

Southern Connecticut State University  
**FACULTY SENATE**

---

**Approved Minutes of November 28, 2018**

<https://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/mins/2018-2019.html>

The 7th meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2018-2019 was held on  
 November 28, at 12:12 p.m. in the  
 Seminar Room of Connecticut Hall.

Members Present/**Absent** (absent members are designated in **bold**)

<b>Wafeek Abdelsayed (Accounting)</b>	Matthew Ouimet (Counseling)	Robert Gregory (Exercise Science)	Robert Forbus (Marketing)	Walter Stutzmann (Part-Time Faculty)	Greg Adams (Sociology)
William Farley (Anthropology)	Natalie Starling (Couns/Sch Psych)		Maria Diamantis (Mathematics)	David Pettigrew (Philosophy)	<b>Angela Lopez-Velasquez (Special Ed/Reading)</b>
Jeff Slomba (Art)	Mike Knell (Earth Science)	Tom Radice (History)	Alain D'Amour (Mathematics)	<b>L. Evan Finch (Physics)</b>	
<b>Lisa Barbaro (Athletics)</b>	Sanja Grubacic (Econ/Finance)	<b>Darcy Kern (History)</b>	Joe Fields (Mathematics)	<b>Jon Wharton (Political Science)</b>	Douglas Macur (Theatre)
<b>Steven Brady (Biology)</b>	Beena Achhpal (Curriculum & Learning)	Yan Liu (Information & Library Science)	<b>Jonathan Irving (Music)</b>	Michael Nizhnikov (Psychology)	William Flores (World Languages & Literatures)
Jeff Webb (Chemistry)	<b>Peter Madonia (Ed Leadership)</b>	Jerry Dunklee (Journalism)	Francine Penny (Nursing)	Kevin Colwell (Psychology)	Cindy Simoneau (UCF)
Deborah Weiss (Com Disorders)	Mike Shea (English)	Parker Fruehan (Library Services)	Lisa Rebesch (Nursing)	<b>William Faraclas (Public Health)</b>	
Wes O'Brien (Communication, Media & Screen Studies)	Paul Petrie (English)	<b>Kari Swanson (Library Services)</b>	Obiageli Okwuka (Part-time Faculty)	Michael Dodge (Recreation/Leisure)	<b>(Grad Council)</b>
Derek Taylor (Communication, Media & Screen Studies)	Scott Graves (Environment, Geography & Marine Studies)	<b>Mina Park (Management/MIS)</b>	<b>Eric Hoffman (Part-Time Faculty)</b>	<b>Paul Levatino (Social Work)</b>	<b>Mia Forgione (Student)</b>
<b>Mohammad T. Islam (Computer Science)</b>	Peter Latchman (Exercise Science)	<b>Allison Wall (Management/MIS)</b>	<b>Mary Ellen Minichiello (Part-Time Faculty)</b>	Stephen Monroe Tomczak (Social Work)	<b>Dr. Joe Bertolino, SCSU President</b>

<u>Guests:</u> Dr. Tracy Tyree (Student Affairs) Dr. Barbara Cook (CMD)	<u>Guests:</u> Dr. Aukje Lamonica (PCH) Paula Rice (Office of Diversity and Equity)	<u>Guests:</u> Dennis Reiman (TT) Trevor Broliar (TT)	<u>Guests:</u> Dr. Ilene Crawford (Academic Affairs) Craig Hlavac (Assoc. Dean of A&S)		
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Call to order: 12:14pm

## I. Minutes of Previous Meetings

<https://>

- Minutes of previous meeting held on November 7, 2018 approved with 1 objection, 0 abstentions.
  - Senator Pettigrew (PHI) stated that the minutes do not reflect the spirit of his comparison of hate speech to tobacco use as public health issues, rather the minutes focused on his comments regarding the banning of hate speech on campus, and that responses from fellow senators indicated this would be a violation of First Amendment. President Diamantis requested Senator Pettigrew provide clarifying language to support revision of his comments.

