Senate Secretary Christian Poehlmann
Reports Submitted for September 25, 2017 Senate:

UNIVERSITY SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT – Karin Reinhold

I. Informational
During May Chair Collins, Vice Chair Reinhold and Secretary Poehlman organized the election of chairs for the councils and standing committees for 2017-18.

In June Vice Chair Reinhold a) held a Senate structure meeting with incoming Vice Chair Mower and Secretary Poehlman, b) participated in record keeping for council meetings with senate leaders and IT Chris Moore with a recommendation that each council should have a group drive for the council records, and c) participated in a Senate and UUP leaders on increased participation of contingent faculty, increase in faculty workload and assessment of deans.

July 11th Campus Governance Leaders (CGL) meeting (Chair Collins, Past Chair Cynthia Fox, Vice Chair Reinhold, incoming Vice Chair Mower and interim Provost Darrell Wheeler and Chief of staff Szelest) addressed the transition of leadership, the assessment of academic units and website.

July 24th CGL meeting with the President-Elect Havidán Rodrigues addressed the shared governance culture of our university.

July 26th Website meeting with JD Hyde and Angela D'Atri. Vice Chair Reinhold was requested graphs for shared governance and content input for the different councils.

Tue Aug 1st & 8th Vice Chair Reinhold met with incoming Vice Chair Mower to plan the elections' calendar.

Thr Aug 10th Scott Bridges gave E. Lopez and Vice Chair Reinhold a tour of the new Campus Center facilities, including the new Board room where Senate meetings will be held once the room is ready.

Wed Aug 22th Senate leadership discussed the future visit of SUNY Senate President Gwen Kay and shared governance graphs to be displayed in the new website. Gwen made us aware that the announcement for Distinguished Professorships has been released, PIF funds (approved by chancellor and CFO) would be released Oct 15, promote and consider presenting at and/or attending the 2017 SUNY Diversity Conference: Engaging Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity in the Classroom, Campus and Community, 29 Nov - 1 Dec.

Wed Aug 23rd CGL meeting addressed the next steps of the Strategic planning process. President Rodriguez will review and set forth his vision for the university during the Fall. The assessment of academic units is underway. The Assessment Advisory Committee has been formed an it includes 3 representatives of the Senate. We continue to request the development of a process for assessment of Deans.

Fri Aug 25th Routing proposals meeting with UPPC Chair Collins, Vice Dean for

Graduate Education Bartow (OGE), Assistant Dean Undergraduate Education K. Winchester and C. Lavalle (UNE), and Associate Provost A.M. Murray.

New programs procedures are clearly documented and procedures for routing changes to programs were clarified. Timetables for proposal evaluation were discussed, to ensure programs receive timely evaluation. It was stressed the need for all involved parties to maintain communication.

Vice Chair Reinhold attended the Convocation. Interim President Stellar and President Elect Rodriguez welcomed the class of 2021, with 4000 students (including transfers).

Wed Aug 30th Senate leaders met with consultant from the AASCU-Penson Center for Professional Development and Dr. Charles Bantz, former Chancellor of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. We discuss items from which the culture of the university will be inferred.

Vice Chair Reinhold and McNutt, chair of CPCA, had meetings and conversations during the summer months regarding the composition of CPCA which needed to be updated after the charter amendment in the composition of CPCA.

Chair Collins and Vice Chair Reinhold run a petition of behalf of contingent faculty to increase contingent faculty representation in the Senate. The petition was distributed to the Senate and was signed by 70 faculty and staff, which included 12 senators.

During the week of Aug 28th, Chair Reinhold had conversations about the Global Distinction proposal with Dean and Vice Provost J. Altarriba, Assistant Dean Undergraduate Education K. Winchester, Chairs of UAC K. Kiorpes & C. Smith, Dean and Vice Provost, International Education H. Charles & Director of Global Academic Programs A. Richie, and Chair of UPPC C. Fox. The proposal was sent to UPPC for consideration.

