

ESF College-Wide Faculty Meeting
3:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011
408 Baker Hall

Attending: **Business Affairs**, Danette Desimone. **Chemistry**: Greg Boyer, Ted Dibble, Theodore, Kelley Donaghy, Huiting Mao, Art Stipanovic, Bill Winter. **Cons Mgmt & Wood Pro Eng**: Paul Crovella, Robert Meyer, Bill Smith, Ken Tiss. **Env Res and For Eng**: Jungho Im, Jungho, Lindi Quackenbush. **Env Science**: Tim Knight, Tim, Russ Briggs. **Env Studies**: Janine DeBaise, Dawnelle Jager, Jack Manno. **Environ & Forest Bio**: Jonathan Cohen, Melissa Fierke, Beth Folta, Jacqueline Frair. **Forest & Natural Res. Mgmt**: Diane Kuehn, Chuck Maynard, David Newman, David Nowak, Ruth Yanai. **President/VPs/Gov Relations**: Bruce Bongarten, Robert French. **Human Resources**: Marcia Barber. **Landscape Architecture**: none. **Moon Library**: JoAnne Ellis, Steve Weiter, Jim Williamson. **Outreach**: Chuck Spuches. **Paper/Bioprocess Engineering**: Biljana Bujanovic, Klaus Dölle, Raymond Francis, Gary Scott. **Physical Plant**: Brian Boothroyd.

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 by Kelley Donaghy.

I. GSA (Katie Barnhill)

The Graduate Student Association has instituted a student speaker series. There is a speaker tomorrow, February 11, at noon in 110 Moon. Please consider attending this and future talks by ESF graduate students.

II. Minutes from 12/1/10 were approved as corrected and posted on the internet.

III. Committee Reports

A. Committee on Research (Frair)

1. Seed Grants

Seed grant proposals are due by 5 pm on Monday, 14 February 2011. The Spotlight on Student Research and Outreach will be held Tuesday, 12 April 2011, from 12-2 pm in Nifkin Lounge. We are returning to the single integrated event involving grad and undergrad students. Space is limited: for the first time, entries will be competitive. There will be 50 grad and 30 undergrad spaces, which is 30% fewer of each this year than last year when we held separate events. We are capping class projects at a single poster per class.

2. Exemplary Researcher Awards

We would like feedback on some changes we are implementing to the Exemplary Researcher Awards. To encourage recognition at any stage of a research career, we have identified three categories under which nominations will be sought, as follows. New this year:

Outstanding Career Achievement

Purpose: To recognize outstanding career achievements in research activity.

Eligibility: Faculty holding a Ph.D. (or other appropriate terminal degree), who have had a professional career of more than 16 years, and who have been employed by ESF for a minimum of 5 years.

Criteria: Documented evidence of outstanding research accomplishments and impact of their work on their discipline. Outstanding national and international recognition in the academic community. Evidence of a substantial positive impact of research mentorship through undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral associates.

Mid-Career Achievement

Purpose: To recognize outstanding research achievements at the mid-career stage.

Eligibility: Faculty holding a Ph.D. (or other appropriate terminal degree), who have had a professional career of 9-16 years, and who have been employed by ESF for a minimum of 3 years.

Criteria: Documented evidence of outstanding research accomplishments and impact of their work on their discipline. Significant national and/or international recognition in the academic community. Evidence of a positive impact of research mentorship through undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral associates.

Early Career Achievement

Purpose: To recognize accomplishments in research unusually early in their professional career.

Eligibility: Faculty holding a Ph.D. (or other appropriate terminal degree), who have had a professional career of less than 9 years and who have been employed by ESF for a minimum of 2 years.

Criteria: Documented evidence of exemplary research accomplishments in their field. National and/or international recognition in the academic community. Evidence of a positive impact of research mentorship through undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral associates.

Each year, one researcher will be selected from all the nominations submitted who is exemplary in their research productivity. There is nothing to preclude people from receiving this award three times here, once for each stage of their careers. The award this year would include a \$5,000 research account, a modest "Presidential Salary" increase, a plaque, and press coverage. Nominations will be due in March, announcement will come out by 15 February so be sure to give feedback to the committee on either the eligibility cutoffs or criteria for evaluation within the different categories.

B. SUNY Senator (Doelle)

1. Klaus Doelle attended the 157th Plenary Meeting of the SUNY University Faculty Senate in Binghamton, NY on January 27th to 29th.

