

MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE SENATE
MEETING OF 1 FEBRUARY 2016

The seventh regular meeting of the College Senate of the State University of New York College at Oneonta was held February 1, 2016 in the Craven Lounge of the Morris Conference Center at 3:00 pm. The Presiding Officer and Secretary of the Faculty were present and serving in their elected capacities.

Dr. Achim Koeddermann (Philosophy) motioned to approve the minutes of the meeting of December 7, 2015 and was seconded by Ms. Kainat Malik. Dr. Richard Lee pointed out that Mary Lynn Benson's name was incorrectly stated as "Mary Lou". There were no objections to approval, subject to correction, so **the minutes are approved with the correction.**

The Presiding Officer, Dr. Michael Koch, gave his report. He spoke to the issue of confusion about policies, procedures, and processes within the Senate. It would be helpful if the faculty and administration develop a single handbook or source of policies relevant to faculty, procedures and processes that need to be followed. This is not about changing policies, just making them clear and accessible.

The President of the College, Dr. Nancy Kleniewski, gave her report. She has hired Kathy Webster, formerly assistant to the CEO of Fox Hospital, as her new assistant. Ms. Webster begins on February 11. The College has a new Chief Enrollment Management Officer, Kevin Jensen, who comes to us from the College of Western Idaho. In the Provost search, there are four finalists coming for campus interviews between February 8 and March 3. The candidates are Dr. Venkat Sharma, Dr. Elizabeth Throop, Dr. Scott Furlong, and Dr. George Arasimowicz. The CVs of the candidates will be mailed out. There will be three open meetings for each candidate, one for all campus members, one for teaching faculty and librarians, and one on campus climate and diversity. The College is about to launch a search for the new position of Associate Vice President of Student Development, a slight reconfiguration of the position that Dr. Jeanne Miller held.

The College has been awarded some SUNY performance improvement grants. The largest was for a financial literacy program to help minimize student debt. The College has already done some pilot programs, and the expectation is that we will become the model for SUNY. There is also a grant for computer-aided advisement. Additionally, there is a grant for needs-assessment for graduate programs, and a collaborative grant with other institutions for class scheduling software. The College did not receive a grant for expansion of EOP, but has created a new program, self-funded, which is similar to EOP and targeted at first generation college students with a certain range of income and high school performance measures. They will have a summer academy and dedicated counselors. This program, called ACE, will be looking to enroll approximately 75 students.

Finally, the Education Trust (a D.C. nonprofit) has identified SUNY Oneonta as one of the top 14 institutions nationally for raising overall graduation rate of our students (between 2003 and 2013) and for closing the gap for students of color.

Dr. Koeddermann asked if the new program counts towards our quota of acceptance. Dr. Kleniewski responded that it does. Dr. Leah Bridgers (MCS) asked whether the summer program would be combining courses with EOP. Ms. Linda Bassette (Office of Special Programs) responded that the students would be combined together in classes. Dr. Jan Bowers (Dean, Education and Human Ecology) pointed out that the College also received funding for service learning. Dr. Kathleen O'Mara (ALS) asked for further details about the requirements for eligibility, and Ms. Bassette stated that the requirement cap would be about 25% above EOP eligibility.

The Provost, Dr. James Mackin, gave his report. On the Library renovation, the cost versus budget analysis has been done, and the scenarios developed based on feedback were about double the budget; so they are being reworked. They do not expect much more opportunity for feedback, since they are balancing current feedback against the budget. A new proposal is expected soon. Dr. Mackin provided a link to the website for the company the College will be partnering with for the scheduling software from the aforementioned grant (<http://www.aais.com/>). They make projections based on past history, and predict future choices regarding general education. He also spoke about curriculum planning and its relation to the enrollment management plan, and asked what could be done with the current curriculum. He mentions that SUNY has had some issues; for example, they have asked why some programs are listed as both BA and BS and whether certain liberal arts requirements in programs qualify as liberal arts. Finally, He mentioned that the College will have two living and learning communities next fall, one on Sustainability and one on Social Justice. There is now a temporary website, if you want to learn more about these communities.

