

DRAFT – Minutes – DRAFT
Faculty Senate, October 9, 2012

I. Call to Order

II. Attendance

Eugene Johnson absent (possibly on sabbatical)

Lenny Smith (excused absence)

Tolu Onasanya (checked in but needed to go to class)

Provost Bain in attendance

2:12 did not have a quorum (11 members present)

Office of the General Counsel:

Andrea Bagwell

Stacy Mills

Smruti Radkar

Webster: Guests are on the agenda

Faculty Senate Membership, 2012-13 academic year

Department	Senator	E-mail	Attendance
1. UDC-CC, 1	Brenda Brown	bbrown@udc.edu	y
2. UDC-CC, 2	Madkins, Steven	smadkins@udc.edu	n
3. UDC-CC, 3	Patricia Myers	pmyers@udc.edu	y
4. UDC-CC, 4	Madiana Odumosa	modumosu@udc.edu	n
5. UDC-CC, 5	Lori Taylor	ltaylor@udc.edu	n
6. Computer Science	Dong H. Jeong	djeong@udc.edu	n
7. Environmental Science	Thomas Kakovitch	tkakovitch@udc.edu	n
8. Nutrition and Food Science	B. Michelle Harris	bharris@udc.edu	y
9. Architecture and Urban Design	Clarence Pearson	cpearson@udc.edu	y
10. Public	Sylvia Benatti	sbenatti@udc.edu	n

Administration			
11. David A. Clark School of Law	John Britton	jbritton@udc.edu	y
12. Accounting / Finance	Eboh Ezeani	eezeani@udc.edu	y
13. Biology and Chemistry	Daryao Khatri	dkhatri@udc.edu	y
14. Management / Marketing	Michael Tannen	mtannen@udc.edu	n
15. Communications	Willie Faye Garrett	wgarrett@udc.edu	y
16. English	Cherie Ann Turpin	cturpin@udc.edu	y
17. Education	Arlene King-Berry	akingberry@udc.edu	y
18. Center for Urban Education	Rachelle Nelson	rnelson@udc.edu	n
19. Criminal Justice, Sociology and Social Work	Margaret Moore	mmoore@udc.edu	y
20. Political Science, History and Global Studies	Guy Schroyer	schroyer@edu.edu	n
21. Nursing	Connie Webster	cwebster@udc.edu	y
22. Learning Resources Division	Ed Jones	ejones@udc.edu	n
23. Electrical and Computer Engineering	Wagdy Mahmoud	wmahmoud@udc.edu	n
24. Psychology and Counseling	Eugene Johnson	ejohnson@udc.edu	n
25. Math and Applied Statistics	Thomas Bullock	tbullock@udc.edu	n
26. Visual and Performing Arts	Lennie Smith	lsmith@udc.edu	N (excused)
27. Civil and Mechanical Engineering	Pradeep Behera	pbehera@udc.edu	n
28. President of the UDC SGA	Tolu Onasanya	Tobox12@msn.com	y

29. President of the UDC GSGA	Aigerim Begadilova	Aigerim.begadilova@udc.edu	n
30. President of the UDC-CC SGA	Jasmine Parker	Jasmine.parker1@udc.edu	n/a

III. Future Meeting Dates

Meeting date for May 2013 – added agenda item

IV. Review of Minutes

Minutes were posted—cannot approve the minutes b/c no quorum

V. Chair announcements; Attendance

By-laws on attendance—*two unexcused absences mean excused from FS body*

A. Certain members not in attendance last year and this year—the secretary will inform those members of the by-laws and rules on being released from FS because of non-attendance

B. All senators were to email the chair on senate committee preferences – all were placed, those who did not email back were placed in committees from previous year conveners must meet to vote for Chair of the committee and conduct business if committees will add additional members from departments it is their prerogative

VI. Oversight Committee Hearing Testimony

Oversight hearing coming up on right sizing on the 11th of October, registration for testimony has passed but you can still submit written testimony to City Council

VII. Old Business-Law School

A. Visitors from G. Counsel – on FS involvement in 3rd step grievance process (Law School Faculty): Ms. Bagwell and Ms. Mills

Andrea Bagwell:

1) What is the faculty’s role in grievance process according to DCMR8? The DCMR is Chap 8 A- law school 8 B- flagship and CC.

Power point to be presented is not a legal opinion- it has been requested that it be forwarded to Dr. Crider (BOT Chair).

