



COLLEGE SENATE BULLETIN

State University of New York at Geneseo
College of Arts and Sciences

Bulletin No. 16
Pages 154-172.
April 14, 2005

Contents

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Topic</u> |
|-------------|---|
| 155 | Announcements Sabbatical Leave Requests for 2006-2007 Nominations Committee – Faculty Personnel Committee Spring 2005 Election Results |
| 157 | Agenda: Senate Meeting on April 19, 2005 |
| 157 | Agenda: Meeting of the 2005-2006 Senate: April 19, 2005 |
| 158 | Minutes: Student Affairs Committee, March 8, 2005 |
| 160 | Minutes: College Senate Meeting, March 22, 2005 |
| 165 | Minutes: University Faculty Senate 140 th Plenary Meeting, April 7-9, 2005. |
| 167 | Minutes: Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting April 12, 2005 |

**Correspondence: Gregg Hartvigsen, Department of Biology,
Bailey 4; e-mail: hartvig@geneseo.edu; phone: 245-5448**

Announcements

Sabbatical Leave Requests for 2006-2007

September 15, 2005: Deadline for applicants to submit Sabbatical Leave Requests to departments for the 2006-2007 Academic Year

October 15, 2005: Departments submit recommendations of 2006-2007 Sabbatical Leave Requests to Provost for review by Professional Leave Review Committee

November 15, 2005: Professional Leave Review Committee submits recommendations of the 2006-2007 Sabbatical Leave Requests to Provost

December 2, 2005: Provost submits recommendations of 2006-2007 Sabbatical Leave Requests to President's Office

Due dates which fall on a weekend shall automatically be effective the following Monday.

In accordance with the Constitution, the Professional Leave Review Committee is charged with publishing the criteria by which they evaluate applications—

“Sabbatical leave proposals are evaluated on the following criteria: clarity of presentation of proposed objectives (including schedule and planned outcomes), potential contribution of the project to the teaching or professional stature, necessity of leave, and evidence of productivity in prior leaves or ongoing scholarly activity. See the Guidelines for the Submission of Proposals for Sabbatical Leaves for further detail and clarification.”

The Guidelines for Submission of Proposals for Sabbatical Leaves and Sabbatical Leave Application can be found under “Forms” on the Office of the Provost's web site.

Eligibility: Academic employees having **continuing appointments** and college administrative officers not in a negotiating unit established pursuant to Article XIV of the Civil Service Law who have completed at least six consecutive years of service within the University or who, if they previously have had a sabbatical leave, have completed at least six consecutive years of service within the University from the date of return from their last sabbatical leave, shall be eligible for sabbatical leave. (The State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees • 2001, Article XIII, Title E, §3.)

Nominations Committee Announcement:

Re: Faculty Personnel Committee

In the fall of 2005, three seats on the Faculty Personnel Committee will be open for election. Each of those elected will serve a two year term from January 1, 2006 until December 31,

2007. In accordance with the conditions for the committee described in the Faculty Constitution, one or more of these seats must be filled by a Full Professor or Librarian and the other two may be filled by Full or Associate Professors or Librarians. Each person elected must hold a continuing appointment, and no two members may come from the same department. The Nominations Committee will presently send out letters to all eligible faculty and librarians, soliciting the names of those willing to serve. If you are among those receiving that letter, please respond promptly. And please say "Yes".

Spring 2005 Senate Election Results

Vice Chair

Secretary

Graham Drake

Treasurer

Barbara Welker

University Faculty Senator Alternate

Ren Vasiliev

General Education Committee, Fine Arts

Amy Stanley

General Education Committee, Humanities

Kathleen Mapes

General Education Committee, Social Sciences

Daniel Repinski

Professional Leave Review Committee, Education and Communicative Disorders and Sciences

Douglas MacKenzie

Professional Leave Review Committee, Library and School of Business

Paul MacLean

Senator at Large (6 or fewer years)

Louise Zipp

Sherry Schwartz

David Robertson

Senator at Large (over 6 years)

Isidro Bosch

Patrice Case

Paul Pacheco
Joan Zook
Jane Morse
Yanxiang (Anthony) Gu

Campus Auxiliary Services Board of Trustees
Nader Asgary

Agenda for Senate Meeting on April 19, 2005

Call to Order

Adoption of the Agenda

Adoption of the Minutes of March 22, 2005 (Bulletin #16, page 160-164)

Senate Reports

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| President | Christopher Dahl |
| Provost | Kate Conway-Turner |
| Chair | Gregg Hartvigsen |
| Vice Chair | Maria Lima |
| Treasurer | Ming-Mei Chang |
| University Senator | Terry Browne |
| Vice President, Student Assoc. | David LaMagna |

