



COLLEGE SENATE BULLETIN

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

Bulletin No. 13
Pages 117-133.
February 17, 2005

Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
118	Announcements GAAC erratum
118	Minutes of the Student Affairs Committee of January 25, 2005
121	Report from University Faculty Senate Plenary Session, January 27-29, 2005.
124	Minutes: All College Meeting, February 1, 2005
128	Minutes: College Senate Meeting, February 1, 2005

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

Announcements

GAAC Erratum

Bulletin #11, page 108. "Revised Course, First Reading: MUSC" should read "Revised Program for the MA in Speech-Language Pathology to include a 599 directed study course." The chair deeply regrets this error and sends his personal apologies to all affected parties.

Minutes of the Student Affairs Committee of January 25, 2005

Present: S. Bossung, K. Davies (Chair), A. Eaton, B. Fearn, J. Girdano, K. Hannam, J. Kleiman, J. Lovett, R. McEwen, A. Muia, B. Nash, M. Pastizzo, J. Principe, A. Sheldon, A. Stanley, B. Stewart, M. Sutherland, J. VanRemmen

Absent: W. Freed, D. Granger

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm.

Welcome back from K. Davies.

Old Business

Update on discussion about students with mental health issues

K. Davies reported on a meeting that she had with Heidi Levine, Director of Student Health and Counseling. H. Levine was able to answer some of SAC's previous questions: (1) There is a difference between the mandatory student health fee and Geneseo's health insurance plan. The mandatory fee is paid through student tuition and covers any services or medication accessible through the Student Health and Counseling Center. The insurance plan, which is entirely voluntary (only about 45 students currently subscribe), will cover services and prescriptions beyond that. If the low numbers of insurance subscribers persist, the program may disappear as the costs outweigh the benefits. At this time, there is no requirement for all students to have some form of health insurance, either through Geneseo's plan or through a family/work plan. For some students, their only access to medical services is through the Health and Counseling Center and S. Bossung noted that students may not even know about the services offered on campus. (2) H. Levine mentioned that the most frequent reasons for outside referrals are that students prefer to see an off-campus provider and/or they are in need of specialized care that cannot be offered on campus.

H. Levine has a student survey on health data from Spring 2004 and wanted to know if this document would be of interest to SAC. The survey includes responses from approximately 650 students. S. Bossung is curious to know if the survey addresses students' awareness of the available services at the Health Center. K. Davies will examine the report and decide if SAC should review it.

K. Davies announced that a group including H. Levine and Dr. Michael Lynch, Psychology Department, is currently working on a grant proposal for the American Academy of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that addresses the kind of mental health issues the SAC has been discussing this year. The proposal will focus on expanding the INTD 101 session that was developed in SAC during 2003-2004, under M. Lynch's leadership.

K. Davies reminded SAC members that the TLC workshop on distressed students will be held February 3 at 12:45 in Milne Library, room 213.

Becky Glass, Teaching and Learning Center, informed K. Davies that the TLC is willing to fund two professors to attend a 2-day workshop on Universal Design (<http://www.cast.org/udl/ProfessionalDevelopmentforEducatorsandTechnologyProfessionals2376.cfm>). The workshop will take place June 2-3, 2005, in Wakefield, MA (15 miles north of Boston). B. Glass is also interested in organizing a workshop for faculty working with students with learning disabilities. K. Davies polled SAC for their preference of an on-campus or off-campus speaker. J. Lovett remarked that an outside presenter would be better. M. Pastizzo seconded. A. Eaton suggested a combined presentation where a Geneseo professor could provide insight on the experiences of Geneseo's student teachers and an outside speaker could bring a different perspective to the discussion. This option seemed to please the group and the information will be passed on to B. Glass.

