

## College Wide Governance Meeting

November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 Wednesday 12:45-1:40 PM Gateway Building A

Attending:

**Chemistry-** Gregory Boyer, Israel Cabasso, Paul Caluwe, Kelley Donaghy, Ivan Gitsov Ivanov, David Kieber, Huiting Mao **Communications-** Paul Otteson **S. Cons Mgmt & Wood Pro Eng-** Susan Anagnost, Robert Meyer, Kenneth Tiss **Env Res Eng-** Douglas Daley, Theodore Endreny, Charles Kroll, Lindi Quackenbush **Env Science-** Russell Briggs (FNRM) **Env Studies-** Dawnelle Jager, Jack Manno, David Sonnenfeld **Env. & Forest Biology-** Jonathan Cohen, John Farrell, Shannon Farrell, Danilo Fernando, Elizabeth Folta, Thomas Horton, Lee Newman, Dylan Parry, William Powell, Stacy McNulty, Kimberly Schulz, J Scott Turner **Forest & Natural Res. Mgmt-** Eddie Bevilacqua, Robert Malmshemer, David Newman, John Stella, Mary Thompson, Phillippe Vidon, John Wagner, Ruth Yanai **Instruction/Grad Studies-** Scott Shannon, Suzette Vandeburg **Landscape Architecture-** Margaret Bryant, Doug Johnston **Moon Library-** Jessica Clemons, Jo Anne Ellis, Heidi Webb, Stephen Weiter **Outreach-** Katherina Searing, Charles Spuches **Paper/Bioprocess Engineering-** Biljana Bujanovic, Klaus Dolle, Gary Scott **Research Programs-** Mark Driscoll, Neil Ringler (EFB) **Student Affairs** – Anne Lombard and Mary Triano **Student Representatives-** Scott Bergey (GSA), PJ Connell (USA) **Undergrad Admissions-** Karaline Rothwell, Susan Sanford **President/VPs/Gov Relations-** Bruce Bongarten, Maureen Fellows

The meeting was called to order at 12:50 by Kelley Donaghy.

### Opening Remarks and Announcements

Please sign in at back table, and check the minutes of the last meeting, including the attendance list.

The Executive Committee is working on revising the bylaws and plans for assessment of the General Education program.

**SUNY Excels** is a system that is coming from Albany, in an attempt to gain \$50M of the budget surplus, using metrics that can be used to sell this to the legislature. We are supposed to respond to various metrics as to whether we could benefit from funding in these areas (Access, Completion, Success, Research, Engagement). Our responses will be combined with those from other SUNY campuses in our sector (statutory and specialized).

We want to be involved, we might get funding out of this, and faculty should be engaged. There is a sheet at the back of the room and we can distribute it for those who aren't here.

**Strategic Planning:** The second draft of the Visioning Document was released today, and is now a Visioning Wall, here in the Gateway Building. Please write on it!

### **Electronic Voting Procedures (Donaghy)**

#### *History*

- Developed by the Officers
- Reviewed by Executive Committee on 10/16
- Reviewed by Academic Council on 11/4
- Final review by Executive Committee on 11/6
- Included with meeting agenda on 11/12
- Posted to website on 11/17

#### *Discussion*

Mark Driscoll: Is this in violation of the bylaws? The Sergeant at Arms has responsibility for voting procedures.

Bob Meyer: (Sergeant at Arms), Steve Weiter (Parliamentarian): This procedure adds help for the Sergeant at Arms, it doesn't take away that responsibility. The proposal passed unopposed.

### **Expectations and Responsibilities for Faculty Mentors and Graduate Students (Shannon)**

#### *History*

- Developed by Graduate Council (Spring 2014)
- Presented to Executive Committee on 10/16
- Remanded to committee (IQAS/COR/SL)
  - All departments connected by your representatives
  - 7 pages of comments provided
- Reviewed by Academic Council 11/4
- Reviewed by Executive Committee 11/6
- Included with meeting agenda on 11/12
- Posted to website on 11/17
- Sent by Dean Shannon on 11/18

#### *Discussion*

Katherina Searing: Has there been input from graduate students?

Scott Bergey (GSA): Yes, and this was endorsed by the GSA in October.

Doug Daley: The discussion on email today was about the value of having people sign it, not about whether the goals are reasonable.

Scott Shannon: The intent is to promote discussion at the beginning of the relationship; signing is a mechanism to ensure that people are aware of the policy.

Jack Manno: Did the examples from other places include signatures?

Scott Shannon: Yes, a good number do. We started with the model from the Max Planck Institute. Upstate does it like this, they all sign it, practically on the

day that they enter the college.

