

**UNIVERSITY POLICY AND PLANNING COUNCIL
2009-10 CHAIR: JOHN DELANO**

**APRIL 23, 2010
MEETING MINUTES**

PRESENT: K. Lahiri, J. Delano, E. Eisenbraun, T. Bessette, J. Fossett, I. Murakami, C. Lenart, R. Johnson, M. Range, B. Shaw, D. Wagner, S. Phillips, P. Ferlo

GUESTS: Dean Donald Siegel, School of Business
Professor Gary Yukl, Director of Organizational Studies Program
Co-chairs of Strategic Planning Committee groups

MINUTES: Minutes of April 9, 2010 deferred

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REPORT

No report was given

CHAIR'S REPORT

No report was given

Discussion of the Organizational Studies Ph.D. program (resumption of admissions) with Dean Donald Siegel and Prof. Gary Yukl

Dr. Delano asked about the meaning of 'large' proportion of external funding – Dean Siegel responded 90% - many of the students are self-funded. He provided examples of students who do not need any funding as typical program enrollees. Sources of external funding will be grants. Since July 2008, SOB has done \$4m in funded research, which is atypical for business schools; they have three NSF grants and lots of sponsorship from industry. Field projects generate some funding that will be used for this program; it is also a major fund raising goal for gifts. SOB wants to build the intellectual and research capital of the school. They have secured lots of donors on board for the new building. They also want to encourage research in entrepreneurship, and think about the accounting profession. This has proven to be easy to fund from agencies, foundations and firms. AICPA and big four firms would actively support this program. Dr. Lahiri expressed his support for the program and saw the potential to build up a really good program. Dean Siegel noted that we are one of two NYS public universities with accreditation in both business and accounting. This helps us with 'academically qualified' GA instructors.

Dr. Murakami requested clarification on assistantships for the program – is 2-3 the number? Dean Siegel replied that they will pay for it themselves, and are not seeking state support. Dr. Delano inquired as to whether the external funding sources are sustainable - Dean Siegel responded that yes,

SOB has a niche that makes it sustainable – the school is pledging its foundation money to this and has raised over \$4m in gifts and donations. They would not restart the program if they didn't believe it was sustainable. Dr. Lahiri noted that these students can teach the big sections, which also makes it sustainable. Dean Siegel added that they are teaching sections of business policy/strategy, which is a writing course – the instructors are very highly rated by their students. Dr. Yukl commented that we have lost 2-3 lines over the last few years, and the ABD (All but Dissertation) GAs have filled the gap nicely. Using adjuncts risks our accreditation because they are not academically qualified. Dr. Delano asked if it is true that there is no projected need for additional faculty - yes. Most the work is volunteer – 2-3 courses a year above current complement.

The topic of course availability was raised. Dean Siegel provided a handout of relevant courses, and noted that we have an exchange with RPI. Dr. Yukl noted that students have a lot of choice – they are not tied down to specific courses; there is lots of flexibility. Dr. Delano revisited the resource implications – there is resource impact to speak of? Dean Siegel responded that there are not a large number of students. Dr. Range requested that the supporting documentation for the proposal include letters from chairs of associated departments. Psychology, Sociology and Public Admin will be canvassed for letters of support. Dr. Wagner affirmed that this will help us meet course minimums. Dr. Delano queried the 'what if' scenario -Dean Siegel replied that SOB would use internal funds to cover that eventuality. Dr. Shaw asked if 700 level management courses are being taught now or whether they are being resurrected, and would there be enough students to fill the seats. Dr. Yukl responded that they not being taught now and are offered every other year; they will be phased in when we have enough students.

Dr. Delano thanked Dean Siegel and Dr. Yukl for their presence. Dr. Delano reminded council that GAC has approved the proposal and polled the council for any concerns. Dr. Wagner voiced strong support for the reactivation, as did Dr. Lahiri. Dr. Delano called for a vote; proposal to reactivate the program was approved unanimously.

Discussion of strategic planning goals, objectives, and action plans with Provost Susan Phillips.

Provost Phillips provided a review of strategic plan goals and objectives – it is still a work in progress. She handed out drafts of the plan and updated the council on progress to date. The process began last fall; launched December 1st and has gone through 5 months of intense work. She went through the six areas of strategic direction, and brought the co-chairs of the subcommittees to address any questions from the council.

General comment from Dr. Wagner determining which aspects of the goals and objectives are resource neutral and identifying where needed resources would come from have not been integrated with each other at this point. Dr. Range echoed Dr. Wagner's statement and noted that there are conflicts between some of the goals at this point.

1) Undergraduate Education (Jim Acker and John Pipkin)

Dr. Range brought up Action Step 5.2 regarding tenure; Dr. Pipkin agreed that this is controversial. Dr. Wagner commented on the national discussion regarding tenure. Dr. Fossett asked about professional programs that may share concerns with the undergraduate education objectives.

2) Undergraduate Experience (John Delano and Christine Bouchard (CB not present))

Dr. Delano mentioned the national survey of student engagement – UA typically is rated low, and the group was cognizant of that during their discussions. Sampling is done through IR and reported out.

