Executive CommitteeUniversity Senate Executive Committee Meeting
January 24, 2005
Minutes

Present: R. Collier, D. Dewar, V. Idone, W. Lanford, A. Lyons, C.
MacDonald,
L. McNutt, S. Messner, G. Moore, J. Mumpower, R.M. Range, M. Sherman,
L. Snyder, D. Wagner

Minutes: The minutes of November 29, 2005 were approved.

Ongoing Business:

·   Mission Review II: – Interim Provost Mumpower reported that
numerous
comments on the Mission Review II document were received from Senate
Councils
and Committees, they have been addressed and have been extremely helpful.
The
Provost's Office has forwarded the document to President Hall. (The
comments
from the meeting of Senate Council and Committee chairs are attached.)

·   Patriot Act Responses: Professor Snyder reported that, on behalf
of
CAFFECoR, he directed questions on confidentiality issues of the Patriot
Act to
Chief Information Officer Christine Haile, who responded that she would
consult
with University Counsel and respond as quickly as possible.

·   Issues of Autonomy in Governance: Distinguished Teaching Professor
Messner reported that the Governance Council has begun the process of
identifying any inconsistencies between the Senate Charter, the Faculty
Bylaws
and the MOU pertaining to promotion and continuing appointment at the
College of
Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE).   The Governance Council met to
address a way to do solicit faculty input. In accordance with the MOU,
the
Council will submit any inconsistencies to the Senate in writing by the
March
meeting.   Dr. Messner asked for suggestions and, after discussion, it
was
agreed that it would be best to follow a two-track approach: (1) solicit
input
immediately concerning the specific matter of inconsistencies surrounding
the
MOU to be able to comply with the deadline in the resolution, and (2)
develop
mechanisms to address more general issues during the course of the spring
semester. The latter will likely involve a faculty survey and discussion
at a

faculty forum. Dr. Messner suggested that the Governance Council should coordinate with the ad hoc Governance Committee on the survey and forum. It was
decided that the Senate Chair will distribute an email broadcast asking for
feedback. A survey will be distributed in February and a forum will be held in
early March.

Provost's Report – presented by Interim Provost Jeryl Mumpower:

Interim Provost Mumpower reported the following:
·   President Hall will be on Campus as of February 2, 2005.
·   Professor Marjorie Pryse has been named Interim Dean of Graduate Studies. She was offered the position after an extensive internal search and
will continue to teach while fulfilling the Interim Dean of Graduate Studies
position half-time.
·   The 2005-06 Executive Budget summary will be discussed at Senate.
Interim Provost Mumpower distributed a Budget Summary Report and highlighted
that it calls for a $500.00 "across-the-board" tuition increase, that the EOP
program is proposed to be reduced by 50%, and there is a proposal to defer
one-half of TAP awards for first-time students until successful completion of
their degree programs.
·   Enrollment: the campus has taken substantial steps to recover enrollment numbers; it is expected that there will be some recovery, although
numbers are still short.

Chair's Report – presented by Professor Carolyn MacDonald, Senate Chair:

·   Provost Search: Professor MacDonald reported that President Hall asked
for nominations for the position of Chair of the Provost Search Committee. He
will consult with both Dr. MacDonald and Dr. Messner before the search committee
membership is chosen.
·   Presidential biweekly lunches: President Hall had informal biweekly
lunches with individual Senate and Executive Committee members in Utah and he
would like to continue that tradition here at UAlbany. Professor MacDonald will
work with the President's Office to begin scheduling the lunch meetings.

Council Reports:

Council on Academic Assessment (CAA), Professor Malcolm Sherman, Chair:
No
report.

Council on Promotions and Continuing Appointments (CPCA), Professor Diane
Dewar,
Chair: CPCA continues to meet weekly on its many tenure and/or promotion
cases
this semester.

Graduate Academic Council (GAC), Professor Louise-Anne McNutt, Chair:
·   GAC has been working on developing a proposal for an
ombudsperson's
office.
·   GAC has received many incomplete applications for certificate
programs.
 Therefore, instructions for completing the forms will be posted on the
Graduate
Office web site and copies will be mailed to Deans and Department Chairs.
·   GAC is working on making services/activities in Graduate Studies
very
apparent and accessible to students and faculty.
·   GAC expects to introduce the Proposal for the name change for
the
Department of Environmental Health and Toxicology and the Proposal to
Revise the
Advanced Graduate Certificate Program in School Leadership as Senate
Bills at
the next Senate meeting.

