Meeting of the College Faculty
16 October 2003
Alumni Lounge
4 PM

1. Meeting was <u>called to order</u> by Scott Turner at 4:00 p.m.

2. <u>Approval of minutes</u>: Minutes from the Sept. 11, 2003 meeting were accepted as distributed. A technology disaster has detained the minutes of the April 2003 faculty meeting. They are expected in November at which time they may be approved.

3. <u>Kudos</u> were offered to colleagues as follows:

   - ***To Bill Shields*** (Environmental & Forest Biology):
     for his work clarifying the use of mitochondrial DNA in forensic applications, and in particular, the importance of ethnic diversity within forensic DNA data bases, which was reported in the Dallas News 25 September 2003.

   - ***To Steve Stehman*** (Forestry):
     for being honored with the ESF College Foundation's Award for Exceptional Achievement in Teaching for 2003.

   - ***To Annette Kretzer*** (Environmental & Forest Biology):
     for her cover design for the latest issue of *Mycologia,* which accompanied her article (Kretzer AM, Luoma DL, Molina R, and Spatafora JW, 2003: Taxonomy of the *Rhizopogon vinicolor* species complex based on analysis of ITS sequences and microsatellite loci. *Mycologia* 95: 479-486.

   - ***To Jim Palmer*** (Landscape Architecture):
     who will be inducted as a 2003 Fellow of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA), the highest honor that a landscape architect can receive from the Society.

   - ***To James Gibbs*** (Environmental & Forest Biology):
     for his recent work published in *Science* (3 October 2003), on the population genetics of giant tortoise populations in the Galapagos.

4. There were no <u>Information items</u> from the floor.

5. <u>Nominating Committee for Chancellor's Awards & Distinguished Professorships</u>: Scott Turner

   Members for this committee have been solicited and the current membership is as follows: Ruth Yanai (convenor,) Allan Drew (Forestry Faculty,) Angela Eddy (student Trustee,) Liz Reif (Vice President, USA,) and Kathleen Creek (undergrad,) The process will start early (next week) Other volunteers are welcome (especially students.) This committee is charged with seeking nominations and to aid in compiling nomination packages. A selection committee will complete the process.

6. <u>Committee on Instruction</u>: Craig Davis presented two issues for information only. A vote will occur later.

    I.   Policy on Incomplete and Missing Grades.

- The College Registrar may assign a temporary grade of "NR" when the course grade is not received from the course instructor by the grade deadline.

- No degree will be conferred until all the grades of "I " or "NR" has been resolved.

The following statement will replace existing policy for incomplete grades in the ESF Catalog:

Incomplete and missing grades

An instructor may assign a temporary grade of "I" only when the student is passing and has nearly completed the course, but because of circumstances beyond the student's control, the work is not completed. *A temporary grade of "NR" may be assigned by the College Registrar when the course grade is not received from the course instructor by the grade deadline.* Grades of "I" *or "NR"* must be resolved prior to the end of the semester following that in which the grade was received. At the request of the instructor and under extraordinary conditions, an "I" may be extended for one additional semester. If the incomplete is not resolved by the appropriate deadline, it will be changed to a grade of "I/F or "I/U." *If the "NR" grade is not resolved by the appropriate deadline, it will be changed to a grade of "NR/F" or ""NR/U." No degree will be conferred until all the grades of "I" or "NR" have been resolved.*

There was <u>discussion</u> of this policy and the following issues/concerns were raised:

- "NR" means that no grade has been submitted to the registrar. This is the faculty member's problem not the students but when "NR" turns to an "F" the student is punished. This shouldn't happen.

- Computation for valedictorian and salutatorian doesn't include "I" grades. What about "NR?"

- Is there a problem with "NR" on a course that is not required for graduation? "I/F" or "NR/F" etc. stays on the permanent record of the student. Can it be explained or resolved? If nothing happens "NR" becomes "I" or "U." Or the grade gets changed.

- Can there be a petition for correction? Yes

- What does this do to the high performing student who is let down by faculty member? The issue should be resolved quickly.

- Current process gives student "I" not "NR." An "I" is the student's responsibility. "NR" is faculty member's concern.

    II.   A Policy to Limit Credit hours for Students on Probation

This comes from the dismissal and appeals process. There is an increase in the number of students on probation taking a heavy load. This policy would limit credit hours for students on probation to 15 credit hours.

There was <u>discussion</u> of this policy and the following issues/concerns were raised:

- What if curriculum requires more credits? Maybe the student should step back, take more time?

- Why 15 credits? What about labs (16 credits might be better?)

- It is important for the student and advisor to discuss this. Both are notified of the probation.   Is a new policy needed?

- Good advising is key to this problem.