## II. Guests:

- Dr. Tracy Tyree, Dr. Barbara Cook, Paula Rice—
  - Dr. Barbara Cook shared the collective effort of the President’s Commission on Social Justice. She shared their mission was the same as the previous Commission, however, the focus has changed to focusing on Social Justice, including related opportunities: grant applications, policies/procedures groups, and the creation of surveys, like our Climate Survey. Over a two-year span of time, the group reviewed literature on campus climate, including how to assess campus climate, along with a review of all past surveys on our campus. In collaboration with the organization, SkyFactor, two surveys were developed, one for faculty/staff as well as a student survey. The purpose of the survey was to gain a better understanding of our campus climate from the perceptions of faculty, staff, and students. The commission aims to identify factors that influence our campus climate, develop goals and subsequent actions, in order to increase campus climate. She shared they are fortunate to have a tremendous amount of data.
  - Paula Rice shared information about the respondents of the faculty/staff survey. Full-time, part-time, adjuncts, and University Assistants participated. There was a high level of participation –a 33.9% response rate. More than half of respondents identified as female. Demographic percentages for other categories, including race and sexual orientation, is reflective of the demographics of our employee population. The Schools of Arts and

Sciences and Health and Human Services had greatest number of respondents. The median age group was 41-60 years, the median number of years of employment was 6-10 years.

- Dr. Cook shared that there were 85 scaled questions, 16 categorical questions, and 20 intuition-specific items. To acquire these 20 intuition-specific items, individuals were invited from different areas of our community to provide input. There were also two open-ended questions. Additionally, there are 14 dependent factors: Perceptions of the Institution, Campus Environment, Visibility, Work Environment, Perceptions of Faculty, Perceptions of Staff, Perceptions of Students, Perceptions of Administration, Administrative Policies, Campus Accessibility, Campus Safety, Individual Response to Sexual Assault, Institutional Response to Sexual Assault, and Personal Attitudes and Behaviors.
  - Data analysis revealed that individual responses were consistent across similar items.
- Dr. Tyree shared that there is a considerable amount of data to share; it is impossible to share all findings today. There will be data presentations across the campus throughout the next two weeks. After this time, a full report will be available. The focus today will be the five high impact factors, which if improved, could have a great impact. Other factors are still important, but the team believes putting energy into those other factors may not have the highest impact. The items that comprise each of the factors are helpful in terms of analysis.
- Dr. Cook shared that if Senators have an idea based on the information shared or related findings, the committee is looking to hear those suggestions.
  - **Question:** A senator asked if the team looked at Carnegie classifications and six comparable institutions. **Answer:** Yes, this information will be provided in the full report. Of note, the comparisons on the student data are much richer. The comparison of faculty/staff data is more limited.
  - **Question:** A senator asked when and where the full report will be available. **Answer:** Dr. Cook shared that the full report will be available Friday 12/14/18 11:00am, EN A120. It will also be made available to all.
- Dr. Tyree discussed the first predictor, Work Environment. Tyree asked the Senators to think about things that can be done to improve the sense of work environment on campus.
- Dr. Cook discussed the second predictor, Perceptions of Administration – She reminded the audience to not lose sight of the mean (4.60). The survey does not allow us to identify which administrator the respondent was considering when completing the survey and the definitions of “administrator” is based on the interpretations of the respondent.
- Dr. Tyree discussed the third predictor, Perception of Institution. Dr. Cook- discussed the fourth predictor, Perception of Staff. Paula Rice discussed the fifth predictor, Campus Safety.
  - **Question:** A senator asked if there was a definition of safety. **Answer:** Paula Rice shared there was no definition of safety on the survey itself, but the actual items help

to define safety, though the term could be considered broad or specific dependent by the respondent.