Reports of the Standing Committees of the Senate

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Undergraduate Curricula | Meg Stolee (see Bulletin #14, pp. 145-147) |
| Undergraduate Policies | Jeff Over |
| Graduate Academic Affairs | Dale Metz |
| Student Affairs | Kim Davies |
| Faculty Affairs | Bill Gohlman |

Old Business

New Business

Adjournment

Agenda for Meeting of the 2005-2006 Senate: April 19, 2005

Call to Order

Adoption of the Agenda

Senate Reports

| | |
|--------------|------------|
| Chair | Maria Lima |
|--------------|------------|

New Business

Adjournment

Minutes of the Student Affairs Committee, March 8, 2005

Committee Members Present: S. Bossung, K. Davies (Chair), B. Fearn, D. Granger, K. Hannam, J. Kleiman, R. McEwen, C. O’Leary, M. Pastizzo, J. Principe, A. Sheldon, B. Stewart, M. Sutherland, J. VanRemmen

Committee Members Absent: A. Eaton, W. Freed, J. Giordano, J. Lovett, B. Nash, A. Stanley

Guest Speaker: Amy Silber, MS Ed., Coordinator of Educational Advocacy Services, LDA Life and Learning Services

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 pm.

Old Business

Update on faculty training for students with learning disabilities

In addition to information the SAC has previously gathered from Tabitha Buggie-Hunt, Assistant Dean for Disability Services, Becky Glass, of the Teaching and Learning Center, arranged for an informal presentation by outside speaker, Amy Silber. A. Silber began with introductions, both of herself and of the SAC members. Ms. Silber’s educational background includes a Bachelor’s Degree in Psychology from the University at Albany and a Master’s Degree in Education from Nazareth College. She has previously worked as an autism counselor at Churchville-Chili Schools and a Learning Specialist at Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). Currently, A. Silber serves as Coordinator of Educational Advocacy Services (EAS) at the Learning Disabilities Association (LDA) of the Genesee Valley, Inc. Within EAS, LDA staff see approximately 500 individuals with developmental disabilities per year, mostly from K-12. The services provided at LDA not only help the students in need, but also empower parents to understand their child’s disability. Employment services are also available at LDA and the organization offers a range of residential services to their clients, both on a limited basis and 24-hour service.

A. Silber asked the SAC of their individual definitions of a learning disability. M. Pastizzo focused on a student’s ability to take a test in a specific period of time. In his past experience, a student with a learning disability requires extra time to complete an exam. C. O’Leary, who self-identified as a student with a learning disability, mentioned that his need for additional support is satisfied with an assistive typing device. Generally, the SAC answered that a learning disability is one that presents a barrier to learning. A. Silber added that to be classified as a learning disability, the barrier must impact one or more major life functions for an individual. What constitutes an “impact”? That is always the question that professionals get stuck on, but it must be interpreted within the federal definition of a learning disability. A. Silber introduced the group to a brief legal history of Section 504 from the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which, she stated, was defined before schools even saw the first implementation of handicapped accessible regulations in 1975. A. Silber further defined a learning disability as something that requires additional support/services to provide

equal access to the curriculum, to level the playing field for all students. Those additional services could consist of assistive typing devices, extra time on exams, assigned note-takers, etc., dependant on the nature of the learning disability. A. Silber stressed that Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) is not considered a learning disability. Furthermore, a learning disabled student generally operates at an average to high level of cognitive ability. Professors will see that although a student may excel at certain areas of the curriculum, they might stumble when it comes to mathematics, spelling, writing, or processing information in a conventional manner.

Professors on SAC are most concerned with how to determine whether or not a student has a learning disability and if they do, how to assist them in finding the help they need. First, it was made very clear that professors should never feel responsible for “diagnosing” a student’s disability, even though many students, particularly freshmen and sophomores, will be hesitant to self-identify. Professors are actually prohibited, by law, to ask direct questions to a student about a possible learning disability (e.g. have you ever been diagnosed as having a learning disability?). However, they may ask probing, indirect questions to gradually elicit a useful response from a student (e.g. why do you think you might need extra time on this test?). There are services on and off campus that can run tests and make certain diagnoses. T. Buggie-Hunt is the obvious resource on campus to meet with students who feel they might have a learning disability. A. Silber suggested that, in addition to the services provided by T. Buggie-Hunt and based upon her recommendations, students be referred to Vocational Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID), where they can be officially tested for learning difficulties. VESID is supported with state and federal funds and is able to work with an individual’s annual income to arrange for partial or full funding of services, which could range from the cost of testing (which could be approximately \$1000) to college textbooks to software and hardware needs. There is a VESID representative in Geneseo, but A. Silber was only able to immediately provide us with the phone number for the VESID office in Rochester (585-238-2900). Ms. Silber warned SAC that the VESID process can be very slow and recommended that any referral to students be scheduled during the summer months. One academic semester does not provide enough time for a student to be tested, diagnosed, and documented in order to receive special accommodations in their courses.