Update on discussion about international/ESL students

K. Davies reported on a meeting that she had with ESL coordinator, Irene Belyakov. I. Belyakov explained that non-native speaking students who come to Geneseo generally fit into one of three categories: international students, AOP students, general admission students. The general admission students are the most problematic, since no office is aware of or responsible for their language difficulties. These students may not want to self-identify for fear of being stigmatized. R. McEwen asked if all students attend first-year orientation and if the general admission students, specifically, are targeted with information on special language services. J. Lovett stated that not all students go through orientation, adding that international students frequently register for courses by mail and do not arrive on campus until classes begin. B. Fearn confirmed that international students go through their own specialized orientation program with Mary Hope, Director of International Student Services. This still does not address those general admission students, in need of additional language training, who do not attend first-year orientation.

M. Pastizzo asked what professors should do when they encounter a student who may have slipped through the cracks. Students should be sent to I. Belyakov, who can better assess their needs. K. Davies added that the College Dean's webpage has links to what each academic department offers in terms of student support (<http://www.geneseo.edu/~acadsupt/>). J. Giordano suggested that the departmental sites may not be up to date and may not be all-inclusive of the available services on campus. As another option for support, M. Sutherland mentioned that any student can attend free speech clinics through the Communicative Disorders & Sciences Department.

S. Bossung questioned why, as a college, we do not have a clear picture of how many students are in need of special language assistance. She asked whether or not SUNY Geneseo should have a testing program. Other questions were raised about the admissions process and whether or not face-to-face interviews and/or writing samples are required. Interviews are not mandatory and students can easily have their application essays proof-read by a parent or a teacher. Although professors are in the best position to assess their students' verbal and written language ability, they are reluctant to tell students of perceived language problems. In the past, Geneseo had a writing requirement where faculty were obligated to score students on their writing and ultimately fail some of them. Faculty did not want to do this and that writing requirement was ultimately lost. B. Fearn remarked that, in recent years, there have been many students referred to I. Belyakov by professors. Following up on that statement, B. Fearn asked if departments perform their own writing assessments. The consensus was that the INTD 105 program should be the initial vehicle for assessing students' language difficulties. However, not all first-year students take INTD 105. For instance, international students have already passed the TOEFL exam to be admitted into Geneseo and, therefore, are not required to complete an INTD 105 course. Some international students opt to take I. Belyakov's WRTG 101/102 if they need additional language training, but are not mandated to do so either. The general feeling from SAC members was that all Geneseo students should take INTD 105. Furthermore, M. Pastizzo suggested that INTD 105 instructors serve as the identifiers of students struggling with their verbal and/or written English. J. Lovett expressed concern that students are not identified early enough. In many cases, they accept a bad grade and do not seek further assistance to improve their language skills. Because INTD 105 can only be taken in one of two semesters in a student's first year, S. Bossung worries that freshmen will lose a course (or two, added J. Lovett) if they don't succeed in INTD 105. Some students having trouble in INTD 105 have been subsequently encouraged to enroll in WRTG 101/102. B. Fearn reminded us that we no longer have ENGL 100, where students needing further assistance after INTD 105 had been channeled. The problem with recommending students to take WRTG 101/102 is that I. Belyakov is the only professor teaching these courses and cannot over extend the number of courses she offers or the number of students within her classes. Community college courses are not an adequate option for additional language training. A. Sheldon asked why Geneseo hasn't implemented a writing exam that would determine which students, both non-native and native speakers of English, will be required to take remedial writing. J. Giordano suggested testing students after INTD 105 to generate numbers of students with language difficulties. K. Hannam and A. Stanley noted that this is problematic. A. Eaton suggested that faculty advisors inform students in need of language assistance of the available services on campus, but the problem of students who do not self-identify still exists. Further discussion of how to inform faculty and administration of these issues continued. J. Principe suggested that numbers be collected through INTD 105 where professors identify problematic non-native (and native) speakers by putting a check next to their name on the class roster. She further suggested an end-of-INTD 105 written exam, following a similar model of ENGL 205: Business & Professional Writing, that would identify students needing supplemental instruction. S. Bossung and B. Fearn had ideas about restructuring the progress notification and grading process in INTD 105. Any change in requirements such as these would eventually have to be passed through UCC. K. Davies will discuss these options

related to INTD 105 with Celia Easton, Associate Dean of Students, and invite her to the SAC's next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Davies
Chair, SAC

Report from University Faculty Senate Plenary Session, January 27-29, 2005.