The representatives from the General Council stressed “*UDC does not discriminate on race, color, sex, gender, sexual orientation, family responsibility, personal appearance, source of income.*”

Because of the merger agreement faculty at the law school are not covered by grievance procedures outlined in the DCMR 8 B.

Other University faculty are governed by the 6th master agreement—which has its own grievance process. If law school faculty have a grievance outlined it is in the merger agreement and the faculty handbook, and not in the 6th master agreement.

2) Does the FS have a role in the grievance process? No.

The FS Charter lays out the four charges—Law school does serve as a member of the merger preserved old law school—1995 - 8A—law school faculty handbook—all changes approved by BOT—last revision in 2002—tenure, faculty meetings, no grievance procedures—thrown back into title 8A - applies to all law school employees (Misunderstanding, dissatisfaction, etc—very broad language).

Grievance process doesn't apply-union employees, adverse actions, matters with distinct appeal procedure (mils).

Law school faculty must file formal grievance within 10 days, must have a oral conference, then a formal process—written statement of grievance, then file with president, the president is the final step in the process.

B. Webster: slippery slope issue—why 8B was more important—yes they are law school faculty, but they are faculty members of UDC—that's why they filed under B because A didn't work—is it strictly A?

Bagwell: it is pretty clear that it is A, the process is laid out, some language that needs to be changed—have to scratch out dean and put in President—have to add language post 1995—have to have the merger agreement to read alongside that

Mills: merger requires an all-encompassing policy—has not been explicitly done—has not explicitly said 8A was being put aside for 8B

Garrett: even though we are under 8B are we under the 6th Master agreement?

Webster: unless there are issues where the 6th Master agreement are silent?

Bagwell: technically yes, but we look to rulings on court decisions, labor board rulings, but the analysis is a little broader

C. Webster: on FS responsibility: our charter clearly defines our roles and responsibilities and does not allow us to get involved in this situation?

Bagwell: yes

Bagwell: law school is making updates in a collective way

Webster: thank you for clarification of our role—we will receive update from board-will pass it on

D. Britton: returned from meeting with Associate Dean—will respond to Provost about updates on grievance process

VII. Old Business-Provost Bain on Release Time for Officers and Program Changes

Webster: Provost coming forward on previous years issues

A. Bain: 1) request for release time for officers of FS; difficult one because in principle we agree on that but we live in difficult times because of budget restraints—can give release time to Chair—but don't have information on giving it to other officers—if our financial situation improves we can give it to other members

B. Bain: program realignment: disposition of physics and FS, once again looked at it carefully, conversation with people on how to move forward with that, was concerned about moving physics to applied sciences and engineering, it is not engineering, evaluated by different criteria, the other consideration was its tradition in the CAS, other programs nationwide, how they are aligned, while a few cases in applied science its not the majority—will remain in CAS—will keep a major but we will need to build on collaboration with other institutions, do not have resources to put in a separate department or to grow a physics program

Was a bit concerned about how the review had been made in the first place, one of the factors not looked at—one factor—our society still needs physicists, we need minority physicists—we need to continue to build the program, we made recent efforts to collaborate with other institutions in the area—courses we can't offer to our students we can send students to—and the reverse—physics research big ticket item—physics declining—we need to reverse the trend.

Undergraduate education—equally difficult—lot of factors there—appreciate argument made by FS—the reality of the national trend is the requiring of all undergraduates wanting to go into teaching be trained in a discipline—strong undergraduate major field before pedagogy—although some elementary teachers do broad training—they all need liberal arts and scientific training—a trend increasingly a norm, state jurisdictions across the country, become quite dominant in thinking, especially with think tanks such as Carnegie institutions, what that will mean is elimination of early childhood education, special education, elementary education, development of a MAT program for DC and the rest of the country, will maintain human development program—not specifically for education which will be done with the Masters level.

C. Garrett: how does that match with original mission, one of the institutions' part of the merger was Teachers College—we should be reclaiming that responsibility Bain—not shrinking from that just moving that to Masters level—teaching requires not only their subject but human learning.

Garrett—are you saying that is what is required to teach in DC?

Bain: national trend, but not in DC. Moving ahead of the standard, want to move ahead of the standard.

Garrett: if we are not doing that, how will we be looked at by the City Council if we are not meeting the needs—we don't even have anything in place to help teachers where they are now?

Bain: what we can do is to offer the very best preparation; we are not shrinking, but improving.

D. Harris: How are we going to support DC residents who want to teach who find that it is not a 4 year program but longer? What will we be able to do to support those who are already teaching?