A. Silber recommended that professors do everything they can to encourage students to get tested for learning disabilities, if that student discloses a concern. Once a student presents the appropriate documentation, which is required by Geneseo policy for any request of special accommodation in the classroom due to a learning disability, professors need to understand that although two students may have similar learning difficulties, the accommodations for each may be completely different. T. Buggie-Hunt can confirm the particulars of what each individual student needs. It was made clear that non-native speakers of English cannot be considered learning disabled, unless they truly have documented learning difficulties other than their struggles to read, write, and speak English. To most effectively cover all student needs, a professor may want to adopt techniques of Universal Design (i.e. providing all students extra time on exams, offering all students the option to use a dictionary, posting class notes to a course webpage for all to see), as was previously mentioned in past SAC meetings. Other helpful approaches are to keep an eye out for students who aren’t taking notes on a topic that the professor feels is essential information

and for professors to stop lecturing when writing notes on the board so that students can concentrate only on the written information being introduced.

Finally, comments were made about learning disabled students wanting to take graduate-school entrance exams, like the LSAT or MCAT. C. O’Leary stated that he preferred to sit for the LSAT without having to submit all of the necessary documentation that would allow him special accommodation during the exam. The proof of a learning disability consists of paperwork dating back to grade school (possibly) since legal, medical, and other professions need to be sure that a potential doctor or lawyer will be able to perform their duties without special needs.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Davies
Chair, SAC

Minutes: College Senate Meeting, March 22, 2005

Attending: D. Anderson, J. Boiani, S. Bosch, S. Bossung, M. Chang, Z. Chen, R. Coloccia, K. Conway-Turner, C. Dahl, K. Davies, R. Dreifuss, A. Eaton, A. Eisenberg, C. Freeman, C. Geiger, J. Giordano, D. Granger, K. Hannam, G. Hartvigsen, K. Hinman, K. Hirsh, J. Hyman, S. Iyer, A. Jassawalla, A. Keddie, J. Kleiman, D. LaMagna, S. Landes, K. Levison, D. Levy, M. Lima, K. Mapes, R. McEwen, D. McPherson, L. Meyer, S. Mulryan, B. Nash, O. Nicodemi, B. Owens, M. Pastizzo, R. Pretzer, J. Principe, A. Rutkowski, S. Schwartz, A. Sheldon, C. Shin, A. Stanley, M. Stolee, D. Sullivan, Y. Tamura, C. Truglia, J. VanRemmen, A. Weibel, C. Woidat

Guests: P. Schacht, E. Spicka

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:04pm

Adoption of the Agenda for the College Senate Meeting

The agenda on page 153, Senate Bulletin 15 was approved.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the last All-College Meeting and Senate Meeting (February 22, 2005), p 137-143, Bulletin 14, were approved after the following correction: Meg Stolee’s name should have appeared under the list titled “Senator-at-large (over 6)” list on page 138.

Senate Reports

President Chris Dahl reported on the following items:

- 1) State Budget related items: Both the state assembly and the senate have passed budget resolutions. There is a proposal to peg the tuition guarantee at the consumer price index rather than the higher education index. The \$71 million hole in the budget is to be filled by state tax dollars for next year's incoming students. It looks like funding for the TAP program will be restored. There is ongoing discussion about reforming the TAP program to make sure that there are no abuses of the system in terms of eligibility requirements and how they are administered. This might result in the tightening of regulations. Full restoration of EOP funding is expected. Phase II of the Integrated Sciences Building project, i.e., renovation of Greene Hall is back on the budget list from last year. We hope that it will stay on the list during negotiations by both the assembly and the senate. It is important to continue to contact legislators to have them make sure that the \$20 million for the phase II stays on the list.
- 2) A national search for a new Vice President for College Advancement is ongoing. The committee will start screening candidates soon.
- 3) One of the things that have gotten lost is ways for faculty members to come together as a community besides committee work. Rose Alent, who was a wonderful teacher brought faculty from different departments together for intellectual exchanges. Using endowment a new "lecture & bash" event is scheduled for Wed, March 30th at 4pm. Bill Cook will speak on "Confessions of a History Geek."

Provost Kate Conway-Turner announced that the Undergraduate Symposium is on April 15th and encouraged everyone to attend. Steve Padalino is returning to the physics departments after outstanding service as the Associate Provost. He will be back with students and research for the fall semester.

Chair Gregg Hartvigsen
Senate elections are underway.