The tone was depressing, because of the budget situation, which is uncertain. There were no motions. A task force for new general educational requirement will be implemented.

2. There will be a Poster Presentation for the March 8th Graduate Research in Albany from SUNY and CUNY.

3. Discussions about student mobility: it is now easier to transfer credit across SUNY institutions.

4. The Chancellor is interested in projects that fall into these SUNY Strategic Plan 2010 & Beyond with its Big Six Ideas (<http://www.suny.edu/powerofsuny/>)

The Entrepreneurial Century

The Seamless Educational Pipeline

A Healthier New York

An Energy Smart New York

The Vibrant Community

The World

If you have a project that falls into one of these areas, please let our administration know so they can forward this to the appropriate task force.

C. Committee on Instruction (Doelle)

1. The committee on Academic Standards met last month. 23 Students were suspended, 9 did not appeal, 14 appeals were received, of which 10 were approved and 4 were sustained.

2. The new petition form for late drops was approved, eliminating the check box for "Forgot to file", and adding a field for approval by the Senior Counselor, Office of Counseling Services (currently Heather Rice).

3. Here is a summary of the COI workload for the past and current academic year.

In 2009-2010, the COI handled 104 Course Proposals, 17 Curricular Proposals, 3 Graduate Program

Proposals, 16 Update Course Description (COI), 10 Update Course Description (Admin), and 10 Policy changes.

In 2010-2011 to date, there have been 34 Course Proposals, 9 Curricular Proposals, 0 Graduate Program Proposals, 25 Update Course Description (COI), 44 Update Course Description (Admin), and 1 Policy change.

4. Important deadlines: Last day for submission of course proposals for implementation in the 2011-12 catalog is 03-01-2011.

Scott Shannon said that they can accommodate emergencies.

Someone said that "Forgot to file" does not constitute an emergency.

5. Klaus showed the COI web site, with proposals currently up for review, past actions, and all the forms.

<https://wwwinfo.esf.edu/scripts/LoginEmployee/logEmpViewApps.asp>

Klaus: We need a new Chair for the COI for academic year 2011-2012, preferably someone from the tenured faculty. Note that we hope to restructure faculty governance to replace this committee with two committees and the workload won't be so heavy. Kelley will present the proposed changes shortly.

Bob Myer: What is the distinction between "Admin" and "COI"?

Klaus: When the changes are trivial, like changing the semester that it's offered, we don't have to take it through the COI. Changes to the course content have to go through the COI.

Bruce: It's another case of the administration serving the faculty.

IV. OLD Business

A. Promotion and Tenure Document and Workload Policy (Bongarten)

I am very pleased that we are near completion of the College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for non-library and non-Ranger School faculty. The Committee has completed a draft that will serve us very well. It's not the document that any one person would have written, but it's the best document for all of us at the current time.

The draft was discussed within your departments in January, and there was a final meeting at which two changes were made. (1) The College Review Committee (CRC) will be composed of one member from each academic department. (2) Although all faculty will review materials and provide comments to Departmental Review Committee (DRC), solicited materials (external letters of evaluation) will not be shared outside of DRC, Dept. Chair, Provost and President. The final document will be posted and emailed to you and will be used in the next round of P&T evaluations.

There are some steps that need to happen this semester. The College standards are written to be applicable to all the departments; departments need to prepare departmental standards that are consistent with the College standards. Departments must establish internal procedures for implementing the necessary practices. Departments may develop and request approval for transition plans, for faculty members caught in the transition.

We need a way to take into account the variation in workload allocation (teaching, research, service, and sometimes administration). First, we need a college-level system. Every land-grant institutions has this; it's required by law. We will benefit from having it because it helps establish that expectations differ for faculty that have different workload allocations. We will develop these with reference to other institutions that use them. We may not have this fully in place for the first round of tenure and promotion decisions, since it hasn't been done formally before now. We will not expect these to be very precise, but it should be helpful.

Bob Myer: What are the other factors that will be used to establish the allocation?

Bruce: For example, we can't make a uniform conversion between credit hours and percentage of your time, there is a big difference in workload per credit.

Ruth: How often should they be revised? Every year I spend my time differently.

Bruce: They certainly could be changed annually, if your activities are changing. When it comes time for evaluation, you would use a weighted average.