Reminders from the Committee on Instruction:

- Wednesday 22 Oct. is the last day for students to drop a course without academic penalty.

- Dates for COI meeting dates (also listed on the web page) are as follows: Oct. 30, Dec. 4, Jan. 15, Feb. 12, March 18 and April 15.

- Remember the deadline for curriculum proposals is Feb. 1 and the deadline for course proposals is March l.

7. Resolution on General Education Assessment: from Scott Shannon was presented by Scott Turner.
    http://www.esf.edu/facgov/miscellaneous/ESFGenEdRes.pdf

<div align="center">

Proposed 9/11/03
SUNY-ESF RESOLUTION
On General Education Assessment

</div>

WHEREAS the SUNY Board of Trustees voted to pursue a standardized system–wide assessment of general education in June 2003; and

WHEREAS the purpose of general education assessment has been understood to be an evaluation of a campus' programs, not an assessment of individual students; and

WHEREAS it is our belief that assessment needs to be a campus-based activity for the following reasons:

- Such a standardized system-wide assessment would interfere explicitly with the fundamental academic freedom of instructors in discussing their subject, an important element of higher education in a democracy.
- A standardized system-wide assessment would appear to presuppose a system-wide curriculum, which would tend to undermine the rigor and comprehensive nature of each campus' General Education Program.
- The College of Environmental Science and Forestry created a General Education Assessment Plan mandated by SUNY System Administration which was approved by ESF's Faculty Governance in May 2002 and approved by SUNY GEAR under the auspicies of SUNY Central Administration's Provost's office, and which is currently in its first year of a three-year cycle of implementation.
- SUNY-ESF adopted the SUNY Learning Outcomes and Guidelines for the Approval of State University General Education Requirement Courses and in addition developed for our campus a more in-depth set of learning objectives.
- The logistics of such testing would appear to be insurmountable, given that general education occurs throughout each student's undergraduate tenure, with students following numerous individual routes in choosing from the intellectually rich diversity that is appropriate to a university education; and given that general education requirements can be met through coursework taken at other institutions, including high schools and study abroad programs, making an examination given at one campus an evaluation not only of that campus but of many other teaching and learning environments.
- Uniform system-wide standardized assessment at any point prior to the completion of the undergraduate general education experience would not reflect the accomplishments of the graduate.

- Any funds which might be spent developing such a vehicle would be better spent on enhancing individual campus-based undergraduate assessment.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Faculty of the SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry will continue to follow the General Education Assessment Plan of its own design, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: the Faculty of the SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry will not support, embrace, or voluntarily participate in any SUNY-mandated standardized General Education Assessment Plan that:

- Does not involve faculty, nor facilitates ultimate faculty approval, in both the design and implementation of a system-wide assessment instrument
- Utilizes a battery of "high stakes" standardized tests delivered to all SUNY students
- Establishes a linkage between campus performance in General Education as assessed using a system-wide instrument and individual SUNY campus budget allocations
- Publicly reports "raw" scores derived from a system-wide assessment instrument
- Does not consider or measure each campus' "value added" as a component in the assessment of General Education learning outcomes
- Is inadequately funded by SUNY Central Administration, or draws upon existing local campus budget resources.

Scott Turner presented some explanation of this resolution and asked that the resolution be passed:

- This proposal for values added assessment from the SUNY trustees is not viewed favorably by the SUNY Faculty Senate and is viewed as undermining the work of SUNY faculty on their campuses.

- SUNY Faculty Senate has a memo of understanding that expresses their concerns. Campuses are passing resolutions like this. This will be an on the SUNY Faculty Senate agenda later this month. Reports in the newspaper indicate that value added testing is a done deal. This resolution would confirm that we oppose this kind of testing. There is concern about intellectual freedom and how tests would be administered?

Following a motion to pass this resolution, there was discussion on this resolution with the following concerns/issues raised:

- Who would write the test and how would it be administered? Details are unknown but Provost Tully indicated it would probably be ETS (Educational Testing Services in Princeton, NJ).

- Provost Tully moved that there be an amendment to the resolution. He asked that "ESF" be inserted in front of Faculty in the first statement of the "be it resolved" section to read: "Does not involve faculty, nor facilitates ultimate _ESF_ faculty approval, in both the design and implementation of a system-wide assessment instrument."

There was more discussion:

- Could this backfire? Are there any political implications? If inevitable, we have to conform. If we agree, will we aggravate people? Faculty taking a position shouldn't make people angry.

- President Murphy supports the resolution. This shouldn't be an issue for us. Action is two years away and much will happen in this time.

The Amendment to the resolution passed.

There was further discussion:

- Confusion about some of the terminology such as "high stakes." Suggest we change adequate from inadequate. Strike some of these terms. Confusing to do this with in meeting.
- Motion to postpone this resolution (until the next meeting) so that cleaner revisions may be made. There was no second to this motion.

