Minutes,
Faculty Senate, November 8, 2011
(Taken by FS Secretary Musgrove)

I. Welcome/ Call to Order
Webster – called to order at 2:15pm

II. Senate Roll Call

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Alexander, Robin</td>
<td>UDC Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Behera, Pradeep</td>
<td>Dept. of Civil &amp; Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Brown, Brenda</td>
<td>UDC-CC 1: Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cousin, Carolyn</td>
<td>Dept. of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ezeani, Eboh</td>
<td>Dept. of Accounting, Finance and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fleming, Jeffery</td>
<td>Dept. of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Garret, Willie Fay</td>
<td>Dept. of Languages and Communications Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hanff, William</td>
<td>Dept. of Mass Media, Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Harris, B. Michelle</td>
<td>Dept. of Nutrition and Food Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Johnson, Wilmer</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Johnson, Eugene</td>
<td>Dept. of Psychology and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Jones, Edward</td>
<td>Learning Resources Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Khatri, Daryao – Vice Chair</td>
<td>Dept. of Chemistry &amp; Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Madkins, Steven</td>
<td>UDC-CC 2: Graphic Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mahmoud, Wagdy</td>
<td>Dept. of Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Musgrove, G. Derek -</td>
<td>Dept. Urban Affairs, Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Musgrove: 17 members are present. We have a quorum.

III. Review and Approval of Last Minutes (November 1, 2011)

Turpin: correction to minutes. Concern bout unexcused absences listed for the Nov 1 meeting.

Webster: Emails announcing the meeting to senators. Did everyone get an e-mail reminder of this meeting? Please let the chair know if you are not getting emails about meetings.

-Turpin will receive an excused absence because she did not receive the e-mail for the Nov. 1 meeting.

Garrett: Motion to adopt the minutes with requested changes. Pearson, second.

Discussion:

Khatri: How many people were there when the votes were taken at the last meeting?
Musgrove: The number is reflected in the minutes.

Webster: Call the question.

Minutes are adopted unanimously by voice vote.

**IV. Committee Updates (Reports from Chairs)**
Webster: Recommends Myers as Chair of the CC Committee

Musgrove: **Motion** to adopt Chair’s recommendation. Second by Khatri.

Garrett: Call the question.

Motion is unanimously approved by voice vote. Myers is appointed as chair.

**ASPPC Report**
Garrett: ASPPC has three subcommittees:
- Subcommittee on minors has not yet met but will before Dec meeting.
- Subcommittee on proposals has considered a request for changes to core courses requested by Computer Science Department. The full committee has not voted on the issue.
- Subcommittee on policies and procedures. This committee is working on four items:
  1. Create a faculty lead group to explore the Noel Levitz study data
  2. Ask the Provost to place reorg. on hold until Senate deals with all issues related to it.
  3. Classify Center for Urban Edu. as an administrative as opposed to academic unit
  4. Departments should have a right to grieve reorganization decisions

Khatri: can we explore the issue brought up by Cousin last meeting.
Webster: we will in the new business section

**Admissions and Retention**
Harris: has sent out a call to committee members to request an initial meeting time and date.

Chen: [returning to ASPPC business] **Motion** for the full senate to accept the two proposals that have recently been considered by the subcommittee on proposals of the ASPPC concerning the computer science department.
Johnson: That is contrary to what we agreed [in committee]
Garrett: No. We agreed that the ASPPC can accept the current proposal and an addendum with the additional changes. Our only objection is that…
Musgrove: Isn’t this something that should happen in committee? We (senate) can not vote on something that the full committee has not written a report on.
Mahmoud: This proposal is only about a change of courses. Lets move this along.
Hanff: Our discussion in committee had to do with the difference between course
proposal and program proposal guidelines. If you are changing core courses, that falls under a “program” change.

Turpin: I am on the ASPPC. It appears that the computer science department was supposed to meet with committee asap. Because people need to know what they are voting on, I agree that we need to wait until a later meeting.

Garrett: Agree with Musgrove as well. The committee must issue a report.

Mahmoud: We do not have expertise in this area [computer science]. The department faculty does.

Cousin: This is a matter of protocol. The committee has not issued a report.

Hanff: Asks Chen to withdraw motion and that the senate put the issue on the agenda of our next meeting.

Chen: I assumed that if a subcommittee voted something up then the whole committee voted something up. [Secretary’s note: this presumption is incorrect]

Webster: Call the question (in favor of Chen motion):
Webster: Call for hand vote
Aye: 9
No: 6
Abstentions: 0

The motion carries.

Musgrove: This is a horrible precedent and I ask the Senate not make this something that it does again.

Alexander: The charter and bylaws committee will take up this issue [to clarify the rules governing this process].

Myers: Do the bylaws cover this issue? If the committee brings this issue to the senate, and the committee has not acted on this issue, can the senate even consider the issue?

Garrett: I voted for it and I want to clarify. My committee voted it up pending changes that will be inserted by the Department.

Pearson: We need to refine our policies and procedures to make sure that this issue is addressed.

Garrett: The specific issue is if this body can vote on a proposal

Arlene King-Berry: because there is no document faculty who are not on the senate haven’t even seen this document.

Alexander: [referring to Roberts rules of order] for this vote to be undone someone who voted for it has to make a motion to reconsider the vote.

Harris: Motion that vote be reconsidered. Second by Garrett.

Discussion

Musgrove: the previous vote was irresponsible. We can not vote on stuff we have not seen.

Mahmoud: we have done this before. We have voted up programs that people have not seen.