Bruce: The committee decided that this plan would be in place for three years and then it should be evaluated. The committee will stay on hold to make minor changes.

B. End-of Semester Course Evaluations (Crovella)

End-of-semester course surveys were developed to help instructors improve their teaching. I'm here to give you an update on this process, which we are still in the middle of. In the P&T document, there is some language about evaluation of teaching; this is a separate issue.

Electronic delivery should give us flexibility both in the delivery method and in the content of the surveys. So far, we are still working on the delivery problems, but flexibility in adapting content of surveys will be next.

A list of concerns came up from the faculty, which we have summarized as follows.

1. Survey Open Dates

- Paper survey – Last two weeks of the semester, instructor controlled. (~ 65% response rate) (but this was 100% for instructors who used it, and 35% of instructors didn't administer it)
- Spring 10 – Started two weeks before the end of the semester, ran through finals, no instructor control (> 80% response rate using "the stick"—they couldn't see their grades until they filed)
The faculty complained about the timeline and the students didn't like the stick.
- Fall 10 – Last two weeks of the semester, no instructor control (40-50% response rate using a "carrot")
The faculty wanted additional control over timing.
- Spring 11 – Instructor controlled start and stop dates (within a window), with flexibility for short courses and a default of last two weeks, corresponding to the timeline of the paper surveys.

2. Results Reporting

- Paper – Two months later a computer printout arrived
- Spring 10, Fall 10 – After survey closed, a text file summary was available
- Spring 11 – After survey closes, along with the text file summary a tab-delimited option will be available. The numeric section can be imported into a spreadsheet, you can analyze the data any way you want.

Jacqui: We wanted to be able to associate the written comments with the scores.

Paul: We don't have that yet, but there shouldn't be a problem any more with confusing the scales. On the scantron, the students had to remember which was 5 and which was 1. That doesn't exist any more, they are identifying whether they agree or disagree.

3. Survey Question - Sets the Next Step

Everybody wants to customize their content. This spring, we will be able to turn off the three questions relating to the lab experience. We will also be testing, with possible roll out in Fall 2011, the option to supply questions for each particular course and section. These can be multiple choice, short answer, or essay questions. Options to remove questions will also be included.

Melissa: I had 80 respondents out of 260; the carrot didn't really seem to work. The stick seemed to work better. I hounded them, I told them every class period for two weeks, and they didn't do it.

Paul: Right, what can we do to get them to fill it out? If we could give them a homework credit for it or something—that's harder to implement. We're trying to take steps towards the easier improvements, first.

Melissa: I gave them a survey in blackboard and asked who filled out the survey. The ones who said they did the survey were the ones on the tails: they hated it or they loved it. The ones in the middle

Neil: You've done a great job and you've addressed 90% of the issues; it's going to be a better tool than we had before.

Paul: We broke it, and we're still in the mode of fixing what we broke. In the future, we'll have a better tool than before.

Eddie: When will we get instructions on how to start and stop the survey?

Paul: Dave Soderberg sends it to me and Jeff and Kelley and we test it out, and after that, you'll hear about it from Scott Shannon's office. I'm sorry I can't tell you when.

Kelley: We have library courses ending soon, so we're hoping for the end of March.

Jack: It worked when we handed it out in class, because we gave them the time to do it. Can we ask them to fill it out in class, and then take it home and fill it out at home? Or bring laptops to class.

Paul: I've reserved a computer cluster, I have 34 students and they can fit in a computer cluster. Obviously this can't work in a lot of classes. Will it be enough to ask them to do the data entry after they leave the room? We're never going to get 100%, but we need to figure out how to do better.

Greg: What about if everyone in the class gets extra points if we get 80% participation?

Melissa: I tried offering them a "synthesis" lecture, which they really like, and that didn't work.

Kelley: I ignored it for two weeks, Melissa plugged it for two weeks, and we both got the same response rate.

Greg: That's why we need to think outside the box about getting the students to incentivize each other.

Valerie: We're measuring perceptions and opinions, and we're losing something by asking them to do it outside of the classroom, when they're not thinking about the class.