In addition to discussions and reports by the President of the Senate and by the various committees and sectors (our sector is the four-year comprehensive colleges), the Senate heard reports from SUNY Provost Peter Salins and Chancellor King. I will try to amalgamate the information in those reports which concern Geneseo.

Campus Based Assessment: in 2004 it was agreed that Campus Based Assessment should not be used to punish, compare, or lead to embarrassment of any sector of the University. Every campus has a program in place and most have been through two cycles. The data and reports were meant to be used as the bases for improvements on each. However, under the Freedom of Information Act, those reports were released to the media in January. All campuses complied individually and put the results into the contexts of their campuses. The results were presented at the University Academic Standards Committee in January. The Provost wanted to make the point of the assessments and the results clear to the Board of Trustees as well as the media. An assessment specialist (Trudy Fonda?) had been invited to comment and attended the meeting, at no fee or even expense. She said that the criteria, planning, implementation and resulting presentation and use of the reports were all highly successful. The media reports which followed the meeting have proved to be balanced and not at all harmful.

Mission Review II: all guidance documents are now in and the Provost's office is now developing a schedule for campus visits, which should all have taken place by next December. A letter will be sent to each President telling what to expect and reiterating the expectation that faculty will be involved. Four-year Graduation rate tables will be included in the reports and are now a big issue. The problems with those reported rates are partly statistical: if a student transfers in from a two-year college and graduates "on time" from the four-year institution, that doesn't count; if a student transfers from a four-year college to another four-year college, even within SUNY, and graduates in four years, that doesn't count in the statistics. As they now stand, the over-all four-year graduation rate across SUNY is 40% (Geneseo and Binghamton share the highest rate at 68%). One reason we must take this admittedly flawed measure seriously is because the public thinks it is important. There was a great deal of discussion of this topic, during which it was pointed out that we have a high faculty ratio of 1:18 overall, and 1:25 in the lower division; and that in public schools, K-12

are funded at \$12,000/student even in New York City (and much higher in some of the wealthier areas) and at \$10,000/student in SUNY.

In our sector meeting, there were four areas of concern:

- 1) Chancellor King has supported us and because of that has come under what seems to be covert attack from some members of the Trustees and the media, and he deserves our support;
- 2) the problem of growing use of adjuncts and reduction of full-time tenure-track professors;
- 3) the demands on faculty time, which include: increasing class size with no release time, taking over secretarial duties in preparation because of the use of computers and copy machines, advising, lack of compensation or time-consideration for service duties, and lack of time for professional development;
- 4) low faculty morale and the growing problem of recruiting and retaining quality professors because of the low salaries and salary compression.

There was general discussion of the Academic Bill of Rights, which was introduced to the Board of Trustees by Chairman Egan and Trustee DeRussy. There were no resolutions introduced, but the consensus was that it was a document which seems to be benevolent—the idea that there should be overall balance in viewpoints to which the students are exposed—but that seeking to “legislate” that is dangerous and unnecessary. Stephanie Gross, Student Assembly and Trustee, spoke against adopting the Academic Bill of Rights and hoped it would go away. Chancellor King pointed out that it was not a new issue and that Trustees Egan and DeRussy had wanted him to direct who would be invited as outside speakers to campuses. He had declined to do so.

During the Plenary session, each sector began its report with independent expressions of support for Chancellor King.

Chancellor King sought to address the concerns of the various sectors in his session with the Senate.

Most of the problems—salary, class size, morale-- of course, are tied to financial resources. He is aware of the adjunct problem and hopes the new tuition proposal will reverse that trend. There will soon be a long-term study of faculty development published and he hopes that will help.

