	Public Health	2024	X	9
Michael	Dodge	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2023	X	12
Carmela	Smith	Social Work	2023	0	7
Stephen	Monroe Tomczak	Social Work	2025	X	10
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2023	X	10
Angela	Lopez-Velasquez	Special Education	2024	X	5
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2024	X	11
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2025	X	11
Luke	Eilderts	World Languages & Literatures	2023	X	12
Natalie	Starling	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2023	X	11
Joe	Bertolino	SCSU President		X	10
Barbara	Cook	Chair, Graduate Council		X	11
Meredith	Sinclair	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form		X	9
Pierce	Kozlowski	SGA		X	3

#### GUESTS

Diane Ariza  
Christopher Piscitelli  
Craig Hlavac  
Jules Tetrault  
Linda Cunningham  
Mike Kingan  
Patricia Gagliardi

Robert Prezant  
Roland Regos  
Sanja Grubacic  
Tracy Tyree

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)	Klay Kruczek
Committee on Reassigned Time	Troy Paddock
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) liaison	Cindy Simoneau
University Library Committee (ULC)	2 representatives – unfilled
Ad Hoc Committee for Non-credit, Continuing Education & Micro-credentialing	Melanie Uribe (APC rep) Rex Gilliland (APC rep) Alison Wall (senator) 1 senator (additional)– unfilled
FASP	Krista Prendergast
Strategic Action Plan Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advancing Social Justice</li> <li>• Maintaining Academic Excellence</li> <li>• Engaging our Community</li> </ul>	Miriah Kelly Kenneth McGill Michael Sormrude

March 29, 2023

Faculty Senate President Natalie Starling called the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:12 p.m. via Zoom.

- I. Announcements
  - A. L. Eilderts: Reminded Senators that if their term is ending, their department should hold an election and let him know the results as we prepare for AY 2023-2024.
  - B. B. Cook: Shared that there has been a disturbing rise in Antisemitism in the state. If Senators are so moved, asked members to support H.B. 6758, which would support and expand Holocaust and Genocide Education in Connecticut. For more information, please visit: <https://adl.salsalabs.org/ct-holocaust-education/index.html>.
  - C. K. Kruczek: Asked Senators to remind their departments about All University Committee nominations.
  
- II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on March 8, 2023, 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. N. Starling drew Senators' attention to items #3 (commencement ceremonies), #4 (Faculty Leadership retreat), and #5 (RIJG and Judaic Studies meeting with administration on Friday).
  - B. N. Starling asked T. Paddock, Senate representative on the Reassigned time ad hoc committee, to provide an update. T. Paddock shared that they had recently met for their final meeting and that they offered several recommendations: 1) improve ways to look at reassigned time across campus; 2) improve how reassigned time is accounted for and categorized; 3) develop some kind of metric of how reassigned time is being used.
  
- IV. Remarks from the University President
  - A. President Bertolino shared that he would attend the meeting on Friday with RIJG and the Judaic Studies program. He is looking forward to a substantive conversation.
  - B. He also shared that the announcement for SCSU's interim president is imminent. After the official announcement, there will be multiple conversations with President Cheng on how best to move forward. President Bertolino's office will organize a formal introduction to the community, and there will be a series of transition meetings to meet with various constituencies across campus. The start date will be June 1 and there will be a month overlap. It is possible that the interim president will be in place for more than one academic year.
  - C. Questions
    - i. K. McGill asked President Bertolino to reflect on what it means to be a Social Justice University. President Bertolino responded by saying that we have done some very good work and that he is proud of our recently formed DEI office. He shared that social justice is a journey, not a destination.
    - ii. C. Simoneau asked if there will be an opportunity for the interim president to be a part of the budgeting process. President Bertolino reported that, yes, the interim president would.
  
- V. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees
  - A. Reports received.
  - B. Academic Policy (M. Uribe): Encouraged Senators to speak with their departments about any issues with the bookstore modifying orders.

