Campus-Wide Faculty Meeting
Wednesday, December 1, 2010
408 Baker Hall
3:30 PM

Attending: **Adir Ecological Center:** ? remote viewing?   **Chemistry:** Neal Abrams, Israel Cabasso, John Hassett, David Kieber, Huiting Mao, Christopher Nomura, Arthur Stipanovic Mark Teece. **Cons Mgmt & Wood Pro Eng:** Robert Meyer, William Smith.   **Env Res and For Eng:** Douglas Daley, Lindi Quackenbush,   **Env Science** Tim Knight. **Env Studies:** Valerie Luzadis, **Environ & Forest Bio:** Terry Ettinger, Melissa Fierke, Jacqueline Frair, James Gibbs, Charles Hall, Donald Leopold, Lee Newman, William Powell. **Forest & Natural Res. Mgmt:** Peter Black, Ruth Yanai.   **Forest Tech Prog:** ? remote viewing? **Info technology**: ? remote viewing?   **Instruction/Grad Studies** Suzette Vandeburg. **Landscape Architecture:** none. **Moon Library:** Jo Anne Ellis, Stephen Weiter. **Outreach:** Charles Spuches,   **Paper/Bioprocess Engineering** Klaus Doelle, Yuan-Zong Lai, Gary Scott. **Research Programs** Mark Driscoll.

The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m. by Kelley Donaghy.

1. First-time Webcast of an ESF Faculty Meeting
This meeting was webcast by Christopher Baycura and Ross Jacobs, allowing viewing from our other campuses and also by Syracuse faculty not able to attend.
http://www.esf.edu/facgov/meeting.dec1.htm
The Excecutive Committee is currently debating whether links to this and future webcasts should be password protected or freely available.

2. Minutes
Minutes of the last meeting were approved as corrected and posted at
http://www.esf.edu/facgov/meetings.htm

3. Committee Reports

a. Committee on Research (Frair)

The committee is currently reviewing McIntire-Stennis full proposals. The ORP will announce those receiving funding by 17 December so PIs can start recruiting their graduate students for the following fall.

Before we break for the semester the ORP will be issuing the RFP for the competitive Seed Grant program, which provides up to $8K in funds to PIs that are intended to be used in a manner that helps refine and bolster larger, externally-funded research proposals. This program was initiated in 2007 with $60K total funding (roughly 8 awards/year), and has become an important source of support for early career scientists, those transitioning between grants, and those wishing to pursue high-risk new directions. Given severe budget cuts in the past two years, we are fortunate to have this program continued even at the reduced level of $30K total funding (roughly 4 grants will be awarded this year). Anyone submitting a proposal this year who previously had seed funding is asked to document how the use of those funds supported their program and stimulated additional awards – that is our first step towards documenting the importance of this program as a way to help ensure its continued funding. We are working out the dates yet as we refine the RFP, but they won't be due until after mid-February to give sufficient time for their development.

I mentioned in our last meeting that the committee was going to take a look at research policies, starting with the newly crafted ORP Policy 10 addressing Ownership of Data. This particular policy will be brought to a spring faculty meeting for input. Currently, I am working with the ORP, Associate Provost Shannon's office, and Art Stipanovic to make sure this policy meshes appropriately with other standing policies both referenced by the document and those influenced by this policy, and that some particular issues regarding the handling of grievances are clarified. In the process of compiling related policies for cross-referencing, I became aware of how relatively inaccessible our research policies are on the internet

(through an intranet site without a direct link from our web pages) and I am now working with the ORP to make them more openly accessible. This is especially important for this particular policy, which affects graduate students and should be readily accessible to them. We'll keep you posted on any changes, and ask for your input on site functionally as things develop.

b. Committee on Awards (Spuches)

The committee is lacking nominations for Chancellor's Awards in Scholarship and Creative Activities (this includes Research) and Faculty Service. These are due by 12/15.

There are no nominations for Distinguished Professorships (due 1/29).