Rather than attempting to summarize the Tuition Proposal, which was covered in some detail, I will refer you to the SUNY web page: SUNY.edu/provost.

Chancellor King will present and explain the proposal in detail at the various campuses, beginning with Geneseo on February 1 at 4:00 in N202.

The purpose of the increase is to permit new money to enter the system which will be directly invested in full-time tenure track faculty, equipment, scholarships, and other areas to enhance the students' academic experience. It is not to replace diminished state support, which has been the fate of every other increase over the past twenty years. The state would

have to agree to pay for mandatory increases (i.e., salary increases). And, families would know what to expect over the course of four years.

Stephanie Gross, SUNY Student Assembly, said the Assembly supports the plan but not the tuition increase; that is, they want the extra money but want the state to provide it from general funds.

There was also mention of Partnership to Accelerate Completion Time (PACT) which would reward comprehensive colleges and universities with \$500 for each student who graduates in four years. It was not clear where that money would come from.

Although the TAP fund proposal of withholding 50% until graduation was not raised (I had thought I was on the list), I chased down Associate Chancellor for Finance and Business after his presentation and questioned him on that problem. He foresees no support for the proposal in the legislature.

Other reports: budgets for SUNY libraries, relative to greatly increased costs of materials, have fallen way behind. Geneseo, for example, has seen an increase in budget from 1998-2002 of 4.3% while cost of materials has increased approximately 24%. Many others have suffered worse fates.

Elsevier is now in operation and 1835 journal titles can be accessed across the system. That cost \$30,000,000 for five years.

Artstor, a digital slide library with rights to approximately 500,000 images, is also now in operation and can be accessed from any campus.

We were also presented with a White Paper on *Strategic Energy Issues in SUNY*. That should be available on the website at SUNY.edu/senate. Some highlights include: the target for each campus to receive energy from renewable sources is 10% by the end of 2005; we are now at about 2% system-wide. The best way to approach the energy problem overall is to reduce use. We have had a 16% reduction over the past ten years, mainly through lighting upgrades.

There were three resolutions passed. While they will be accessible through the SUNY.edu/senate website, I will include two of the resolutions without the “whereases” (the third, concerning Chancellor’s Awards, was not presented to us in printed form and was amended, therefore I am not confident of the wording):

Senate as a whole:

“Resolved, That the University Faculty Senate expresses its strong support for Chancellor King’s leadership of our university and, be it
Further Resolved, that the Senate acknowledges Chancellor King’s ongoing willingness to work directly with the Senate and with its president; and, be it

Further Resolved, that the Senate endorses Chancellor King's vision of excellence for our university, aligning resources available to him to enable our university to move forward in the front ranks of higher education; and, be it

Further Resolved, that the Senate applauds the results of Chancellor King's leadership, such as increased enrollment System-wide; greater selectivity in admissions, where appropriate, in each sector; wider areas of faculty research; and an increase in philanthropic giving of over one billion dollars to the University; and, be it

Further Resolved, that the Senate rejects unspecified charges against chancellor King from anonymous sources appearing in newspapers and other media in early 2005; and that the Senate reasserts its support for our colleague, Robert King, a strong, effective leader and advocate for the concerns of all members of our university community."

Passed without dissent.

Operations Committee:

Be it resolved, that

1. The university Faculty Senate request that campuses be encouraged to develop target ratios of Full Time Tenure Track faculty to non-Tenure Track faculty;
2. Development of these ratios be part of the Mission Review II process and be reflected in the MOUs; and,
3. Each MOU should include a timetable for achieving the ration.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Browne, University Faculty Senator

January 31, 2005

Minutes: All-College Meeting, February 1, 2005

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:03pm

President Dahl opened the All-College Meeting by welcoming college senate members, visitors, guests, students, faculty and staff. He then introduced SUNY Chancellor Robert King as someone who has provided strong leadership and who has been a powerful advocate for SUNY. Chancellor King is here to talk about the tuition policy, which would provide for more flexibility in funding from the state. The new tuition guarantee is one of the best things to happen and Dr. King is here to tell us more about it.

