Office of the Faculty Senate  
Faculty Senate Minutes  
Tuesday May 16th 12:00-2:00pm 1877 Club

**Present:**  
A&S: Larry Gould, Anne Pidano, Bryan Sinche, Erin Striff, Michael Walsh, Bin Zhu, Kristin Comeforo, Natalie Politkos  
Barney: Daphne Berry, Malek Lashgari, Narendar Sumukadas, Jerry Katrichis  
CETA: Seth Holmes, Akram Abu-aish, Ted Sawruk, Ying Yu, Paul Slaboch  
ENHP: Adam Goodworth, Lucy Richard, Lisa Zawilinski  
Hartt: Cherie Caluda, Warren Haston, Justin Kurtz, Peter Woodard  
HAS: Power Boothe, Zee Onuf, Andy Wollner  
Hillyer: Paula Alderette, Jonathan Daigle  
President: Walter Harrison  
Interim Provost: Fred Sweitzer  
Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies: Clark Saunders  
Staff: Ben Ide  
SGA: Katie Fumosa  
Non-Senators: Jane Horvath

**Absent:**  
A&S: Paul Siegel  
Barney: Deb Kidder, Irina Naoumova  
CETA: Sigridur Bjarnadottir  
ENHP: Claudia Oakes, Michael Wininger  
Hartt: Steve Davis  
HAS: Ellen Carey, Michael Vahrenwald  
Hillyer: Mari Firkatian, Scott Scribner, Bilal Sekou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **12:00** | Convene  
Amendment to April minutes. Cherie Caluda was present at both sessions of the April meeting. |
| **12:05** | Votes:  
**April Minutes:**  
Approve: 26  
Do not approve: 0  
Abstain: 0  
Total: 26 |
May Curriculum Committee Report:
Approve: 26
Do not approve: 0
Abstain: 0
Total: 26

Provost’s P&T Committee
Joanna Borucinska-A&S: 11
Ellen Carey-HAS: 4
Williams Major-Hillyer: 20
John Nordyke-HAS: 8

Absentions: 2

Board of Regents
Slate of officers:
Anne Pidano
Warren Haston
Jon Daigle

Approve: 22
Do not approve: 0
Abstain: 1

BAT Nominations:
Jerry Katrichis-Barney
Suhash Ghosh-CETA
Bryan Sinche-A&S
Names approved and will be forwarded to Arosha Jayawickrama who will pick one nominee to sit on the Budget Advisory Team.

BFT Nominations:

Ted Sawruk- CETA volunteered from the floor.

Statement from Hartt School regarding diversity vote held in March.
Read by member of Diversity Committee, Peter Woodard-Hartt School.
Request put forward on May 2nd to reexamine and revisit the faculty senate diversity votes on the two proposals brought forward by the diversity committee. According to bylaw #5, consideration of this matter was to be placed on the agenda for May 16th, but this did not occur.

- Reason not on agenda: statement sent to senate chair on May 2nd was worded in such a way that it requested a vote on a combination of two diversity vote proposals and, therefore, language was not correct. On May 2nd chair’s reply was sent to Paula Alderette (Diversity Chair), Peter Woodward (Diversity committee),
Vice Chair, Zee Onuf, and Secretary, Lucy Richard explaining the need for language from Hartt school asking to reconsider the vote and decide if we wanted to void the March vote and to request a revote on a combined proposal. Could not go on agenda since it did not state what it needed to say in terms of requesting that senate reconsider the vote and void the original vote.

