

UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND POLICY COUNCIL
2004-05 Chair: Marjorie Pryse

November 29, 2004
Meeting Minutes

Present: J. Bartow, R Baum, N. Claiborne, R. Geer, J. Hanifan, F. Hauser, F. Henderson, T. Hoff, G. Kamberelis, S.B. Kim, C. MacDonald, D. McCaffrey, J. Mumpower, K. Murray, G. Paul, M. Pryse, S. Stern, J. Wick-Pelletier, E. Wulfert

Guest: P. Bloniarz, R. Farrell, N. Murray

Minutes: The minutes of September 27, 2004, October 11, 2004, and November 1, 2004 were approved.

Chair's Report – Professor Marjorie Pryse:

Professor Pryse reported that UPC, as a Council, had not been asked specifically to respond to the *ad hoc* University-wide Governance Committee Report, but inquired if any Council members wanted to respond. Professor Kim reported that he did respond to Professor Acker in a letter containing some proposals and asked Professor Pryse if, as Chair of UPC, she would contact Professor Acker to request his proposals be included in the report. Professor Pryse agreed to contact Professor Acker on behalf of Professor Kim.

GEAR Report: Council member Goutam Paul attended a UAC meeting as the UPC representative and reported as follows:

-
- POINT 1: There are three General Education learning outcomes as drafted by the GEAR group: (1) Mathematics, (2) Critical Thinking (Reasoning) and (3) Communication (Written). Some of these, in particular the Statistics portion of Mathematics, are offered by five different departments. Some UAC members commented that to evaluate students from different departments, five different tests in Math might be needed. But then there is the question of feasibility, cost, etc. UAC, in its response to the GEAR Draft review request, would suggest addressing this diversity issue.
- POINT 2: Two possible measures are suggested in the draft: (1) A nationally-normed measure, and (2) A locally-normed measure that correlates with a nationally normed measure. UAC suggests a *Mix-and-Match* approach that would be suitable for the SUNY students.
- POINT 3: In view of points 1 and 2 above, one major issue that is yet unclear is: what is the University's goal in the General Education Assessment; to assess the students, to assess the courses, or to assess both. UAC thinks that this needs to be determined first.

Professor Pryse will continue to follow up on this and determine if UPC should be involved.

Professor Pryse also requested feedback on the Provost's Assessment Advisory Committee's DRAFT "Institutional Assessment Plan."

UPC Committee Reports:

University Facilities Committee (UFC), Frank Hauser, Chair: No report.

Resource Analysis and Planning Committee (RAPC), Nancy Claiborne Chair: The Committee outlined priority items it would like to see included in the final draft of the Mission Review II document as follows:

Priority Items Generated from UPC - Mission Review II - November 10, 2004
(submitted by Marjorie Pryse, 2004-05 UPC Chair)

After devoting two UPC meetings and two RAPC meetings to a discussion of Mission Review II, we present a short list of priority items that we would like to see included in the final draft of Mission Review II. These include:

1. The University at Albany values educating the whole student. Therefore we aim to integrate goals for residential and student life into our goals for academic life. In an attempt to enliven students' entire spectrum of experience and to be responsive to student opinion, we commit to a new in-house survey that will increase and deepen our knowledge of student response to the education they receive and allow us to implement a collaborative model of student, faculty, and administrative vision for continuing to reach toward educational excellence.
2. The language of the document needs to redress a descriptive imbalance between CAS and the professional schools and programs. The University at Albany should highlight the way maintaining strong core programs in the Arts and Sciences will allow the campus to recognize the full benefit from "premiere" new programs that have garnered external resources (e.g. CNSE).
3. In an attempt to add more "soul" to the document, we strongly urge a return to some of the best language from the 1992 Mission Statement. For example, we read there that "the modern University at Albany emphasizes the integration of teaching, research, creative expression, and public service in its undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs."
4. We note that our financial growth is inextricably linked to our intellectual health and that the intellectual climate attracts both faculty and students interested in research. In other words, we want more emphasis on the intellectual benefits of being a research institution, not just the contribution of research to the balance sheet. Here again, we suggest the 1992 language where we read that "[Our] educational mission sustains an intellectual climate in which the research and creative endeavors of the faculty enlarge their sense of inquiry on behalf of their students...."
5. Please include more specific information both on faculty/department achievements and on the achievements and recognition our students receive.
6. As we consider the role of energy planning and management and its affect on the balance sheet, we return to the institution's early innovation in exploring alternative

energy models (e.g., the design of Alumni House) and commit to exploring possible cost-benefits of incorporating current and emerging technology (e.g. solar for the podium) as part of such planning. In this way, current research at CESTM might integrate research, planning, and budget needs.

Old Business:

Status of UPC-sponsored in-house scientific survey: Dr. Wulfert reported that she asked faculty members from Industrial Organization Psychology to conduct their own set of analysis on data they already have and determine the best way to proceed once those results are compiled. It is Dr. Wulfert's opinion that it would be best to work with extreme groups, use a small questionnaire, and conduct interviews. She indicated that approximately 900+ students would be a statistically significant number with which to work.

Mission Review II Discussion: There was discussion on how the MR II document language refers to CAS and professional schools. In the interest of time, it was decided that Council members would work on suggested language independently, send out their suggestions to other members via email and try to come up with agreed upon language.

Provost's Report – presented by Interim Provost Jeryl Mumpower: Interim Provost Mumpower reported that the Mission Review II document revisions have very high priority, along with preparing an enrollment plan for next year.

There was discussion on the enrollment shortfall and the *4x4 Plan* was mentioned. Interim Provost Mumpower said that he and Interim President Ryan would consider revisiting the previously proposed *4x4 Report* and that it would be appropriate for UPC to take up the matter. Professor Pryse will contact Dr. Ron Bosco for a copy of the *4x4 Report* for UPC review.

Proposed move of the Department of Computer Science from CAS to SISP: Guests: Peter Bloniarz and Neil Murray.

Dr. Bloniarz provided a brief review of the IT Commons initiative and noted that there have been four new faculty members hired this September, each with joint appointments in their primary area and the School of Information Science and Policy.

Due to lack of time, the remainder of the discussions on the IT Commons, further discussion of the "Institutional Assessment Plan," and the *4x4 Report* were tabled until the next UPC meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Jayne VanDenburgh, Recorder