

## **Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting 09/20/19**

### **Welcome**

Laura calls meeting to order at 12:48.

Minutes from May meeting approved.

### **Action Items**

#### **1. Election of Members to Senate Executive Council**

Three nominations: John O'Hara, Robert Marsico, Arleen Gonzalez

Winner by plurality and by secret ballot: John O'Hara

#### **2. Election of Committee Vice Chairs**

Nominations for vice chair of Academic Policies: Robin Hernandez. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of Academic Programs and Planning: Michael Law. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of Administration and Finance: Christy Goodnight. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of General Studies: John O'Hara. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of Information Technology and Media Services: Joe'l Luydovich. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of Library Committee: Elma Kaiser. Elected

Nominations for vice chair of R&PD: Justin Ostrofsky. Elected

Nomination for vice chair of Student Affairs: Arleen Gonzalez. Elected

#### **3. Resolution on Gender Violence**

Betsy Erbaugh speaks in support of the resolution creating a Presidential Task Force on Gender-based Violence and is encouraged by the new Task Force based on discussions with students, faculty and administrators.

Q: Is there a need for putting in language to discuss the charge of the task force?

A: We have the same charge we did last year, and now that there is a Presidential Task Force, we will have help with those tasks.

C: The current Senate task force will remain. This is a new task force.

C: We don't have the authority to set a change on this because it is not a Senate task force, but a presidential task force.

Q: Do we have data on the number of incidents of gender violence?

A: Yes, and the task force will be looking at these data. But we are not going to review it here. Some of the data is available from Stockton's website.

Vote in support of resolution: Passes unanimously

There are also two new chairs: Jennifer Bar and Emily Van Duyne

#### **4. Endorsement of Recommendations from Hate Speech Task Force**

These are recommendations that the University adopt these policies. (Policies listed in document available at Senate website.)

C: I am speaking as a female and member of an ethnic minority. I have a concern about the language, especially about what constitutes hate speech. I feel like we should educate students on this, not prohibit it. If it is prohibited, it will remain, but be underground. It is our responsibility to educate people on the wrongness of this, but should not ban it.

C: Students come to classes misinformed about the reality of social welfare programs and say things that would constitute hate speech as defined here. After students have been taught what is accurate regarding issues like social welfare, I want to be able to accuse them of hate speech.

C: I have concern about the legality of this policy, and perhaps a challenge from the ACLU. [Speaker passes out information from the ACLU and reads from it, explaining these concerns.]

C: Member of committee that created recommendations: These were issues the committee considered. We, on the committee, prioritized protecting our students from some of the violent speech that is going around. Speech itself can have a violent effect. We also considered other universities' policies, so others have used similar language.

C: Another member of the committee: We know that free speech is not absolute. What we thought about was, first, we are an educational institution and we don't need to allow some views be heard over and over. Secondly, it is important to recognize that every time we have a public gathering, we are excluding someone. So if we are having a white supremacy event here, who are we excluding? We also ran this language by the legal administrators and they did not see anything seriously problematic.

C: I appreciate the views of those concerned. But this goes beyond the standards established in Brandenburg v. Ohio. Can we have a vote for support but with reservations?

C: The policy does not ban hate speech on campus. The wording in this policy makes sense for a University that wants an inclusive and supportive policy.

Q: Is this language similar to other universities in NJ?

C: We have links to every policy for every NJ university and we went with established policies as much as possible.

C: Regarding issues that have been considered, people still have a right to hold views that are considered crazy or are factually wrong. Limiting speech that we do not support opens the door to our speech being limited.

C: I looked at the policies of other universities mentioned. Much of it is the same.

C: Again, we are not banning hate speech.

Motion to divide the recommendation, separating the hate speech section and the guest speaker section. Changed to a motion to separate all sections.

The report will go to the administration but they will get the vote for what parts were endorsed.

Vote on hate speech definition: passes 22-8

Vote on hate speech policy: passes 25-4

Vote on criteria for invited speaker: passes 16-13

Vote on draft off-campus conduct policy: passes 22-8

Vote on suggests for future work: passes 28-2

Request for microphones that don't require us to pass them around for people online to hear.

We will look into this.

Meeting adjourned at 2:05