[applause]

SUNY Chancellor Robert King: Thank you. Before I start talking about tuition, I would like bring up one other subject that is not on the agenda. There was a recent assertion made that we [SUNY] were not doing very well. I had a member of my staff look into how we compare we compare with the national average and so forth. In making such a comparison we need to take into account that diverse types of institutions all come under one umbrella. So we will need to separate the four-year colleges, masters and PhD granting institutions.

This is unlike in California, for example, where they have separate systems for PhD institutions and comprehensive or liberal arts colleges. Here's what I learned: out of 259 comprehensive public colleges Geneseo ranks #1 in the country with regard to on-time graduation! [applause] Ten of the other twelve SUNY colleges rank in the top 50% and almost every one of them rank in the top 20%. There were a number of states that have NONE in the top 50 list--none as good as Geneseo. [applause]

We have a slide show about the tuition guarantee program. I would first like to give you all an overview of the University.

Overview:

- 64 campuses
- 413,000 students (1.1 million, if continuing education students are included, 160 countries)
- 1.1 million continuing education enrollments
- 81,000 employees
- 21,000 research employees
- 6500 courses of study (at associates, bachelors, M.S. and PhD levels)
- Enrollment at an all time high, 413,577
- Minority enrollment is high at 78,124
- Market share of high school graduates over 38%
- SAT scores and academic profiles are above average
- Graduation rates for comprehensive colleges well above national average.
- \$854 million in sponsored research
- \$1 billion in philanthropy since 1999. (\$3 billion target)
- Three new campus Centers for Excellence (at Buffalo, Albany and Stony Brook) attracting the finest graduate students.
- \$4 billion in SUNY capital projects through 2008 (like the Integrated science building)

The tuition plan: Our budget of \$8.5 billion is an "all funds budget" that includes hospitals, dorms, food service, etc. Core Instructional budget is about \$2.1 billion (state/taxpayer support) and the revenue from tuition is about \$846 million, which makes a total of \$2979 million. The break up in terms of expenditure is given by: about 72% wages and benefits, about 14% Debt services, 14% supplies, equipment and travel and about 0.5% central administration, etc.) Historically, the university was put in a position of going for 5, 6 or 7 years with no change in tuition. This allows for no capacity to predict. It's wonderful during the 5, 6 or 7 years, but not for those who are in college when the sudden jump appears. There are two main problems with this system: (1) there is no way for families to predict a jump in the tuition, (2) in every single instance, revenue from tuition increase was offset by a commensurate reduction in state support and this results in no net direct benefit for the students who are paying more. These two deficiencies with the current system needed to be remedied. The proposal is to impose a "tuition freeze" for current and incoming students for 4 years.

Students entering in 2006 will pay the 2005 tuition and an increment determined by the higher education price index. This index has been under 4% over the last 10 years.

Under the new plan:

- (1) gives predictability, for both the students/parents and the university.
- (2) makes financial sense, encourages students to graduate in 4 years.
- (3) provides for modest increases for newly admitted students.
- (4) recognizes the higher cost of education at university centers through differential tuition (in cost between university centers and comprehensive colleges like Geneseo.)

The government will continue to fund core operations at current level and will agree to finance the growth in cost. New resources to invest in academic quality will come from the students. New revenue from tuition will not replace lost state dollars. New faculty, lab equipment, new technology, etc will be funded by the tuition revenues.

Comparison chart for tuition in public campuses:

Geneseo \$5435
University Centers \$5726
Rhode Island \$6752
Connecticut \$7308
New Jersey \$8564
Massachusetts \$9008
New Hampshire \$9226
Vermont \$10,220
Pennsylvania \$10,856

We are well below our neighboring states.