Dr. Janet Nepkie (Music) asked whether the question of definitions of Liberal Arts courses came from SUNY or this campus. Dr. Mackin responded that it is from SED (State Education Department). Dr. Koch spoke regarding the library renovation and the question of lack of consultation, particularly regarding the Chair of the Library Committee's expressed frustration at the Senate meeting of December 7. Dr. Koch expressed his concern that this is an example of lack of consultation even after consultation had been promised. Dr. Mackin responded that the committee was invited to all subsequent meetings, and it was his understanding that the committee was satisfied. Dr. Koch indicated that he would follow up with the committee.

Student Association President, Kainat Malik, gave her presentation. She announced that on February 15, at 6:15pm in the Red Dragon Theater, President of SUNY SA, Thomas Mastro, would be holding a meeting. She formally invited the faculty to attend, and will be sending a flyer through the Presiding Officer.

Dr. Koch gave the University Faculty Senator report on behalf of Renee Walker, who is on sabbatical. Dr. Koch and Dr. Walker attended the Winter Plenary, and Dr. Walker has sent out her report. He spoke on the passing of some resolutions by UFS. In many cases it is appropriate to bring them back for endorsement by our Senate. There were three resolutions, on expanding family leave policy, gender-inclusive spaces, and recognition of preferred name and gender identity. These were passed by UFS, and Dr. Koch will be bringing them to the Steering Committee. If the Steering Committee endorses them, they

will come before Senate. The UFS Executive Committee endorsed a Service Learning document, with strategies for implementation. Steering Committee will discuss whether that should come before the Senate for review and possible endorsement.

Ms. Rhea Nowak (Art) asked whether more involved info could be found in Ms. Walker's report. Dr. Koch responded that it could be, and he will post them as separate resolutions, so senators can look at them individually. In some cases, they are in the appendices of the document in the report. Dr. Nepkie asked whether the College is planning to use the UFS document being prepared for the April deadline. Dr. Koch stated that the applied learning group for that stage of the process has not yet been formed. Ms. Nowak asked whether service learning and applied learning are considered two different things. Dr. Koch responded that they are, but there is overlap.

Dr. Koch then spoke on shared governance between the faculty and administration, as an issue that came up at UFS. One particular case was the goal of ensuring there is adequate faculty representation on presidential searches, and seeking to use that representation to increase the diversity of the candidate pool. The SUNY Provost expressed frustration with the lack of diversity for presidential searches; there is currently brainstorming going on about how to increase that. SUNY is working to find a more formal role for governance. On some campuses there have been crises in faculty support for the president, and there were conversations about how to prevent this. What was said over and over again is that the best way to avoid crises is to make disagreement clear early in the process and attempt to resolve situations as soon as possible. UFS and SUNY have mechanisms to intervene in those situations. There were also conversations about the role of governance in SUNY mandated plans. The importance of bringing faculty governance in from the start was discussed, and the idea was brought up to provide a "faculty narrative" on how the faculty was consulted. Provost Zimpher mentioned that a "minority report" would be useful.

Next were highlights on the executive budget. There was no money for SUNY pay increases, or maintenance of effort. There is a proposal for renewal of SUNY 2020, allowing campuses to increase tuition. There is the possibility of another round of performance funding. The budget has a 485 million dollar cut from the CUNY senior colleges, which is about 30% of their budget. If it doesn't happen, the state will need to pay for that some other way, and the question is whether that would come out of SUNY. There is a proposal for a DREAM Act, as well as a \$15/hr minimum wage for all workers on SUNY campuses. SUNY is requesting a return of the money borrowed from faculty salaries, and increase of investment and performance fund, and has noted there has been a 9.5% reduction in funding for higher education across the board. The conclusion was that state funding has declined across the country, but SUNY is doing better than most.