- C. Elections (K. Kruczek): The committee is reviewing implementing term limits on All-university committees. Currently, only the P&T committee has term limits (3 years). T. Paddock shared that he felt three-year terms are appropriate. H. Marx echoed T. Paddock. C. Simoneau felt that whatever decision is made, it should be universal across committees.
- D. Finance (C. Simoneau): The committee is gathering information on two ongoing issues: 1) Travel; 2) Department Operating Budget procedures. The committee continues to seek more input on both issues.
- E. Technology (D. Macur): Encourages faculty to contact him if they have any specific technology-related issues.

#### VI. Reports of the Faculty Senate Special Committees

- A. Reports received from UCF, Grad Council, and FASP.
- B. Grad Council (B. Cook): Shared that they are starting the process to write a constitution. They are also planning to align documents and procedures with the UCF. Since the latter is more pressing, the former will be taken up in the Fall. Their body would also like to thank Provost Prezant who came to GC. During their meeting, the Provost showed interest in gathering information on several topics, one of which was 4+1 and 3+2 programs. Faculty interested in starting new programs should speak with T. Milburn as soon as possible. A second topic concerned how to increase our international student population. A third topic centered on gathering the thoughts of the GC on offering Ph.D. programs, with the understanding that there would need to be a revision of statutes at the State level (currently only UConn is allowed to award PhDs).
  - i. Provost Prezant shared that he feels there is no doubt we could offer Ph.D. programs; however, the question is “should we?” If we begin to look at transdisciplinary Ph.D. programs, then it does become more viable. This being said, we are a long way away from any changes. He looks forward to the conversation.
  - ii. B. Cook shared that there was some concern that this would shift us from a primarily undergraduate-serving institution, which could have an impact on potential funding; however, the Provost did mention that with a change in status would come different funding opportunities.
  - iii. B. Cook shared that the GC is planning to craft a survey and asked interested Senators to contact her.
- C. Finally, GC and UCF are creating an ad hoc committee on curriculum and learning; previous committees have done great work, but no policy has come forward from these endeavors.
- D. T. Paddock asked how receptive the system office is to this change to offer PhDs?
  - i. Provost Prezant shared that during a conversation with President Cheng that he was in support of this change.
  - ii. E. Horch shared that our “system-ness” might play to our advantage here since departments across the four CSUs would be able to create programs.
    - 1. Provost Prezant shared that there is certainly strength in numbers.
- E. FASP (K. Prendergast): Some committee members met with the Council of Academic Chairs for an open discussion about course caps for writing courses. The discussion continues. Ad Hoc committee on non-credit/continuing education/micro credentialing (R. Gilliland): The committee is working to finalize a draft of a document that provides definitions for micro credentialing, badging, etc. Once finished, it will be circulated to Senators for feedback.

#### VII. New Business

- A. S. Monroe Tomczak **moved to approve** the resolution regarding Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, And Accessibility (DEIA) In Renewal, Promotion, And Tenure Processes.
- B. C. Simoneau **moved to amend** the resolution by adding “*Resolved*, That Beginning with the Academic Year 2023-2024 and with the Tenure-track Faculty hired at that time and thereafter, the following will apply”. **Seconded**.

- i. T. Paddock **moved to call the previous question. Seconded.**
- ii. Hearing no objection, the motion was approved by unanimous consent.
- iii. The body then moved to a vote on the amendment to the resolution.
  - 1. Vote tally
    - a. Yes.....9
    - b. No .....32
  - i. The motion to amend the resolution **failed.**
- iv. K. Kruczek **moved to postpone** the motion. **Seconded.**
  - 1. L. Eilderts advised the body to vote this motion down and instead recommit it to the Personnel Policy committee.
  - 2. N. Starling asked the body if there was any objection to rejecting this motion. Hearing none, the motion **failed** by unanimous consent.
- v. L. Eilderts **moved to recommit the resolution** to the Personnel Policy committee for further review. **Seconded.**
- vi. Hearing no objection, the motion to commit the resolution was **approved** by unanimous consent.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