The question was called and the resolution passed unanimously.

8. By-laws amendment: Representation of Faculty Governance on Academic Council: Scott Turner presented this amendment to the Faculty bylaws:

   http://www.esf.edu/facgov/miscellaneous/accourep.pdf

Faculty Governance Representation on Academic Council

Amendment to ESF Faculty Governance By-Laws

Introduced 16 October 2003

Motion: To make the following alterations (underlined) to the ESF Faculty Governance By-Laws.

C.1.b. Executive Chair. Biennially, in even-numbers years, the voting faculty shall elect one of its members to serve as Executive Chair who may serve no more than two successive terms. The Executive Chair shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the Faculty, and Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee, shall represent the faculty at College Board of Trustees meetings, and at ESF Academic Council meetings, and shall exercise other powers as are set forth in these by-laws. In the absence of the Executive Chair, the Secretary shall act as Executive Chair.

Scott Turner moved that the faculty pass this amendment to the bylaws that would amend the duties of the executive chair to include representing the faculty at Academic Council. A vote would be taken at a later date via secret ballot.

Discussion/questions followed:

- Where did this come from? There is concern from some that this is important, that faculty interests are not adequately represented through faculty heads on the Academic Council.

- President Murphy has a few concerns. The Academic Council is an administrative entity. Has Provost Tully been consulted?

- What is the role of the executive chair of the faculty on the ESF Board of Trustees? Executive chair attends meetings and represents the faculty but has no vote.

- What would be the role of executive chair on the Academic Council?   Don't the Faculty Chairs represent their faculty? Why is the elected head of the faculty not included? There may be issues of the faculty as a whole that are not represented?

There was a <u>motion to postpone the resolution indefinitely</u>.

More discussion followed:

- This needs to be discussed among the faculty.

- It is the prerogative of the administration to invite people to this meeting, not the faculty.

<u>The Motion to postpone the resolution passed</u>.

9. Sense of the Faculty Resolution on Tenure & Promotion at ESF: Scott Turner
        http://www.esf.edu/facgov/ExecChDocs/tpresol.pdf

Resolution on Tenure and Promotion at ESF

Whereas:

I. An *ad hoc* Committee on Promotion and Tenure was empanelled last year to examine current practices and policies of evaluation and recommendation for promotion and tenure, specifically:

   A.   to report on the state of tenure and promotion at the ESF campus, in particular whether is it leading us to institutional excellence.

   B.   to inform us of alternative models for promotion and tenure, and our opinions on whether these might better foster a culture of academic excellence at the College.

   C.   to lead the general faculty in a broad and open discussion concerning these matters.

   D.   to make recommendations for changes in our practices of promotion and tenure if we see fit.

II. That committee reported to the ESF faculty its findings and submitted a written report outlining its activities and recommendations, available at the Faculty Governance web site (http://www.esf.edu/facgov/ExecChDocs/ptfinal1.pdf).

III. Among its findings were:

   A.   that policies on tenure and promotion sometimes differ significantly between departments,

   B.   that it would be desirable to have a single set of policies and procedures that could be effectively used by all units on campus

   C.   that tenure and promotion policies should take into account the diversity of academic disciplines on campus.

D.   that many other institutions are attempting to streamline their processes of evaluation, promotion and tenure, to make them more reflective of scholarly excellence, less dependent upon the "audit culture" for measuring scholarly merit, more transparent, and less susceptible to inappropriate judgments.

E.   that improvements in our policies on promotion and tenure would foster a culture of academic excellence that would both help our faculty develop in creative ways, and help attract and retain the brightest scholars.

IV.   Among its recommendations were:

A.   that tenure and promotion should be more formally affiliated with the mentoring of faculty at every stage of their careers.

B.   that there should be a college-wide policy on the kinds of portfolios that are generated and maintained by all faculty eligible for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

C.   that there should be a minimal set of objective goals to be met in individuals' progress towards promotion and tenure.

D.   that portfolios for evaluation should reflect the missions of individuals' administrative units.

E.   that evaluation for promotion and tenure should move as much as possible away from the "audit culture" that equates scholarly excellence with simple measures like numbers of publications, weighting of credits for authorships, numbers of students, cumulative credit hours taught, and so forth.

F.   that portfolios should, as much as possible, be "individual-centered", built upon a candidate's individual case for why they are worthy for promotion and tenure.

G.   that there should be a campus-level system, run by faculty, for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure, that will either supplement or supplant the current system of departmental evaluation.

