

Present

Bongarten, Bruce
Briggs, Russ
Daley, Douglas
Donaghy, Kelley
Endreny, Ted
Fierke, Melissa
Folta, Elizabeth
Hassett, John
Lombard, Ann
Leopold, Don

Meyer, Robert
Quackenbush, Lindi
Rundell, Rebecca
Ringler, Neil
Shannon, Scott
Smith, William
Spuches, Charles
Tiss, Kenneth
Weiter, Stephen

Agenda

K.D. Announcements

- Presidential search update
 - The search firm is developing a survey which will be sent to faculty soon
 - They will be back for more forums 4/10 to get faculty/staff/student input
- The UUP negotiations team is on campus, please consider participating
- First Year Experience team worked with ITS to provide student pictures which are now available to faculty

Jen Smith - COR update on Spotlight on Student Research

- It will be held in the Gateway Building
- Posters will be on view from 10-4:00 with judging from 12-2:00
- Jerry Mead will be presenting at 3:00 followed by poster awards
- Consider being a judge

K.D. - FG needs new officers

- Secretary
- SUNY Senator
- SU Senator
- Committee chair positions are also open
 - Looking for someone to fill from within

Bruce B – Solicited questions regarding accessory instruction

- Ted E. – Is there somewhere that students can access how many hours of SU hrs they have available?
- Scott S. – on MYESF somewhere... no one was sure where

John Hassett – overview of proposals COC reviewed

- GPES changes
 - MS – min of 36 CR
 - MPS – min of 30 CR
 - Sadie R. – Why 30 CR for MPS

- Ruth – It is the minimum (confirmed by Scott S.)
 - PhD – MS not required, except for Environ & Nat Res Policy
 - Unanimous pass
- FNRM changes
 - Discussed how we could allow 24 CR
 - Eddie B. – It has always been this way... and credits are counted a bit differently. Students and faculty are there and in contact from 8-5:00 every day.
 - Charlie H. – Can students take regular Physics or do they have to take Physics of Life?
 - E.B. – they can take either
 - Unanimous pass
- Next COC meeting 4/15 at 3:30
- C.H. – Why was Biophysical Processes not presented?
- J.H. – It was not submitted on time or was not complete, either way, it was tabled and will be discussed at the next meeting.

K.D. Overview of Bylaw Sub-committee and proposed bylaw changes, noted these have to be voted on through a formal voting process, i.e. this was an overview and a chance to discuss

- R.Y. – Will we be able to vote on individual changes?
- K.D. – Yes.
- Term limits
 - DD – He interpreted the current wording to mean that someone could serve, take a break and come back and do it again. Questioning if it is a good idea to have someone serve continuously.
 - KD – Most vital FG do not have term limits.
 - RB – Likes the idea of two and then off, then can come back. Maybe make that more explicit.
 - BP – If we remove term limits, then basically someone becomes the permanent chair.
 - R.Y. – It is good to step away and let someone else do it.
 - DD – With regards to “vital FGs”, what works for others may not work for ESF. He understands that if someone is doing great, then why would we replace them – but change can also be good.
 - BB – Turnover is good, but we need to ensure FG continues. If faculty step up, then great, this is moot, but questions if we as a faculty are prepared to see this as important. Will senior faculty step up? If we can get to that in our culture, then this removal of term limits is unnecessary.
- Executive Chair remaining on executive committee in an advisory position
 - No discussion
- Term initiation change
 - DD – Supports.
- Standing Committee Chairs
 - No discussion
- IQAS charge change

- No discussion
- Make the Technical Committee a standing committee vs an ad hoc one
 - Bob – Why not specific #s for committee make up?
 - K.D. – Will ask – Brendan, the chair was not present.
 - DD – Why make standing?
 - K.D.– technology is not going away. It is becoming more important for both students and faculty, everyday and for teaching, e.g., OPEN SUNY
 - S.W. – Expanded on as a previous member of the committee
 - Ann L. – Why are students not on this committee?
 - KD – Will ask.
 - DD – Should this be a FG committee considering all the trouble with populating committees?
 - KD – Absolutely no trouble populating this committee.
 - LQ – Back to Bob’s concern about who is on the committee – this is not consistent with how other committees are populated.

