

The Arts & Sciences Senate meets on Monday, February 21 at 3:30 PM in the Javits Room of the Library.

Tentative Agenda
Arts & Sciences Senate
February 21, 2004

- I. Approval of tentative agenda
- II. Approval of minutes from November 15, 2004
- III. Report of the President (F. Walter)
- IV. Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative (R. Susman)
- V. Report of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee (C. Jansen)
- VI. Nominations for Senate Officers for 2005-2006
- VI. First reading of a proposed Constitutional Amendment (see attach. below)
- VII. Other Old Business
- VIII. Other New Business

Arts and Sciences Senate Meeting
Minutes of November 15, 2004

I. Approval of tentative agenda

Fred Walter called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM in the Javits Room.

II. Approval of minutes from October 18, 2004

The minutes were approved and seconded.

III Report from the President of the Senate

Fred Walter reported that a departmental review of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies took place on November 3 and that he represented the Arts and Sciences governance. There were no problems with this and he will talk to Joe Auner about Arts and Sciences having a permanent presence in this process.

Walter reported that the curriculum committee and the SBU undergraduate coordinating council had met at 12:00 to discuss SBU 102 courses. He had spoken with Bill Collins, representing the Undergraduate Colleges, who reported that last May, the full senate had approved making SBU 101 a mandatory course for freshmen. However, credit from this course is not required for graduation. It was established that the senate does not have the power to make courses mandatory, only the curriculum committee. 6 SBU 102 courses to be taught starting in January 2005 have never been brought before the committee. Some misunderstandings were exposed at this meeting and it's hoped that communication will continue to improve between the curriculum committee and the undergraduate colleges. Dean Staros suggested that the seminars be treated as special topics of one course to save the trouble of having to approve each course. Fred responded that this was the case, and that the 6 courses would have 120 different sections all totaled. There is one blanket course for each undergraduate college, and approximately 20 versions of each course are taught. It was also determined that the curriculum committee must approve the grading scheme. 102s are letter-graded A-C and U.

IV. Report from the Dean of Arts and Sciences (J. Staros)

The Dean began his report by apologizing for not attending recent meetings because he was out of town. He then proceeded to summarize the current state of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. His report was in four parts.

1. CAS Fiscal Update: The monetary allocation system for CAS has changed. It now sits with the Provost; previously it came from a central allocation system. The Dean reported that the college has taken up a challenge to do things that will increase our revenue and make us less dependent on the budget for support. One of these was a move to increase out-of-state tuition. This is in principle agreement: it hasn't yet started to increase revenue.

2. Faculty Searches Authorized: 23 faculty searches have been authorized, including 22 FTE positions and one Brookhaven lab joint appointment. 10 of the authorized searches are for SBS, 7 for HFA, and 6 for Natural Sciences. The total value of these positions has a salary value of 1 1/2 million dollars, which is booked against recent losses in faculty positions. Many temporary long-term staff positions have been converted back to regular positions.

3. Under enrollment: There were 173 fewer freshmen enrolled in CAS for Fall 2004 than anticipated, which caused a loss of \$1 million in state aid and tuition. There were 36 fewer returning students, most from CAS, at a loss of \$250,000 in state aid and tuition. This could translate into a lowered graduation rate. An increase in new transfer students (53) could offset the decrease in part time students (87). This may reduce funds available for new hires. The Dean suggested faculty should do what they can to increase student retention. His suggestions were providing seats in key DEC, intro, and gateway courses; supporting changes on campus to support student success; helping students understand prerequisite requirements for majors; and supporting undergraduate courses. During an initiative by the undergraduate advisory office led by Emily Thomas, the Dean asked for graduation rates by major, and found that CAS majors were at or better than the university average. This shows an undefined variable. It turns out a large group of students had never declared a major but fell under CAS jurisdiction. In 2003, 1400 registered students had never declared a major; this number was reduced by 1000 by the efforts of Academic Advising. The Dean suggested that a 6 year graduation goal is a reasonable expectation for most of our students. He said we are offering more core courses in the summer.