- Request by a senator to reread by-law #5. Faculty can request in writing that faculty senate shall reconsider agenda item without specifying anything about vote and revote.
- Senator: asking for reconsideration and reinsertion on agenda was the request; by-law very clear that college followed proper procedure. They were not asking for a void and revote, just to discuss reconsideration.
- According to Chair, can understand how you’re interpreting it differently. Chair conferred with other officers. May 2nd email from chair to above recipients requested clarification and explained why the request for revote to void and why senate needed to follow proper procedure. Cannot vote on a new vote without voiding the old vote (vote on record cannot be ignored). Voting on combined statement was the request for reconsideration. No reply to email or clarification received. Therefore, the chair believed the request was for voiding the vote on two proposals and voting on the combined proposals (one vote rather than two). Chair stated she would have placed the item on the agenda had clarification been provided.
- Senator questioned reasoning for a revote?
- Back issue is about 2 proxies that did not reach senate in time which would have tied the vote. This was initial reason for request to revote. Proxies caught in mid-stream, never reaching the faculty senate destination until after the March meeting. Would have tied the vote. This was a technicality that affected the failure to approve second vote.
- Senator: Hartt School asked for reconsideration of issue to be put on agenda. Not appearing on agenda, in effect, acted to silence a college. Procedure is clear by virtue of by-law #5.
- Chair had no intention to silence a college; did not know that statement was going to be stated so did not bring original statement from May 2nd to share. Understanding was not a request to revote but to vote on something new and different.
- Senator: Senate is compelled to reconsider mistake in the votes. Mistake referring to two votes being missed/not counted.
- Chair not aware about mistake in the votes.
- Senator: not a mistake, but a glitch in the process, proxies missed the vote which were sent before meeting, but not seen and included at meeting time. Chair explained that votes cannot be included if not seen by senate officer/coordinator.
- Discussion will be continued at Thursday’s meeting.

Clark Saunders- Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
Master of Music in Jazz Studies- New Program to be reviewed and approved. First level of approval already from Provost and will now be reviewed over the summer by a Program Review Committee (4 people). Must be tenured faculty member from within or outside Hartt. Will go through regular curriculum committee review as well.
- Curriculum approval process feels new to some senators, but this process has been in place for years.
- One-pager that gets put forward to the provost’s office. Provost rules on merits of program and then moves to a review committee.
- Clark is handling the graduate studies and Chuck will be handling the undergraduate curriculum.
- Senator feels there are already several levels of approval and this adds another layer. This is one of the layers post-provost approval. Working with Finance Dept. and I.E. as well.
- This is a necessary committee that determines a business plan:
  - Anticipated enrollment, revenue, and expenses.
  - Projected new faculty.
  - Demand and how many programs in this area would be competing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>President-Walter Harrison</td>
<td><a href="https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/x5SFd73G">https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/x5SFd73G</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Walter’s Recognition</td>
<td><a href="https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/Hc24Nwj5">https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/Hc24Nwj5</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, May 18, 2017 12:00 noon

**Present:**
A&S: Larry Gould, Kristin Comeforo, Ann Pidano, Paul Siegel, Bryan Sinche, Erin Striff, Michael Walsh, Bin Zhu
Barney: Deb Kidder, Narendar Sumukadas, Oz Onur
CETA: Akram Abu-aishah, Paul Slaboch, Seth Holmes, Ying Yu
ENHP: Adam Goodworth, Claudia Oakes, Michael Wininger
Hartt: Justin Kurtz, Peter Woodard, Cherie Caluda, Warren Haston
HAS: Andy Wollner
Hillyer: Paula Alderette, Jonathan Daigle
Staff: Ben Ide

**Absent:**
A&S: Natalie Politkos
Barney: Irina Naoumova
CETA: Sigridur Bjarnadottir
ENHP: Lisa Zawilinski
Hartt: Steve Davis
12:00 Reconvene

12:05 Interim Provost- Fred Sweitzer [https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/Eg63WfNa](https://ensemble.hartford.edu/Watch/Eg63WfNa)

Challenging year; in spirit of collaboration we navigated the challenges together. Thanks to Chair, Anne Pidano, Vice Chair, Zee Onuf, and Secretary, Lucy Richard.