Call for Nominations 2004-2005 Richard Roark Award

The Richard Roark Award is given to a graduating senior whose scholarship and community service exemplify the qualities that were so important to Richard Roark. The recipient is given a stipend to purchase books, and the recipient's name will be inscribed on a plaque displayed in the MacVittie College Union. Please submit letters of nominations by April 1, 2004 to Gregg Hartvigsen, Department of Biology, Bailey 004.

Vice-Chair Maria Lima
No report

Treasurer Ming-Mei Chang: We have received about 30 donations so far. Donations will not close. Please continue to donate generously.

University Faculty Senator Terry Browne announced that the G. Hartvigsen and he are going to Syracuse on April 7-8 for the next University Senate Meeting.

Student Association President David LaMagna

Elections for SA executive committee are underway on KnightWeb. Budget advocacy day is next Wednesday.

Reports of the Standing Committees of the Senate

Undergraduate Curricula Committee chair Meg Stolee made the following correction: On page 147, under the math major program revision, the course number should read Math 348 instead of Math 248. With this correction made, the following items were presented for approval.

NEW COURSE – FIRST READING
(Bulletin #14, p145)
CSCI 240: Foundations of Algorithms

Motion carries.

COURSE REVISIONS – FIRST READING
(Bulletin #14, p145-6)

Arts 101: Three-Dimensional Design
Revision: add F/designation
Chem 100: Chemistry First Year Experience
Revision: change method of grading from S/U to letter grades
CSCI 142: Principles of Computer Science
Revision: new description and prerequisites.
CSCI 241: Principles of Computer Organization
Revision: change in prerequisites – CSCI 141 could be taken concurrently; this will no longer be the case.
CSCI 242: Analysis of Algorithms
Revision: change in prerequisites: prerequisites are now CSCI 240 and Math 237 or 239
Conn 105: Introduction to Journalism
Revision: change in description and prerequisites

Motion carries.

NEW PROGRAM – FIRST READING
Native American Studies: new minor (Bulletin #14 page 146)

Motion carries.

PROGRAM REVISIONS – FIRST READING
(Bulletin #14 p 146-147)

CDSC major revision: change in description and order of courses for majors who are not seeking certification.

Communication major revisions: change in the ordering of courses within the major - the placing of COMN 270, COMN 267 and COMN 363.

CSCI major revision: dropping CSCI 141 and replacing it with CSCI240 and changing the sequence of required courses:

CSCI minor: Revision is same as for the major

Applied Computer Science concentration revision is change in required courses.

Computer Science Concentration revision is same as for the major.

BA in Geography revision: Geog 361 (new course/Senate approved 2/1/05) is being added to list of courses from which students may choose to fulfill the "Advanced Physical" requirement of the geography major.

Mathematics major revision: add Math 348 as an option within the major to address SUNY's oral and research requirement.

Motion carries.

COURSE REVISION – SECOND READING (Bulletin #12 p115)

Soc1 212: Sociological Research. The revision is deleting the prerequisite of Soc1 211.

Motion carries.

End of Report.

Undergraduate Policies Committee chair Jeff Over
No report.

Graduate Academic Affairs Committee chair Dale Metz (A. Eisenberg presented the following to the senate for vote.)

NEW COURSES – SECOND READING

(Bulletin #12, page 115-116)

ANTH 426: Native Voices: Mesoamerica and the Andes

ANTH 435: Early Civilization in the Americas (note Bulletin #12 has "535")

Motion carries.

Student Affairs Committee chair Kim Davies.
No Report.

Faculty Affairs Committee chair Bill Gohlman presented second reading of the following item regarding the internet distribution list "faculty-I":

The faculty-l@geneseo.edu is to be used to communicate curricular, pedagogical, personnel and other information pertinent to the faculty only. This list is not intended as a forum for dialogue. All faculty, including librarians, are automatically included on this list. While faculty members may elect to unsubscribe to this list, doing so may cause them not to receive pertinent information about the above topics. Because the members of this list are on the allstaff-l list, it is not necessary to send the same message to this list in addition to the allstaff-l list. The chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the College Senate monitors this list.

C. Freeman proposed to have the words “intended as” from the second sentence. The amendment was approved with many “yes” votes and a few “no” votes.

The new version with the second sentence reads “This list is not a forum for dialogue.” This was approved with many “yes” votes and a few “no” votes.

There will be open forums to discuss items relating to the Faculty Roles, Rewards, and Evaluation report. The first forum will be Tuesday, March 29 at 4:00 in Newton 203 and the second will be Wednesday, April 6 at 4:00 in Bailey 135.

Old Business

None

New Business

SUNY Student Assembly will be participating in a Lobby Day in Albany and also attending a conference in Rochester to talk about the successful voter registration drive that was organized at Geneseo last fall.

