

Faculty Governance Meeting April 9, 2014

In Attendance:

Laura Crandall, Ted Endreny, Scott Shannon, Scott Blair, Gary Scott, Doug Morrison, Bob Meyers, Anne Lombard, Mary Chandler, JoAnne Ellis, Kevin Reynolds, Nazri Abdel-Aziz, Scott Turner, Jess Clemons, Ruth Owens, Heidi Webb, Steve Weiter, Laura Rickard, Doug Daley, Bob French, Bruce Bongarten, Paul Caluwe, Kenneth Tiss, Lindi Quackenbush, Paul Hirsch, Sharon Moran, Melissa Fierke, Ruth Yanai

Above incomplete... we will fix this as soon as possible... Please let Melissa know if you aren't listed here and you attended.

1. Opening Remarks/Minutes (Donaghy)
2. Technology Report (Turner) – acknowledgements & reasons for establishment. White paper overview:
 - a. Good news – in good shape on some fronts, relation to SU, students, excellence in scholarship
 - b. Bad news - \$\$\$ important, underfunded, understaffed and underequipped. Issues w/ admin structure related to technology. Cultural barriers – uncertainty about how innovative approaches to technology will be rewarded/recognized. No coherent vision for moving into the digital future.
 - c. Solutions/recommendations - not a checklist or a prescription, but a start of a longer strategic conversations.
 - d. Faculty need to be empowered to move things forward.
 - e. Recommendation to rethink administration.
 - f. Increase \$ charged for technology. Students expressed support for a technology fee in meetings.
 - g. Content providers – how to market and generate \$, requires skill sets that faculty may not be comfortable with or time to cultivate. Suggest establishing graduate assistantships for this.
 - h. Break out of zero sum game to generate \$, start a capital drive or establish a technology development fund through endowments.
 - i. Bringing students in to listen to professors isn't cost effective and so need to be more creative.
 - Chuck – is this a culminating or initiating event?
 - Scott – initiating. Many opportunities were presented for input and information was solicited. We need as a community to have a deep conversation about how we carry out our mission.
 - Chuck – how to you characterize the feedback received?
 - Scott – there were concerns that they did not go into research computing funding for technology. They are addressing the broader picture first.
 - Bob F. – The faculty endorses the white paper to guide all... - sounds like a culminating document, a way forward – not a conversation starter or the beginning of a discussion. Sounds like it should be a vote to endorse the recommendations.
 - Scott – the committee doesn't have the power to set policy, just to recommend. Perhaps wording of should or could was not the best, but the spirit of the resolution was a starting point.
 - Kelley – so do want a formal ballot? This was offered to the committee as they wanted

broader input.
Scott – he wants to move forward with a vote.
Ruth – thinks taking it to a broader vote will raise consciousness – so we should vote and on whether we should vote.
Scott – Wants it to go to vote... but then pulled resolution and will go to a formal ballot resolution.

Need judges for Spotlight!!!

3. CoC Actions (Daley)

Courses up for review – few comments/input received.

- a. Mathematics Minor
- b. Physics Minor
- c. Computer and Information Technology Minor
- d. Environmental Writing and Rhetoric Minor

Lindi – for EW, this is a revision to an existing minor?

Doug – mainly updating the course list

Overwhelming ayes for a **voice vote**!

4. IQAS Actions (Abdel-Aziz)

- a. Cross Registration Policy overview

Doug – clarification of why we are doing this...

Bruce – SUNY says

Brendan – you can't charge a SUNY student to take additional classes within the SUNY system.

Kelley – we don't want students to take our courses somewhere, e.g., Calc at OCC when they can take it here

Laura R. – Seems applicable for Calc, but what about policy or social sciences... whose responsibility?

Nasri – it has to be approved through the petition process

Scott – Advisor, Curriculum coord, and his office

Kelley – clarified that this is true of any transfer class.

Called to **voice vote** – all ayes (no nays)

6. Bylaws (Donaghy)

- a. Composition of COR

- b. Library Council

COR composition changes overview – change to populate like other committees with every dept being represented. Clarified the language around “professional staff” – they are supposed to be represented through our faculty governance as per SUNY bylaws.

Make the Library Council a standing committee – moving from an ad hoc committee.

Neil R. – typically committee makes recommendations to the Vice Provost (himself) – so this doesn't make a change as far as he's concerned.

Kelley – agreed, coming into accord with the other committees

Doug – why not get 5 people who care rather than having this formal committee set up – small depts. are overburdened, plus many times people just don't show up.

Bruce – what you say is true, you want 5 invested people to show up consistently. If you just ask people to volunteer, it doesn't get populated – it works better if the dept takes

- responsibility for populating it. The other thing is that you get narrow and biased perspectives. What this does is that it really reinforces the idea that as faculty we have a responsibility for the operation of the institution – this is part of the commitment even if it isn't the most important thing they do.
- Doug – how many committees do we have and how many faculty do we have and do we have enough people to facilitate this? He's looked at other governance structures and they've got fewer committees – this could be a sub committee and we are tapping out the number of people available.
- Bruce – when you combine, you have fewer to work and so each person has to do more work – is this what we want?
- Scott – he can attest to this, they had very engaged people and they did a great job.
- Neil – effective committee (8 people) Library needs 13?
- Steve – guarantee that no more than 5 people will show up.
- Greg B. – if you go with a rotating structure like the COR in the past, then people who want to be engaged can not be.
- Lindi – is there anything stopping someone to being on the committee? Can't they stay on it?
- Kelley – Yes, anyone can go to the meeting – she hopes that
- Melissa – can they vote?
- Kelley – left up to the chair...
- Lindi – they have more committees than faculty members and this doesn't fit in my 10% very well.
- Bruce – combine departments?
- Kelley – this will go to a ballot, please vote.

7. CoPSO (Donaghy)

- a. Committee deactivated – no one would chair – no meaningful work. President Wheeler wants reactivated and get folks engaged to build relationships in NYC. This committee would also explore developing online content for civic engagement – also need an award. Engaged in finding funding.
 - b. Anyone want to come forward and volunteer to chair and populate this committee?
- Chuck – we do have a wonderful relationships and partnerships with institutions in NYC... NYC high schools w/ 60-100 kids taking ESF in the high school courses (including the STEM mentors grant – through SUNY and New York Academy of Sciences).

8. Elections (Meyer/Fierke)

- a. Governance Chair
- b. Faculty Senate
- c. SU Senator

9. Scholar's tables – come together for conversations

- a. Modeled after Cambridge tradition
- b. 4/11, 11:30 in Nifkin lounge

Pitch for last college-wide meeting as well as EC meetings.
Pitch for getting chairs for committees.