Tentative Agenda
Arts & Sciences Senate
March 28, 2005

I. Approval of tentative agenda
II. Approval of minutes from February 21, 2005
III. Report of the President
IV. Report of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (J. Staros)
V. Update from the Curriculum Committee: GenEd and College 102 (J. Lochhead)
VI. Second Reading of a proposed constitutional amendment
VII. Other Old Business
VIII. New Business

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 at-large faculty 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 at-large 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 faculty 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
Submitted to the Arts & Sciences Senate for a second reading, 28 March 2005

Arts and Sciences Senate Meeting
Minutes of the February 21, 2005

I. Approval of tentative agenda

Fred Walter, president of the Arts and Sciences Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm in the Javits Room. The Agenda was approved and seconded.

II. Approval of minutes from November 15, 2004

The minutes were approved and seconded.

III. Report from the President of the Senate

The president proposed that hereafter, the A&S Senate meet on the third Monday of every month except February, during which time it would meet on the fourth Monday of the month. The senate voted unanimously to approve the proposal.

IV. Report from the Faculty Athletic Representative (R. Susman)

Randy Susman, Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, gave an overview of his role and of the university's Division I athlete-students. He described the student-athletes' situation as one of great pressures to perform well both in the classroom and on the playing field. Under the direction of Jim Fiore, Paul Schlickmann, and Donna Woodruff, the athletic program is modeling itself on an Ivy League model of excellence in academics. He pointed out that the average athlete's GPA of 2.88 is higher than the university average of 2.6. He explained that athletes are allowed to miss class for scheduled athletic events according to page 80 of the NCAA regulations manual, and that professors are obliged to reschedule exams that occur during these meets.

Susman reported several regrettable anecdotes about the mistreatment of athletes by professors in the university who consider the academic performance of athletes to be generally substandard, including professors who have stated they prefer not to have athletes as students in their classes. He reports that it is only 15-17% of athletes who struggle in class, and that these are students whose confidence must be built. He asked senators to counsel their colleagues to access these students' advisors when these students perform poorly so that intervention may take place.

Robert Kerber stated that we should emphasize that faculty who exclude ANY student on the basis of the group to which he/she belongs should be, at minimum, brought to the attention of the department's chair. Dean Staros agreed and stated that any such case that had been brought to his attention had resulted in the faculty member being reminded that this is a part of contractual duties. Susman complimented Dean Staros and his office on exemplary handling of these cases.

It was suggested by Robert Kerber and others that new faculty be given an academic orientation to introduce them to general academic responsibilities such as fair treatment of all students. Ruth Ben-Zvi pointed out that there is awareness about issues such as sexual harassment, but not about academic responsibilities. The dean agreed it was a good idea and he would consider it. Susman finished his report by lauding exemplary scholar athletes and athletic staff. Fred Walter said that the intercollegiate athletic board at SBU consisted of himself, Jim Lattimer, Marty Levine, and Mary Kritzer, and that matters concerning these issues could be brought to their attention.

V. Report of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee (C. Jansen)

The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee report was delivered by Charles Jansen. He explained that the committee's mission was to decide policy issues for faculty in general and not to adjudicate individual cases. Last year was the committee's first full year. The main business of the last year was deciding criteria for the tenure review of faculty arriving in the School of Professional Development Professional Education Program (PEP). This was a challenge because these were tenure-track individuals

who were not primarily research faculty, so new guidelines had to be developed for their tenure review. The program was concurrently given a review by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. After guidelines were developed, they were passed by the A&S Senate. PEP reported that the guidelines helped them to meet the external review, and that the program was not recommended to make changes by the review board.

The FAR Committee also investigates issues of fairness for all faculty, including part-time faculty. There is a broad area of overlap with the Provost's task force on non-tenure track faculty. One area of concern is using teaching evaluations fairly to evaluate teachers' performance. Some discussion ensued, and it was brought up that larger and more demanding courses tend to get lower evaluations from students. This is an issue that can also affect PEP faculty's tenure review, in which evaluations play a role.

Robert Kerber proposed that students' grade reports should show the average grade in courses along with the individual faculty member's grade for each class. It was debated whether this information should be made publicly available. Charles Jensen asked if such a report exists already, and if so, what are its whereabouts? Fred Walter suggested Melissa Bishop at DoIT might be able to answer, and Dean Staros suggested contacting the Registrar's Office.

VI. Nominations of Senate Officers for 2005-2006

Fred Walter discussed the upcoming A&S Senate elections. He stated that this year, we need to elect both a president and a vice-president, and that further nominations were needed for the office of Secretary. He also stated that standing committees needed to be fully staffed. Next September, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee needs to fill six vacancies, the Curriculum Committee needs to fill two positions from Humanities and Fine Arts, Academic Judiciary Committee needs to fill two, CASA needs to fill three, and 18 at-large senators are needed. Walter said he will ask the Dean to send out a general call to fill the vacancies. The ballot must be ready in March.

