

Faculty Governance 10/16/13

Meeting called to order by Kelley Donaghy at 12:52 PM

Attendance

Blair, Scott	Fierke, Melissa	Quackenbush, Lindi
Bevilacqua, Eddie	Folta, Elizabeth	Richard, Laura
Bongarten, Bruce	Hawks, Richard	Ringler, Neil (EFB)
Boyer, Gregory	Hawks, Richard	Ryan, Sadie
Bryant, Margaret	Jager, Dawnelle	Sanford, Susan
Caviness, Debbie	Kieber, David	Schulz, Kimberly
Clemons, Jessica	Kyanka, George	Scott, Gary
Cohen, Jonathan	Lai, Yuan-Zong	Smardon, Richard
Connell, PJ (USA)	Lazzar, Craig (GSA)	Spuches, Charles
Crandall, Laura	Liu, Shijie	Tiss, Kenneth
Daley, Douglas	McGee, Gregory	Vandeburg, Suzette
Dibble, Theodore	Meyer, Robert	Verosteck, Jane
Dieterlan, Susan	Morrison, Douglas	Vidon, Phillippe
Donaghy, Kelley	Murphy, Cornelius	Volk, Timothy
Ellis, Jo Anne	Newman, Lee	Whipps, Christopher
Farrell, Shannon	Owens, Ruth	Yanai, Ruth
Feldpausch-Parker, Andrea	Patterson, Gordan	

KD – Minutes from last meeting approved.

Samantha Meserve announced ERE club fundraiser for their annual trip.

**Virtual Bookstore - Debbie Caviness** – This will be only place to get ESF books – SU will no longer carry out books. Book Look – makes us compliant with law.

**New faculty:** Doug, new chair for LA. Glad to be back in Illick 5 classroom.

**Presidential search update – Lindi Q.**

Take the time to look at CVs and go to seminars... then take the time to provide feedback on the surveys.

PV – how good will feedback be since it's on such a short time-frame.

LQ - It is a big concern, but they'll be working through the weekend

They are sending 3 names and a list of reasons why those people are on the list.

They need positive and negative feedback – if you have major issues, you've got to let them know.

There will be a listening session on Monday morning l- see e-mail from TT.

DD – what is duration of feedback?

KS – will be there until 11:00. The feedback will be read by all the committee members.

RY – can we read them?

KS –no, only committee members.  
LQ – explained compressed timeline.  
KD – get everyone involved.

### **Library Council – Margaret Bryant**

Background on why it exists – occurred when we were severed from SU system.  
Reviewing the budget, vetting library programs, etc.  
Informed about an Open Access panel discussion that is set for next week, one for faculty & one for students with Diane Keuhn and Sadie Ryan.  
We have access to 65K journals and will have more as soon as SUNY & EBSCO come to an arrangement.  
Faculty now know a bit more about the inner workings of the library & it gives Steve a sounding board.  
It costs \$1million for access to those journals. This year some \$ were taken back and so they are going to drop access to some abstracts and keep full journals. Elsevier is an example, \$168K goes to them – we still get reduced costs because of their honoring the contract (though SUNY has a contract w/ them as well) – translates to \$4/download.  
Library staff are working on creating a new vision (½ are new w/in the last 2 yrs) and so are undertaking a self study to do so. They are going to use ILL requests to inform future acquisition additions.  
KS – wants access to the whole journal, not just downloading individual articles  
ROwens – She’s the one doing the combining of ILLs and acquisitions and there are copyright issues.  
KD– she’s going to try again, and if she can’t Ruth will let you know why.

**COC – Doug Daley:** Request approval of revising the doctoral candidacy exam updates.  
Highlights: retake w/in 1 yr, results shared or not, breadth & depth requirements, the big change is form 3 can be done by all depts. rather than just chemistry.  
LQ – commented, but didn’t know if those were addressed.  
DD – they were addressed and were online (*TRUE – I looked*)  
LQ – when would take effect?  
KD – Bruce?  
BB – It is in the catalog and is a contract, but we could override if we felt it should be.  
LQ – concerned that form reflects these changes, but we (the faculty) haven’t approved.  
(*This was incorrect – per follow up with Suzette V.*)  
KD – is it updated online? (DON’T KNOW)  
BB – move sentence  
DD – word-smithing? Yes.  
Bob – need to add that the committee needs to meet before it can move ahead.  
KD – clarified  
RY – they’ve done it via e-mail  
TV – insert “determined by the committee”  
DD – clarified that the intent is there  
Bob – agreed  
PV – should have read before...  
DD – yes, he should have

PV – is it a double requirement? Research proposal and examination?

CW – you don't have to use it.

RY – seems to recall that chemistry used to have a mechanism for breadth, which isn't there anymore.

DD – Add sentence earlier to require a comprehensive exam to insure a breadth of knowledge?

Greg – Comprehensive or candidacy? His view is comprehensive knowledge is important as well as having a solid research proposal.

KD – breadth & depth friendly amendment CW – Pointed out that it already says that.

PV – grad school is enforcing need for research proposal so doing Form 3 is redundant

Ted – These are logistics

DK – As part of a candidacy exam you are asking students to think critically and probe breadth/depth and to defend their research proposal.

Lee – in order for a student to be a candidate they have to submit a research proposal and if we say that Form 3 is

KD relinquished chair to Secretary MF to engage in debate.

### **Motion was made:**

KD Return to the status quo with respect to Form 3 that only the chemistry department has permission to use this form.

RY Seconded it

MF – called for questions/discussion/vote, 19 yea, 9 nays - carried

KT – need to vote on previous amendment by Bob to move the sentence as well

KD – called for vote - passed unanimously

PV – still concerned –

KD – must move on

DD – please bring concerns to COC if you have them on this... ALSO LOOK AT THEM!

Provide feedback in a timely manner.

KD – in favor of passing the amendments – unanimous

KT – Did we resolve when does it go into effect?

KD – Next year.

### **Scott Blair – College Hour resolution**

It been popular with students & faculty. The question before us is whether we want admin to include a college hour when they do the college reset.

KT – resolved to what?

SB – We are not resolving to what today. This is about feedback on whether we want this to happen and we'll present it to the people who are most involved in the process to come back to us with options.

LQ – It is a waste of resources having classrooms sitting empty at prime teaching time.

BB – They (admin) are looking for a reaffirmation that we (the faculty) want them to consider a college hour when they do the course reset. They'll figure out the tradeoffs and let us know... it will come back to us for ratification.

GM – spaces will be populated with other meetings.

RY – 3 hrs, 2 hrs (TT), Friday mornings?, we don't know when is best and at this point, it would be inappropriate to be dictating how/when to do it – our goal is to let them know whether we want them to try to.

CW – But the timing of when it happens does matter.

SB – These are valid pts, but again they will come back to us with options.

KD – Called to a vote - passed unanimously.