- Jackie McClean Fellow for next year in Social Science Dept. in Hillyer. Former McClean Fellow will be on faculty next year in Dept. of English. Finishing her dissertation before entering the tenure track faculty.
- Progress in AFE.
- Positive conversations about Clinical Applied, ETC positions.
- Challenge with the budget; predictors not working as well. May 1st deadline for deposits. Up until the Friday before, acceptances tracking high, but over that weekend that uptick slowed down. Now creeping up with 25 students ahead of last year. Numbers usually fluctuate over the summer. Deposits in Hillyer are up this year. Hart School numbers are up as well. In general, running ahead of last year which was a weak year in itself.
- Changes on state level will be challenging for us regarding losing tax exempt status as well as less scholarship money available to students.
- Facing another challenging year with budget.
- New president has two priorities: goal of increased enrollment and retention, as well as fund raising.
- Library will be open and operating next academic year. Positive impact on visiting students.
- EC hiring can only be positive in increasing numbers and bottom line, as well as keeping us in the international arena.
- UIC (replacing AUC next year) roll out will be very exciting.
- Portfolio of programs: new undergraduate programs such as Computer Science in Engineering program in the process of program review.
- EAB information will be presented by October; information (data points) that will help us look at programs through an additional lens. 3-step process and we are in middle of step 2.
  - Step 1 was data mining comparing us with New England competitors. Suggestions were presented.
  - Step 2 is employer interviews (talking to people) regarding skill sets in mid-Atlantic and Northeast.
  - Step 3 is the focus on us. Turning their attention to us in June when they will be on campus. They’ll figure out capacity and see where we can grow. This will come together in the fall. Where programs can grow as well as new programs. If we’re at capacity on certain programs. Admin wants to be involved in these
discussions in terms of resource perspective, although these are not admin’s decision; faculty ultimately makes these decisions.

Questions and discussions:

- What will happen with these suggestions? Restructuring or moving around of resources?
- Hard to know, but example illustrates. Ex. There is no speech pathology program. That would take huge investment. So not choosing to do right now. Deciding whether a program will work is all about the details. How well positioned are we to take on new programs.
- Existing programs will be evaluated in terms of growth. Are they comparing current programs to “other” programs? Space issues will be important; square foot per student is big question. Benchmarks will be important and looking to faculty for answers as well.
- EC message to international students; relaying confidence in moving here and is Hartford area being discussed? Do not know in detail the composition of the message. Will be marketing UHart as well as themselves.
- Are the EC students looking at liberal arts or the professional areas only? Will evaluate the departments on their own terms. Ability to pursue small undergraduate skill programs that can be paired with liberal arts programs. May make an English major more attractive by being more confident about finding employment with a skill set.
- Motivational issues addressed getting students more involved in the courses; Blackboard gives statistics, metrics, on how many hours students spend in areas of need. Time and energy invested in HIP, flipping the classroom promotes higher degree of engagement and counteracts inertia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12:40</th>
<th><strong>Committee Reports:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA:</td>
<td>Nothing to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Environmental and Sustainability:</strong> cigarette butt clean-up took place a few weeks ago and was successful involving multiple student groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA:</td>
<td>No meeting this month. MAPP change will be continued over the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;N:</td>
<td>BAT and BTF all set. Names have gone to Arosha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity:</strong></td>
<td>continuing to work on proposal and last meeting went back to the mandate, so will work on refining the proposal in the Fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA:</td>
<td>Laura Whitney spoke at last staff assoc. meeting for more than an hour. July 1st, time entry will change to new Banner system instead of empcenter. Epaf systems will change as well. Different software system, so technicalities about submitting time sheets will change. Student workers will have to submit their hours as well instead of clock in and clock out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12:50</th>
<th><strong>Institutional Advancement</strong>- Samantha Sokoloski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison Endowed Fund for Faculty Development. This is Walter’s legacy and he wanted to establish fund to assist faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June campaign to increase money in fund.