VII. First reading of a proposed Constitutional Amendment (see attach.)

Fred Walter read a proposed Constitutional Amendment for A&S Senate to change the constituency of Executive Committee (attached). This is the first public reading of the proposed amendment; one or two more will follow before voting. He explained that AJC and CASA do not need to report every month to the Executive Committee. Heads of standing committees will not be required to attend each Executive Committee meeting. Instead, they will meet in a Coordinating Council. Floor was opened for discussion. Robert Kerber suggested a change to article E1-4 in which the faculty representative would be described as an at-large member. Walter agreed to clarify the passage. It was explained that the executive board retains the right to call chairs to the monthly meeting for specific issues of business.

VIII. Other Old Business

No old business was discussed.

IX. Other New Business

No new business was brought forth.

The meeting was adjourned by President Walter and seconded by various members of the senate at 4:38 P.M.

Minutes submitted by Cynthia Davidson, A&S Senate Secretary

Report from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee-AY 2003-04

The main activity of the A&S Senate Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policy Committee (FRRPC) for the AY 2003-04 was the creation of guidelines for hiring and evaluation of faculty hired for the Professional Education Program (PEP) of the School of Professional Development (SPD). These guidelines served two functions: 1) to ensure that these full-time faculty, whose primary mission is not research, are hired, evaluated, and promoted fairly; and 2) to provide a model of this process to assist in the accreditation of

the SPD approach by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 2004. It appears that both functions were accomplished.

The issue was first raised at an A&S Senate Executive Committee Meeting in October of 2003, guidelines were formulated by FRRPC by December and circulated for input by the A&S Senate Executive Committee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, SPD, the Dean of A&S, and the provost's office. A semi-final draft of the guidelines received A&S Senate approval, with minor modifications, in February of 2004. These recommendations were adopted by SPD and submitted to NCATE in March of 2004, and formed part of the program review in May 2004. The PEP guidelines were favorably reviewed, as detailed in the following quote from Mary Ann Short, Associate Director for Administration in PEP:

"The Guidelines were not only useful, but proved to be a necessary element for our meeting accreditation Standard 6 - Unit Governance and Resources requirements. The Board of Examiners were completely satisfied with the Guidelines, as was evidenced by the fact that we unequivocally met all requirements for Standard 6. For this particular standard, the examiners offered not a single recommendation for necessary improvements."

The main thrust of the guidelines was to ensure that PEP faculty are hired and evaluated by both their home departments and by PEP, in relation to the purpose for which they were hired. According the Mary Ann Short, the guidelines have been implemented already in a total of 5 completed and ongoing faculty searches (Departments of English and Biochemistry). PEP faculty are participating in search activities as recommended in the Guidelines. All stages of search activities for teacher education faculty must be endorsed by both the PEP director as well as the relevant academic department chair. To ensure that the guidelines are followed, a search activity checklist was created by PEP (see attached document). The PEP director also confers with the hiring departments to ensure that teaching loads reflect the guidelines; for instance, teacher education program *directors* are currently granted a course reduction. The PEP director also needs to approve all departmental recommendations for reappointment and tenure of junior PEP faculty. Senior teacher education faculty have been in involved in recent mid-career evaluations of junior PEP faculty.

The FRRPC spent some time investigating another issue of fairness in faculty treatment, with special reference to part-time faculty. However, when we found out that the Provost had already convened a task force on the overlapping (albeit not quite identical) issue of the status of non-tenure-track faculty, we dropped out of the matter. The Provostial task force's draft report is available at http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/provost/Reports/Non-Tenure%20Track.htm. At present, we have no plans to pick up this issue.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
RECRUITMENT ACTIVITY CHECK-OFF LIST

Department Requesting Position: _____

Department Contact Person and Phone Number: _____

Job Rank/Title for Recruitment: _____

Pre-Search Activities - Recruitment Plan: Date Received: _____ Date Reviewed: _____
Note: Two representatives from the PEP faculty should be involved in the full process of hiring new faculty, regardless of the home department in which they reside.
Recruitment Plan Comments: _____

_____

_____

Recruitment Plan - Approved/Disapproved: _____
(Signature of PEP Director or Authorized PEP Designee)

Request for Waiver of Recruitment: Date Received: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

Name of appointee: _____

Waiver of Recruitment Comments: _____

_____

_____

Waiver of Recruitment - Approved/Disapproved: _____
(Signature of PEP Director or Authorized PEP Designee)

Mid-Search – Interview Pool Summary: Date Received: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

Interview Pool Comments: _____

_____

_____

Interview Pool – Approved/Disapproved: _____
(Signature of PEP Director or Authorized PEP Designee)

Post-Search/Pre-Hire: Date Received: _____ Date Reviewed: _____

Name of Proposed Candidate: _____

Gender of Proposed Candidate: Male Female Ethnicity of Selected Candidate: _____

Veterans Status: Yes No

Date of Proposed Appointment: _____ Proposed Salary: _____

Proposed Candidate Selection Comments: _____

_____

Proposed Candidate Selection – Approved/Disapproved: _____
(Signature of PEP Director or Authorized PEP Designee)