SEC meeting of September 11th:

The President Havidán Rodríguez addressed the SEC in his first day in office and asked how do we move collectively and collaboratively forward making UAlbany stronger, with passion, engagement and enthusiasm in the 4 key areas: teaching, research, service and community engagement?

Provost Jim Stellar updated us on the work of the implementation groups on Contingent Concerns and Graduate Students Concerns. Current reports are not available, but he expected them soon. He also addressed the perceived negative impact on CAS due to the creation of the new schools. He explained that this is largely a myth and that enrolments in the new schools surpassed expectations. He cited the donation of 4Million for the School of Engineering. Stellar urged us to find possible synergies between CAS disciplines and the new schools and find projects/programs among schools. Some of this is already happening with the Global Distinction proposal.

When asked about the situation with DACA, Stellar stressed that UAlbany, the whole SUNY system and the State are all strongly in favor of the affected students and are doing all that they can to support them. He estimated that UAlbany has between 20-50 DACA students and added: "We don't know exactly because we do not ask". If you know students in need of assistance, direct them to the Student CARE Services Program.

This year the Senate should look into the issue of having UAlbany better represented within the SUNY-wide Senate which works in many of the same issues we do. We should try to make the SUNY-state wide Senate be relevant to UAlbany.

We should work on better engaging undergraduate students in the work of the Senate. It was recommended the creation of a 1 credit Institutional Leadership course that undergraduates can take for credit if they serve on the Senate. There already exists one at the graduate level. We should look into whether graduate students senators can take the course for credit while serving in the Senate.

It was recommended that each council cost-out the work of its council and subcommittees. This would serve as a way to estimate the value of the work done in councils and standing committees. This should be done every 4-5 years.

The chair of CPCA recommended that UAlbany should encourage more women faculty to consider promotion onto full professorship and that the policies for tenure and promotion should be re-examined to have clearer and more consistent sets of standards.

Vice Provost for Administration Szelest recommended reaching out to Ann Marie Murray of the Provost's Office regarding her work with the archivist to establish a the adoption of a proper nomenclature for naming files for files that will be shared by the council/standing committees groups.

SEC voted to support the Resolution 1718-01R: Incorporating part-time and contingent faculty in the university Senate.

On Sept 14th Chair Reinhold met with Patricia Keyes, Virginia Yonkers and Joe Creamer regarding representation of contingent faculty. It was recommended to implement the voting campaign for amendment to the bylaws 1617BA01 (rights of contingent faculty to vote for their own representative) early in the Fall semester and to have an extended period of voting for a chance of achieving quorum.

II. Actions taken
- Appointments of Senate representatives to the Assessment Advisory Committee: Penny NG from CAA, Ilka Kressner from GOV & Joette Stefl-Mabry from UPPC.
- Global Distinction proposal was sent to UPPC.
- Resolution 1718-01R: Incorporating part-time and contingent faculty in the university senate, was added to the Senate agenda.

III. Recommendations for actions

- Council and standing committee's chairs review the shared governance website page for their council/standing committee, become familiar with posting calendar, minutes and agenda on the website & prepare news and updates as appropriate.
- Explore the adoption of a proper nomenclature for naming files for files that will be shared by the council/standing committees groups.
- Explore cost-out the work of each council and subcommittees.
- Explore measures for increase participation of undergraduate and graduate students in the Senate.
- Encourage participation of UAlbany members in the SUNY-wide Senate.
- Re-introduce Bylaws Amendment 1617BA01, Right of contingent faculty to vote for their own representative, early in the Fall semester and install an extended period of voting to have enough time to achieving quorum.

IV. Announcements

- SUNY Senate President Gwen Kay will visit SEC on Oct 2nd and the Senate on Oct 16th.
- **Vacancies**. Please send nomination to Vice Chair Mower for the following vacancies:
  - Senate representative to the UAS Board of Directors.
  - Campus Recreation Advisory Board Vacancy
  - School of Business representative in UAC
- [2017 SUNY Diversity Conference: Engaging Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity in the Classroom, Campus and Community](), 29 Nov - 1 Dec.
- SUNY Undergraduate Research Symposium 2018: Friday, April 20 at Oneonta, and Saturday, April 21 at Monroe County Community College. UFS supports this opportunity for students across the SUNY system to come together and display, talk about, demonstrate and/or perform their research and scholarly activity.