- **Question:** A senator asked for clarification of definitions for tenure, tenure-track, and non-tenure. **Answer:** The committee team clarified definitions.
- Dr. Cook shared data from some low impact factors, including feelings of acceptance and diversity. In terms of responses about personal attitudes and behaviors, responses suggest interest in being part of a welcoming community, and a community wanting to do more to enhance our campus community. In the full report, each area will be described in greater detail, along with differences amongst groups. We should focus our efforts on the high impact factors, but we can also look at other areas to make changes.
- Paula Rice shared data from SCSU-specific questions. Gender, age, and race were the top factors related to experiences with discrimination.
- Dr. Cook shared there were 653 responses to open-ended question #1. She shared random quoted examples of responses to the question.
- Dr. Cook continued by highlighting the student survey, which included a 13.4% response rate. Of note, when looking at comparable Carnegie class schools, all schools struggled with student participation rates. One clear conclusion stands out to the committee: if the survey is useful to us, we could pursue implementing again with the student participation.
- Dr. Tyree reminded the Senate the survey was completed about one year ago. Context is important and shared that there were crimes involving cars that occurred on campus at this time.
- Dr. Cook discussed the six predictors from the student survey. Dr. Tyree reminded the Senate that how students interact with each other in the classroom is important.
- Dr. Cook indicated that there is room/opportunity to collect more data, though not necessarily implementing another survey. Select items could have focus groups, delving deeper into why people rate areas the way that they do.
- Provost Prezant thanked the three committee representatives for their hard work on this survey. Provost Prezant also stated about the data shared about perceptions of staff. He encouraged all to consider how we can show appreciation of staff and how to ensure staff feel appreciated.
  - **Question:** A senator asked if the team compared results to a prior survey. **Answer:** Dr. Cook shared that they cannot make direct comparisons because this survey was never done before, but this topic could be a future discussion with acknowledgement that this would involve a significant amount of work.
  - **Question:** A senator noted that perhaps we have done a similar survey before, but results were not utilized, so why do another? **Answer:** Dr. Tyree shared that they do not believe a survey like this has been done in the past. This survey can serve as a benchmark for future implementation, perhaps every 3 or 5 years.

Senator Rebesch (Nursing) stated that (if the survey were implemented again) SkyFactor would provide longitudinal data and they do a great job with examining changes over time.

- **Question:** A senator asked if the team reviewed and discovered any differences in answers from full- vs. part- time faculty? **Answer:** Dr. Tyree shared there was no statistically significant differences between responses from full- vs. part-time, however the data do exist and will be available in the full report.
- **Question:** President Diamantis asked if clearer graphs will be provided, noting that some graphs on the PowerPoint slides are not easy. **Answer:** Dr. Tyree indicated that they can share PowerPoint electronically with the Senate and that the graphs in the full report will be readable.

President Diamantis thanked Dr. Tyree and indicated that upon receiving the PowerPoint she will share with the Senate.

- Dr. Cook indicated that if questions arise, whether about more detailed quantitative data, let the team know.

### III. President's Report

President Diamantis reminded Senators that item #1, the first Presidential Dialogue with President Bertolino, can include open dialogue about the Climate Survey results.

President Diamantis asked for input about item #3, the Honors Convocation committee's changes/recommendations for awards, specifically the immediate implementation of some changes: (1) only Seniors would receive awards and (2) related catalog revisions.

Senator Shea (ENG) asked if the changes mean that awards would not be given to those who are not Seniors. President Diamantis indicate that this was true.

Senator Dunklee (JRN) stated that he had never heard of the Honors Convocation committee. President Diamantis stated that it could be an All-University committee.

Senator Weiss (CMD) asked what prompted the changes, what were the issues, was there a particular goal, is the issue related to how long is the ceremony is taking? President Diamantis indicated the number of awardees was increasingly high, there is a lack of consistency across departments in determining awards, and there is no specific goal for the number of awards. President Diamantis further clarified that the concern is the number of awards rather than the duration of the ceremony.