Regarding the future of SUNY. There is the question of whether the comprehensive colleges are being squeezed between community colleges and SUNY centers. In the Q&A period with Chancellor Zimpher, she spoke of the unbundling of degrees. There is the question of whether this will undermine the campuses by taking away control of curriculum. Provost Cartwright spoke about OPEN SUNY 2.0, calling it a reboot. His talk was a "sharing of ideas." He asked whether it is possible to have a student taking classes from many SUNY campuses in order to obtain a degree; for example, can a student take one course from each SUNY campus, and earn a degree? Who would grant the degree? There followed a discussion within Senate of the topics of

"unbundling", certificate programs, and "micro-degrees"; the idea that some students might earn certificates in lieu of or to augment degrees, and modules. Certificates were mentioned as one way for SUNY to meet its goal for the overall number of degrees granted. Dr. Kleniewski mentioned this is one way to provide access to those who don't currently have access to a four-year degree.

Dr. Nepkie mentioned that, as Chairman McCall pointed out, the students approved rational tuition based on the fact that the money they raised would be matched by the legislature.

There was a session on Applied Learning with presentations linked online at the UFS website. Dr. Koch will post links to them. One thing included was Dr. Nepkie's presentation on the update of the UFS internship, now including a guidebook. Dr. Nepkie stated that the UFS Senate has approved it, so it is being brought to print.

Patrice Macaluso (Chair) gave a report from the College Curriculum Committee. The full text of Ms. Macaluso's report can be found on the senate website at:

<http://www.oneonta.edu/academics/senate/2015-2016/Reports/CCC-Senate-Report-2-1-16.docx>

The courses FASH 231 (Fashion Entrepreneurship), MKTG 263, and BIOL 258 were approved. Revisions to Fashion & Textiles (11/4/15) and Dietetics (11/18/15) were approved. A new Marketing Major was approved. A Shared Resources Policy was approved. There was discussion of an ad-hoc committee on applied learning, and those who wish for their courses to be considered for a Sustainability designation this semester have a deadline of mid-February.

Julie Licata (Chair) gave a report from the Committee on Instruction (CoI). The CoI took over the charge for creating a draft proposal for a Faculty Center from an ad-hoc task force created as a result of the Strategic Planning Council (SPC).

Ms. Nowak spoke on behalf of the SPC to provide context: The Strategic Plan (SP) has four goals, each with multiple objectives, each objective with action items, and each action item with a responsible person. The first goal is "increase student engagement throughout the collegiate experience". Under this is the objective to formalize a Center to "serve as the focal point of activity for advancing teaching, learning and engagement." The action items included developing a charge and forming a committee, and developing a proposal. In the interest of shared governance, the CoI agreed to take on the task of developing the proposal. The CoI incorporated both reports previously created by faculty committees, and consulted with the Committee on Research, as well as faculty on Campus who are currently actively involved in faculty development, among others. The committee used a draft form composed by Kathy Meeker specifically for establishing new entities on campus. Ms. Nowak stated the design described in the draft is one that can adapt and change with the needs of the faculty, and asked the faculty to approach the draft in the spirit of collaboration to move things forward.

Dr. Licata took over the floor, clarifying that the CoI is looking for questions and comments on the draft, and it is not currently up for vote. She spoke on the process of creating the draft, discussing campus members and previous reports that were consulted, and the long history of trying to establish a faculty center. She mentioned a key flaw in previous attempts was that they did not incorporate research or creative activity. She listed the studies that have indicated the need for such a center, and stated that the goal is

for this to work for as many people as possible. She then went over an outline of the key points of the draft.

