

**State University of New York
College of Environmental Science and Forestry**

**Meeting of the Faculty
March 22, 2001**

Faculty Attendance: Abrahamson, L.; Allen, D.; Anagnost, S.; Bentley, W.; Bevilacqua, E.; Black, P.; Bobbie, C.; Boyer, G.; Briggs, R.; Brock, R.; Caluwe, P.; Castello, J.; Chatterjee, A.; Chatterjee, S.; Curry, G.; Deming, M.E.; Dibble, T.; Drew, A.; Elkins, E.; Endreny, T.; Fernando, D.; Floyd, D.; Frey, R.; Giner, J.; Hall, C.; Hall, M.; Hassett, J.M.; Hassett, J.P.; Hawks, R.; Hopkins, P.; Hussein, R.; Keller, D.S.; Kieber, D.; Kyanka, G.; LaLonde, R.; Leopold, D.; Malmshiemer, R.; Meisner, M.; Meyer, R.; Muller-Schwarze, D.; Murphy, C.; Nakatsugawa, T.; Norton, R.; Porter, W.; Powell, W.; Quackenbush, L.; Raynal, D.; Reuter, D.; Ringler, N.; Schulz, K.; Scott, G.; Senecah, S.; Shannon, S.; Sardon, R.; Smart, L.; Smith, L.; Smith, W.; Spuches, C.; Stipanovic, A.; Stribley, K.; Teale, S.; Teece, M.; Tiss, K.; Tully, W.; Versotek, J.; Weir, A.; White, E.; Williamson, J.; Winter, W.; Yanai, R.; Guest Attendance: Bennett, M.; Boothroyd, B.; Collella, G.; Corbin, R.; Davis, S.; Driscoll, M.; Fellows, M.; Fennessy, M.; Fletcher, T.; Guerin, K.; Hamilton, J.; Heffernan, J.; Sanford, S.; Shaw, H.; Slocum, T.; Smith, J.; Storrings, D.; VanTress, D.; Wasiel, J.; Webb, C.; VanDruff, L.; Rafferty, M.

I. Call to Order

Chair Scott Shannon called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. in 5 Illick Hall.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of College Faculty meeting of February 15, 2001 were approved with no modifications.

III. Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Shannon reported on the slate of nominees for the upcoming Faculty Governance elections. The Committee will continue to seek nominees to round out the slate. Candidates include Gary Scott for Chair, Committee on Instruction; Bennette Tiffault, SU Senator; and William Bentley, William Winter, Paul Szemkow and Charles Spuches for At-Large Representatives.

IV. Report of the President

Dr. Murphy presented a Powerpoint presentation report summarizing the need for strategic planning at ESF; the proposed strategic planning process; the program "Daring to Dream;" and the proposed schedule for implementing the strategic planning process.

Dr. Murphy began with the question of "Why now?" He feels a sense of urgency and a need to get the College out of the "baling wire" approach to College planning. Many of our decisions are made in response to external constraints that are in the past.

The expected outcomes of strategic planning are first to recognize our shared values, which has already started at the Cabinet level. As a Faculty, we have challenges and opportunities to revitalize our vision for where we want the College to be in 2020. Most importantly, we must celebrate our success.

Lewis Marshall in 1929 and other influential figures in ESF's history encouraged big thinking and had visions for the College's future. Strategic planning is not new to ESF, but the process may be different now.

ESF is facing competition from other SUNY and private schools. 18 SUNY campuses have environmental programs that draw students from what were traditionally feeder institutions to ESF. Students have greater number of choices to pursue environmental programs, so we need to distinguish ourselves. Changes in technology and demographics will also influence how we conduct ourselves. The implementation schedule will include a Kickoff Convocation in Marshall Auditorium on April 12, a Strategic Planning Council meeting on May 23. Individual faculty and administrative unit efforts will continue through October 2001. Invitations to participate in the Strategic Planning Council will be sent out by the end of March 2001.

Faculty input will be sought throughout the process, but most particularly in the assessment of strengths/weaknesses, needs of society, new instruction and research areas, staff requirements and physical facilities.

The process will include

- Phase 1: Getting Organized (December 2000 through April 2001);
- Phase 2: Taking Stakes (April 2001 through December 2001);
- Phase 3: Developing a Vision (December 2001 through March 2002);
- Phase 4: Creating a Plan (March through May 2002);
- Phase 5: Implementing the Plan (May 2002 through September 2002).