C. Bylaws (Donaghy)

A set of proposed bylaws are available for comment at www.esf.edu/facgov: use the link marked "bylaws" to access them. The Executive Committee, who have all contributed to the new set of bylaws and committee structure, consists of Klaus Doelle, Jacqui Friar, Jack Mann, Bill Smith, Ruth Yanai, Lisa Campagna, Steve Weiter, Bruce Bongarten and Neil Murphy. We've also had input from department chairs, Charlie Hall, Scott Shannon, Bob French, John Turbeville and Chuck Spuches. Thank you all!

We had two separate sets of bylaws, because the 2009 revisions were not made to the 2006 bylaws but to an earlier set. The revisions approved in 2009 have now been applied to the 2006 bylaws. The Executive Committee decided that this document did not require approval, as the changes were already approved, so we're going to go with that. There are department name changes and language corrections in the "marked up" version of the documents found on the website www.esf.edu/facgov.

I'll walk you through the major proposed changes to the bylaws. Instead of voting on the bylaws as a whole and risking the loss of everything, we'll be voting on individual amendments. There are four changes that are important, which will come up as separate votes.

1. Quorum: There are approximately **135 faculty members** eligible to vote, and under the current bylaws at least **45 voting faculty** (1/3 of voting faculty) would have to be present to conduct the business of the faculty. Today we have 25 or 30, maybe not all at the same time. I'm all for following the rules, so let's change the rules to allow the business of faculty governance to be conducted, regardless of attendance at the meeting. If you're here, you can vote. Snooze you lose!

2. Adding professional staff to the committees and changing how we populate committees.

Professional staff have important insights and can contribute to our committees. The current method of recruiting for positions on committees has failed to fill committees, has overburdened some departments and does not adequately represent all groups on campus. For this reason the following has been proposed to secure the number of elected seats required to fill positions, and add a role for professional staff to participate in faculty governance. Professional Staff without faculty status would be able to serve on committees that do not deal with curricular or research matters. The number of proposed professional staff seats (12) would not jeopardize the faculty role in governance of the college; faculty would hold 38 seats. Some of the staff would be voting members on the committees, others not. At this point, no provision has been made to include staff in the votes at Full Faculty meetings. Staff would not sit on the Curriculum Committee.

To establish as equitable a representation as possible without overwhelming smaller departments a rotation was established between certain departments. The total number of faculty in each department was considered and the following rotation partners was established:

FCH (17) and PBE (9) for a total of 26

EFB (31)

ES (12) and LA (12) for a total of 24

FNRM (27)

SCME (9) and ERE (9) for a total of 18 (being the smallest combination they will be granted the flexibility to sit out certain committees at the discretion of each department's Faculty and the Chair)

	Curriculum	Instructional Quality and Academic Standards	Research	Public Service and Outreach	Student Life	Promotion and Tenure	Total
EFB	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
ERE	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.33	3.33
ES	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.5
FCH	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	4
FNRM	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
LA	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	3.5
PBE	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.33	3.33
SCME	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.33	3.33
Library	1	1	1	1	1	1	6

What this means is that at any given time, the number of faculty governance representatives from each department would be:

LA - 3.5 (29%)

PBE - 3.33 (29%)

ES - 3.5 (29%)

Chem - 4 (24%)

SCME - 3.33 (29%)

ERE - 3.33 (29%)

FNRM - 7 (26%)

EFB - 7 (23%)

Library - all (100%)

Professional staff 12: 3 from each of the four VPs.

Note: this includes representatives for the P&T committee but not awards (this committee is chosen specifically by the chair). Also these numbers have been rounded up in the bylaws document.

Elections will still be held College-wide for Exec. Chair, Secretary, Committee Chairs for each committee, SU Senators and SUNY Senator and alternate. Departments will decide who will be their representatives either as a departmental election, volunteer or chair appointment. Committee Chairs will be asked to contact department chairs for the names of their representatives in May.

3. Committee Structure

This amendment adds the **Committee for Student Life**, the college-wide **Promotion and Tenure Committee** and splits the current Committee on Instruction (and its three sub-committees) into two committees (**Curriculum** and **Instructional Quality & Standards**). This brings the number of standing committees to eight including the Executive Committee.

Dividing the COI is intended to ease the workload on the members of that committee, who are also serving simultaneously on the current sub-committees, and spreads that workload to other faculty members and

increases participation in this aspect of faculty governance. We will move from an 8- person model to a 15- person model for our instructional decisions. The first committee will be the **Curriculum Committee** and is primarily focused on course proposals, program continuance, start-up and deactivation and general education requirements and petitions. The second committee will be **Instructional Quality and Standards**, which will deal with course evaluations, academic advisement and methods of instruction. The chair of this committee or his or her designee will convene the Academic Standards Committee each semester.