V. Three Things for all Senators

- IMPORTANT: In your next departmental faculty meeting, be an advocate in support of the Amendment to the Bylaws 1617BA01 Right of contingent faculty to vote for their own representative.
- The president requests questions from faculty and students. Encourage your colleagues to submit questions for the President that can be addressed in upcoming Senate meetings.
- Senate FAQ with a condense summary of Robert's Rules: http://www.albany.edu/senate/index.htm   Select: **University Senate FAQs for Senators**

OTHER REPORTS

UFS (University Faculty Senate) – Diane Hamilton, Walter Little & Latonia

Spencer, SUNY Senators

- Walter Little is attended the UFS planning meeting in Syracuse September 14th and 15th and Friday.

GSA (Graduate Student Association) – Dawn Wharram, Lead Senator

- Nothing reported

SA (Student Association) – Jerlisa Fontaine, Student Association President

- Nothing to report

COUNCIL/COMMITTEE CHAIRS' REPORTS:

CAA (Council on Academic Assessment) – Alifair Skebe, Chair

- Nothing reported

CAFFECoR (Committee on Academic Freedom, Freedom of Expression, and Community Responsibility) –Carol Jewell, Chair

- CAFFECoR will meet for the first time this semester on September 27, 2017.

CERS (Committee on Ethics in Research and Scholarship) – Michael Jerison, Chair

- Professors Marina Petrukhina, chemistry, and Richard Goldstein, mathematics, say they are willing to be CERS members. CERS is expected to meet before 9/25 to elect a chair.

COR (Council on Research) – Robert Rosenswig, Chair

- The first meeting will be on Sept 18th.

CPCA (Council on Promotions and Continuing Appointments) Louise-Anne McNutt, Chair

Summary for Academic Year 2016-2017

The Council reviewed 31 applications: 17 for promotion to associate professor and continuation (i.e., tenure), 3 for continuation at the associate professor level, and 11 for promotion to full professor. In the interest of confidentiality, individual applications are not discussed in this report. Rather, this report provides insights regarding policy, procedure, and process issues that arose as Council members reviewed dossiers, deliberated,

and wrote recommendations.

The Council members' diverse areas of expertise encouraged robust discussions and, occasionally, resulted in a lack of consensus. This document raises the major issues discussed over the year. This is *not* a consensus document, rather issues raised by one or more members are included so that diverse perspectives can inform future discussions. For complex issues such as teaching evaluation and selection of external reviewers of scholarship, we recommend an ad-hoc committee be charged with careful deliberation and recommendations for updating the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review*.

Amend Charter: Increase number of CPCA members

The service commitment on CPCA averaged approximately 150 hours, per member, during the past academic year, which is excessive for faculty members with multiple service responsibilities. Given the planned growth of the University, the expected increase in faculty hiring will result in a larger workload for the CPCA in coming years. On April 6, 2017, the Council held an open meeting to review multiple options to address the service burden. After considering several different options, the Council concluded the number of dossiers reviewed by members should be reduced by increasing the number of Teaching Faculty serving on the Council and by removing the requirement that all dossiers be reviewed by every Council member. The College of Arts and Sciences' Tenure and Promotion Committee has an existing procedure for assignment of dossiers, which was recommended as a model for the CPCA. Senate bill 1617-02A to amend the Charter was passed on May 8, 2017.