The next senate meeting is on April 19, 2005.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:28pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Savi Iyer, Department of Physics and Astronomy

Minutes: University Faculty Senate 140th Plenary Meeting, April 7-9, 2005.

The meeting was held at the College of Environmental Science and Forestry in Syracuse. I will attempt to summarize briefly reports, many of them overlapping, given by UFS President Joe Hildreth, Chancellor Robert King, SUNY Provost Peter Salins, and the various Senate Committees. At the end of the report I will include resolutions passed by the Senate.

Although the budget passed on time this year and the tuition plan that was outlined by Chancellor King was not adopted, the issue is not completely dead. The Legislature approved \$84.3 million in tax support, which will cover mandatory salary increases and provide 10% inflation factor for energy. However, it is still possible that some of that figure will be met through a tuition increase somewhere in the range of \$115 to \$125. If that does take place, it falls within the range of TAP support and those most in need will be covered. While EOP funding is still under negotiation, Chancellor King felt that it would be restored fully.

Capital funding was passed with many additions.

The Academic Bill of Rights was proposed for inclusion in the Academic Standards Committee by Trustee DeRusy. Fr. Crimins, declared that the agenda was full and the issue would not be discussed. It was pointed out that the Board of Trustees already has a statement on academic freedom. Individual campuses are urged **not** to make any statements or resolutions about the issue.

A medallion for Distinguished Professors has been designed and will be presented at a ceremony in Albany on April 29, 2005.

UFS Senators met in Albany with Senator LaValle in March and from now on will meet with him three times a year.

There will be a conference on assessment held in Syracuse April 27-28. There will be representatives from all the major national testing programs, although choice of assessment instruments will still be up to the individual campuses.

The Provost's report on Faculty Development will be released this week. Provost Salins said he will put together an advisory council if requested to do so.

The concerns expressed during the sector session of the Comprehensive Colleges, of which Geneseo is one, were about the same as they were at the last meeting: concern over the number of associate faculty (adjuncts and non-tenure-track lectureships); the amount of non-teaching responsibilities that faculty must undertake; low salaries, salary compression and the lack of incentive raises at some units; the relatively high teaching loads combined with research expectations. All were viewed as resource problems and were presented to the Chancellor as such.

The Undergraduate Programs and Policies Committee has constructed an Undergraduate Internship Survey and encourages everyone who deals with internships respond to it. To respond electronically, please go to: www.suny.edu/facultysenate and select SUNY Undergraduate Internship Survey link.

Provost Salins reported that campus visitations for Mission Review is underway: there have been five visits and there are fifty-four to go. He hopes to have completed those by the end of the year.

There was discussion of a resolution to increase library support. Although the need for such support seemed to be unanimous in the face of recent serious reductions of funds and

greatly increased costs, the resolution was sent back to committee for further consideration of how best to word it.

There was a panel presentation by the Governance Committee and general discussion on faculty evaluation of administrators; later the full Senate passed a resolution in support of such evaluation, and that is appended.

Joe Hildreth completed his second term as President and chose not to run again. Carl Wiezalis of Upstate Medical University was elected as the new Faculty Senate President.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Browne, University Faculty Senator

RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution in Support of Faculty Evaluation of Administrators:

Whereas over the past decade a movement towards greater accountability and transparency has occurred in higher education as elsewhere, and faculty evaluation of administrators is one response to this increased expectation, and

Whereas the opportunity to evaluate college administrators is an important faculty prerogative, which, if pursued carefully, can give faculty a stronger sense of participation in the governance of the college, and

Whereas evaluation of administrators by faculty works best when all parties involved consider it an attempt to improve the health and strength of the institution rather than targeting individuals,

Now therefore be it resolved:

That the University Faculty Senate affirms the prerogative of local governance bodies to engage in evaluation of administrators, in a manner and on a schedule of the body's own choosing, and

That the University Faculty Senate affirms the value of, and endorses the practice, of faculty evaluation of administrators on those campuses of the State University of New York where it is regularly and systematically practiced, and

That the University Faculty Senate recommends to the governance body of those campuses of the State University of New York that do not now regularly and systematically evaluate administrators that they make provision to exercise their prerogative to do so, and

That the University Faculty Senate recommends to all local governance bodies that their evaluation process and procedures be designed and reviewed in light of the best practices identified in the University Faculty Senate's Governance Committee Report, *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators*, presented at the Winter 2005 plenary, and

That the University Faculty Senate directs the President of the Senate to send copies of this resolution, together with the referenced report, to all local governance leaders.