Senator Petrie (ENG) asked whether or not awards were being eliminated or if there was a need to control the number of the awards given at that ceremony? President Diamantis clarified that awards were not being eliminated.

Provost Prezant stated that there were junior awards, cohort awards, and others, all of which increased the number of awards given at the ceremony.

Senator Shea (ENG) recommended that language be revised to reflect these changes, specifically that the convocation be called the “Seniors Honors Convocation.”

Senator Rebesch (Nursing) made a motion to approve this recommendation, Senator Graves (EGMS) seconded the motion. Senator Weiss (CMD) asked about collegiate record clarification.

**The Motion to change the name of the Honors Convocation to the Seniors Honors Convocation was approved with 4 objections and 0 abstentions.**

President Diamantis highlighted Phase 2 of item #3 regarding the Honors Convocation.

Senator Weiss (CMD) asked if the changes would affect Latin honors. President Diamantis indicated no, the Latin honors would not be affected.

Senator Fields (MATH) shared that his online search resulted in no indication that the Honors Convocation committee is an All-University committee.

Senator Shea (ENG) clarified that the committee is not an elected committee, but the committee has been in existence for a long period of time.

Senator O’Brien (CMS) asked if the committee had discussions about opportunities for non-seniors to be awarded. President Diamantis indicated she would share this question and follow-up with the committee.

Senator Weiss (CMD) stated that there is a lot of information for item #3, creating a challenge for immediate decision-making, and that it would be helpful to have had the opportunity to review the information beforehand.

Senator Shea (ENG) suggested there be a Non-Senior Honors Convocation, particularly given this experience is important to their growth and motivation as students. He noted that students are motivated by recognition and it is important to have awards for non-seniors. While departments may give awards, it is not the same as awards given at the university-level.

Senator Dunklee (JRN) shared that, in the past, the Honors Convocation ceremony would go on for over 3 hours, recalling that faculty and chairs presentations took time. This process was reduced several years ago, and the ceremony is now less than 2 hours. Given this information, perhaps the concern about the ceremony and awards is not a problem.

Senator Graves (EGMS) stated that there are department-specific awards, though it is unknown if later these are also awarded at the Honors Convocation ceremony, thereby lengthening the ceremony duration. He suggested one announcement of an award.

Senator Petrie (ENG) suggested there be a full conversation at a later date. President Diamantis indicated she will gather more data.

Senator Graves (EGMS) suggested senators go back to their department to gather feedback about this topic.

Senator Forbus (Marketing) indicated he would like to see the actual data related to the topic.

Senator Petrie (ENG) questioned item# 6c, clarification of President and Provost communication, “The President recognized that we have had revolving doors in the area of administrators, we are committed to stay here but worries of how he can keep people here if barriers continue, he will not be able to keep them.” Is there an assertion from the President that faculty are resisting changes related to online education? President Diamantis confirmed that the communication in this item is that administrators may not stay here if barriers exist for the development of online education. She clarified that there may or may not be faculty resistance to the development of online education.

President Diamantis offered the floor to Provost Prezant.

Provost Prezant stated there were past efforts in the area of online education at Southern, including Charter Oak resources, and that online course development discontinued or dissolved.

Trevor Brolliar (IT) (Guest) indicated that a report is coming shortly that addresses online education, along with a business plan.

President Diamantis stated that newly tenured faculty have communicated a need for assistance if further online education is developed at Southern, that faculty not happy to jump into such an endeavor without resources. She shared that the President has heard this concern and shared an interest in hiring to meet these needs. President Diamantis emphasized that concerns about online education were expressed by both faculty and administration.

Trevor Brolliar (IT) (Guest) shared that there are efforts toward making hiring and training decisions related to online education. Trainings were offered recently; exact attendance data is not available.

Provost Prezant stated that money, personnel, and infrastructure are needed to move forward with developing online education.