KD – Grade Grievance Policy, was starting to overview and was interrupted

- Ken T. – Why Paul C. not presenting
- P.C. – Came forward and reiterated the same overview from the last FG meeting, transparency for students, etc. Additional information regarding Student Conduct Coordinator and that it had been discussed with Dean Lombard and Kevin Reynolds.
- D.D. – He had issues with Google Docs in that he spent a great deal of time putting in comments/edits, but then they were all gone. He did not have time to do them again. There also are not links to the site via the FG website. He is wondering if any others had issues as well and implored for a different way of doing this.
- DD – Also wording is “reconstituted”, does that mean it will be with original members or new ones?
- PC – It would be the same ones unless there was a problem with a specific member of the committee (if that was the reason the “appeal” was made, e.g., a member did not maintain confidentiality)
- DD – Why not use the word “reconvene” then?
- P.C. – That would be fine as a friendly amendment.
- Gary S. – Clarified that we are not looking for a second opinion, that the appeal would be for new evidence and so the prior committee should be fine
- DD – Move to make it “reconvene”
- PC – This is the intent, agreed with amendment unless Assoc Provost feels it should be changed.
- SW – Is there any other instance where an appeal goes to the same committee?
- BB – There shouldn’t be an appeal except in the instance new evidence is presented. There would not be an appeal of the decision – really it would be a continuation of the process.
- GS – Change “appeal” to “reconsideration”
- BB – Great idea.
- KD – This would prevent the process going to another group.
- DD – That’s the point – it should go to another body.

- PC – No, it is really a “reconsideration” if there is new evidence, but if there was a breakdown in the process, then it would be an appeal.
- DD – This is not clear. How do we write it so it can be implemented 10 yrs from now given the confusion we are hearing now. This needs more work and it needs to be clarified. Who’s running this? The executive committee or the Provost?
- BP – Time period for student appeal is too long. In his course, he gives 1 wk for a grade appeal. If they don’t come to him during that time, too bad. This time period puts too much on faculty.
- KD – The idea is to give the student and faculty time to confer.
- BP – Students should take care of immediately
- SW – What if it is an end of the semester grade?
- SS – The e-mail trails he’s seen carries over months. It is rare for a student to understand the circumstances quickly.
- LQ – Some edits... change “academic” to “grade” in bullet for Time Limit as well as in the first sentence.
- KD – Done
- BP – Does not want a student coming to him on 5/15 about a grade back from December
- LQ – This could be a mechanism to protect the student if they are taking another course with the same instructor
- PC – Also allows time for students to understand if it is a grievable grade or not.
- BP – How about within 30 days of the following semester?
- PC – Could move to amend.
- DD – Will the Assoc Provost hire a mediator?
- PC – Yes.
- DD – How?
- KD – The Assoc Provost will deal with this.
- KT – Mediation is not binding and either party can refuse – it has happened. We then lose time, etc. This should be arbitration and should occur after the college ruling.
- PC – If the student and faculty can’t come to an agreement, the college will decide. Having mediation in place would bring an angle of objectivity to the process.
- BB – The hearing committee is doing the arbitration, internally. There is no other reasonable arbitration available.
- KD – Clarified it would be a professional mediator.
- KD – Called time on questions.
- DD – Objected – he has more questions.
- CH – Wants to hear DD’s questions.
- KD – We are out of time. Called for a consensus to end questions.
 - Many more “ayes” than “nays”
- KD – Vote on Policy, ayes and nays too close, called for a show of hands
 - Accept – 14
 - Opposed – 7
 - Abstained - 2