

**University at Albany, State University of New York
Governance Council**

Friday, October 29, 2010
Susanna Fessler, Chair

Minutes

PRESENT: Tom Bessette, Nan Carroll, Liang Chu, Nicholas Fahrenkopf, Susanna Fessler, Andi Lyons, Candace Merbler, John Pipkin, Tremayne Price, Donna Scanlon, Laura Schultz, Joette Stefl-Mabry, Daniel White

GUESTS: Brett Bowles, Laurence Kranich, Richard Matyi

The meeting convened at 1:00 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 8 were approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT BY SUSANNA FESSLER

Chair Fessler informed GOV that she has been receiving an electronic petition concerning the Theatre Department. The petition originated with Leah Golby, a member of the Albany Common Council.

The Chair had a discussion with William Hedberg concerning the history of CPCA and he provided a comprehensive history. He has encouraged revisiting the council's composition.

NEW BUSINESS

Meeting Schedule:

GOV members agreed that the best time to meet that would allow the greatest participation is Friday afternoons at 3:00 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 19.

GAC's Request to Clarify CAA's Role in Program Reviews--GAC Chair Larry Kranich and CAA Chair Richard Matyi:

GAC Chair Kranich opened the discussion on the issue which is twofold: clarification of the role of the Academic Program Review (APR) Committee and its charge, and clarification that that CAA may recommend policy changes to the University Senate as stated in the Charter, Section X.6.5. Chair Kranich explained that it was only last year that GAC began to review the CAA reports. It appears that there may be some overlapping jurisdiction between GAC and CAA. Chair Matyi said he believed that program review procedures are to certify the process

which includes a self-study followed by an external review and a response to observations from the external review. He said that CAA does not wish to perform the program review. CAA's role is to certify that the loop has been closed by ensuring that the program director or chair of the assessed program addresses any shortcomings that the external reviewers bring to their attention. He stated further that there needs to be a direct way to communicate with a representative of UAC and GAC on these matters. Chair Kranich said that since the process is new to GAC and still being modified, they want to be clear on whether it is in the purview of the APR to make programmatic recommendations. Chair Fessler said she believed that GAC should be making the recommendations concerning programs. Chair Matyi recommended having someone from both GAC and UAC serve on the CAA to ensure cross communication between those councils and CAA. Chair Kranich agreed that was a good idea but he would like to see specific language in the Charter that says CAA's role is to conduct assessment and GAC's role is to review programs. Chair Fessler suggested that the councils work out a proposal to bring back to GOV.

Budget Cuts--Governance Concerns: Brett Bowles:

Professor Bowles, from the French Program of the Languages, Literature, and Cultures Department, provided an overview of the different phases of consultation that occurred within the College of Arts and Sciences between Dean Wulfert and the CAS Department Chairs. He pointed specifically to a meeting of the Council of Chairs on April 28, 2010, when the chairs were asked to develop principles for disinvestment and for the purpose of the exercise to consider the 5% reduction scenario. At that meeting, Dean Wulfert noted that she would ask that each chair individually identify units within the college that he/she considered not essential to CAS or to the university and also encouraged that the chairs identify programs outside of the college or outside of Academic Affairs. She emphasized that she would hold individual suggestions in strictest confidence and would not share them with anyone including her own staff. Prof. Bowles said that it is unknown what role, if any, those lists played in the decisions of the Provost and the President.

In May of 2010 the CAS Dean presented two possible reduction scenarios to the University Planning and Policy Council (UPPC) and BAG3. One was based on a 5% reduction of CAS and proposed retrenchment of four tenured faculty and the elimination of one degree program. The second scenario of 15% included retrenchment of 31 tenured faculty and eliminating seven degree programs and three departments. The Dean was given a 6.8% cut *this year* and she recommended the retrenchment of 14 tenured faculty and eliminating five degree programs. Budget projections through 2011-2012 indicated a further similar cut, and the dean's cuts were based on that two-year projection.

At the UPPC meeting of October 15, questions were raised as to how an impact that was three to five times greater was recommended. The CAS Dean described two separate sets of criteria that were used. The first scenario used a two year window of projected resignations and retirements by August of 2010 and 2011. The second set of criteria was a one year window of declared resignations and retirement. Professor Bowles stated that this was her recommendation that was presented to the Provost and the President but not shared with any sector of governance. It wasn't until October 1 that the Provost and the Dean had individual meetings with faculty of the affected departments, informing them that enrollments were low and that this should have been predicted. He stated further that no input was requested from

anyone in LLC on how they might reshape their programs in response to the budget. He also discussed that over the summer the Provost and Dean met with the sole remaining faculty member of Judaic Studies and negotiated to move him into the History Department, thus preserving Judaic Studies and downgrading it to an interdisciplinary minor. Professor Bowles and said the Dean should have afforded those in the deactivated programs the same courtesy and find her actions a violation of consultation with governance. He and his LLC colleagues ask that a resolution similar to the one approved by the SUNY wide faculty be introduced to UAlbany's University Senate.

GOV members discussed the information discussed by Professor Bowles. John Pipkin spoke in his role as Associate CAS Dean and said he believed that the highlighted section referred to Professor Bowles handout was accurate and noted that the Dean solicited ideas from CAS chairs on possible restructuring throughout the university. Andi Lyons also referred to that section and stated that the Dean made it clear she was in charge to make the final decision but also sensed she was seeking input for alternative solutions to factor into her decision. Candace Merbler stated she supported the notion that there was a lack of consultation with governance. She stated further that the decision was financially driven and reflects a business model and not an academic one. SUNY Senator White informed GOV members that at the SUNY wide meeting it was learned that both SUNY Binghamton and Stony Brook have set aside all tenure and tenure track lines before budget cuts were made.

OLD BUSINESS

Response to the President's Memo on Program Deactivation

Chair Fessler asked GOV members to turn their attention to the response being requested in President Philip's memo of October 1, keeping the focus on governance issues. SUNY Senator White moved to support the resolution on governance from the University Faculty Senate. A motion to do so was made and seconded, and the motion was passed. Chair Fessler said she would like to put together a document that will indicate that things can be done in a more solicitous way in the future. Joette Stefl-Mabry read the Chancellor's Statement on Governance which in part states that, "In light of recent challenges to the basic structural elements of the University, I join with the Faculty Senate in reaffirming the validity of governance as the appropriate and organic process for the involvement of constituent groups in campus decision making." By this statement, University faculty, staff, and administration are reminded of the charge contained in the 1972 Master Plan that "the governance arrangements within the university will be increasingly clarified and improved methods of consultation will be developed to reflect the need for effective governance based upon widespread participation..."

Chair Fessler requested that GOV members e-mail their response so that she could develop a response prior to the meeting of the Executive Committee for the following Monday.

Evaluation of Administrators and Administrative Offices

The discussion was tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints.

CPCA Membership (pending news from Bill Hedberg)

Addressed in the Chair's Report

A motion was made to reopen the debate on the Charter amendment concerning council chairs. The motion was seconded but the resulting vote opposed reopening the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Gail Cameron, Recorder