---

L. Eilderts  
Secretary

Meeting/Retreat of Faculty Leadership Executive Teams (FS/UCF/Grad Council/FLC)

**Possible take-aways from the Senate, UCF, Grad Council, AAUP retreat**

I am providing an interpretive, mediator's response to the discussions that occurred during the recent retreat. This is not simply a summary. It is an analytic sorting out. The meeting resulted, in my estimation, in two main take-aways:

1. There is some need/desire to solve the problematic language of "autonomy" in both the senate and committee documents. There probably needs to be an ad hoc committee with full, broad representation to explore the problem and make recommendations, which would then feed into the Senate rules committee for final tweaking (since UCF and the Grad Council exist under the "umbrella" of the Senate contractually).

Items of thought: perhaps thinking about *functional or sufficient autonomy* (not independence or absolute autonomy) as productive way re-imagining language that seems to have been intended to capture a productive division of labor between faculty bodies. In practice, this means perhaps losing the language or autonomy, or re-imagining it within clearly articulated limits (contractual but also functional limits). The aim would be functional efficiency—minimal reduplication of work and effort--while maintaining responsibility to the faculty as a whole, especially for large-scale issues. This involves some consideration of the problems of historically accrued territorializations on all sides. The goal would be to make each committee and the Senate do its particular work as efficiently and effectively as possible in a coordinated way. This work will be most effective and forward looking if it is not conceived as simply solving the referendum problem. One wants neither to under-react or to over-react to that. The question may be something like this: given the learning that has occurred from the events of the past year, how do we build and facilitate more effective interaction of the faculty bodies with less unproductive conflict?

My take from the meeting: this is a two-tier problem. There is the document problem, focused around the language of "autonomy." There is also the more complicated problem of the living dynamics of coordination, cooperation, non-alignment and power, which documents, by themselves, can't solve, because the documents only exist in their uptake by living people, and this invariably means issues of disagreement, dissension, perspectival non-alignment, otherness. And this leads to take-away 2.

2. There needs to be thought about sufficient, functional and welcome consultation between the bodies through their leadership, especially as particular forms of knowledge, responsibilities, interests, and accompanying perspectives don't exist equally everywhere. I use the term "consultation" intentionally, as it is contractual language and aims to go beyond mere communication. One proposal at the meeting was for the heads of the curricular committees to be on the Senate Executive Committee. For a variety of reasons, that may not be feasible; if it's not, the aim *is* feasible—to think about structural

mechanisms of consultation, which consider both the dialogic component of consultation and the necessity for real consultation to occur regularly and early, especially around major issues (gestational consultation is not the same as communicatory consultation which is not the same as post hoc consultation, which occurs only after the template for the consideration of a given issue has already been formed). Consultation needs, in this framework, to be proactive and thought to be necessary, not an inconvenience. It is worth noting that structurally, proactive consultation and functional limited autonomy/separation will always be in some tension, especially the more that consultation means “having a say.”

Items for thought: any program of consultation needs to consider and respect the structural divisions of labor represented by the separation of work performed by each faculty body (the curricular priority of the committees; the contractual umbrella responsibility of the Senate). Also, imagining parameters about when and on what issues consultation is necessary or advisable would be useful, with the general thought that consultation is *welcome* (which doesn't mean that it involves small issues or it goes on infinitely if one doesn't get the answer one wants or that it is a surrogate for oversight). The bodies are separated so that they can do most of their work separately. One wants *better, more coordinated* interaction, not *more cumbersome or conflicted* interaction.

Final mediator's thought: Conversation on these issues takes place in a time of great upheaval for the university (change in leadership, dire budget, student body contraction, etc.). Anything done should minimally affect workload and focus on faculty alignment (while fully respecting collegial dissent). It also should not draw faculty leadership's attention away from the urgencies of dealing with administration and larger institutions and publics to protect the needs of faculty and students.