Resolution on Academic Misconduct:

Whereas, throughout its history, the University Faculty Senate has been an advocate for the highest standards of professional practice, and

Whereas academic misconduct on the part of SUNY faculty brings discredit to the campus, to the University and to the profession, and

Whereas State University of New York campuses have procedures in place to investigate allegations of academic misconduct, and

Whereas the existing collective bargaining agreement insures that persons accused of academic misconduct are afforded due process, and

Whereas public confidence in the University is eroded when there is an appearance that academic misconduct is not subject to transparency, and

Whereas the announcement of a finding of academic misconduct before the local campus governance body at the conclusion of the disciplinary process and after all appeals have been exhausted, is an appropriate venue for disclosure;

Now therefore be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate conditionally endorses the attached proposal by the Chancellor to require that a final determination of academic misconduct—after all appeals have been exhausted—be reported by the campus president to the faculty governance body during a scheduled meeting, and permitting further disclosure at the discretion of the campus president. the endorsement of the body is contingent upon the incorporation of additional language, either directly or by reference, carefully defining research, academic misconduct, and plagiarism, such as those definitions used by North Dakota State University appended to this resolution.

Be it further resolved that the President of the Senate be directed to convey the conditional endorsement of the proposal to the Chancellor.

Definitions used by North Dakota State University:

“Academic or scientific misconduct” shall mean fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, misrepresentation of sources, breach of confidentiality, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, for conducting, or reporting research; or material failure to comply with a sponsor’s requirements that uniquely relate to the conduct of the research. It does not include honest error, or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data. “Plagiarism” shall mean taking over ideas, methods, or written words of another without acknowledgment of and with the intention that they be credited as the work of the deceiver. Different academic disciplines may have their own separate definition which may add additional elements that need to be taken into consideration in an allegation of plagiarism. “Scholarly inquiry,” “creative activity,” and “research” shall be considered synonymous terms.

There was also a resolution passed specific to Alfred University and the College of Ceramics.

Minutes for Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting April 12, 2005

Present: Chair B. Gohlman, J. Boiani, S. Bosch, R. Dreifuss, J. Kirkwood, S. Kirsh, J.

McLean, S. Mulryan, Y. Tamura

Arriving later: D. Bicket

Meeting was called to order at 4:10 PM.

The main order of business was to prepare action on “The Geneseo Teacher Scholar: A Conceptual Framework for Faculty Roles, Rewards, and Evaluation,” hereafter referred to as

the Conceptual Framework or CF. The CF was prepared and recommended by the President's Task Force on Faculty Roles, Rewards and Evaluation, and two open forums have been held by FAC to receive faculty feed back.

There was some discussion on the proper procedure. It was determined that since the Task Force was not a body of the senate, it falls to FAC to present the document to the Senate for adoption, modified as FAC sees fit.

The biggest issue identified in the forums was an apparent disagreement in emphasis between the CF, which treats Service as a separate category of faculty roles on equal footing with Teaching and Contributions to a Discipline, and the PER evaluation form proposed by the Task Force, which seeks to integrate Service activities into the other two categories. It was noted that in the second forum, former Task Force members made it clear that the proposed PER form was intended more as a discussion generator than as a fully-fledged recommendation. There was discussion as to whether the treatment of Service needed to be further resolved before the CF was brought to the Senate, or indeed whether all the recommendations of the Task Force needed to be brought into consonance before presentation to the Senate. Consensus was reached that (A) the CF should be brought to Senate as soon as possible, to serve as a guide in further development of other issues, and (B) FAC feels that the separate emphasis on Service in the CF is preferred over the PER form approach.

The CF refers to Geneseo as a "liberal arts college," and a concern was expressed that this slights the professional degree programs. A motion was brought to change such language to "the liberal arts culture at Geneseo." There was discussion as to whether the term "liberal arts" is incompatible with Geneseo's designation as a Comprehensive College. It was pointed out that professional students must satisfy the core curriculum, and the Schools even sometimes tout that as an advantage of coming to Geneseo. The motion was defeated unanimously.

It was moved to change the phrase "the College and faculty to aid, guide, and nurture new faculty" in the last paragraph of the CF to "the administration and faculty to aid, guide, and support faculty." After brief discussion, this passed unanimously.

There was a motion to add "reflection on pedagogical development activities" to the list of elements of peer review of teaching in the fifth paragraph of the CF. It was noted that we do not necessarily wish to require all faculty to engage in pedagogical development, only to encourage it. The term "reflection" is intended to convey this. Motion passed unanimously.

In order to more explicitly represent the topic of Rewards in the CF, it was moved to use a portion of the report of the Task Force Subcommittee on Resources and Rewards as a final paragraph in the CF. The original suggestion was to use the first paragraph plus the last sentence of the second paragraph from that report. An amendment was offered to exclude the entire first paragraph except the first sentence, in order to avoid any implication that faculty are motivated *only* by Rewards. Amendment and motion both passed unanimously.