Let me summarize: The tuition guarantee program allows for predictability and investment in quality. It is not a replacement for state support. The plan is part of legislation that has been submitted. We need your help to persuade the legislature. Thank you.

Chair Gregg Hartvigsen announced that there will be a 15-minute Question/Answer session.

Question 1: According to this plan, how can there be a guarantee that it won't go above inflation levels?

Chancellor King: The plan explicitly states that the increase will not be allowed to go over the higher education price index, unless the government fails to meet its obligation. There is a practice in Albany that is characterized by "history rules". Once something becomes history, it is hard to violate, except for unforeseen circumstances.

Follow up to last question: It won't go above inflation level even during a bad year?

Chancellor King: There is a risk there as with anything in a bad year or in the case of unforeseen circumstances. With political pressure, the government is not likely to break its deal.

Question 2: Given that there is a need to cover costs, it is better to have incremental rather than huge increases. However, reliance on the state worries me. Each time other states tried this approach the rates were far more than inflation rate. For example, at Iowa State University the tuition increase that should have been about 4.6% actually ended up being 22.3%. [applause]

Chancellor King: With all due respect to the legislature, we have been in a situation where the university was not seeing any significant increase in state support. This plan is part of a dream to get more state support, not less. I don't know about other states with different situations. What we tried to do is to construct a model that gives the kind of predictability for the state *and* the students. We cannot guarantee anything absolutely. This is the nature of public system. It requires good faith. Is it 100% iron clad? No. As dysfunctional as the legislature may or may not be, the new plan takes tuition increase out of their political purview as long as they meet reasonable expectations. It is as doable from the state's perspective as it is from the University and student perspective.

Question 3: From where I stand it sounds like a plan from a corporate CEO. Where is the money coming from? Why isn't the state responsible for educating its children? Sounds like corporate downsizing. The administration is asking for huge salary increases while exhorting adjunct labor. Faculty salary at Geneseo is the lowest, yet we are doing the best job. Families are being burdened by the tuition increase. Is it SUNY or a corporation? [applause]

Chancellor King: It would be wonderful if the state would pick up 100% of the cost of running the system. This is not realistic. The state is called upon to do disparate things. Our state government has been able to fund at a higher level than many other states. Direct operating cost is all that is reported. There are other fringe costs. Two-thirds of the core operating budget is funded by the state and the other third by students. Many states have this ratio at 50-50 or even at higher student burden. The reality is to reestablish the current 2/3 – 1/3 proportions. This year the cost of fringe benefits went up! The state is picking that up. In a perfect world the state would pay for everything. But in the end, the state is just us paying taxes. We need to balance how taxes compare with other states. Let me clarify the issue with regards to my salary. State law obligates to file a salary plan. Salary plan for administrators are at least 5 years old. This is especially true for campus presidents. We lose out when hiring presidents because of competitive salaries elsewhere. It needs to reflect current market levels. The chancellor (me) is not given a raise. My salary has been the same for 5 years. The salary *range* has been changed. My salary has not changed. My salary is 35th among state systems despite SUNY being one of the largest, most complex systems in the country. As for the question about adjunct faculty, we have not had the resources in the past few years to restore tenure-track lines. If the tuition plan is adopted we can get back to full time tenure-track faculty.

Question 4: Predictability is good. But how is my family to predict tuition increase?

Chancellor King: Once again let me clarify that the tuition freeze takes away the uncertainty because tuition is frozen for four years.

Question 5: You said that there are no guarantees when it comes to the legislature. Where's the predictability?

Chancellor King: Right now, there is no law! This plan puts in place a *law* that limits tuition increase by the higher education price index. There is not guarantee with the legislature. However, it is more likely to abide by a law than violate it! That's the value of political pressure. This state has the most generous tuition assistance program [T.A.P.]. Students from families up to \$50,000 household income would see full amount covered. If our plan goes into place, eventually this ceiling will go higher. The TAP program will be kept at a vibrant level. New tuition will be set aside in part for students who need it. Money coming from philanthropy will be used for providing scholarship. This combination will provide resources for students from low income.