Resolved:

That Faculty Governance should take steps to establish and implement a campus-level system for promotion and tenure in accordance with the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

This is an Issue from last year, reported last October by the Committee on Tenure and Promotion. More discussion occurred during the year and the committee now puts forth this resolution to consider moving forward with their recommendation and the policy they recommend. If the resolution passes steps to move in this direction, including a campus level committee would be taken.

Discussion:

- What does establish and implement mean? It means go back to committee and ask them to move forward. The mechanism for moving forward would be determined by the committee. Steps would be discussed along the way by the faculty. How is it that we evaluate faculty? Committee would come up with set of recommendations.

- Study and recommend? This is unclear.

- Was there an administrative representative on this committee? There is disagreement as to whether this resolution represents what the committee decided. Challenged.

- The problem isn't adequately defined. Other institutions' problems are not necessarily ours.

- Tenure and promotion is perhaps the most important thing we do. There is too much confusion with this resolution to vote now.

- This should go back to the committee to continue the dialogue and identify the appropriate steps.

It was moved and seconded that the <u>vote be postponed until the Dec. meeting</u> with ample time provided for discussion. <u>This motion passed unanimously.</u>

10. Sense of the Faculty Resolution on Faculty Review and Oversight of the Budget: Scott Turner
   http://www.esf.edu/facgov/miscellaneous/bcresol.pdf

Resolution on Faculty Review and Oversight of the Budget

Whereas:

I.   The Executive Committee of Faculty Governance is charged with reviewing the College's budget requests and appropriations throughout the budget cycle with the President,

II.   Review and oversight of the budget is a vital concern of the Faculty of the College,

III. The SUNY Senate has determined that an essential part of rational fiscal policy is regular consultation between faculty and administration over spending priorities and budget allocations,

IV.   The SUNY Senate has included among its "best practices" for rational fiscal policy the involvement of an independent, and fully engaged faculty committee charged with budgetary matters,

Resolved:

That Faculty Governance should take steps to establish and implement a new standing Committee on the Budget, to be charged with reviewing the College's budget requests and appropriations throughout the budget cycle with the President, and making recommendations that reflect the considered opinion of the faculty on budgetary matters.

Passing this resolution would start the process of creating a new standing committee on the Budget. If passed would bring ESF into conformity with SUNY Senate Best Practice. The executive committee moves adoption of this resolution. No second was needed.

Discussion followed with these comments/concerns:

- President Murphy indicated that he is prepared to operate with this however the faculty wishes. He currently presents a budget report to the ESF Board of Trustees and to the ESF Faculty twice each year with few questions. There is a very short time between budget notification and when ESF information is due back to SUNY. This is generally only a few weeks and occurs in the summer when the ability to have consultation with faculty is difficult.

- We have administrators to handle budget issues. The Faculty does not have the information necessary to participate.

- Vice President Webb pointed out that over 70% of the budget is allocated for salaries. A large portion of the balance is for facilities (mail, utilities, etc.) Only 3-4% is left for

discretionary expenses (known to faculty as OTPS.) This leaves very little room for meaningful faculty input and is that a good use of faculty time?

- This is not a new concern for faculty governance. The OPEC (Organization of Past Executive Chairs) functioned as a budget advisory group in the past.

- Create an ad hoc committee and try it out before establishing a standing committee.

- Executive committee is "budget committee" in a sense. But SUNY Senate recommends we undertake a standing committee.

- We have a more collegial relationship and good communication with our administration than do many SUNY campuses. We have enough information about the budget.

Motion to adopt this resolution failed.

11. President's Report: In the interest of time President Murphy did not review his prepared slides but discussed two important issues.

I. Ethics Commission Faculty Reporting Requirements:

- There is a significant change in the ethics commission reporting requirements. The Office of Human Resources is ready to help with questions regarding the necessary questions

- SUNY Faculty who earn $70,851 or more must file an Annual Financial Disclosure directly with the New York State Ethics Commission instead of the SUNY-1 form, which was administered by the College.

- November 15 is the Deadline for filing the Annual Financial Disclosure Statement.

II. Budget issue:

- There is a contingency in the budget to be used if there is a mid- year cut. It looks promising that we will not have to use the contingency funding.

- We need to invest in faculty.

- We will identify 3-4 faculty slots to fill and will begin searches as early as Nov. 1

- We will then review the budget vs. expenses at the end of the second quarter and may proceed with 1-2 additional searches in mid January.

- Chairs and faculty should advance their priorities to Bill Tully.

12. Old business

The new scheduling paradigm at SU has not been approved yet. It is complicated, more than changes to the MWF schedule and changing classes to 80 minutes. Alternatives are being proposed with more traditional and different blocks. The proposal is only for undergraduate classes. Graduate courses not affected. Labs and studios were not considered. A vote is scheduled for the Nov. meeting at SU Senate.

13. There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth A. Elkins (for Ruth Yanai)