Governance Council (GOV), Distinguished Teaching Professor Steven
Messner,
Chair: The joint working group with the College of Nanoscale Science
and
Engineering will continue to meet; it is now discussing curriculum
issues. The
Council will also have an active role in the faculty input solicitation
and
forum as discussed in ongoing business earlier.

Council on Libraries, Information Systems and Computing (LISC), Professor
David
Wagner, Chair: LISC is considering the issues of supporting open source
and
open access software, rather than only supporting brand-name products
such as
Microsoft. The Council is also discussing the issues of cost and demand
for
widespread wireless access and the problems of unauthorized wireless
routers.

Council on Research (COR), Professor Vincent Idone, Chair:

COR voted to fund 13 FRAP-A applicants. It also acted to accept additions by
the IRB Policy Review Committee to recommendations made and adopted by Council
in May, 2004 regarding the establishment of a permanent IRB Policy Review
Committee, and to dissolve the ad hoc IRB Policy Review Committee. COR voted in
favor of a one-year provisional center status for the Center for Elimination of
Minority Health Disparities, and permanent center status for the Gen*NY*Sis
Center for Excellence in Cancer Genomics; these will be brought to UPC and the
full senate.
COR continued the discussion on IT Commons (ITC) including how to support this
new initiative, yet make sure that it is complementary to, and not competitive
with, many disciplinary programs. The decision making base may need to be
broadened; it appears that the current decision focus rests primarily with the
Dean of Information Science and Policy and his advisory committee (e.g. the
substantial number of IT Commons hires over the next few years). The possible
IT Commons hires necessarily entail considerable resources, research and
departmental implications. Although the assertion is that this enterprise is
entirely voluntary, it may not be completely benign in actual implementation,
despite the best of intentions. Tenure and promotion issues remain a possible
problem. Aspects of accountability, overall oversight of the program, and
quality controls are issues that should be considered. Given the fact that the
University has made the decision to pursue this initiative, the concern is to
ensure that the ITC develops in a manner that both benefits the overall IT
infrastructure on the campus while simultaneously allowing the foundational
disciplines to thrive.

Undergraduate Academic Council (UAC), Professor Seth Chaiken, Chair (report
submitted in writing): The UAC has met on 1/26 and 2/2 of this year. A number
of academic program proposals have been passed; they are being forwarding to the
Senate after technical correction. A new Art History major program proposal was

referred to the Curriculum and Honors Committee. Information about the
Early
Admissions Assurance Agreement into Albany Med.'s Physician Assistant
program
was received and discussed. The UAC confirmed that such agreements will
be
documented and publicized to current and prospective students in the
Undergraduate Bulletin, Special Opportunities section under Academic
Advisement,
and by the Pre-Health Advisors. The UAC recommends no other action. The
major
current interest of the UAC is to solicit wide faculty comment on the
draft
proposed policy on academic advisement and the accompanying report from
the
advisement Task Force. Responses are requested and needed by February
14, to
inform UAC discussions and Senate proposals, which may entail great
changes in
the philosophy and practice of Undergraduate Advisement in some units. A
reference to this material has been included in the recent Senate
emailing, and
an emailing to chairs and program directors has been requested.

University Life Council (ULC), Professor Gwen Moore, Chair:
Lee McElroy of Athletics spoke to ULC about the Athletics Master Plan; he
reported that UAlbany is behind other universities. There is a 200
million-dollar plan to build a new stadium, renovate the hockey fields,
artificial turf and athletic facilities.   These plans will need to be
brought
to UPC. ULC is working on the class suspension for religious holy days.
ULC
hopes to have a bill for Senate in March. The smoking policy on campus
is being
revisited, possibly with letting people know where to smoke, rather than
where
not to smoke.

Committee on Academic Freedom, Freedom of Expression, and Community
Responsibility (CAFFECoR), Professor Lawrence Snyder, Chair: CAFFECoR
has been
working on a "Policy for Recognition of Faculty and Staff Organizations."
Chair
Snyder reported that Senate Bill 0304-24, "Campus Distribution Policy for
Newspapers and other News Periodicals" is about to emerge from the office
of
Provost William Hedberg. Senate Bill 0303-25 "Campus Policy on Freedom
of
Expression" is still being worked on there. Also, Committee members were
alerted that SUNY Trustee Candace de Russy is requesting that the SUNY
Board of
Trustees endorse the "Academic Bill of Rights."