3) Graduate Education (Ginny Goatley and David Wagner)

Dr. Wagner stated that if we are going to do a good job deciding what programs to support, we need to have a solid set of evaluation criteria. Dr. Fossett noted that we have a fairly sizable representation of professional graduate programs that would not necessarily be evaluated in the same way as a research oriented degree. Placement is a good metric for professional programs. Dr. Wagner agreed that clarification is needed to discern between the different types of programs in the goal. Dr. Lahiri – another way of looking at is that the program outcome should be considered. Ratings are based on program faculty; mission should be looped in the context of where the students are going when they leave us. We have nationally ranked programs, but should not forget that we have to look forward to where the jobs are being created, and how much our students are earning in the world – program outcome should be a very important part of evaluating quality. Dr. Lenart had the impression that throughout the university, there is a loss of competitiveness, even within SUNY. He lauded goal to raise stipend levels. Dr. Delano asked about the 7 year review cycle (which is a State Ed requirement). Dr. Wagner brought up the desirability of intermediate reviews.

4) Research (Jim Dias and Carolyn MacDonald (C MacD not present))

Regarding the goal of hiring Nobel laureates, Vice President Dias wanted the group to think of this in terms of overall excellence, i.e. can we use our excellence awards as a launching pad for

pursuing national prominence. He sees it as an avenue to advance our faculty to the highest level possible. Creating, nurturing and enhancing a culture that supports excellence. Dr. Wagner saw this as desirable in terms of creating aspirational sense of bringing in and creating people who have these goals. Dr. Lahiri suggested that for the Research award, we should set up a committee that can identify a true scholar and can look at the quality of the grants. Provost Phillips mentioned that juxtaposing research and undergraduate education has been brought up in the town hall meetings; feedback has been launched to create synergies between education and research. Dr. Range questioned the CNSE exclusion regarding research acquisition. Dr. Dias responded that if you take CNSE out, we certainly have room to increase our trajectory. Dr. Range – looking at federal funding alone, CNSE has only a small portion and should be encouraged to increase that as well as the other side of the street. Provost Phillips – HRI funding is also excluded. Dr. Dias agreed that the objective needs to be rewritten. Dr. Fossett added that this is placing a considerable burden on a limited number of disciplines; looking at the Federal research portfolio, it focuses on a narrow band of hard science disciplines. Given that we don't have a lot of the big moneymakers (engineering, medical, etc.); he wondered whether we are (institutionally) positioned in a way that this is a reasonable goal for us. Dr. Dias commented that the hard part is sustaining the arts and humanities as there is not much out there in funding. Dr. Lenart supported hiring faculty with proven scholarly records as a good indicator for future productivity. Dr. Dias added that training grants are a magnet for high quality students, and as a mechanism we have to define the training environment. The process of writing a training grant helps you evaluate if you have the proper environment for funding. Dr. Lahiri brought up federal grants represent national competition – this is a higher level of recognition than state funding. Dr. Dias noted that a big part of the NSF ranking is the opinion of outside people and is not always straightforward. Dr. Delano closed the discussion by expressing his support for the idea of self promotion – we need to change the culture.

5) *Infrastructure and Environment (Steve Beditz and Marybeth Salmon (neither present))*

Dr. Delano reported on discussion that followed the April 22nd Town Hall meeting, citing Milne 200 as an example of how the Downtown campus feels collegial, where the Uptown campus feels industrial. Improving the environment with cosmetics has proven to have an impact on the 'feeling' of the space. Dr. Wagner commented that one of the most viable aspects of the Arts & Sciences renovation was the addition of color. Dr. Range recalled that until a few years ago, bulletin boards were everywhere, and made the environment friendlier. Dr. Fossett commented that most major research institutions have a central resource infrastructure for software and statistical methodology that is lacking at UAlbany. Mr. Bessette responded that IT infrastructure is expensive and constantly evolving. It is easy to forget that if we need the support of the latest hardware/software,

we don't really have a DBA who can build the resources that Dr. Fossett is looking for. Glad to see that as a goal. Dr. Lahiri cited a need for recreational facilities outside of the athletics complex; in the dorms, etc.

6) *Alumni and Community (Kevin Bean and Jennifer Carron)*

Dr. Wagner – the degree to which our involvement in the surrounding community has a significant impact on all of our outcomes. Dr. Delano relayed a comment from David Anderson regarding fostering a 'gift relationship' – imbuing students with a sense of obligation to repay the school because the value of their education is far greater than they are paying – they have a 'debt' to repay. Mr. Bean noted that private schools start this at orientation; we do not raise money from parents. Scholarships are based on philanthropy, and we need to drive that home to our current students.

Discussion of budget spreadsheets received in response to the UPPC Motion of March 26

Dr. Lahiri asked if there are any CPA's in the Office of Financial Management and Budget (there are not). The University's books are audited by external auditors, and the budget documents are internal with no external reporting requirements. Dr. Lahiri felt that all accounting should be in one place in a transparent manner. Vigorous discussion followed regarding the history of acquiring this information and the goals of the council in utilizing the data.

Motion was made to adjourn at 5:50pm with Dr. Delano's thanks to all in attendance.

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Stern