



One Forestry Drive, Syracuse, NY 13210, USA

Faculty Governance Meeting, February 28th, 2008

Attendance: Larry Abrahamson, Neal Abrams, Marcia Barber, Bruce Bongarten, Kelley Donaghy, Allan Drew, Mark Driscoll, Betsy Elkins, JoAnne Ellis, Linda Galloway, John Hassett, Richard Hawks, Tom Horton, Maria Hosmer-Briggs, Marla Jabbour, Laura Lautz, Shijie Liu, Robert Meyer, Sharon Moran, Doug Morrison, Lindi Quackenbush, Cariann Quick, Neil Ringler, Gary Scott, Bill Smith, Art Stipanovic, Kenneth Tiss, Ruth Yanai, Lianjun Zhang

1. Call to Order at 3:37 pm
 - a. Bill Shields
 - b. Note: no quorum
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting (1/2008) - approved
 - a. Laura Lautz
3. Reports of the Standing Committees
 - a. COI Chair: Gary Scott
 - i. Approved by COI
 1. Landscape Architecture
 - a. LSA 312 Place/Culture/Design
 - ii. Submitted for Faculty Approval
 1. Dual Majors
 - a. Approval process for Dual Majors (apply for by petition)
 - i. 2.0 GPA
 - ii. After 30 and before 90 credits (BS)
 - iii. After 18 and before 45 credits (AAS)
 - b. Interdepartmental majors
 - i. All combinations allowed
 - c. Intradepartmental majors
 - i. CMWPE : Construction Management and Wood Products Engineering allowed
 - ii. EFB : Biotechnology with any other EFB program except Environmental Biology
 - iii. FNRM : Not allowed at BS; allows at AAS
 - iv. PBE : Bioprocess Engineering with either Paper Engineering or Paper Science
 - d. Advisors in both programs
 - e. Complete plan sheets for both programs
 - f. Proposal is up for a vote by faculty
 - i. There was a move from the floor to suspend rules of order (due to lack of quorum),

which was seconded. By suspending rules of order, we are allowing a vote without a quorum. Approved by vote from the floor (Tom Horton dissents).

- ii. Dual Major proposal approved by vote of faculty.
- iii. Discussion at Next COI Meeting
 1. Paper and Bioprocess Engineering
 - a. BS Bioprocess Engineering
 - b. BPE 310 Colloid and Interface Science
 - c. BPE 335 Transport Phenomena
 - d. BPE 420 Bioseparations
 - e. BPE 421 Bioprocess Kinetics and Systems
 - f. BPE 440 Bioprocess and Systems Laboratory
 2. Forest and Natural Resource Management
 - a. BS Natural Resource Management
 - b. Minor in Recreation Resource and Protected Area Management
 - c. FOR 476/676 Ecotourism and Nature Tourism
 - d. Drop Recreation Resources Minor
 3. Environmental Resource and Forest Engineering
 - a. FEG 331/511 Ecological Engineering in the Tropics
 - b. FEG 412/612 River Classification
 4. OI&GS
 - a. Full-time Graduate Certification
 5. COI Academic Standards
 - a. Late drop petition form
 - b. Policy for deletion of required courses
- iv. Awaiting Action from Department
 1. Landscape Architecture (R. Hoffman)
 - a. LSA 333 Plant Materials
 - b. LSA 433 Planting Design and Practice
 2. Environmental Resource and Forest Engineering (J. Hassett)
 - a. BS Forest Engineering
 - b. FEG 133 Introduction to Engineering Design
 - c. FEG 275 Ecological Engineering I
 - d. FEG 335 Numerical and Computing Methods
 - e. FEG 365 Principles of Remote Sensing
 - f. ERE 468 Solid Waste Management
 - g. ERE 475 Ecological Engineering II
 3. Division of Environmental Science (T. Volk)
 - a. Option in Renewable Energy
 - b. Minor in Renewable Energy
 - c. ESC 325/625 Energy Systems
 - d. ESC 335/635 Renewable Energy