Bain: all of the teachers who will be certified to teach will have the very best in training, will be a MAT, a five year program—students coming in will have to focus on subject matter

Harris: lot of students need better financial support

E. Myers: my concern—all the undergrad programs discontinued for the grad program—no program to house it that has been approved by NCATE or accredited-by the state—will not have completed a state approved program. Right now you have students who will not be prepared in programs approved by the state—it is almost criminal—you dismantled we did have before we have a program in place

Bain—simply having undergrad training is not sufficient

Myers—you should not have students in before having accreditation in place

F. Moore: what has been done to implement and market the grad program

Bain: lot has been done—15-20 students currently in program—program based on different kind of model for teachers-going to use traditional literature—wide variety of research literature of how people learn

Has consideration future for the university

Human learning/human development

G. King -Berry: in terms of special education the research I conducted says that the alternative route is not appropriate because they have to have clinical training for children with special needs, autism—what research have you conducted in this area?

Bain: broadest research – body of knowledge that special education teachers have to have, enormously important for what they do—what is missing is a broader education. If they just focus on special education they do not have a field background, students need to be educated in humanities, sciences—they need teachers in disciplines as well as special educated-thus what will have offer to students that first prepares them then offers opportunities for special education

Berry—would like know your sources because my research indicates something different

Bain—what they are not prepared in is the social sciences, arts, humanities, science, specific pedagogies—there is alot to know about special needs—often argued in national forums someone dealing with special education requires much more extensive preparation than others dealing with other types of students

But they have to be broadly educated

King-Berry: don't see anything wrong with that but the 5 year program will not address that

Bain: maybe not, may need more but will not move backward into undergrad

Berry: trend with 5 yrs program started with Holmes report -Howard tried that—bringing back undergrad—we need teachers, people going back into teaching

Bain: we could expand requirements of undergrad program—160 or 180 undergrad program but that would be unfair to students

H. Myers: are you saying the national accrediting agency doesn't know what our students need? We have 80 percent completion rate with students passing the standards/requirements—with 30-40 states with NCATE approved programs. I don't think this is a valid argument

Bain: I hear your argument but we want to improve the quality of the teachers at our public schools

120 hours for undergrads mean a limited amount of hours that students can take

Garrett: what kind of certification will we offer?

Bain: certification that will get them jobs

I. Brown: if you wanted to enhance the undergrad MA would provided that—but we need to look at what the real problems are—one year would not provide that Don't understand when we have a standup accredited program—when we get ranking high in HBCU, national Newsweek ranking, for some odd reason the administration does not understand we are doing what needs to be done—tearing down fully functioning program that are advancing the needs of the program—what tear down a baccalaureate program—fine arts being changed into a minor—usually a fine arts as a minor backed up by an education major. The undergrad program is pointed towards people going immediately into the classroom—ma pointed towards people going into research. We had a masters program in mathematics that allowed people to specialize and teach. Why do we deny access to jobs professions when we have the construct at the university already?

Bain: want to provide not for jobs for but the best education for k-12?

We want them to have the kind of education that will provide excellent education k-12.

In my mind it is a small step towards what people are doing across the country.

Looking at what's happening around the world, outstripping what's happening in our public and private institutions.

One of the problems encountered is students have misconceptions that originate in the classroom, teachers giving misconceptions

Educating not training of teachers in the undergraduate level

J. Turpin: we are destroying our humanities programs—our English program approved by NCATE is being destroyed, foreign language, drama majors being destroyed—the report being presented does not support this Masters vision—how can we destroy our programs you just emphasized and do the Masters—cannot rely on human development. You are about to go City Council to talk about preparing

students for jobs now and for the 21st century—but you cannot justify that by destroying programs.

Bain: couldn't agree with you more

Turpin: we need to hear that from you—and for you to say that to those who make decisions

K. Virginia Howard: people not academically trained are making decisions; Howard going back to undergraduate program; people outside of credentials making decisions without knowing that they are doing, people designing programs who don't know what they are doing.

Had not been for dc teachers college, I would not have succeeded, nor my sister who now writes million dollar grants, or my brother who went into business management. Sometimes we look at things, but we don't look at them with an open eye. We should develop and keep the good. We need to research those who have graduated. We are making a big mistake.

Bain: we have had a long, strange situation in education. We prepare people to teach by having them work in education, and training education, pretended there is nothing to learn about human learning, fostering learn—it requires both. We do need prepared people in the disciplines.