The primary changes in the Charter are:

	Prior	Amendment
Number of members	9-13 members	14-22 members
Quorum	Majority (6-7 members)	7 members
Senators	4 members	3 members
Full professors	No requirement	At least half
Dossier review assignment	Full Council	7 members (minimum) 1 Senator 4 Full Professors

Support Staffing

Historically, the Office of the Provost has provided support staff for the Council. The support is in the form of collecting, formatting, and distributing the cases; scheduling the Council meetings and securing meeting locations; communicating with the Council members, candidates, and department/college staff; taking notes of the discussion at the meetings; drafting the Council's recommendation for each case; distributing the draft recommendations to the Council members and making revisions; and distributing the final recommendations to the candidates for their review and response. This substantial set of duties, coupled with the large number of cases reviewed on a weekly or biweekly basis, has contributed to a delay in advancing the cases to the next level of review. Over the summer, the CPCA Chair and Provost Office discussed this issue and developed a plan to improve the timeliness of the process. The new plan needs to be carefully monitored and adjusted where needed.

- New plan for 2017-2018: The CPCA member presenting a dossier for discussion will complete, in advance, a template-formatted collection of key elements of the case. In tenure cases, an Associate/Assistant Provost or professional staff member will take minutes at the meeting and an Associate/Assistant Provost will use the notes and template-formatted collection of case highlights to draft the case summary. The summary (recommendation) will then be reviewed by CPCA voting members in attendance, edited if needed, and approved.

    o The expectation is that the recommendation will be available for review, revision and approval within one week of the meeting.

Recommendation: Review the timeline during Fall 2017 and modify if needed.

CPCA member reviewed for promotion

Currently, a CPCA member may be reviewed for promotion to full professor. However, this situationn is uncomfortable for all and potentially disruptive to the Council's unbiased functioning.

Recommendation: Modify the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review* to specifically exclude current CPCA members from candidacy for promotion.

Review of late and incomplete dossiers

A recurrent problem is late and incomplete dossiers. Central to this issue is the conflict between who controls the timeline for processing the dossier (department/school/college) and who is most harmed by enforcing deadlines

and completeness (candidate). When crucial information was found to be missing, the case was tabled and a request for information was obtained. However, when no crucial information was missing, the case was reviewed but submission to the Provost was delayed until the dossier was complete.

Recommendation: Encourage the Provost's Office to make more explicit the individuals (i.e., Department Chair, School/College P&C Chair, Dean) responsible for the timely completion of the dossier and closely coordinate both the movement and completeness of dossiers.

Promotion and Continuation Dossier Management System (Interfolio)

Interfolio, a computer system to administratively manage dossiers, has been selected by the University and is expected to be implemented by Fall 2017. The system was reviewed by the incoming and outgoing CPCA Chairs and other stakeholders on campus. Interfolio is utilized by many major universities; the basic product has core functions that will be useful for our campus. However, a few additional features are needed to meet our goals (e.g., reduce administrative processing time) and adhere to P&C procedures (e.g., provide stepwise access to the file by the candidate).

Recommendation: Ask a couple of current or former CPCA members to evaluate the system. Specifically,
- Review and verify Interfolio maintains both the spirit and written policies of the P&C guidelines; suggest modifications where needed.
- Review the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review* to identify opportunities using Interfolio that might facilitate a more efficient review.
    - o Provide suggested page lengths for internal letters, including letters from Chairs, Deans, and subcommittees.
    - o Identify opportunities to reduce staff, faculty and administrator time while maintaining the integrity of the P&C process.
- Note: This recommendation is specific to CPCA. Many other stakeholders also will be reviewing the system during initial implementation.

SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact Faculty Hires

In early January 2012, the Provost called for NY SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact proposals for funding under the Governor's and Chancellor's NY SUNY 2020 initiative. The key requirement for funding was that proposals

show that any faculty appointment made under this plan resulted in increased enrollment and/or increased external and graduate student support. Specifically, the guidelines stipulated,

> "Given the critical nature of enrollment and extramural funds to the overall UAlbany 2020 plan, careful attention will be given to the outcomes of hiring during the five years of the plan. An evaluation of this will begin toward the end of "year 2" following initial hiring, using the metrics outlined in the successful proposal. The central funding for hiring plans made under the NY SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact program for whom expected external funding and/or instructional responsibilities (of the individual hire and of the unit) are unmet will be removed. Continued employment for those hired will need to be funded by unit resources. The same will be true if the academic unit overall instructional and/or external funding pattern declines (NY SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact Ground Rules and Request for Proposals for new Faculty, p1)."