4. More Fiscal Update/Debt Reduction Plan: Dean Staros reported that the Provost has charged him with a deficit reduction plan that will reduce the CAS deficit by \$1.5 million per year for 3 years. The plan will depend on several factors. Decreases in expenses and increases in income both count. Plans to increase income are as follows:

out-of-state tuition

- increased Masters Degree program enrollment
- increased Summer School revenue
- increased grant support

Plans for decrease expenses:

- less than full replacement of faculty departures
- less than full replacement of staff departures
- reduction in SIB (adjunct) budget

The Dean suggested departments could assist by facilitating new BA/MA or BA/MAT programs, by proposing them, and by optimizing summer session offerings. He also suggested encouragement of proposals for extramural funding.

Fred Kemp asked why reducing the number of adjuncts would save CAS money, especially if new programs were being proposed that required the use of more adjuncts. Dean Staros said that the small number of full-time faculty being recruited might actually reduce the need for

adjuncts and save money. He said adjuncts will always be needed in some areas but that they should be applied to courses that maximally draw students.

A question was asked by Fred Kemp about the CAS deficit, if the College was spending more than its allocation, and if not, what was the reason for the deficit? He asked if the Provost is allocating enough money to the College. The Dean suggested one problem was that allocations were given after we've already given to some projects and those projects needs had to be estimated before having the budget. He also said that occasionally dollars were spent twice when requests were made for replacement faculty.

A question was asked as to where money comes from for building upgrade and maintenance, specifically for research buildings which are in disrepair. The Dean said that NSF and NIH give the university 50 cents for every dollar the university spends, but the real issue is if enough total dollars are being spent on maintenance, since Dick Mann has reported that his budget hasn't grown despite rapidly rising utilities costs. These come out of the same fund pool as maintenance.

V. Report of the Academic Judiciary Committee (J. Shea with Maria Doelger)

John Shea reported that this year, AJC received 200 accusations, which are down from the previous year's record of 260. The number of cases has increased by 5 times over the last 6-7 years and appeals are up. This is mainly due to the easily verifiable nature of many cases (Internet plagiarism). Guilty findings are up because they are easily verified (80-90% guilty). There have also been many cases of exam cheating. Maria Doelger, the AJC executive officer, has been offering training sessions in avoiding academic dishonesty to introductory courses, athletes, and other high-risk areas. She said more faculty than ever are buying into the system because it is a fair system and offers legal protection to the faculty. She mentioned that the use of a cell phone in an exam room constitutes academic dishonesty, but that it is a difficult area to adjudicate because sometimes people just forget to turn off the phone, etc. Last year, Maria implemented a survey of the university community's attitudes toward academic dishonesty, administered by Don McCade at Rutgers University. He determined that SBU has every possible risk factor for academic dishonesty problems: public research university, commuter students, Division 1 athletics among these. Maria stated we are probably only catching the tip of the iceberg. Time management is a big issue for many students and causes panic dishonesty; these students, if caught and if they take the "Q" course, usually do not become repeat offenders. The Q course has gotten many positive evaluations from the student (eerily so, Maria said, as she was expecting complaints from the offenders). The Q course is unusual and being copied by other institutions.

Fred Kemp asked if more cheating was occurring or if reporting was simply up, and John said that probably both are true.

VI. Other Old Business--There was no other old business.

VII. Other New Business-- Fred Walter mentioned last month's suggestion that faculty organize social events for the Arts and Sciences Faculty and the CAS Senate. He said he would contact members to inquire about participation in a committee to organize this.

The meeting was adjourned and seconded at 4:45 PM.

Minutes submitted by Cynthia Davidson, CAS Senate Secretary

A Proposed Constitutional Amendment Affecting the Makeup of the Executive Committee

Background

The Executive Committee of the Arts & Sciences Senate consists of the three offices of the Senate, the immediate past president, the chairs of the five standing committees (or their appointees), the representative of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (non-voting), one professional, one graduate student, and two undergraduates, as detailed in item E of the Arts & Sciences Senate Constitution.

For the past four years or so, the executive committee (EC) has functioned at less than full strength. This may be a good thing, in that the Senate Lounge would get rather cozy with 14 in the room. The main reason why the EC operates at less than full strength has been that many of the standing committee chairs do not attend.