Cannot just be trained in disciplines but need to be trained in human learning. Must be trained in disciplines before pedagogy. Not tearing down anything but we are building a new program

Will not just look at traditional body of literature, but a new part of literature, that's come out of social and cognitive psychology

Not part of accredited programs

L. Khatri: I think can agree, but there might be an alternative. We have very strong education programs that need strengthened, if you try to eliminate accredited programs in favor of programs not accredited credibility of university eliminated—you could phase it out in 4-5 years

Bain: looks at los of alternatives—the one we are going to take is the best

Garrett: so are you saying nothing is now in place?

Bain: no not the case at all

Garrett: don't understand what we have in place in Masters currently. What we are offering?

Bain: MAT in teaching

Myers: not approved by DC

Bain: needs to be approved

M. Harris: what will happen to people already in the program trying to get the job?

Bain: how many people complete the program?

Myer—4-5 per semester because they don't get free tuition like law school—all of them are placed

King-Berry: especially African American males. One size fits all Masters does not work. Those who get masters go out into the field esp. in urban areas burn out in two years—they don't have clinical experience

Really need to look and make sure those going out into the field special needs, pre-k can address these needs—cannot do that with current program in place

Bain: would like evidence put in writing--be specific

N. Webster: my concern is the process and the shared governance model – discussion should have happened before final decision—two major changes—it has not been an evident process—will say that Thursday—if it is a true shared governance process this sort of dialogue needs to be in place rather than FS being in a reactive mode

O. Pearson: lot of good ideas but if not vetted properly they piss people off—what you have been talking about has not been vetted.

Bain: I have

Pearson: No. If you are going to make decisions must be in the open between faculty and administration—cannot have two-three deans talk to admin and say it's been discussed—rarely gets to program level

You need to ask yourself have you included the general faculty

Turpin: if you want changes, we the faculty who do the research and teaching must be in the center or it will fall to pieces

Bain: could not agree with you more

P. Brown: can you make your decision process public for people to respond? We don't know what you are saying, your process—my concern—what is it we gain from the change that we are hearing? Where does this come from?

Big transition from undergrad to graduate—big gap—unless you are prepared to do the research—there is a big gap.

Bain: what is the evidence that people are better off majoring undergraduate education, better educated to teach rather than in disciplines?

Webster: going to ask that Brown and Bain continue to dialogue—he asked you for evidence that supports your position—and you are asking for the same that supports his position

Bain: to be prepared to teach one has to be prepared in the field-what I hear Brown saying is that people would be better off majoring in education

Brown: no, wanted to know what evidence did you have to support your position.

Bain: you are on contending something that is counterintuitive.

Brown: people need to be prepared to teach elementary education--don't know what the discipline is for first grade.

Student Gov President asked via Khatri: a number of students have been dropped for nonpayment of fees. Why have they been dropped? 12 hours students taking—many students cannot be subsidized—financial aid goes to UDC if loan is approved-lose 6500 when we drop students

Bain: apparent some things you are assuming that is not the case—told by financial aid 65-75 students never apply for financial aid at all so they didn't have the financial aid in the first place—

Khatri—but these are students who do have financial aid—why can't we have students pay in installments

Harris—have students sleeping because they are working overtime

Q. Khatri: we should ask the executive committee of the FS to prepare a response to the report

Webster: can't do it in the short time span

Pearson: would rather the FS vet before it goes to the public—the senate needs to see it first

Webster: recommend an ad-hoc committee

Berry: we can send it out to faculty

Pearson: Thursday not a final date

R. Webster: shared governance: would have appreciated respect for us to take a position and not to be placed in a reactionary mode.

S. Myers: what's so disheartening about it all—when the president and vice president first got here I wrote a long paper of suggestions—what is in the report is what Sessions first proposed—not intention to involve the faculty—the new person in charge of gen education—came to community college—going to try to implement them—Myers asked for research on results—Mansueto said no research done—FS is just an advisory body, does not matter—changes will be made

Pearson: hope we don't put everybody in the pot—Bain already told my dept going to waylay any decisions on general education until hearing impact on my program.

What we need to do is keep talking to him. We need to ask what is the purpose of general education—we were told we would not add more credits to our program.

Turpin: I propose a review of the general education program

Pearson: there was no true piloting of the gen ed program

Berry: was there a review of the education program

Webster: sounds like things are already in place for five-year program, the new chair is going to get to the bottom of this—

Harris: we need to have our voices heard

VIII. Adjournment

Katri: moved to adjourn, seconded by Harris

Meeting adjourned at 3:55