- e. ESC 422/622 Energy Markets and Regulation
- f. ESC 450 Renewable Energy Capstone Planning
- g. ESC 460 Renewable Energy Capstone
- 4. Currently Under Review
 - a. Paper and Bioprocess Engineering (S. Liu)
 - i. BPE 441/ERE 641 Biomass Energy
 - b. Environmental and Forest Biology (D. Parry)
 - i. EFB 101/102 General Biology I
 - ii. EFB 103/104 General Biology II
 - c. Paper and Bioprocess Engineering (S.Liu)
 - i. ERE 501 Bioprocess Microbiology
 - ii. ERE 502 Bioseparations
 - iii. ERE 503 Bioprocess Plant Design
 - iv. ERE 534 Transport Phenomena
 - v. ERE 542 Bioreaction Engineering
- b. COR Chair: Tom Horton
 - i. Spotlight on Student Research – April 16th
 - 1. Future online submission for abstracts
 - a. This will be finalized by next week, depending on security of system and logistical issues.
 - b. This is being facilitated by Paul Otteson’s new colleague.
 - c. If online submission goes through, April 2nd will be the due date for abstracts
 - 2. Alumni association is getting involved to judge undergraduate posters and to provide prize money for winning posters (1st, 2nd and 3rd place - \$500 total)
 - a. Also looking for judges for graduate student posters – Faculty? Postdocs?
 - b. All chairs – please let Tom know about ideas for representation for judging at the Spotlight
 - ii. Exemplary Research Award announcement has gone out and nominations are coming in
- c. COPSO Chair: Allan Drew – no report

4. Discussion

- a. Will Faculty Governance survive? Today, we discussed the relevance of Faculty Governance at ESF and how we can foster greater participation

Members of College Faculty will need to nominate or be nominated (make sure your choice is willing to serve!) as replacements for:

- i. **Outgoing Executive Chair**
- ii. **Chair of the Committee on Public Service & Outreach**
- iii. **Four At Large members of governance**
- iv. **One SU Senator**

When (if?) nominations are received, a mail ballot will be prepared and submitted to the Faculty for action.

b. Discussion

- i. Bill Shields – No nominations received so far.
- ii. Elizabeth Elkins – Please describe the process used to solicit nominations.
- iii. Bill Shields – Nominations are due at the same time every year, per the bylaws.
- iv. Ruth Yanai – How many time has the executive committee met this year?
- v. Bill Shields – This year? Zero. Last year, twice.
- vi. Ruth Yanai – It's your job to convene the Executive Committee monthly to plan these meetings. Normally, the Executive Committee also serves as a nominating committee.
- vii. Bill Shields – In the past, few individuals have shown up for executive committee meetings. I accept responsibility for the fact that few people show up at faculty governance meetings and/or participate in the process. People see faculty governance as a waste of time. What are we doing about it collectively or individually? What are suggestions for improving faculty governance? One idea is to get speakers for faculty meetings to discuss important topics. When the faculty was solicited for topics of discussion last year, there was lots of feedback.
- viii. Bob Meyer – Others have looked forward to the President's Report. Why doesn't he present at faculty meetings anymore?
- ix. Ruth Yanai – I will volunteer to convene nominating committee, if Bill won't organize it.
- x. Bill Shields – I will organize a nominating committee to nominate individuals for faculty governance...As an example of faculty governance's limited role/recognition, the Provost organized an ad hoc committee recently to revise the P&T process. He was not aware of previous efforts of faculty governance to review and address the P&T process. The faculty governance ad hoc committee of the past addressed many of the issues now being raised by the Provost. If the campus is run, in part, by faculty, then why are our efforts being duplicated?
- xi. Bruce Bongarten – This is a community issue. Many have a role in making faculty governance work. This is something that we as a community need to solve together. Much of what is being discussed is true. We need to make faculty governance more meaningful. It is one thing to have discussion, but it needs to play a greater role. For example, the P&T issue will come before this faculty – faculty need to have a voice in the matters that concern them. I have a role, as well, to involve the faculty in the decisions that are being made. The Provost can accept some of the blame for

faculty governance not being all that it can be, but we need to work towards improvements. A good start is convening a committee to solicit nominees. We should resolve to make faculty governance more meaningful.