Question 6: Will we be getting more services for the larger tuition?

Chancellor King: This is exactly the point. Library resources, lab equipment, etc. The focus will be on quality. So the short answer is YES!

Chair Hartvigsen thanked the Chancellor for his visit.

There was no old or new business.

All-College meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Minutes: College Senate Meeting, February 1, 2005

Attending: D. Anderson, C. Annala, D. Bicket, J. Boiani, R. Bonfiglio, S. Bosch, S. Bossung, T. Browne, M. Chang, L. Chatterton, E. Chun, R. Coloccia, K. Conway-Turner, C. Dahl, K. Davies, K. Deutsch, R. Dreifuss, A. Eaton, A. Eisenberg, B. Fearn, W. Freed, C. Freeman, C. Geiger, E. Gillin, J. Giordano, B. Gohlman, D. Granger, K. Hannam, R. Hartman, G. Hartvigsen, K. Hinman, J. Hyman, S. Iyer, C. Jadlos, A. Jassawalla, D. Johnson, J. Kleiman, D. LaMagna, S. Landes, K. Levison, D. Levy, M. Lima, J. Lovett, K. Mapes, R. McEwen, J. McLean, D. McPherson, D. Metz, L. Meyer, H. Myers, B. Nash, D. Norris, J. Over, B. Owens, M. Pastizzo, R. Pretzer, J. Principe, A. Rutkowski, S. Schwartz, A. Sheldon, C. Shin, A. Stanley, B. Stewart, M. Stolee, D. Sullivan, M. Sutherland, Y. Tamura, G. Towsley, C. Truglia, J. VanRemmen, E. Wallace, A. Weibel, C. Woidat, C. Xiao

Guests: P. Perrin, A. Kline, B. Howard

Call to Order

The college senate meeting was called to order at 5:04pm

Adoption of the Agenda for the College Senate Meeting

The agenda on page 86, Senate Bulletin 10 was approved.

Senate Reports

President Chris Dahl reported on the following items:

Budget report:

- 1) The actual operating budget for the University, as recommended by the governor, remains steady for the 2005-2006 year.
- 2) Tax dollar support is reduced from the adjusted base, which covers last year's base plus mandatory increases like contractual salary increases and price increases in utilities, by \$85 million.
- 3) A tuition increase of \$500 per student is recommended, which would generate \$85 million in revenues to cover the contractual salary increases for faculty and staff and the utility price increases.
- 4) Tuition increase for CUNY was recommended at \$250.
- 5) If we do not get an additional \$85 million in State Tax Dollar support, or tuition revenues to cover the shortfall, we will have a \$2 million hole to fill at Geneseo.
- 6) EOP program is reduced by \$7.8 million (50%) by eliminating all stipends for the university's neediest students.
- 7) One-half of TAP awards for entering students would be deferred until successful completion of a degree program.
- 8) Funding for "donor" campuses for the save-harmless from two years ago remains at \$16.7 million. There is an additional \$10 million of "dry" appropriation to help reverse the \$50 million save-harmless, but the University has to find the revenue to activate that appropriation.
- 9) There is \$1.473 million to start a Partnership to Accelerate Completion Time (PACT) program. This represents \$50 per first-time, full-time state-operated SUNY student. The program is intended to be an incentive for 4 year graduation. Colleges would guarantee the availability of courses required for students to complete their degrees, and students would agree to fulfill their degrees within four academic years. College would be awarded \$500 for each successful baccalaureate candidate.
- 10) Capital bill reappropriates all remaining projects from the last Five Year Capital Plan.
 - Includes additional funding of \$234,400,000 for 9 capital projects and 2 community college projects.
 - Revised matching program of \$250 million---\$100 million for Independent Sector, \$150 million for competitive grants to public or private sector with no sector receiving more that \$100 million at a 3:1 private to state match. Precludes use of tuition or student fee revenues to support the non-state portion.