In spring 2017, the first tenure cases associated with NY SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact faculty hires came before the CPCA for review. The question the CPCA debated was whether these particular 2020 UAlbany Impact faculty should be held to additional standards of performance? Should the faculty being evaluated for tenure also show that the funding requirements were met as a requirement for tenure? Alternatively, did the department or school need to show that the requirements were met or if not, that they could fund this additional faculty resource themselves. There is no clear guidance for the CPCA concerning how to evaluate these tenure cases.

Recommendation: The Provost should ascertain who is tracking the performance requirements of the NY SUNY 2020 UAlbany Impact funding proposals and make sure some form of documentation about how these requirements have been addressed is included in the tenure file. Alternatively, the CPCA needs additional guidance from the Provost concerning how to handle these cases.

CPCA tenure review and vote prior to University at Albany employment

The procedures for senior scholar employment and tenure review differs from the typical assistant professor hire. Currently, procedures exist for employment of senior academics who transition to U Albany from peer academic institutions. If an individual has tenure from a comparable

university, they may be granted tenure without CPCA review. If they have sufficient experience to be appointed at the associate professor or professor level, but not tenured, they are given a three year contract with a continuation (tenure) review during the second year.

With the increase in professional education, UAlbany will be recruiting senior scholars who have extensive experience in government, industry, and research institutes, but potentially limited teaching experience. As a case in point, this academic year a high-quality scholar who was offered employment replied that acceptance was contingent on tenure. This posed a challenge to the current system given the candidate's limited teaching record.

Recommendation: Add guidance on pre-employment tenure review for employment of senior scholars who lack a traditional academic background to the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review.*

Evaluation of teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the University. As such, a thorough evaluation of teaching performance is critical to identify candidates who are best suited to providing high quality education.

In Fall 2016, the UUP sent a report titled The Place of Student Evaluations in Assessing Faculty Teaching to the Senate Chair who shared it with the CPCA. The report argued that peer assessment should be the focus of teaching performance evaluation; student evaluations should have minor input. The report bases its argument on two points: (1) University documents that guide teaching evaluation processes, and (2) bias in student evaluations.

Review of Senate Bill 8384-07, including its rationale, does support the contentions UUP argues. Specifically, that peer assessment should be the focus; student evaluations should have limited weight in the overall evaluation. Peer teaching evaluation was noted to have multiple components, including (but not limited to): review of teaching statement, syllabi, and course materials; peer observations of class; and an assessment of student evaluations, internship mentorship, and theses mentorship. The CPCA members read and discussed the UUP report. Overall, it appears that the current system is in compliance with policy, however, there are aspects that could be strengthened.

Recommendation: Given the importance of teaching evaluation, CPCA members recommend that an ad-hoc committee carefully discuss how current teaching evaluations are performed and provide specific recommendations for updating the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review.* The following issues and questions have arisen related to teaching evaluation:

- Peer observation of teaching typically is limited to two 1.5-hour class periods during the year prior to P&C review. It is recommended that observations occur with more frequency and over a longer period of time. This is particularly important prior to the tenure decision.

  o As noted in the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review* "Departments

    should avoid conducting peer observations only at the time of the tenure review process."

- The UUP report correctly notes that student evaluations are known to be biased by demographic characteristics and grading. However, based on the literature, these same biases exist with peer and supervisory evaluations also.

  o CPCA suggests consideration be given to providing adjusted SIRF scores along with the unadjusted scores. Scores can be adjusted for professor's demographics; class size and student's self-reported expected grade in the course.

- Other SIRF issues have arisen.

  o The low response proportion continues to concern CPCA members.

  o The window of time for SIRF responses is wide, allowing students to start the evaluation process weeks before material is covered. Could the window be shortened and begun nearer the end of the semester?

  o Is it possible to allow departments to conduct evaluation surveys designed by the department?