Honorary degrees: Please send your ideas to the committee by 4/1/11.

c. Committee on Instruction (Doelle)

The petition for dropping a course after the deadline no longer includes, as a reason, "Forgot to file registration form and/or to complete drop process" or "Advising problems." The new form retains the other reasons, which are personal health, family emergency, personal emergency, and financial hardship, each requiring documentation.

Important deadlines:

Last day for departments to submit listing of inactive courses that need to be dropped in the 2011-12 catalog. 15-Dec-2010
Appeals Review Meeting of Subcommittee of Academic standards. 13-Jan 2011
Last day for submission of curriculum proposals for implementation in the 2011-12 catalog. 01-Feb-2011
Last day for submission of course proposals for implementation in the 2011-12 catalog. 01-Mar-2011

Please visit the web site to review proposals and send us feedback. http://cww.esf.edu/coi/

2. SEFA/UNITED WAY (Ettinger)

There are two days to go on the campaign. We were setting records for contributions until two weeks ago, but now we are about $7000 short of our goal of $65,000. We have 20% fewer contributors than in previous years. However, 50% of contributors have increased their contributions. If you haven't contributed yet, please do, and encourage your colleagues to contribute. Come Friday morning to Moon Library Conference Room for the end-of-campaign bagel breakfast.

3. TG This Friday (Katie Barnhill)

Please come to the TG in Nifkin this Friday for Trivia Quiz night. Bring your mug.

4. SUNY Senator Report (Doelle)

The SUNY Senate met at Alfred State College on October 23.

Topics focused on the budget crisis, and particularly the cutting of programs without faculty consultation. Two resolutions were passed.

Resolution on Consultation with Governance

Whereas SUNY campuses are facing extraordinary financial pressures, and

Whereas campuses may be forced to consider program consolidation, suspension or elimination, and
Whereas the procedures for reaching such decisions have not always involved appropriate consultation with existing governance, and
Whereas SUNY has clear policies for establishing and revising programs, and the impact of program consolidation, suspension or elimination is as significant to a campus as the establishment of programs,

Therefore, Be It Resolved
The University Faculty Senate urges System Administration to ensure that campus administrations and existing governance bodies employ formal procedures for consultation before reaching any decisions regarding program consolidation, suspension or elimination.

Resolution on the Suspension of Programs at the University at Albany

Whereas the core mission of a comprehensive University Center is to deliver an education and to do research of national and international repute

Whereas one of the six big ideas of the SUNY strategic plan ("The Power of SUNY") is "SUNY and the World" which emphasizes SUNY's global mission

Whereas the motto of the University at Albany is "The World Within Reach"

Whereas the administration of the University at Albany has suspended admission to the following academic programs: Classics, French, Italian, Russian, and Theatre

Whereas these academic programs are part of the core mission of a comprehensive University Center

Be it resolved that the actions of the administration at the University at Albany compromise the core mission of that University Center and compromise the ability of SUNY to fulfill its global mission as articulated by "The Power of SUNY" strategic plan.

SUNY has 465,00 students, 88,000 employees, $28 billion, see the web site:
http://www.suny.edu/powerOfSuny/

5. On-Line Forms for Graduate Advising (Shannon/Chumley/Vandeburg)

Laura Chumley developed our electronic systems for undergraduate advising and graduate student applications. Now she has developed a system to allow all our forms to be converted to on-line format (e.g., Form 2A, Form 3B).

Laura showed us how the system will look. We will see a button for "Graduate Student Forms and Records." For example, students can propose committee members (formerly Form 2A). They can save, cancel, or submit. If submitted, the major professor and the designated representative from the student's department (grad coordinator) need to sign off. For the Form 3B, there are fields to enter courses. There is also a place to add requirements, which is an improvement over the old form. For example, a GIS course could be required without specifying the course. Once the forms are available for approval, it's the student's responsibility to notify the major professor that it needs to be reviewed. Within a few months, we hope to have an automated email notification.