University Planning and Policy Council (UPC), Professor David McCaffrey, Chair –
reported by Professor Carolyn MacDonald: UPC is continuing to discuss the 1996
 4-Credit Standard (4x4) report and the 1998 task force report to increase
student satisfaction. It is moving forward with a reanalysis of the student
satisfaction surveys. It will consider the certificate program from the School
of Education and the proposed formation of the College of Computing and
Information.

Committee on Ethics in Research and Scholarship (CERS), Professor R. Michael
Range, Chair: CERS will have the University at Albany Policy and Procedures on
Misconduct
in Research and Scholarship document to be voted on at the next Senate meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne VanDenburgh, Recorder

Recommendations from the Senate officers, Council Chairs, SUNY-wide Senators and
Student Representatives to the Senate Executive Committee on the Mission Review
II "Final" Document from meetings of 12/28/2004 and 1/06/2005

1. The document has numerous typographical errors, which we have not addressed.

2. Page 5: Third full paragraph: "IT Commons, a University-wide program, is
based on memoranda of understanding between" should be replaced with "IT Commons
is based on cooperation between"
Rationale: The memoranda have not been shared with or approved by faculty
governance. It is a concern of governance and a principle of academic freedom
that disciplinary decisions should not be driven solely by administrative
initiatives. Specific proposals remain to be considered by the faculty.

3. Page 5: Fourth full paragraph: "Together with future development" should be
replaced with "Together with planned development"
Rationale: Specific proposals remain to be considered by the faculty.

4. Page 8: It is recommended that the reference to the "Princeton Review" be
removed in view of the methodological flaws in the survey while maintaining a
more positive statement of continued effort to enhance the undergraduate
experience, including the specific issues, e.g. faculty accessibility. This
could be used as a platform to address the need for increased number of faculty
to reduce class size.

5. Page 9: Goal 2 should end at "disciplines." ["through initiatives to make
new faculty hires a substantial portion of which will support research,
undergraduate teaching, and the General Education program" should be deleted].
Rationale: As phrased it does not reflect the point of the Senate resolution
which was that the "substantial portion" should be in the areas that have been
eroded, and leads to the question of what that portion who are not supporting
research and teaching intend to do.

6. Page 9: Goal 3 should read "or slightly above" .
Rationale: Elsewhere in the document it is stated that very large increases in
enrollment are not intended. It is noted that according to the table later in
the document this should probably read "then striving" rather than "while
striving" since the numbers increase first, followed by increased selectivity.

7. Page 9: Goal 4. Insert "." after "admissions", and rephrase the following
phrase to "Pursue the adoption of the planned Honors College within the College
of Arts and Sciences, and enhance the honors opportunities currently in
development in other undergraduate programs, to attract and retain more Group I
and other outstanding students and improve their academic experience."
Rationale: The "through" in the current phraseology implies that the only motive
for the honors college is recruitment. There should be some mention of enhanced
experience and retention. The "other outstanding" refers to the reality that
good students are not always identified by the SUNY numerics.

8. Page 9: Goal 6: Insert "teaching".
Rationale: As phrased, the goal does not reflect the Senate resolution to
reflect that external funding, in the broader sense (as well as perhaps in the

federal grant sense) should be applied to the teaching as well as the research
mission.

9. Page 9: Goal 7: Change to "Continue to develop the private overall
fund-raising capabilities of the University."
Rationale: The specific goals of the "Bold.Vision" campaign may be
unrealistic
and the priorities did not arise from consultation with faculty
governance.

10. Page 9: Goal 9: Change "Expand" to "Continue to review expansion of"
and "in
order to" to "for example to".
Rationale: It is premature to commit to expansion and specific uses
before
formal consultation with the Senate.

11. Page 9: Senate resolution goal number 3 has been omitted, "Ensure
the
realization of improvements in teaching, learning and research
infrastructure by
providing sufficient staffing to support campus initiatives requiring IT,
library and faculty development, such as on-line learning course
objectives."

12. Pages 11 and 15: There is concern about the lack of documentation of
the
potential costs, in both dollars and selectivity, of the additional
numbers of
students. This enrollment increase has significant implications and the
details
should be discussed with the University community as a whole.

13. Page 13: What is the expected resource implication, particularly
with
respect to self-pay master students, to the "graduate tuition
scholarship"
program?