- For dossiers being reviewed for promotion to Full professor, consider: separating pre-tenure and post-tenure teaching records into

  o two separate sections in the dossier.

  o providing results of SIRF scores separately for pre-tenure and post-tenure periods.

- Grade distributions should be stratified by the type of grading system (i.e., A-E and S/U) to make comparisons between the professor and department averages. Providing A-E grade percentages separately would facilitate comparison of a professor's grading distributions to department norms.

- Teaching which occurs outside the traditional classroom is inconsistently filed in the dossiers, typically either in the teaching or service sections. These activities include project mentorship, thesis committee work, development of degree curricula, etc. Some of these activities align well with the service section, making organization of the dossier somewhat inconsistent.

- Further, with respect to mentorship commitments, quantifying the role and time commitment would add further detail and consistency of review.

  o Consider asking candidates to delineate the role and time commitment for thesis activities (e.g., committee member), internship mentoring, research mentoring, and routine academic advisement. For example, did doctoral committee membership include intellectual involvement in the design and process of thesis work, or was the candidate's involvement limited to reviewing the thesis to assure department standards are met?

External reviewers of scholarship

The importance of the external reviews cannot be overstated; however, attention must be given to ensuring selection does not bias the review process. Given that most dossiers include scholarship substantially outside most CPCA members' expertise, these letters are crucial in the assessment of the scholarship's quality and quantity. In the majority of cases reviewed, CPCA members discussed the inappropriateness of at least one external reviewer based on the guidelines in the Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review. Central to these deliberations was the interpretation of "arm's length" distance between the candidate and reviewer, including the following examples:

- reviewer had previously stayed in the candidate's home while visiting U Albany

- reviewer had been invited by the candidate to U Albany previously for a seminar talk

- reviewer had recruited the candidate to serve on a journal's editorial board

- reviewer and candidate spent several summers together at a small group workshop

- reviewer had interviewed the candidate for a job previously

- reviewer potentially had a professional or personal stake in relationship with candidate

Other issues that arose and would benefit from deliberation and potential modification of the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review* include:

- The requirement that reviewers are at peer or aspiring institutions.

  o In some cases, the most well-respected scholar in a field is a powerhouse at a university that is not considered peer or aspiring.

  o International work benefits from international external review. Non-US universities can be difficult to measure as peer or aspiring except at the highest level. Again, the selection of scholars with strong, documented scholarship records is extremely valuable and may be a better criterion for qualifications as a reviewer involving international research.

  o Scholars in non-academic settings also are highly valuable to provide a review of scholarship, particularly in disciplines that are applied in nature.

  o Reviewers who have all traveled through one or two universities taps into a network that some Council members thought was too limited. In very few fields are there truly only a couple of institutions capable of producing all scholars capable to review a dossier.

- Reviewers have strong relationships with senior faculty in the department (e.g., former students, collaborators). These relationships can appear to bias the resulting letter in some cases.

- Reviewer was previously a faculty member at U Albany. Again, this can be seen as lacking the independent, external review that is sought.

- Quality of external reviewer letters

  o The most concerning issue is unusually short letters (i.e., one brief paragraph). This suggests little actual review occurred.

In this case, the department should consider soliciting an additional letter as some Council members may disqualify the review.

- o No substantial evaluation of the candidate's publications even within a longer letter.

Recommendation: Given the importance of scholarship evaluation, CPCA members recommend that an ad-hoc committee carefully discuss how current external reviews of scholarship can be improved and provide specific recommendations for updating the *Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Review.*

Conclusions

The process of reviewing dossiers is extremely gratifying to CPCA members. Clearly, the university can attract exceptional talent, a reflection on our own faculty's expertise and scholarship. Our colleagues are successfully pursuing excellence in scholarship, integrating cutting edge methods of teaching while remaining actively engaged in service in the university, their profession, government and communities.