In the forums there was a suggestion to mention rewards with a shorter time frame than the tenure/promotion process, and rewards applying after tenure. FAC felt that this was adequately addressed through the last motion.

In the forums there was a suggestion to more fully express the value Geneseo places on faculty-guided student research and creative activity, even when such activity reduces faculty scholarly productivity. FAC felt that this was adequately expressed in the last line of paragraph four in the CF.

In the forums there was discussion about the degree to which individuals are expected to balance activity in the areas of Teaching, Disciplinary Contributions, and Service, with a particular emphasis on the first two. FAC felt that paragraph six adequately expresses that every individual is expected to be active in both teaching and scholarship. While more detailed guidelines may be desirable, they would probably depend on the field, and thus are not appropriate for this general document.

In the forums there was some concern expressed on the balance between departmental self-governance and administrative oversight of the evaluation criteria and process. FAC felt that this is adequately addressed in paragraph eight, especially sentence two, of the CF. Although this paragraph is in the context of contributions to the discipline, we believe that it is sufficiently clear that there is a place for such balance in the other areas as well.

In the forums it was suggested to describe in the CF some of the broad categories of rewards that are available to faculty. To address this, it was moved to include in the final paragraph of the CF the first three sentences from the second paragraph of the report of the Task Force subcommittee on Resources and Rewards. Motion passed by acclaim.

At this point, FAC decided that the issues had been sufficiently covered to bring the CF before the senate for adoption. The motion follows this report.

A discussion followed regarding the standards currently being applied for acceptance of submissions to the faculty-l email list. Some college senators feel that the list is being inappropriately censored. Chair Gohlman reported that this issue was discussed in Executive Committee, and he expects that at the next Senate meeting there will be a motion to rescind the FAC motion passed earlier this year on this topic.

In discussion, it became clear that various FAC members had significantly different interpretations of that earlier motion. All agreed concerning the requirement that postings be “pertinent to the faculty only.” It seemed clear that some of the contentious recent submissions had been appropriately rejected on these grounds alone. However, some FAC members understood that to be the only significant criterion. Other FAC members interpreted the motion’s language, “curricular, pedagogical, personnel, and other information,” to exclude politically charged postings. Chair Gohlman, *ex officio* moderator of the list, has been applying a very stringent criterion, avoiding any controversial subject that might cause annoyance of any subscriber. The suggestion was made that next year’s

FAC could look at the possibility of having a small advisory subcommittee of FAC for the chair to consult whenever she/he is in doubt about a posting.

Meeting adjourned about 5:30pm.

Respectfully submitted by J. McLean.

(For the convenience of those already familiar with the Task Force version of the Conceptual Framework, in the following motion sections where FAC has made changes are indicated by underlining.)

Be it moved by the Faculty Affairs Committee that the following document be adopted by the College Senate as a statement of guiding principals for the faculty evaluation and development system at SUNY Geneseo.

THE GENESEO TEACHER SCHOLAR
A Conceptual Framework for Faculty Roles, Rewards, and Evaluation

Geneseo's faculty is a diverse community of teacher-scholars with individual strengths and expertises who work together to advance the College's Mission. Through their dedication to teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service to the campus and the greater world beyond it, faculty promote essential Geneseo values such as excellence, innovation, diversity, and community. The system by which faculty members are evaluated is most effective when their roles are in consonance with the Mission, when evaluation is aligned with these roles, and when the reward structure is consistent with that system. Nurtured within the larger context of teaching, scholarship, and service, faculty development is an integral part of Geneseo's roles and rewards structure.

The College has made a diverse faculty and student body a high-priority goal. Beyond the structural diversity inherent in a wide variety of populations, the faculty at Geneseo value intellectual and pedagogic diversity. A wide variety of teaching styles and intellectual approaches, both traditional and innovative, is employed on our campus. Indeed, a major commitment of the faculty is to model diverse approaches to research problems, to foster the transmission and assimilation of knowledge, and to demonstrate the art of civil disagreement for students at Geneseo.

The system in place for evaluating Geneseo's faculty must acknowledge the importance of diversity and must be clearly aligned with their accepted roles, the first and foremost of which is teaching. However, because participation in scholarly and creative endeavors is important to the intellectual life and the liberal arts culture of our college and because it clearly improves the ability of faculty to keep the curriculum current and to engage students, contributions to the discipline must also be evaluated. Because we view Geneseo as a community of teacher-scholars, faculty members should be evaluated as well on their participation in governance, planning, and assessment of the College at the department,

institution, and University levels. Each of these facets — teaching, contributions to the discipline, and service to the College — will be addressed in turn.