14. Page 17: In the discussion following the table, the Senate
resolution that
a "substantial fraction" of new hires be used to redress recent erosion
is not
included.

15. Page 17. The reference to the increase in IT lines to 25-35, which
the
Senate recommended deleting, remains.

16. Page 17. It is recommended in reference to interdisciplinary hires,
that
caution is used in replacing typical disciplinary retirements with

interdisciplinary new hires without balancing the needs within the existing
disciplinary strengths of the units.

17. Page 18. It is not clear why there are 632 faculty on page 17 for 2003 and
588 faculty on page 18. The number of part time faculty is much larger than the
difference and is not mentioned.

18. Page 18. The recommendations of Senate resolution C2 are omitted:
Retention of accomplished faculty is a priority, as well. We recognize the
importance of developing the intellectual environment of the university to this
end. Concerted efforts are made to retain faculty, including investments in the
physical environment--offices teaching spaces, research laboratories--and
services, equipment assets and networks to enhance the University's research and
teaching infrastructure. The campus also strives to be competitive in
responding with counter-offers to faculty who are being recruited to other
current or aspirational peer institutions while attempting to avoid developing
systemic inequities. Nevertheless, in 2004, the University lost three
distinguished faculty to other institutions.
Rationale: The intellectual environment is part of what makes this university
distinct, so noting its impact on faculty retention and the need to expend funds
to improve it is worthwhile. The reference to avoidance of systemic inequities
is important given the conclusions of the provost's salary committee of the
impact of unbalanced raises on gender differences in salary.

19. Page 19: FRAP, journal support, etc. should perhaps be moved here from
page 22.

20. Page 20: The 7% increase in research funding might appear high to a reader
and should be justified in terms of actual dollars of increase of recent
nanoscience funding.

21. Page 20: It should be made clear that the second set of bullets refers to
newly founded centers, which should include the Prevention Research Center for
Chronic Illness and the Center for Public Health Preparedness, both funded by
the CDC in the School of Public Health.

22.   Page 22: Because some programs and researchers are disproportionately
highly funded, there is no direct correlation between the rate of increase of
funding and the rate of increase of funded investigators. Therefore the rate of
increase of 7% in funded investigators should be separately justified based on
current rates of increase.

23.   Page 22: There should be a reference to the difficulties inherent in
creating and enforcing tenure and promotion policy with an increase in
interdisciplinary hires.

24.   Page 23: Delete the last sentence (beginning "such function…") from the
first paragraph under faculty role in campus decision-making.
Rationale: There is no evidence for the assumption of more active participation
relative to the newly created more "representative" model of the University
Senate.

25.   Page 23.: None of us recall having seen a HERI survey or any results from
it.

26.   Page 24: The list of departments with national ranking from page 28 should
be moved up to here.
Rationale: This avoids the feeling of disconnect which arises when they are
introduced after repeated mention of a smaller list.

27.   Page 25 and 29: Some proposed programs are missing, for example
globalization and medical physics.

28.   Page 25 paragraphs 3-4, page 29, paragraph 4, page 55: Reduce the IT
commons emphasis, characterizing the program as more developmental given the
resource constraints and lack of formal governance consultation. Emphasize that
the program should complement, not compete with existing academic areas.
Rationale: This emphasis has not been formally discussed by faculty
governance.

29.   Page 27, paragraph 2. "A General Education Committee is charged with …
ensuring adequate courses...to complete the requirements in a timely way" should
be deleted or modified.
Rationale: While the adequacy of individual courses is somewhat within the scope

of the committee, it cannot control the adequacy of the supply of
courses.

30. Page 30. "Together with a major capital initiative to build a new
School
of Business building" should be replaced with, "The School of Business
has begun
planning and governance consultation towards a capital initiative to…"
Rationale: Again, the development of a new building requires faculty
governance
consultation.

31. Page 31. It should be explained that the drop from 222 to 63
students
taking the ATS-W is due to the cancellation of the undergraduate
education
program. Since the average on the LAST test for 2002-3 is less than the
state
average, the reader is left wondering how it could rank "among the
highest
relative to other NYS institutions." Perhaps the table should be
deleted.

32. Page 33. Benchmarks of graduate program quality: Since grade
averages and
membership in professional societies are easily manipulated by the
program under
review, it is recommended that they be dropped. It is not clear that
faculty to
student ratio is a good measure, since that would be high for a program
which
produces only the occasional doctorate. A statement of the effect of low
graduate stipends on the yield rate should be included if this is to be
retained
as a benchmark. These measures could be replaced with numbers of
students
supported on external fellowships, and numbers of other student awards.