Many dossiers were well organized, providing an opportunity to thoroughly access the content and assess the candidate. The contents of this summary focus both on the process of the review, committee membership, and the substance of the dossiers. It is our hope that the details provided herein sufficiently guide further contemplation of the challenges inherent in refining the P&C process and specifically provide a starting point for those who labor in this endeavor. The outcome will undoubtedly serve the University well by attracting and retaining faculty capable of carrying out its vision—developing innovative solutions, exceptional professionals, rigorous 21st century scholars and the next generation of visionary leaders.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of CPCA 2016-2017, Louise-Anne McNutt, PhD. Chair

GAC (Graduate Academic Council) – Sean Rafferty, Chair

- GAC has staffed most of its committees and will be having its first meeting on Tuesday the 26th.

GOV (Governance Council) – Jim Mower, Chair

- GOV met for its initial 2017-18 meeting on September 6. The chair (Mower) explained the functions and duties of GOV and its interactions with the Senate. He discussed known agenda items for the upcoming year including old business (reconsideration of Faculty Bylaws Amendments BA 1617:01 and BA 1617:02). The chair also recounted the meetings between the Senate leadership and the interim Provost and incoming President over the summer. As an item of new business, GOV appointed Julio Cuccio Slichko to the Campus Recreation Advisory Board.

LISC (Council on Libraries, Information Systems, and Computing) –

- Nothing reported

UAC (Undergraduate Academic Council) – Christy Smith, Chair

- In early May via email UAC voted to approve some changes to the major in Computer Engineering. Selected courses from the CEN program have been revised to meet ABET accreditation requirements and guiding principles.

- On May 22nd, Registrar Karen Chico Hurst and Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Education Kathie Winchester extended an invitation to members of UAC and its four subcommittees to attend a meeting to continue discussion of the draft proposal to expand the language of the undergraduate grading and grade change policies. The goal was to be in compliance with SUNY's 2013 guidelines, incorporate current business practices into the policies, and set a time limit on when grades could be changed. Earlier UAC and CAS feedback had been incorporated. Chief of Staff Szelest also had input into the document. In June it was circulated via email to the working group in attendance at the meeting for final approval.

- In late May via email UAC and the Curriculum and Honors subcommittee reviewed a proposal from the Center for International Education and Global Strategy for a Global Distinction milestone. During a UAC meeting earlier in spring semester there was a discussion of how Vice Provost Harvey Charles was making presentations on campus regarding dual-degree programs integrating study abroad and international internships. The Global Distinction milestone evolved from those presentations. The Global Distinction Milestone would be awarded to students after they complete a set of integrated academic experiences including language study, study abroad, and an internship. The program would be administered by CIEGS. It does not involve any alterations to

degree requirements for any major or minor. Over the summer, CIEGS' program coordinator will assemble lists of potential courses which will be reviewed in Undergraduate Education prior to CIEGS setting up meetings with individual departments. The milestone will appear on the bottom of the student's transcript when completed. The proposal was approved.

- The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee reviewed two proposals for University-Wide Internships for fall once the August application deadline had passed.

- The General Education Committee finalized two pending proposals for general education category designations that had been revised.

- The Committee on Academic Standing met two full days in June to review appeals for petition for late drops and academic dismissals. Approximately 265 students were academically dismissed and 134 appealed. CAS also met later in the summer to revisit two appeals involving new information. They met again to adjudicate an academic grievance coming out of the College of Arts and Sciences. They had their first fall meeting to review petitions for readmission and for exceptions 9/6. Another meeting is scheduled for 9/21. They will meet every two weeks.

- The first UAC meeting is scheduled for 9/19. Subcommittees are forming.

ULC (University Life Council) – Ekow King, Chair

- The first ULC Meeting is being held on Wednesday, Sept. 20th.