The Student Life Committee will provide faculty input and direction over the interaction between faculty and students in and out of the classroom, the judicial process concerning academic integrity and disciplinary hearings, and to provide a liaison to the Intercollegiate Athletic Board, which is not part of faculty governance and the College Foundation with respect to Centennial Hall.

This amendment further strengthens the reporting responsibilities of the committees to the faculty as a whole, so that timely, informed, and appropriate input on the part of the faculty may inform committee and faculty governance decisions.

4. Charlie Hall's "Escape Clause"

This amendment is intended to give the faculty the ability to pull things out of committee for full faculty votes. A petition to the Executive Committee signed by 3 or more faculty members will precipitate a vote at the next College-wide Faculty meeting. Charlie Hall is working on the language of this amendment, from his sabbatical in Ecuador.

5. Where do we go from here?

We would like to invite you to comment on the drafted bylaws between now and February 25th. The Executive Committee will consider your comments and draft a final version by March 4th. Voting on the amendments will take place 3/7-3/18, the week before and the week of spring break. Results of the vote will be announced at the next faculty meeting to be held on Wednesday March 23rd. We need to know the results of this vote so we can hold elections in May; we know we have to fill vacancies. The final faculty meeting is the "No Excuse Reading Day" meeting on May 4.

Where can you send your comments, suggestions and corrections? kdonaghy@esf.edu

Complaints should go to Bruce Bongarten (just kidding).

Where can you find the bylaws - www.esf.edu/facgov

Bob Myer: My vote is not worth much, but if I have an opinion and can explain my feelings to people, they can vote with me.

Kelley: Steve, does this have to be a secret ballot, or can we vote on March 23rd?

Steve: It does have to be a ballot offered to everyone, we can't vote on it during the meeting.

Neil Murphy: Kelley, you have more courage and more energy than any previous executive chair, and we owe you a lot of credit for making this happen (applause).

Kelley: I couldn't have done it without the support of committee and the administration, too; everybody worked hard on this.

Ruth: Let me explain, because this was hard for me to understand. We get the bylaws based on the amendments; we don't then have to vote on the amended bylaws. Note also that we have the combined bylaws now, with the 2006 and the 2009 improvements. Any amendments that pass will give us even better bylaws. And we don't lose everything if people don't like some part.

Bob, Jacqui: We want to have an opportunity to discuss the amendments.

Kelley: We're under time pressure, because this affects our ballot. We could have an open forum meeting on Feb 25, prior to voting on the by-laws and having elections in April.

Bob: You're talking about elections, I'm talking about by-laws, those are two separate issues.

Ruth: They are related, because we can't add a committee without changing the by-laws. So we have to change the by-laws before the election, or it's too late to change the system for another year.

Bruce: The open forum is a good idea.

Kelley: Okay, I will find a room for an Open Forum on Feb 25, and after that, we can have a vote.

Ruth: Changing the bylaws is so important that everyone gets to vote, even if you're not here. So it has to be a ballot.

Steve: They have to be voted on 7-10 days after they are proposed and debated.

V. NEW Business

A. Graduate Student Applications (Shannon)

Most of you are aware that we have been working feverishly up in the grad office to get applications scanned and ready for your review. The number of decisions coming through is better than at a comparable time last year: thank you for all your hard work. We are hoping for your first round of decisions by Feb 21, because we promised answers to those students who made our Jan 15 deadline by March 1.

Lindi: Do you have a feel for how many are left to scan? I have an applicant who assures me that everything is in, but I can't see anything.

Scott: We scan them as they become complete, we don't scan each document as it comes in. We have a new scanner coming on line tomorrow. By next week, we should be all caught up, and applications will be visible within a day or two of when they are complete. Your coordinators can see the applications are in process, and they can ask for them to be made visible if they know of great applicants.

Neal: A faculty member with a particular interest can go the office and look at the documents that are waiting to be scanned.

Ruth: A student should email grad@esf.edu to find out what's missing?

Scott: The students are getting emails telling them what's missing every time an item comes in. They know exactly what's missing.

Kelley: Thanks everyone, now finish the food and drink!

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Ruth Yanai