



One Forestry Drive, Syracuse, NY 13210, USA

February 2, 2006

Attendance:

Bennett, M; Boyer, G; Daley, D; Drew, A; Ellis, J; Fernando, D; Hall, M; Hanna, R; Hassett, J; Hawks, R; Keller, S; Laura, L; Liu, S; Maynard, C; Meyer, R; Powell, W; Quackenbusch, L; Raynal, D; Scott, G; Shannon, S; Smardon, R; Smart, L; Smith, W; Spuches, C; Stipanovic, A; Tiss, K; Turbeville, J; White, J; Winter, W;

1. Call to Order Scott Shannon
 - a. Meeting called to order at 3:33 pm
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting Rudy Schuster
 - a. Minutes approved as they stand
3. Announcements & Report of the Executive Committee, Scott Shannon
 - a. Preparing for faculty governance elections – there will be a call for nominations (Emails will go out to solicit volunteers). Positions opening are:
 - i. Executive chair
 - ii. Chair of committee on public service and outreach
 - iii. SU senator (2-yr rotating term)
 - iv. 2 at-large committee representatives
4. President's Report Neil Murphy
 - a. New York State FY 06/07 Executive Budget
 - i. Not What We Expected!
 - ii. Similar Political Gamesmanship as Last Year
 - iii. System Revenue Increase of \$84.6M (4.09%)
 1. State tax dollar support \$3.6M (0.34%)
 2. University income (largely from \$500 tuition increase) \$81M
 - iv. Energy Expenses
 1. \$29.1M added to current year (FY 05/06) core budget
 - a. Could mean \$254,000 to ESF
 2. \$45M as contingency in FY 06/07
 - v. Empire Innovation Program: \$6M
 1. Likely 1-2 new faculty members for ESF
 - vi. Tuition Increase and Tuition Guarantee Program
 1. Legislators won't likely support a \$500 tuition increase in an election year
 - vii. TAP Reductions in the Amount of \$190M
 1. Most will be restored by the legislature
 - viii. Increased Budget for STEP and CSTEP: \$9.5M
 - ix. New PACT Program (Partnership to Accelerate Completion Time) proposed to encourage on-time graduation

1. Each on-time associate degree graduate earns \$250 for institution
 2. Each on-time baccalaureate degree graduate earns \$500 for institution
 - x. \$20M of Capital Committed to Ethanol from Wood program: initiative to get businesses to adapt to new technology developed in Paper Science area
 - xi. Additions to SUNY Capital Plan: \$48.3M realized vs \$550M proposed
 - xii. Part G Temporary Retirement Incentive Program: we don't know if it will stick, but we will get some type of retirement incentive program
 - xiii. Legislature will Substantially Modify the Executive Budget: we shouldn't be in angst about the budget; neither should the students; we anticipate a better budget
- b. Mid-year Review of ESF Operating Budget
- i. Table presented comparing annual budget to actual expenses so far this year
 - ii. Generally, we are at ~16.5 million expenditures at the mid-year mark; This is compared with anticipated annual expenses of ~33 million for entire year. We are on budget (or even ahead).
 - iii. Looking at more faculty additions because of current budget scenario. Anticipate even better budget next year – we are doing well.
- c. Recent College Distinctions
- i. Landscape architecture recognized by DesignIntelligence Journal as one of the top programs in that discipline. (9th for undergraduate program and 14th for graduate program)
 - ii. Environmental Engineering program ranked 36th by US News and World Report
 - iii. US News and World Report ranks SUNY ESF 43/50 for public national universities
- d. Baker Laboratories Phase 3 Rehabilitation
- i. Interior demolition, asbestos abatement, and hazardous material removal project; Space has been cleared out for rehabilitation; Much of the interior is currently a wide-open space
 1. Project value: \$1.2M contract
 2. Estimated completion: February 2006
 - ii. Phase III construction
 1. Bids opened: 1/12/06
 2. Low bidder: Murnane Building Contractors; This contractor was involved in earlier parts of the project so they have experience with the Baker Lab facility
 3. Bid: \$14,349,000 (\$150,000 under the architects estimate, which is as good as we could hope for)
 4. Estimated contract award date: March 2006