UPPC (University Planning and Policy Council) – James Collins, Chair

UPPC (University Planning and Policy Council) Final UPPC from Cynthia Fox, Outgoing Chair

I. Informational

A. The Council met on May 11. New members for the 2017-2018 academic were also in attendance.

1. The agenda included several reports:

a. Vice Provost Ann Marie Murray gave the provost's report on behalf of

Interim Provost Wheeler. She reported 1) that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee is moving forward. There have been meetings at all three campuses to discuss the proposal. Attendance has been good and the reaction has been positive; 2) that the Provost's office held the first tenured faculty reception made up of the applicants from 2015-2016; and 3) that the Provost's office is getting prepared for the new format of graduation and will meet subsequently to evaluate the changes.

b. The Resource Analysis and Planning Committee reported on its meeting of May 10 art which they discussed the impact new enrollments and new programs have on the College of Arts and Sciences. They voted on two motions.

1. Motion one states that the Campus Impact Form should be amended to better reflect the real impact new programs will have on the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. Motion two states that once a new program is approved it should be mandatorily reevaluated again in either two or three years in order to assess its ongoing impacts.

The subcommittee also discussed the enrollment shortfall and its impact on the University's budget planning. Vice President of Finance and Administration Jim Van Voorst reported that the shortfall would be made up through other sources.

c. The Facilities Committee reported on its meeting of April 6. Mary Ellen Mallia, Director of Sustainability, gave a report on Sustainability initiatives. Associate Vice President of Facilities Management John Giarrusso gave a presentation on 2017-18 budget implications for Facilities Management and also on construction projects around campus.

2. New Business

a. The language in the draft strategic plan was discussed.

b. Proposed changes to the Campus Impact Form were presented and discussed, with new questions raised about the form's effectiveness in evaluating the resource implications of new programs and the final instructions

c. Also, the committee debated the final instructions on the approval page, especially the instructions given for the routing of forms.

3. On July 26, Chair Fox attended the Libraries' staff meeting on the topic of proposed changes to the Science and University Libraries.

4. In August, Chair Fox circulated a draft of the new Campus Impact Form that included the proposed changes.

II. Actions Taken

A. The Council approved updates to the Campus Impact Form.

III. Recommendations.

    A. None at this time.

UPPCReport090117 for SEC Meeting on 09/11/17

I. Information:

    A. The Council met on August 30. It heard a report from VP for Finance and Administration James Van Voorst, and council members discussed the basis for the VP's remarks about the capital side of the budget regarding the CEAS/Schuyler renovations and other works, and about the operational side of the budget, focusing on enrollments and complexities of the Excelsior program.

    B. The council heard a report from Sridar Chittur, Chair of the Facilities Committee, and discussed ways of helping define committee goals for this year. That discussion will continue, and administrative visitors will be requested to help shape that agenda. Chair Collins raised the issue of constituent concerns over space changes made in the main University Library and the College of Arts and Sciences.

    C. The council heard a report from Prof Mitch Leventhal, Chair of the Resource Analysis and Planning Committee, and discussed staffing of the committee, and a schedule of reports to the full council, tied to committee meetings with representatives from the Office for Finance and Administration.

D. Chair Collins provided an overview of Council mission and functions for new members; reported on the current state of the University's strategic plan, based on summer Campus Governance Leaders, and discussed appointments of Senate representatives to the Assessment Advisory Committee for the Assessment of Non-Academic Administrative Units -- Professors Stefl-Mabry from UPPC, Kressner from GOV, and Ng from CAS.

E. The Council discussed proposed revisions to the Campus Impact Form, all of which were accepted, with additional modifications.

F. The Council also discussed a 8/23/17 meeting of Senate officers with members from the Offices of the Provost, Graduate Education, and Undergraduate Education. Participants in the meeting considered various ways to improve routing of academic program proposals through the administrative and shared governance processes. It was decided not to adopt strict deadlines for proposal submissions but rather to encourage early consultation about all proposed program changes, whether of small or large scale.

II. Actions:

A. None taken

III. Recommendations:

A. That the Senate leaders and appropriate councils, as well as the Offices of Undergraduate and Graduate Education communicate with Academic Deans and Departments about the need to consult early with representatives of the Deans of Undergraduate and Graduate Education about all proposed academic programs and changes to existing programs. Such consultation will help those involved to better understand the scope of the proposed changes, their implications for more than the proposing academic units, and the best or most feasible timetable for their review.