Senator Shea (ENG) asked for clarification about item# 7a, recalling his membership on an ad hoc committee with Peter Madonia. There was an effort to help departments create guidelines for P&T expectations. Some processes were developed and some started to be followed, however, President Papazian discontinued these processes. At a later date, the process represented to administration, but not all deans supported this process. The Faculty Senate is waiting for feedback on this document so the committee can meet again to revise if needed.

President Diamantis acknowledged this process and the related document, and recalled having engaged in discussion with the Provost.

Provost Prezant stated that too many processes exist. Enacting the described process would be a process on top of a process.

Senator Shea (ENG) stated that the need for such a process at the department-level is related to equity in decision-making within and between departments.

Senator Weiss (CMD) shared a question related to item# 4a, appointment of faculty to faculty administration. She asked for clarification of “special cases” related to administration’s ability to appoint faculty, what are the special cases?

President Diamantis offered the floor to the Provost Prezant.

Provost Prezant stated that if there are directors, coordinators, or other related roles connected to Senate then such appointments are a Senate decision. If an opportunity for an open position is coming from the provost’s office, then those decisions about appointment can be with the office. He provided the Director of Research and Innovation role as an example, stating that she was appointed, and had unique skills to go back into that position.

Senator Weiss (CMD) stated that considering other faculty, possibly unknown to administration, may reveal that other faculty have credentials and skills related to an open position. Such consideration and extension of the opportunity to apply for such positions would enrich the candidate pool. There may also be situations of which the provost would not be aware. Senator Weiss emphasized the benefits of the process being as open as possible; such efforts would help create a better climate.

Provost Prezant stated that there is always going to be a case where someone (a candidate for a position) can be missed. (the process of making) Appointments are not unique. To move forward, sometimes appointments need to be made.

President Diamantis stated that publically sharing such opportunities will allow for inclusion of minority faculty members in the candidate pool.

Senator Weiss (CMD) asked for clarification and an updated about item# 7b, the timing of administration survey.

President Diamantis stated that the survey of administrative effectiveness is ready, however, there was a question from the provost’s office about whether or not to conduct the survey right now, how do we proceed? She also mentioned the concerns about the publication of responses about specific administrators, and consideration of the potential harmful impact.

Provost Prezant stated that an email came from the President and the Provost about historical concerns regarding this survey. He shared that just as we want input on the questions asked in Student Opinion Surveys, it makes sense that administration should have input on the questions being asked in this administrative survey. If indeed there is shared governance, when do we assess faculty leadership?



President Diamantis stated that the plan was to introduce this topic under “New Business” on today’s agenda. She also shared that the Senate President is evaluated in relation to the credit load for the role and through the electoral process.

Provost Prezant stated that this should topic should be discussed further.

Senator Shea (ENG) clarified that this topic would benefit from discussion by the full Senate.

In the interest of time, President Diamantis suggested the agenda continue, and asked for objections to changing the order of the agenda. Hearing no objections, the order of business was changed.

President Diamantis directed attention to agenda item VI. b. Name Change for the Department of Exercise Science to Health and Movement Sciences.

Senator Tomczak (SWK) made a motion to approve the name change of Department of Exercise Science to Department of Health and Movement Science. Senator Shea (ENG) seconded the motion. Question from a senator, clarifying that this change would begin in Fall 2019. President Diamantis confirmed the change would begin Fall 2019.

**The Motion to approve the name change of Department of Exercise Science to Department of Health and Movement Science, was approved unanimously.**

Quorum was lost at 1:58pm; President Diamantis reminded everyone to review the President’s report.

Ajornment at 2:00pm

IV. Standing Committees (not reviewed)

V. Reports of Special Committees (not reviewed)

VI. Old Business (not reviewed)

VII. New Business (not reviewed)

**Executive Committee Meeting: Ten minutes following adjournment**

Fall 2018 meetings: December 5.

Spring 2019 meetings: January 23, February 6, February 20, March 6, March 27,  
April 10, April 24, May 8.

---

Natalie Starling  
substituting for Senate Secretary Kari Swanson