5. Estimated contract completion date: Summer/Fall 2008

- e. Mission Review II Update
 - i. All Documents Submitted
 - 1. April 25, 2005 – Dialogue with System Administration
 - 2. July 22, 2005 – Mission Review II Performance Matrix
 - ii. Preliminary Feedback: We are moving towards becoming a Tier 1 institution. We proposed that we can do it with \$0.5-million in funding (requested). Current goals are:
 - 1. Selectivity Tier 2 to Tier 1 – increase to 80%
 - 2. Regarding Retention/Graduate Rates, our goals are:
 - a. 1st Year retention – increase to 85%
 - b. 6 year graduate rate – increase to 75%
 - iii. Most Recent Dialogue
 - 1. 1/20/06 – Meeting w/Dr. Anne Huot and Dr. Bob Kraushaar
 - a. ESF is doing well
 - b. Review the metrics and make sure you are comfortable; metrics for undergrad enrollment have been exceeded – looking for a higher metric in that area.
 - c. Tighten things up
 - d. Identify resources required to go to Selectivity 1
 - e. Identify your physical facility requirements
 - f. Identify new programs of study
 - f. Question: Will Baker Lab be completed? Answer: Yes. And in the future, we will not have the same problems we have had with Baker – we are not going to rehabilitate and inhabit a building at the same time in future construction projects.
 - g. Question: What do you mean by new programs of study (in bullet e,iii,1,f – above)? Answer: Focus is on new programs of study, such as Bioprocess Engineering program and the new PhD program being developed between SU/ESF. We are looking at potential indicators of where we want to go – without firm commitments.

5. Reports of the Standing Committees

- a. Committee on Instruction, Larry Smart, Two Proposals:
 - i. Revised Plan for Assessing Student Learning Outcomes in General Education: Meeting Strengthened Campus-based Goals. Prepared by subcommittee on general education (chaired by Sharon Moran). Fundamentally, the provost office is proposing to custom design new assessment exams in mathematics, basic communication and critical thinking. The provost will fund implementation. The proposal is to adopt use of the new assessment tools as well as the current survey on student engagement. Starting Fall 2006, we will assess these general areas

of education. The exams will be prepared by ATE and development is funded by SUNY Central.

1. Implement mathematics assessment in Intro to Calculus, critical thinking assessment in Global Environment and basic communications assessment in CLL courses.
 2. Question: Are there thoughts on assessing students involved in foreign languages? Answer: We are exempt from that requirement from SUNY central.
 3. Question: What is penalty for failure (for students and SUNY ESF)? Answer: Results give a mean performance on campus – then it is up to individual instructors to respond to the results. There are no penalties for individual students. This is a tool for college self-assessment – there are no penalties.
 4. Question: Why focus on those three areas exclusively? Answer: Those are the exams being prepared by SUNY Central. We will also continue to use our in-house assessment techniques in other areas.
 5. Motion to accept revision to assessment plan. Motion carried, no opposing votes.
- ii. Proposal to drop EFB226 and APM153 from Construction Mgt curriculum
 1. This is a revision to the program in construction management. It proposes dropping EFB 226 and APM 153 as program requirements for the undergraduate major.
 2. Motion on the floor. Motion carries, no opposing votes.
- b. Committee on Public Service & Outreach, Art. Stipanovic
- i. This past fall we had a symposium highlighting examples where teaching, research and outreach have been combined. We want to continue this by including an outreach component in the ‘Spotlight on Research.’ Particularly, we want to highlight work that students have done in terms of outreach.
 - ii. We are working on a collaborative program between ESF and Newhouse to develop a plan to publicize outreach activities We want to improve marketing and promotion of outreach programs.
- c. Committee on Research, Bill Powell
- i. Regarding the recent Grantsmanship/mentoring conference – Thank you Neil Ringler and research staff. Excellent conference, lots of good information.
 - ii. Update on Mac-Stennis
 1. Review process is complete – thank you to those contributing to review process
 2. 4 of the 11 proposals will be funded, pending extension of the Mac-Stennis program