Individual Faculty units will be scheduling meetings with the Provost throughout April. There will be a Workshop on May 9 and May 23, 2001.

In discussion, President Murphy stated that external facilitators will be used throughout the process at certain points. The process will include external review and stakeholders from outside ESF. Provost Tully noted that ESF's Strategic Planning process is more open with better participation than the current SU efforts.

V. Report of the Committee on Instruction - (Professor Lewis)

- a. Committee on Instruction recommends accepting proposal for Faculty of Chemistry to add a new course FCH 612 Advanced Environmental Chemistry. Motion passed voice vote.
- b. Committee on Instruction recommends accepting proposal from Faculty of Construction Management and Wood Products Engineering for the following curriculum changes and revised courses:
Revised Courses:
 - WPE 326 Fluid Treatment of Wood
 - WPE 331 Construction Safety
 - WPE 343 Construction Estimating
 - WPE 350 Construction Methods and Equipment
 - WPE 453 Construction Planning and Scheduling
 - WPE 454 Construction Project Management
 - WPE 455 Construction Contracts and Specifications
 - ERE 682 Transport Processes

New Courses:

WPE 376 Decay of Wood Products
WPE 430 Computer Applications in Construction Management
ERE 525 Construction Methods and Equipment
ERE 531 Construction Safety
ERE 543 Construction Estimating
ERE 630 Computer Applications in Construction Management
ERE 653 Construction Planning and Scheduling
ERE 654 Construction Project Management
ERE 658 Construction Contracts and Specifications
ERE 770 Biodegradation of Wood

Curriculum Changes:

Changes to the curriculum are proposed in the attachment to these minutes.
Changes are proposed to conform to professional accreditation requirements.
Motion passed by voice vote with no discussion.

- c. Professor Lewis presented the Committee's motion to approve a Resolution on the Implementation of General Education Programs. The full text of the resolution follows.

In response to discussion, Professor Lewis indicated that ESF is one of 22 campuses that will be submitting this resolution to SUNY. Students have been represented in discussions through the President's office. The Resolution passed by voice vote.

A fundamental principle of American higher education in public institutions is that the faculty of individual colleges or university campuses are responsible for the specific content of the academic curriculum, within a broad framework set by public governance. Local faculty members, who are most familiar with their professional fields and home institutions, are best able to design programs fulfilling the educational mission of the campus. This view is supported by the Report of the Provost's Task Force on General Education in 1999 and, particularly, the Report's guideline noting that the "Campuses are charged with devising distinctive and varied ways of achieving the goals of General Education in the spirit and within the parameters defined by the Trustees' resolution." This guideline was in keeping with the Board of Trustees' Resolution 98-241 on General Education, passed in December 1998, specifying that "The faculty of each institution will retain the responsibility for establishing the specific course requirements and content of a General Education curriculum reflective of the best practices in American higher education." Over the past two years, the administration and Faculty Governance at SUNY-ESF have worked diligently to create a General Education Program across a diverse array of faculties to comply with the Trustees' Resolution 98-241. As the General Education initiative has been implemented during past year, however, the Provost's Office of the State University of New York, under the auspices of the Provost's Advisory Council on General Education (PACGE), has controlled not only the framework of ESF's General Education program, but the specific courses and their content that will be allowed within the program. This centralized regulation of a local campus's curricular decisions has significantly hindered the successful implementation of

General Education curriculum and is contrary to the directives of the Trustees' Resolution.

The Faculty Governance at SUNY-ESF, speaking on behalf of the faculty, professional staff, and students, objects strongly to such detailed regulation of the General Education Program on our campus. We ask the Provost's Office to discontinue the practice of detailed course-by-course review and regulation that has undermined the effective establishment of the program, and to allow us to complete, without further disruption, the implementation of the program as required by Trustees' Resolution 98-241.

d. Policy for Undergraduate Minors

Professor Lewis moved, on behalf of the Committee, to accept a proposed policy for Undergraduate Minors, as detailed in the attachment to these minutes.