- $550,000 currently in fund
- June 19th and 20th campaign for Faculty Endowment-2-day event to drum up excitement.
- Web page is very interactive that allows IA to track progress over that period.
- Faculty, staff, and alumni will be solicited through emails and social media.
- Goal of 350 (full time faculty members) targeted for contributions; this is about participation not dollar goal.
- Video upcoming with Walter speaking with friends, students, faculty, and staff explaining why this fund is important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>College Break-out Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>Committee Break-out Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Old and New business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two votes were taken in March; 1st was approved. Vote #2 was not approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee had decided the opposite, to combine votes. If combined then need separate vote. Necessary to negate first vote because it would be in conflict with new vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2nd email from Pete with a same day response from Chair. (Email response was read in meeting). No reply to that May 2nd email explaining procedure with the understanding that it was to be a combined proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email sent this past Monday from Paula. Chair asked “which proposal” - transparency or combining vote? No response to that email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not get Hartt’s diversity statement ahead of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have paper votes available to vote on today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If combined, then have to void out first March vote and revote in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steps need to be separate (diversity chair speaking). Never was a question about one or separate proposals in terms of revote. Proxy votes were not acknowledged and they would have tied the vote. It was the Hart School that requested revote not Diversity Committee. Two different issues on the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic: Monday’s email about by-laws #5 and request for the revote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never clarified about what the vote would have been on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question for Senate is in fact a revote from March with two proposals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate today is not the same body of senate from Tuesday May 16th when initial statement and discussion took place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This 2017-18 senate has a voice to vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

- Reconsideration is unclear; shouldn’t there be a motion for a reconsideration?
- Hartt vote was not written down; unanimous by voice- all yeas.
- Improper to proceed without Chair having full clarification.
• Reconsider in terms of the law means to revote; take a vote as to whether we want to look at this issue again, then discuss. Assumption with word “reconsideration” is that there will be a vote.
• Still unclear about definition of diversity.
• According to the procedures- this was not in our list of votes, so not worth voting on today; motion made to table it.
• Not on agenda because did not have clarity about combined or separate votes.
• Covered a number of topics that were anomalies in this process; nothing in writing.
• Paula discussed in EC, but nothing in writing. Paula asked why it wasn’t on agenda because it wasn’t in two weeks in advance as dictated by by-laws and the phrasing from hart school didn’t meet the standard if it was going to be a vote on combined.
• If there were a vote to reconsider March vote; vote would be “no.” Wanted to send clear message to admin that we are troubled that nothing is mentioned in strategic plan about diversity. We need to come to consensus before we hire director and give charge to new center. Diversity already has the charge to come up with definition before we vote on center/director.
• New senator: If had been on agenda, could have prepared for it. Should be next time. Can’t vote today since multiple senators missing and not prepared.
• Charge from March meetings was very clear about need for definition for diversity.
• There is a leaning towards not voting today.
• Motion to table until September with further discussion at a later date. Voice vote:
  Approve: majority
  Do not approve: 3
  Abstain: 2

New Business:
• Suggestion that we invite Arosha back for October- perhaps twice a year.
• Suggestion for senate and officers to meet with new President over the summer. Good possibility since Pres. elect Woodward is very interested in meeting with faculty.
• “Challenge Support Succeed/Repeat” concerns about the marketing campaign. Spending dollars on marketing that does not resonate with one of the senators.
• CETA had big conversation about P&T and definition of scholarship constantly shifting. Ranking of scholarship; concern about changing the rules. Need tried and true method. Lack of definition on the P&T; depends on who’s on the committee since no guidelines regarding definition. This is a universal problem, not unique to CETA.ENHP feels the same way as CETA
• President concerned about standards. Would like to have statistics of reversals with different provost offices. How many times has the provost reversed decisions about P&T? Those numbers are kept somewhere; we have no power but can meet with Fred since colleges have concerns about P&T.
• Need definition about excellence and sustained, etc. Barney is defined because of their accreditation program.
| 1:40 | Adjourn |