Mr. Thomas Sakoulas (Art) asked whether the Faculty Center would be a new layer added on to current development activities, or a gathering of them. Dr. Licata stated they are hoping to gather. There was an extended discussion of how faculty representatives would be chosen, and whether it would include representation from all schools. The current draft doesn't specify that there be at least one representative from each school, but the intention is that each school have the choice of providing a representative. The current draft has a "filtering" of eligible representatives by Deans, and there was discussion of what the intention of this is, and whether it is necessary. It was mentioned that placing the call for representatives through the Deans seemed a natural way to encourage each school to provide a representative, and that the intention was not for the Deans to act as filters. On this issue, it was pointed out that there is a two stage process: the first is establishing an initial advisory council, and the second, once the center is established, is choosing representatives going forward. These don't have to have the same procedure. The question was raised whether there should be a representative from the grants development office.

Dr. Licata and Dr. Koch will work to establish a discussion board in the Blackboard Senate Organization for further discussion and feedback on the issue. Dr. Licata encouraged faculty to voice not just concerns, but potential solutions to those concerns as well.

There was some discussion of the budget (provided in the draft) as well as a statement on ethics. To the question of where the budget would come from, Dr. Morgan-Zayachek stated it would come from the SP budget. The question was raised regarding how IAC and GEAC will relate to the Center. Ms. Nowak requested that whenever the proposal reads "research," it should instead read "research and creative activity".

Dr. Licata stated the faculty can disregard the previously mentioned February 5 deadline for feedback; and the goal is to vote on this by the end of February.

There was no new business.

Dr. Koch mentioned that at this time quorum has been lost. He welcomed a motion to adjourn, but the Senate went on to discuss the applied learning issue.

Dr. Koch stated that there is an applied learning partners group making an inventory of approved applied learning activities at Oneonta, which has a report due on February 15. He and Provost Mackin have agreed to find a way to shift responsibility for the next part of the process to faculty governance. There are three reports due April 15. The goal was to present the idea to the Senate, ask senators to contact Steering Committee with thoughts or feedback, and Steering Committee would create a proposal to bring before Senate for debate and vote on February 15. The issue is that of deciding how we will organize how the College goes about meeting that mandate. The current group exists outside faculty governance, and the importance of faculty governance playing an integral role in such plans has been emphasized again and again.

Dr. Koeddermann asked that the difference between applied learning and internships be clarified, and Dr. Koch read the relevant text from the SUNY guidelines for approved applied learning. There may be instances of experiential learning that occur

that do not meet all of those criteria. This document is posted on the College Senate Blackboard page for this Senate meeting. Dr. French asked if the issue was important and time sensitive enough to demand we need a special meeting? Dr. Koch responded that it might be. Dr. Koedderman asked whether this is the domain of the curriculum committee. Dr. Koch responded that there are two options: the first is having existing committees take charge; there is an excellent case that Curriculum Committee is the appropriate committee. Because this is a focused, specific, time-limited plan, there is a second option: appointing a faculty-lead task force to oversee the process. This would include representatives from key faculty committees, Senate Steering Committee, each of the five schools, students, and relevant college offices. In either case, anything decided by the committee would come before Senate as part of its process. The concern is that the current workloads of relevant committees and time-sensitive nature of the issue might preclude those committees taking over. Ms. Macaluso mentioned the CCC would be discussing the issue in their upcoming meeting; noting its importance and relevance to the curriculum. Dr. Nepkie pointed out that the faculty are appointed responsibility for the curriculum by the Board of Trustees; and our choice is whether to accept or reject that responsibility. If the faculty do not take this on, then as a consequence we have to accept that non-faculty will deal with it. Ms. Nowak asked whether data was still being collected, and who should be contacted. Dr. Koch responded that the school representatives in the applied learning partners group should be contacted, and the list of members is in the document available at the Blackboard Senate Organization. Dr. Koch pointed out that after February 15, there will be much more than just data collecting, and those involved will be making decisions with curricular ramifications. Finally, while he agrees with Dr. Nepkie's assessment, he believes both models he proposed constitute the faculty taking responsibility for the process.

Dr. Koedderman motioned to adjourn, and Dr. Nahson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Keith Jones
Secretary of the Faculty