Bob Malmshaimer: Having the conversation is a good idea. But the language about responsibilities and requirements sets up obligations, rather than simply promoting communication.

Philippe Vidon: We can't have a policy to prevent bad relationships. (what else did he say?)

John Stella: I have my students sign a document that describes our responsibilities. I would like to see this policy allow individuals to add to the agreement, for example defining our minimum expectations for scholarship.

Scott Shannon: We do encourage more specific agreements, many of our faculty have those (see A. 10.)

Dave Keiber: Let's put that up front. In Chemistry, we are developing departmental guidelines that are more specific than this, for example describing expectations for publication.

Scott Turner: I propose an amendment to the title: "Guidelines" rather than "Expectations and Responsibilities." Seconded.

#### *Discussion*

Ruth Yanai: We are going to have a lot of suggestions for improvements, can we ask to see this again rather than try to create a document that we will approve today?

Ken Tiss: There are going to be a lot of changes required to convert this document to "guidelines" and we don't have time for that now.

Scott Turner: To make this acceptable will require considerable revision.

Margaret Bryant: We can identify the parts we agree with and remove the parts that don't provide guidelines.

Scott Shannon: "Expectations and Responsibilities" is the most broadly used language. "Guidelines" are also common but are broader than this. The American Association of Medical Colleges is one of the leaders, and ours is 80-90% based on that.

The motion received 24 yes and 15 no votes.

Scott Turner: I propose that the policy be sent back for additional revision. Seconded (Ken Tiss).

#### *Discussion*

Scott Bergey: I want to speak as the GSA representative. What we like about this document is that it would be stated in writing what to expect, which would give piece of mind especially to incoming students. We are in favor of having a policy that applies to all students. Signing it shows that it has been discussed, which doesn't seem to be too much to ask. The cases where these relationships go bad are very rare.

Scott Turner: I agree with all of that, and nobody is uncomfortable with the goals stated here. It's just the contractual nature that people are uncomfortable with.

Who asked: What other group this could be sent back to? IQAS

Bruce Bongarten: The issue here is about us as faculty making a minimal set of commitments. I voted against calling these guidelines, it's about dealing with those rare cases when we have problems. This gives some respect to our graduate students, who have relatively little power. We get in trouble when we

have an issue, if we avoid the idea of commitments. This document came from the Graduate Council and the Graduate Students working together to define the minimal set of commitments we make to each other to establish this relationship. The document should establish a mutual commitment and mutual respect, which we should be prepared to make to our students in exchange for their commitment to us.

Dylan Parry: EFB faculty discussed what happens to graduate students who don't live up to their commitment. What about tenured faculty who don't live up to their side? If nothing can be done, it's pointless to have a document.

David Newman: What is the contractual obligation incurred by signing this agreement?

Scott Shannon: I didn't mean that the signature doesn't commit you. A policy is binding whether you sign it or not.

Doug Daley: It's worthwhile to discuss what direction we want to give to whomever is going to revise this document. We need to know what a policy is, how does it differ from guidelines.

Scott Turner: We have given some guidance already with the title change.

Kim Schulz: Getting us to have the conversation is important, and having guidelines that are specific to the faculty member or the department. At the college level, we need to define a process for addressing problems.

Ted Endreny: I don't understand the value of the document. The student handbook defines what an advisor should be. And we have a grievance policy. We approved the motion to table the proposal.

Tom Horton: Can we compose a committee of the people who commented?

Kelley Donaghy: We don't know who made the comments in the on-line discussion, they are not attributed.

We approved a motion to assign this to a task force yet to be determined.

## **Ownership, Representation and Distribution of College-Related Media and Other Creative Media Policy (Turner)**

### *History*

- Policy was issued in June of 2014
- Technology committee indicated that it had some issues 10/3
- Tech reviewed the policy and drafted a new one in collaboration with VPs Rufo, Bongarten and French 10/29
- Reviewed by Academic Council on 11/4
- Reviewed by Executive Committee on 11/6
- Included with meeting agenda on 11/12
- Posted to website on 11/17

### *Discussion*

Scott Turner: The original video policy had some problems, for example with intellectual property and ownership of creative media. There are some legitimate issues with branding and the control by the college. The current policy recognizes the other laws that govern us.

The policy passed unopposed.

**Minutes** of the last meeting were passed unopposed.

**Next Meetings**

Fall 2014

December 11, 2014 at 9:30 AM (Reading Day)

Spring 2015

January 21, 2015 at 12:45PM

February 18, 2015 at 12:45PM

March 25, 2015 at 12:45PM

April 29, 2015 at 3:30PM (Reading Day)

**Adjourned** at 1:48 p.m.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Ruth Yanai.