When the MP and the DRSD (designated representative) sign off (or reject), this shows on the record.

Currently, about a third of the course of study plans (3B) are filed within 2 weeks of graduation; it's easier to wait until the courses are taken than fill out forms and amend them. The fact that these forms will be easier to change should make them more useful.

We noted that all committee members were required to sign the paper Form 3B, this was a decision made through faculty governance to better involve committees in advising students. When the new system is fully implemented, it should require all the committee members to sign, or else this topic should come back for our review.

6. Update on End-of-Course Student Surveys (Donaghy)

This semester: End-of-Course surveys opened on Dec 1 and will close on Dec 10. We are still hoping to allow individuals to control the timing for their surveys. We also want to be able to add our own questions, as was possible with the paper format.

There will be a positive incentive: A netbook will be randomly awarded to one of the respondants. There will not be a penalty involving the release of grades.

Tell the students in your classes to fill out the evaluations!

Note that surveys can be filled out by classes with fewer than 7 students, as in the past. The minimum for statistical analysis of the responses is 7.

7. A Tale of Two By-Laws (Donaghy)

Kelly began to study the by-laws, because we needed to at least update the names of departments, and we were thinking about other improvements to our structure. She found a problem.

In 2006, we changed the bylaws to allow standing committees to operate without bringing decisions to the full faculty: we were having trouble getting a quorum at meetings to conduct routine business. Notably, the COI no longer brings course and curriculum proposals to our ESF Faculty meetings.

In April in 2010, the bylaws were amended to establish a Committee on Awards (and update names of departments), but it didn't include the changes approved in the 2006 revision.

What should we do now? Options include:
1. Accept the 2010 bylaws, which means we revert to the system in which all decisions have to come before the faculty.
2. Go back to the 2006 bylaws and add the COA (and other changes from the 2010 bylaws)
3. Take this opportunity to make additional improvements, as follows.

A. Restore to the full faculty the responsibility for approving changes in policy

The notable recent example was the change in the End-of-Course Student Surveys, which was decided within the COI. Our current (or rather, the 2006) bylaws allow committees to make such decisions.

B. Reorganize and add committees

We propose breaking up the COI, which has a huge workload, and which has subcommittee populated primarily by members of the parent committee. We also want to add a committee on Student Life (with responsibility for issues such as classroom civility and absences). The roster of committees would be:

Curriculum (formerly part of the Committee on Instruction)
Instructional Quailty and Academic Standards (formerly part of the Committee on Instruction)
Research (no change)
Public Service and Outreach (no change)
Awards (no change)
Student Life (new committee)
Athletics (recently approved committee)

C. Populating committees

How would all these committees be populated? A lot of people are already involved; most of these committees already exist. We need a better way than filling empty slots on a ballot with write-in votes. We also want to include staff and students in governance, at least in some areas.

Bruce proposed that departments would elect members to governance positions, with some departments combined to make reasonable demands per person. The Division of Engineering (ERE, SCME, BPE) would provide one person, and LA and ES combined provide one person, to certain committees. For many committees, it's not essential to have representation from all departments (we don't have it now).

D. Larger Campus Involvement

We already have staff and students on committees, although the bylaws say that we do not. We want professional staff involved in issues that affect them. We will restrict voting rights to faculty for issues pertaining to faculty (such as curriculum issues). This would move us towards a "campus governance" model.

Discussion

Bill Powell: Why can't Athletics come under Student Life?
Neil Murphy: It's a requirement of the NAIA that the Athletics committee operate independently.