Professor Lewis moved to amend the proposed policy by striking from the proposed policy "*Minors will be open to all ESF students, however, students may not pursue a minor in the Faculty in which their major is located, but they may pursue an interdisciplinary minor even if their program Faculty is participating.*" and adding "*Interdisciplinary minors and minors centered at Syracuse University are open to all qualified students, however, students may not pursue a Faculty minor offered by the program in which they major.*" Motion was seconded by R. Meyer.

Roy Norton provided clarification of the intent of a minor is to pursue a body of knowledge outside to the chosen major. An Interdisciplinary minor is difficult to define, but the defining purpose should be to maximize the number of credit hours spent outside of the home program in pursuit of the minor.

Roy Norton moved to accept an amendment to the proposed policy stated as follows: *Requirements of interdisciplinary minors should be structured to ensure that course work taken within the student's home program is minimized.*

Norton motion seconded by R. Smardon.

P. Hopkins cautioned discretion in how a "course of study" is defined, since a course prefix does not necessarily indicate for what major the course is required. W. Powell requested clarification of "option," "concentration" and "minor." R. Frey replied that options and concentrations occur within a major, where a minor is not in the major.

C. Hall expressed concern over problem words such as "minimized" as too discretionary. L. Smart suggested requiring a minimum number of credit hours outside of major, rather than "at least half". W. Bentley indicated need for exceptions for students that want to minor in an interdisciplinary minor that is administered within a Faculty, but involves interdisciplinary coursework. M. Hall expressed concern that guidelines need to be offered with specific language of how an interdisciplinary minor is defined and administered. W. Tully summarized the discussion that the policy should be considered guidelines for evaluating proposals to develop minors. The policy should neither encourage nor preclude

proposals, and it's up to the minor to describe how the "minimum" required coursework will be determined. A. Lewis expressed that the policy should minimize prescription. R. Brock cautioned against too much prescription, since students want additional knowledge. A. Lewis stated that the presence of minors will be a useful recruiting tool for students seeking flexibility. A. Lewis indicated that some double counting of courses/credits may be allowable under the proposed policy. By way of example, most liberal arts colleges have minors because majors generally require about 32 credit hours; ESF requires typically in excess of 100 hours for its majors, so the demand for minors has been relatively small.

R. Meyer called the question. On the Norton amendment, there were 34 "aye" and 13 "nay" votes. The amendment passed.

On the Lewis amendment, there were 46 "aye" and 2 "nay" votes. The amendment passed.

On the proposed policy as amended, there was a majority by voice vote. The proposed policy passed as amended. The amended policy is included in the following passage.

Policy for Undergraduate Minors

An academic minor is a curricular component that enables a student to make an inquiry into a discipline or field of study, or to investigate a particular theme. It is organized around a specific set of objectives or question. The objectives of a minor are achieved through an ordered series of courses. Minors are intended to provide general insight in the subject. Course offerings in a minor may be centered in a specific Faculty or drawn from several Faculties as in the case of a topical or thematic focus.

The term "minor" in baccalaureate programs at ESF designates an approved use of 12-18 credit hours that constitute a coherent plan of study.

Minors may be a Faculty minor, an interdisciplinary minor, or a minor centered at Syracuse University. Faculty minors are defined by a program Faculty. Interdisciplinary minors are defined by two or more Faculties with oversight provided by a committee consisting of faculty from each participating Faculty. Minors centered at Syracuse University involve the ESF Dean of Instruction and Graduate Studies as such minors impact on inter-institution arrangements

Students elect a minor by application to (a) the Faculty offering the minor; (b) the committee overseeing an interdisciplinary minor; or (c) to the Dean of Instruction and Graduate Studies through their program Faculty for a minor centered at Syracuse University. Interdisciplinary minors and minors centered at Syracuse University are open to all qualified students, however, students may not pursue a Faculty minor offered by the program in which they major. Requirements of interdisciplinary minors should be structured to ensure that course work taken within the student's home program is minimized.

Proposals for minors will include (a) the prerequisites required; (b) specific courses requirements to complete the minor; and (c) how the courses will be chosen from among lower and upper division courses, general education courses, professional prerequisites, major requirements, and electives.

*Upon successful completion, minors are identified on student transcripts.
The College Faculty approves all minors prior to description in the College
catalog and other communications.*

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring the signature and any text that might have been present.

Douglas Daley
Secretary