Garrett: the process is the issue. In the past we have voted on proposals that require changes. We do not have a proposal here.
Turpin: Agree with Garrett. This is about the sanctity of the decision making process of the senate.
Eboh: The committee agrees with the changes. This is just a minor change.

Musgrove: call the question. (to rescind the previous vote)
Aye: 12
No: 3
Abstentions: 2

The motion carries

Webster: the Senate will be waiting for the report from the ASPPC

Garrett: Motion hold a meeting to pass the Computer science proposal for 30 minutes next Tuesday. Second, Chen.

Discussion:
Musgrove: I believe the right to call a meeting is reserved to the EC.
Alexander: The Bylaws are silent on the ability of the senate to call its own meeting. It appears that it can.
King-Berry: I hope the senate gives all affected departments the right to comment whatever it does.
Chair of computer Science Department: We included everything we needed to in the original submission.
Brown: CC senators who have classes that end at 1:50 can not get here on time. If we are going to have a special meeting can it start at 2:30pm?
Webster: lets decide this issue and then we will deal with your issue. Roberts rules states that the senate does have a right to call a special meeting.
Garrett: Accept friendly amendment from Brown
Webster: call the question:
Aye: 13
No:
Abstentions: 2

The Motion carries

Bylaws
Alexander: Committee has not met.

Webster: we have been given a charge by Trustee Crider that this body move the UDC-CC charter forward expeditiously. I will be assigning it to the Bylaws and UDC-CC Committees together, so please look for that.

UDC-CC
Has yet to meet.
Webster: Any issues, Myers that you expect will come up.
Myers: Who is on the UDC-CC committee?
Webster: Musgrove will post.

V. New Business
a. Senate attendance
[secretary note: no discussion occurred]

Reorganization
Webster: Concerns have been expressed regarding reorganization of programs. I am currently looking into the matter and speaking with Provost and members of relevant Board committee.
Cousin: can senators attend these meetings?
Webster: I would prefer not now. I am just gathering information. After that though, I hope that we can have all senators involved.
Webster: The Bylaws and Charter chair was asked to look into the MR8 to find out the senate’s role, in reorganizations.
Alexander: Reads from several sections of MR8. Concludes that there is no mention in the MR8 of the Senate’s role in reorganization. We can give the Board advice on reorganization but that is it.
Webster: I have reached out to the Board to improve our relationship with them. Trustee Crider has asked the Senate to expedite the UDC-CC proposal for a senate, so that the Board can vote on this issue by January 1.
Garrett: since we have been asked to expedite this, can the proposal be given to the entire senate at the same tie it is given to the Committee?
Webster: The EC just received the document so it will be posted soon.
W. Johnson: The issue of the UDC-CC: Sessoms has said we should not view the UDC-CC as outside of UDC. It is a college of the university.
Webster: My questions to Crider were along those same lines.
Khatri: want a statement from Cousin about pending reorganization about chemistry and Biology

b. Clarification of the relationship of the UDC-CC to the FS
1. Assignment of the UDC-CC proposal for a Faculty Senate to a combined Bylaws and Charter / UDC-CC Committee
[secretary note: no discussion occurred at this point. See above for assignment of this matter to committee]

c. Senator Vermillion: Government Procurement Program
Webster: I want to tackle Vermillion’s question to the body last week that is on the agenda before we move to a new issue.
Vermillion: I raised the question last week of whether the registrar’s office has moved to kill the government procurement program by unilaterally refusing to enroll new students. We have found following a request for information that the registrar is now enrolling students. There is, however, still an asterisk on the website indicating that the program is scheduled for deletion.
King-Berry: Education has the same problem.
Webster: I did request from the provost, our current status, the proposed status and what the process is for moving from one to the other.

Cousin: In response to Khatri question above. Bio and Chem depts were shocked when we were told that the two departments would be merged. Dean told the two departments that this is planned. We oppose the plan. We asked about the reasoning and were not given a reason. We have a numbers faculty lines in the Department and a lot of grants. We risk loosing good candidates and several grants if we are merged. I propose that we not have this happen.

Posey (Chair of Chemistry): we were told it did not have to do with money. Were not given a definite reason.

Khatri: We had a meeting with April Massey (interim CAS dean) and we were told that the decision was that of the provost, not the dean.

Garrett: the provost does not believe that restructuring requires faculty input. I thought we asked last year that this body asked for information from the provost on the rational for restructuring. If the provost will not address our concerns we should maybe send them to the board.

Williams (Professor of English): We should not underdeveloped the flagship to develop the CC

Pearson: I am not aware that the senate has made a formal request to the provost in writing. I think that we should – especially before we take it to another level.

W. Johnson: We have a responsibility to protect the existing academic departments.

Brown: Has the senate reviewed the program review? The review focused on issues of students and money in its recommendations.

Cousin: Biology has plenty of money and students so we are confused as to when we are being asked to merge.

Vermillion: same with us.

Khatri: Motion that the senate request the provost put on hold all changes to programs until the senate reviews them. Second by Johnson.

Discussion:

Alexander: there is nothing in the MR8 about the faculty’s role in reorganizations.

Myers: do we know if changes in programs are approved by the board?

Pearson: do we have the authority to do what is stated in this motion? Our posture should be to get info from the provost.

Alexander: we can get info from the board executive secretary about this matter.

Musgrove: we should ask the provost for information – in writing.

Hanff: Board did adopt strategic plan for UDC

Musgrove: call the question.

Aye: 12
No: 5
Abstention: 2

The motion carries.

VI. Adjournment

Musgrove Motion to adjourn. Second, Hanff. Unanimous by voice vote.