

**Governance Council**  
**Wednesday, November 2, 2016**  
**2:45 PM**  
**UNH 300**

Karin Reinhold, Chair

**Minutes**

**PRESENT:** Earle, Keith; Herrmann, Susan; Kressner, Ilka; Moore, Chris; Petry, Greta;  
Poehlmann, Christian; Reinhold, Karin; Schmidt, John; Slye, Katherine

The meeting convened at 2:51 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of October 5<sup>th</sup> were unanimously approved, with minor changes.

GOV members agreed to the recommendation that written Chair and subcommittee reports be circulated with the agenda and included in the meeting minutes going forward.

**CHAIR'S REPORT – Karin Reinhold**

Bruce Szelest is the new Chief of Staff. He has received the website updates that Liaison committee made last year. His office will be working on improving the website so he welcomes our input.

We have an undergraduate student representative: Austin Ostro.

Gov. committees are formed, but we still need one faculty for Gov. Council and two faculty members for GAC's Admissions and Academic Standing Committee.

On Oct 13<sup>th</sup> SEC meeting we discussed briefly about Senate rights and responsibilities and ways to improve senate visibility. These are issues that are connected to the themes in the survey and that Gov. should consider.

SEC also discussed problems with formal consultation over the most recent Compact Planning. There is a proposal that for the next round of Compact Planning, the Senate will be invited to submit a proposal of funding priorities. However, at the moment, it seems that there will not be a Senate representative among decision-making team. UPPC will be provided with updates on the campus compact plan awardees.

The Resolution on Student Representation was approved by the Senate on Oct 24<sup>th</sup>. This resolution calls for Gov. to write a section of the Senate Handbook on best practices for encouraging strong and fair student representation.

There was a proposal for a Senate meet and greet at the Faculty Meeting where all Senate Councils will have a table with info about what each council does a suggestions box.

The Provost mentioned during Senate meeting of Oct 24<sup>th</sup> that 18 futuring papers identifying key opportunities will be posted online soon. They will be available for comments for 2 weeks. Keep an eye on e-mails. Also keep an eye for an invitation to participate in the Concert of Ideas events during Dec 9 & 10.

The Presidential Search website was launched as a central hub which contains key information and other items with regard to the search. For reference: <http://www.albany.edu/presidentialsearch/> The tentative target date to complete the search process is June 2017.

Online nomination process for faculty, staff students and deans was completed with approximately 900 nominations received. There were a total of 305 community nominations. Each nominee was contacted and asked if they agreed to server if selected.

- 84 faculty members nominated (includes librarians): 53 accepted, 31 did not
- 94 students nominated: 88 accepted, 6 did not
- 127 staff nominated (includes deans):105 accepted, 22 did not

Key consistency meetings (“listening sessions”) with targeted stakeholders including members of the following groups: deans, executive committee, academic leadership, diversity council, senate leadership and students, were held on 10/11 & 10/19.

Elections for the six faculty representatives on the search committee started yesterday.

New business for consideration: updating the Albany Handbook, which is terribly out of date. It was last updated around 2000 <http://www.albany.edu/senate/UHandbook.htm>

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Liaison and Elections Committee (LEC) – Christian Poehlmann, Chair**

Recently the Liaison and Elections Committee met to develop a recommendation on how to ensure scholarly diversity in the upcoming election for the Presidential Search Committee. As you know, there will be 6 faculty elected to the search committee. We recommend the six vacancies be filled according to the following plan.

- The Uptown campus is allocated 4 representatives, while the East and Downtown campuses are each allocated a representative.
- The candidates receiving the highest vote on each of the three campuses will fill three of the candidacies.
- One candidate each from the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences will fill the three remaining vacancies on the uptown campus.

Camille Chesley is a new member of the committee.

### **Assessment of Governance and Consultation Committee (AGCC) – Greta Petry, Chair**

The committee reviewed the Report of Assessment of Governance Survey and accepted the survey with suggested edits and recommended a small change in the table breaking down survey participant data (including gender, undergraduate, M.A., Ph.D. status, ethnicity) in the summary table on p. 3 of the student survey for Spring 2016 semester. The category percentages in the table should have next to them, in

parentheses, the corresponding category for the university as a whole, with an appropriate explanatory note at the bottom of the table. Example of proposed modification below with fictitious data: Males 248 40% (47%), Females 377 60% (53%). Note: Percentages in parentheses are for the university as a whole.

These percentages should be requested from Institutional Research.

*Chair Petry added that the amount of work last year's AGCC members put in on the survey was appreciated. GOV Chair Reinhold recommended deleting question #11 from the survey and would be making the recommended updates to the pending survey reports.*

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Scope of Consultation**

Chair Reinhold circulated a handout with additional information on the issue from an e-mail she had received that day. She later submitted the following written summary of GOV's determinations at the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting:

The Governance Council considered the issues of the scope of consultation with the Senate regarding proposal that are considered "minor" changes. There are often proposals that involve varying degrees of curricular changes as well as personnel and fiscal impact. Some of them must be reviewed by UPPC and GAC or UAC and referred to the Senate for discussion and a vote. A prior SEC recommended that proposals with apparent small or non-curricular and/or fiscal changes might not merit a separate consultation process. However, often changes do have consequences for other university bodies and consequently, there is a need for a procedure to inform the Office of the Provost of changes to be implemented. Additionally, the determination of what constitutes a "small change" has led to cases in which major changes in the way a department operates were enacted without apparent consultation with the affected faculty.

The Governance Council considered the procedure the Senate should follow when handling proposals, even when they are presented as "small changes", and recommended the following steps. Our major concern is to have a procedure that ensures that all parties involved are timely informed of proposed changes to their program.

The first two recommendations are designed to keep faculty that could be affected by new changes, timely informed about changes that are proposed in their own department.

**Recommendation 1.** To ensure that all proposals have had due early consideration and discussion in the department of origin, proposals must include the minutes of the faculty meeting or the program committee meeting where the proposal has been discussed with a broad group of faculty of the department in question.

**Recommendation 2.** To ensure that the Senate communicates to its constituency the business it is considering in a timely manner, committee reports should be included with council meeting agendas.

**Recommendation 3.** All proposals should be directed to the appropriate Senate councils: UPPC and GAC or/and UAC. They should also be sent to CAA if appropriate. The councils will then determine whether the proposal is ready for consideration by the SEC and the Senate. If the council agrees with the proposal,

it will send it to the SEC and the Senate for discussion and vote. If the council disagrees with the proposal, it will send it back to the originating unit with suggestions for improvements.

Proposals that are truly “minor” modifications will go through the process expeditiously and thus we considered that this procedure does not constitute an undue burden. On the other hand, if a proposal has unforeseen implications, this process serves as a process of uncovering issues, as an opportunity to remedy them, and as a measure to inform faculty in the affected departments.

A motion was made and unanimously approved to accept recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Report on shared governance survey**

A motion was made and unanimously approved to accept the Reports on Shared Governance for presentation to the SEC and the Senate, with minor modifications as discussed during the AGCC report.

### **Representation of contingent faculty**

GOV members began considering individuals to include in a discussion and ways to solicit feedback on this issue.

Chair Reinhold circulated proposals being considered for the assessment of the deans.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Elisa Lopez, Recorder