Teaching is the most valued activity of our faculty, who engage students in the classroom, laboratory, library, and studio using innovative, intellectually rigorous curricula and pedagogies. Library faculty also provide support that is essential for student learning. Quality teaching requires extensive scholarly preparation, effective use of technology and other resources, and a willingness to follow where inquiry points the way. Geneseo faculty recognize a variety of learning styles and value different teaching methods within and across disciplines. Excellence in teaching is based on a commitment to scholarship and requires the skills of a discipline-based scholar at a very high level in course preparation, classroom presentation, the creation of a rich learning environment, and the evaluation of student work. In addition to their traditional professorial or instructional role, Geneseo faculty are also committed to academic advising, mentoring students in professional development, and providing opportunities for participation in research and other creative and scholarly endeavors.

In order to be meaningful and effective, the evaluation of teaching requires the participation of faculty, students, and administrators. At Geneseo means of assessment include student opinion of faculty instruction, self-reflection by the faculty members being evaluated, and peer evaluation. In addition to direct observation of instructional activity, peer review of teaching includes analysis of instructional materials, consideration of pedagogical methods, reflection on pedagogical development activities, and examination of teaching efforts that take place outside the classroom.

At a premier public liberal arts college, teaching and contributions to one's discipline are integral and interrelated aspects of the role of a faculty member. Indeed, the definition of a teacher-scholar at Geneseo requires that the two areas or functions be inseparable: a teacher-scholar will bring his or her scholarly knowledge, experiences, and abilities to every course. A faculty that is constantly growing intellectually is the finest model for student learning and the *sine qua non* of a vital liberal arts curriculum and of academic excellence.

An active involvement in scholarly and creative pursuits is an important and valued responsibility of Geneseo faculty. These pursuits — including publication, performance, presentation, and exhibition that expand knowledge, improve skills and understanding that can be shared with others — ensure that faculty remain current in their disciplines and further develop their expertise. Such activities, which require review and usually expand beyond the College, can take a variety of forms such as basic research or the creation of new knowledge, informed criticism of research within and outside one's discipline, the synthesis and exposition of existing knowledge for use by audiences within and beyond the academy, application of disciplinary skills to help solve problems, and the improvement of the teacher-learning interface with pedagogical innovation or the creation of curricular materials (*e.g.*, textbooks and/or other instructional media).

Evaluation of scholarly and creative activity at Geneseo is based on discipline-specific expectations consistent with College and University requirements. Guidelines for such

evaluation are developed at the department level and approved by the Provost. Examples of recognized contributions to the discipline are refereed publications (articles, monographs, and books), presentations at regional, national, or international conferences, workshop participation, artistic production, scholarly communication(s) with agencies outside the College (e.g., NEH, NIH, NSF), preparation of reports concerning applications of discipline-specific work, and the authoring of textbooks and related instructional material.

Professional service is valued at Geneseo, where faculty, in connection with as well in addition to their teaching and scholarship, are also involved in the governance of their departments, the College, and the University. They play essential roles in helping the institution and individual units progress toward their goals. Our Mission requires faculty leadership in designing the curriculum, assessing student progress, promoting diversity, enriching the collegiate experience with co-curricular activities, and cultivating relationships with the wider community. Individual faculty members provide service to their disciplines and the greater society. Faculty who hold leadership positions in professional organizations and make discipline-related contributions to agencies outside the University strengthen the College-Community relationship and increase the recognition of the individual professor as well as the College as a whole.

The role of the Teacher-Scholar in a liberal arts institution intimately links discipline-based service and service to the college and its students. Examples of such service that contributes to the successful functioning of the College include serving on committees, assessment activities, advising student groups, presenting departmental or college-wide seminars or colloquia, maintaining departmental instruments and archives, staging performances and exhibitions for the college community, seeking to improve both the sense of community and a diverse climate, and assisting in fund-raising, public relations, and recruitment activities. Discipline-related service can take the form of participating in scholarly and professional organizations, consulting with government and other agencies, offering lectures and workshops to community groups, and representing the unit, College, or University in a professional capacity.

Faculty development is an integral part of Geneseo's roles and rewards structure. Opportunities to explore new teaching techniques and pedagogies, to grow intellectually and develop professionally, and to be actively involved in scholarly and creative endeavors are necessary for an engaged and informed faculty. Because such development is a pedagogic ideal as well as an ongoing and incremental process, it is the responsibility of the administration and faculty to aid, guide, and support faculty in becoming the excellent teacher-scholars that Geneseo requires in order to remain at the forefront of leading public liberal arts colleges.

Rewards are linked to faculty roles, recognizing both ongoing excellent performance and exceptional performance in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Rewards fall into several categories. One group provides recognition for behaviors. Another offers resources that are available to support ongoing activities. All rewards and use of resources must be linked to successful performance of faculty roles, which in turn are linked to and help fulfill the mission of the College.