3. Neil Ringler will be announcing the programs that were funded
 4. Reviews will also be distributed
 - iii. Exemplary Researcher Award introduced this year
 1. The goal is to recognize one of the top, active researchers at ESF
 2. The award includes 1 GA for one year, \$5K in research funds and a plaque (for them and one for Bray Hall)
 3. Confidential nomination letter are due 2/14/06 – send in a letter to nominate (2 pages). Research office will pick top 5 or so. For those 5, they will collect more information, select reviewers and then grant the award.
 - iv. Spotlight on Research
 1. Tentative date: 4/19/06, 10am – 3:30pm
 2. Goal is to see what students are doing on campus in terms of research
 3. This year it is paired with Earth Week festivities
 4. Top student posters will be selected and then displayed at SU's MayFest
 5. Question: Can posters for Mayfest be sent directly (to meet the submission deadline)? Answer: Yes, but we want to make sure the best posters are shown – we will submit our choices for best poster based on abstracts to meet the deadline for submission for Mayfest.
6. Report from Marla Bennett on SU's academic coordinating committee
 - a. Marla represents ESF on the committee
 - b. The committee is considering a new policy – teachers being able to drop students from their class based on attendance. Exploring potential pitfalls.
 7. Report from the SU Senate Susan. Senecah & Ruth Yanai
 - a. They are renegotiating the numbers of senators representing different units, but no change is proposed for ESF.
 - b. They are discussing recommendations for addressing academic integrity, the most ambitious piece of which is creating an Academic Integrity Office in the Division of Academic Affairs.
 - c. I didn't see anything in the course or curriculum changes that would affect us; I think Marla is now monitoring activity over there, which should help prevent surprises.
 8. Discussion Item: Report on Expanded Faculty Governance - Options & Discussions
 - a. Revisiting revisions to faculty governance
 - b. Over break we held two special meetings on issues related to expanding governance at ESF to offer an inclusive opportunity for those outside of the faculty. Also explored other opportunities for leadership by faculty.

- c. A variety of ideas arose from meetings:
 - i. There is a clear desire to maintain and expand the use of faculty meetings for communication and to continue the practice of having governance meetings open to entire campus community.
 - ii. There is a clear desire for governance meetings and discussion to be open and inclusive for all campus community members. Continue to use meetings as a tool for open and candid discussion for entire community
 - iii. There is a desire to keep business of faculty governance as brief as possible. But there is a desire to continue having opportunity for debate and decision-making (including voting). Those are potentially in conflict.
 - iv. When we do vote, it is problematic. We often do not have a true quorum. Also, there is some question as to who is eligible to vote. Also, the voting process is questionable – how valid is our voting procedure (hand raising, etc)?
 - v. Scope of faculty governance is currently narrow and it could be broader. May need expansion into a number of areas (including planning, endowment development, etc)
 - vi. Most changes in governance are seen as increasing the faculty workload (which is already high).
 - vii. Appears to be little desire by individual faculty to transition from ‘participation’ to ‘leadership.’
 - viii. No clear consensus on methods to address these issues other than NOT revising bylaws as suggested to date.
- d. Suggested actions
 - i. Form a task force to investigate these issues
 - ii. Task force would report back by March and April meetings.
 - iii. Task force composition: 3 voting faculty, one member of governance executive committee, one administrator, and one staff.
 - iv. Proposals should address: voting issues, inclusiveness issues, and potential for expanded scope (new committees and subcommittees).
- e. Discussion Points
 - i. Let’s get a proposal together, make a decision and move on.
 - ii. This proposal addresses the major issues that have been brought up. The two discussions held over break fulfilled what we hoped for, in terms of discussion.
 - iii. There is concern that the make up of the task force will give a bias towards how the faculty feels about these issues. Should there be another forum for concerns and participation by non-faculty? Or should there be more non-faculty representation on the task force?
 - iv. The problems with voting are primarily a quorum issue – should we move to representative voting? The difficulty is that it involves a fundamental restructuring. How can we provide a vehicle that addresses quorum issues (one suggestion has been voting on-line)?

The on-line voting proposal was rejected because it didn't allow for discussion. There may be a way to overcome this obstacle.

- v. It makes a lot of sense to revise the voting procedure for curriculum revisions. Voting at meetings seems to be pro forma. If the committee on instruction had a representative from each faculty, with some restructuring, voting could be done by the committee of curriculum and instruction, rather than at meetings.

9. New Business

- a. Marla Bennett: Indoor Environmental Quality Center will be funding 4 proposals for summer internships. Managed similar to Sussman program. Campus announcement will go out via email soon.

10. Old Business

- a. Volunteers for task force regarding Expanded Faculty Governance? Scott Shannon will be soliciting volunteers.

11. Adjourn 4:35pm, minutes submitted by Laura Lautz