The standing committees are an integral part of the Senate. Much of the business of the Senate is conducted in its standing committees. The standing committees are required to report to the Senate, and receive direction from the Senate. Consequently, it has been perceived as useful for the chairs of the standing committees to be members of the EC.

The argument for the chairs being members of the EC is that the EC, which directs the Senate, should be aware of the issues which face its constituencies. The EC provides a forum for the chairs to discuss their progress and problems with the officers and the other chairs. In principle, this can keep everyone on top of the issues.

Certain chairs have made the case that discussions in the EC are not useful to the functioning of their committees, and that their insights are not helpful for other committees. Some chairs are resentful at having to give up another hour of their week. This has become a contentious issue at times during the past 5 years (and perhaps longer).

There are arguments to be made on both sides. As a practical matter, I submit that it is not necessary that all chairs be present at all EC meetings. The primary roles of the EC are to set policy, to coordinate the operations of the standing committees, to set agendas for Senate meetings, to ensure that posts are filled, to run the election, and to otherwise advocate for faculty governance. There are rarely issues on the table that directly affect the standing committees.

Coordination of the operations of the standing committees hardly requires that the chairs be present at all EC meetings. Three of the standing committees (CASA, AJC, PTC) are rarely involved in policy matters - they tend to enforce policies (CASA enforces policies set by the University Senate, not the A&S Senate). Only the Curriculum Committee (because of the current issues with the History skills, the undergraduate colleges, and assessment) and the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policies have a hand in policy matters at present.

The Proposal

I propose we replace the current EC structure with a structure more similar to that in use in the University Senate. The University Senate has an EC, but the chairs of the standing committees are not members of the EC. Rather, they form the Coordinating Council, which meets with the EC on occasion (once or twice a year) to report on issues arising in their committees.

I propose that the chairs of the standing committees be ex-officio voting members of the EC. This permits them to attend and participate, while removing the responsibility of required attendance.

The chairs of the standing committees will constitute the coordinating council. The coordinating council will meet with the EC twice annually. The EC will retain the authority to compel individual chairs to attend EC meetings, when deemed necessary for Senate business.

In the interest of maintaining a faculty majority on the EC, membership will be increased by one teaching faculty member of the Senate in addition to the officers.

The number of undergraduate student government representatives will be reduced from two to one.

In sum, the membership in the EC will be the 4 officers, one faculty, one professional, one grad student, one undergrad, and the Dean's representative.

This will require

- a constitutional amendment to revise article E.1, and
- a new article describing the Coordinating Council, and
- a change in the B-Laws Article B.4.

The wording of the proposed Article F is taken directly from Article VII.3 of the University Senate Constitution.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment

E.1(3) the elected chairs of each Arts and Sciences Senate Standing Committee, or their delegates, are ex-officio members of the executive committee, with full voting privileges.

E.1(4) one member of the Arts and Sciences Senate, elected as specified in the By-Laws

E.1(4) renamed E.1(5)

E.1(5) renamed E.1(6)

E.1(7) one undergraduate student, selected through the usual procedures for this purpose by the respective student government.

E.1(7) renamed E.1(8)

Article F will be renamed Article G.

Article F: The Coordinating Council

The function of the Coordinating Council is to facilitate the sharing of information and the coordination of activities among the standing committees of the Arts and Sciences Senate. The Coordinating Council shall consist of the members of the Executive Committee and the Chairperson or other representative of each standing committee. In the event a committee is represented by someone other than the chairperson, the designee will be chosen by the committee from among its members. The President of the Arts and Sciences Senate shall chair the Coordinating Council. The Coordinating Council shall meet at least once per academic semester.

Proposed Change in the By-Laws

Article 4. Insert the following line:

The faculty representative to the Executive Committee will be elected by vote of the faculty members of the Arts and Sciences Senate, from among the current membership.

Approved by the Arts and Sciences Senate Executive Committee, 7 February 2005
Submitted to the Arts & Sciences Senate for a first reading, 21 February 2005