- xii. Bill Shields – Is there any other campus where the honors program is run by administration? (as an example) What is the role of faculty?
- xiii. Bruce Bongarten – Administrators do have faculty appointments. In the case of the honors program, there were no faculty interested in taking on responsibility for the honors program
- xiv. Bill Shields – Faculty don't live up to the responsibilities of helping run campus activities. Why? Because we are comfortable. But, faculty should take a greater role in these activities. I'm not sure how to solve this problem – we'll go out and recruit nominations for faculty governance. We have come up with ideas for increasing participation in faculty governance in the past (such as the new faculty governance structure that was voted on last year), but it was voted down.
- xv. Bruce Bongarten – What would we like to see from faculty governance?
- xvi. Ruth Yanai – Department governance works well (high attendance, interest).
- xvii. Bill Shields – Yes, because we make decisions.
- xviii. Bruce Bongarten – Should we have fewer meetings that are full of more significant content? (Right now we have 6 meetings a year.) The bylaws can be amended to make this change.
- xix. Tom Horton – What do we bring in to meetings that will make a difference? We voted on the Dual Major proposal without a quorum. Why not refuse to take action until we have a quorum?
- xx. Bill Shields – Maybe we don't need full faculty governance if things are distributed, such as they are for COI (representative structure). Should we move towards committees with representation from each department?
- xxi. Rich Hawks – Faculty do show up for the committee meetings (such as COI) routinely and in high numbers. It is the larger assembly that doesn't draw participation. Faculty are participating in governance, through meetings and committees, etc. So, we should abandon the idea of governance? At this level, there is little participation. It appears that COI is effective and working. But, we can't even get a debate on crucial issues in the larger faculty governance.
- xxii. Bill Shields – We did generate a lot of participation for discussion of Environmental Science. But then the discussion just stopped. What is the role of the larger faculty?
- xxiii. Lindi Quackenbush – It isn't a lack of interest. It is just time. Everyone is quite overwhelmed and has limited time. We all

review the minutes to get information, but often lack time to attend the meeting. We may participate in faculty governance through other committees, etc. The delegation of responsibilities to representative committees, such as COI, is working.

- xxiv. Bill Shields – Can we go back to departments and ask why people don't participate and why they voted against a more representative structure for faculty governance? Why are we more willing to have standing committees for full faculty?
- xxv. Elizabeth Elkins – We used to make decisions in faculty governance. Now those decisions are made in committees, such as COI. This is not a new problem and it has been developing over time. Maybe we should have fewer meetings next year that could be to discuss governance structure. To come together as a community is helpful for the community. We used to have faculty governance generate an agenda for the year to tackle through the meetings.
- xxvi. Bruce Bongarten – Everyone agrees that the issue is what value do you get from faculty governance. A couple of things that would increase the value are to have the President speak (or Provost) and to have fewer meetings with more significant discussion.
- xxvii. Bill Shields – The best attended meeting last year was the one where Neil Ringler discussed how IFR is spent. It was a meaningful discussion with important information.
- xxviii. Tom Horton – What would be relevant for these meetings? The chair could ask the faculty for topics of importance to the community. This would be a mechanism where people could get their ideas into the agenda.
- xxix. Bill Shields – We did this in the past and have been working through issues raised during that brainstorm. Faculty governance would be improved if we all returned to our faculty and asked what would make faculty governance better, including what topics they want to discuss. I also suggest that items of concern need to be address, rather than just discussed. If we didn't have an Executive Chair we would be operating illegally according to the SUNY Board of Trustees. Faculties have to govern the faculties they are on.
- xxx. Bruce Bongarten – What would it take to have 2 meetings a year rather than the current structure?
- xxxi. Bill Shields – It would require a change to the bylaws and a paper ballot vote. What do we think about fewer meetings? (Many hands shown in support of this idea.)
- xxxii. Dudley Raynal – There is important decision making that this body must do (such as decisions regarding dual majors). Fewer meetings may discourage participation in faculty governance and in these important decisions.

- xxxiii. Gary Scott – COI currently works from a bottom up structure (individual departments make proposals, they are reviewed by COI and sometimes forwarded to the full faculty). Faculty governance should guide COI on larger topics for a top down approach. For example, initiating a humanities college at ESF would come out of faculty governance, rather than bottom up (from departments). Faculty governance should emphasize establishing the bigger picture, rather than just responding to the bottom up topics.
- xxxiv. Bill Smith – If we go to 2 meetings minimum, we will probably only have 2 meetings (not more). From my perception, many of us feel that our employment is through our department rather than the college. Therefore, cutting back the number of meetings takes away the feeling that we work for the college, rather than the department. Meetings have to address topics that impact individual faculty.
- xxxv. Bill Shields – There is not much decision making at the college level. It all happens in standing committees.

5. New Business

- a. Next meeting will include the President's Report.
- b. Bruce Bongarten – Most of you know we have an ad hoc P&T committee. That will be a topic of discussion next fall that will be of great interest to the community.

6. Old Business

7. Adjourned at 4:25