33. Page 34: Some departments are more than $5k below national norms for
RA
stipends.

34. Page 41: Has the IGSP certificate has been approved by GAC and by
state ed?
(We assume so, but didn't recall when).

35. Page 43: What is the homeland security initiative? Should this read
the
"proposed" or "planned" initiative? The certificate should say "pursuant
to
governance and state education approval".

36. Page 45: Given that there has been no increase in retention since
1996 and

there are no additional resources for the sorts of programs which require
one-on-one attention and small classes, what are the planned mechanisms
to
increase the retention rate to 90%? Are there potential consequences of
overstating this? The need for more money to accomplish this should be
explicit.

37. Page 46: There is some ambiguity in the discussion of 4 year
graduation
rates for rising juniors as to whether that was 4 years total or 4 years
after
becoming a junior. There are insufficient specific mechanisms to justify
an
increase in graduation rate to 70% without an increase in resources. The
need
for more money to accomplish this should be explicit.

38. Page 47 and page 50: No mention is made of master degree program
assessments
and student outcomes. Masters students are a significant fraction of the
graduate student population.

39. Page 48: There should be some mention of the implication of the new
general
education structure on transfer students and their graduation rates.

40. Page 48-51: As a demonstration of the on-going University-wide
commitment
to matters relating to "Student Support/Student Life" it should be noted
that
the University Senate affirmed the Charter revision of the University
Life
Council, with its three standing committees "Health, Safety and Well-
being,"
"Athletics," and "Residential Life."

41. Page 48: Insert some reference to GSO in this section. The Graduate
Student Organization sponsors 30 groups catering to the educational
social and
cultural needs of the 5000 graduate students.

42. Page 50: While a paragraph is devoted to the Career Development
Center and
student satisfaction surveys, no mention is made of the curtailing of the
services of that center. The 2002 hiring rates of Albany graduates (35%
upon
graduation, 80% within six months) are mentioned with no indication
whether
these are superior, "on par" (the phrase used for law admission), or a
serious
problem.

43. Page 51: It would be desirable to indicate an intention to provide
the

feedback to governance.

44.   Page 52: middle of page: change "course content" to "course
material". We
like to believe that the actual presence of the lecturer contributes to
course
content, but not 24/7.

45. Page 54: More emphasis should be placed on the need for additional
staff,
including clerical and help desk staff, for IT initiatives.

46.   Page 55: "The University envisions development of" an IT building
still
implies some governance consultation has occurred.

47.   Page 55: Some mention should be made of the potential for placement
of a
performing arts center or stadium on the Harriman campus, both of which
have
been discussed.

48.   Page 55: second bullet: What master planning process?

49.   Page 56: There should be mention of the facilities committee of the
University Planning and Policy Council (and an actual tie should be
planned
between it and facilities planning and with the space committee).

50.   Page 57: Before the list of priorities, "Top priorities for the
current
proposed multi-year capital plan continue to be:" should be "Priorities,
to be
discussed with the University Planning and Policy Council, are expected
to
include:"

51.   Page 58: Mention (and use) should be made of ties between UAS and
the
University Life Council Residential Life Committee.

52.   Page 59: With respect to the energy plan, mention should be made of
coordination with UPC and ULC.

53.   Page 60: The faculty bylaws were changed to increase the
participation of
both the administration and the faculty in shared governance and
consultation,
not to "bring governance structure and practices into line with those of
similar
research universities."

54.   Page 60: Mention should be made of an intention to share the MOU
with

faculty governance.

55. Page 62: "reallocate funds between objects" should be "objectives"

56. Page 63: the "faculty advisory group" at the top of the page should be "the
Resource Allocation Committee of the University Planning and Policy
Council".

57. Page 63: Does DIFR stand for discretionary IFR? Spell this out.

58. Page 65: Change "key areas of need" to "key areas of interest" to more
accurately reflect the process, which did not involve formal faculty input into
defining "areas of need".

59. Page 66: There should be a stronger tie between these priorities and those
discussed earlier, e.g. on page 55.

60. Page 69: The community relations section could contain some mention of
student volunteerism, and the probable role of UAlbany in post-tsunami
redevelopment.

61. Appendix C should be condensed into a table or two. If some numbers of
"national awards and honors" are roughly counted from the data, no one can be
too offended.