Charlie Hall: I believe that the faculty are the university, and should have the option of running the university. We're also all overworked. We should always allow faculty to bring a topic out of committee to the larger body. Maybe at least three faculty members should be needed to bring an issue to the floor.
Kelley: We want to change the bylaws to make sure that important issues are brought to the floor.
Doug Daley: It's not true that we are excluded from the process; we have 24/7 access to proposed policies. The problem is that people aren't taking the time to review the policies.
Charlie: Why should we, if we have no power?
Doug: You do, you have a representative on the committee.
Bob Myer: We make comments, and they disappear into the void.
Klaus: They don't disappear, they come to the COI and to Suzette and to the proposing faculty.
Scott: Over the last two years, we have proposed a dozen policies through the COI, and all of them have been significantly improved in the revision process. None of them is even close to what I originally wrote. The ideas and the final language are developed through interaction with the COI.
John Hassett: The intent was to move the routine stuff off to the COI. We expected that substantive issues would be brought to the full faculty. I've been surprised that more of these issues have not come to the faculty meetings.
Charlie Hall: Remember when I proposed to teach a course with economics in the title, we had a wonderful debate. This is when the full faculty should have the option of having power. It was resolved in the interest of academic freedom.
Bob Myer: Fifteen years ago, we came to these meetings to hear what Charlie had to say. Some of us old-timers think the COI is operating in a vacuum, in Bray Hall. I like Charlie's proposal.
Valerie Luzadis: Do I understand that it's policy decisions that we want to bring to the floor, not the routine course change proposals.
Kelley: Yes, my personal opinion is that we don't want to go back to seeing every decision from the COI.
Jacquie: It could be the Chairs of the committees who decide which topics are big enough to go the faculty for discussion.
Gary Scott: It's that way now, but it's not written that way.
Doug Daley: You have the ability to form ad hoc committees. Have you considered doing that, prior to doing the whole by-laws thing? I'd like to see the charge to the COI. I agree, there are some things that should be brought to the floor. The problem is that people are reactive, not proactive. It isn't real for them when it's on the internet waiting for their input. We need to do what's necessary to get a reaction in timely fashion.

Doug: We have lots of committees on this campus that aren't part of faculty governance. Why would Athletics be a faculty governance committee?
Kelley read them all. Brockport has a good one. They have Athletics and Student Life together.
Bob Myer: We can't have a committee that we didn't approve. The Athletics Committee requires more discussion.
Kelley: The college needed the Athletics committee to be in the NAIA. Bob French did bring it to the faculty last spring. We voted at that meeting that we wanted to be part of the NAIA, and so we needed that committee. Bob French didn't want it to be a Faculty Governance committee, but he wanted us to elect the three faculty members who serve on it.
Neil Murphy: If we broaden Faculty governance to Campus Governance, this will be fine, but I don't think it can be under Faculty Governance, or we are at odds with NAIA.
Kelley: We also have staff and students on committees, who vote, and our bylaws say that we don't.
Bill Powell: We could provide representatives to that committee, like we do the SU Senate and SUNY Senate, without it being part of faculty governance.

Kelley: We can populate all these committees using about 30% of our faculty in a given year
Ruth: It's fewer than that, because many of us do double duty.

Klaus: We need about 40 people in all the roles.
Bill: Can we limit how many people are on a committee?
Kelley: Absolutely. Except for Athletics, where will we need to follow the NAIA requirements.

Ruth: Can we outline the steps we need to take to get to where we need to be?
John Hassett: As a first step, may I suggest merging the two sets of bylaws.
Kelley: I've already done that. I want to do even better. Populating, not overworking, more equitable workload. The numbers that have to be supplied by department will be more fair.
Bill: Have the members of the committee decide who the chair will be.

Peter Black: We all owe you thanks, this is a good plan. (applause)
Kelley thanked Bruce Bongarten and Steve Weiter for their contributions to the plan.

8. Announcements

Art: We welcome Dr. Huiting Mao, Associate Professor in Chemistry, the last of the Empire Innovation positions. She comes to us from the University of NH – Climate Change Research Center (8 years there). Ph.D. from SUNY Albany in Atmospheric Science. Research interests: Data Analysis and Modeling of Regional / Global Air Quality.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Ruth Yanai.