President Dahl attended 250th anniversary of Moscow State University. A dual degree program is being set up between Moscow State University and Geneseo.

Committee for a national search for VP for College Advancement has been formed. The following members will serve on this committee:

Gary Towsley, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Mathematics, Chair
Kenneth Book, Member, College Council and the Geneseo Foundation

Gregg Hartvigsen, Chair, College Senate
Debra Hill, Executive Director, Alumni and Parent Relations
Harry Howe, Associate Professor, Jones School of Business
Kate Huggler, Resident Assistant, Livingston Hall
Ellen Kintz, Professor and Chair, Anthropology Department
John Linfoot, Vice Chair, Geneseo Foundation
James McNally, Director of Institutional Research Emeritus
Betty Minemier, Member and Past President, Geneseo Alumni Association Board
Mary Mohan, Associate Professor, Communication Department
Dan O'Brien, Member and Past President, Geneseo Alumni Association Board
Edward Pettinella, Member and Immediate Past Chair, Geneseo Foundation
Edwin Rivenburgh, Director of Libraries
Zachary Staff, President, Undergraduate Alumni Association
Robert Wayland-Smith, Chair, College Council, and Member, Geneseo Foundation Board

Laura Wribel, Executive Assistant to the President, Staff to the Committee.

Provost Kate Conway-Turner: No report

Chair Gregg Hartvigsen: The university faculty senator Terry Browne and I went to Albany for the SUNY Faculty Senate meeting. Campus governance leaders spoke about Mission Review. Geneseo as a campus is very unique and under great leadership. [applause]

The distribution of the Academic Bill of Rights, by a Board of Trustee who will remain nameless (Candace De Russy), was discussed. Hartvigsen heard of another Trustee who expressed surprise at receiving this.

The request to gather assessment data from all SUNY campuses through the freedom of information act was met. There was the delivery of a large number of documents to the press, from which little was heard.

Vice-Chair Maria Lima announced that the Excellence committee had done an excellent job. Recommendations have been made.

Treasurer Ming-Mei Chang announced that two flower arrangements have been sent last month. Please donate generously to the senate fund.

University Faculty Senator Terry Browne: The University Faculty Senate met recently. Graduation rate table will be included in the Mission Review. The public takes this very seriously. Two year transfers don't count. There was a lot of support for Chancellor King's tuition proposal. Other items that were discussed at the Faculty senate meeting include: growing use of adjuncts, increasing class time, faculty morale with regard to recruiting and retaining faculty.

A resolution that the university faculty senate supports the chancellor's vision of excellence and his leadership, his effective leadership and that it rejects unspecified charges against king

was passed. Also, another resolution regarding a time table to increasing the tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty ratio was also passed.

Chair Hartvigsen announced that University Faculty Senator Terry Browne is retiring and the position is open.

Student Association President David LaMagna announced that voting on the SA referendum is of Feb 21/23. The referendum is on two items (1) whether to keep the student activity fee mandatory, and (2) whether this fee should be raised from \$75 to \$85 per student. A total of 1000 students need to vote (on KnightWeb) and approval is based on 2/3 of these votes are in favor. If faculty would like to bring Student Association representatives to come to their classes to talk about the vote please contact the student association. The revenues will be used for student clubs, scholarships, undergraduate research fund donated to the Geneseo foundation, new programs like Geneseo Late Knight and other cost of living increases. If faculty would like to bring Student Association representatives to come to their classes to talk about the vote please contact the student association.

Reports of the Standing Committees of the Senate

Undergraduate Curricula Committee chair Meg Stolee presented the following items for approval.

NEW COURSES – SECOND READING

Geog 361: Applied Physical Geography
Germ 316: Grammar and Syntax
Hist 359: Women and U.S. Social Movements

Motion carries.

REVISED COURSES – SECOND READING

SOCL 374: Criminology

Motion carries.

REVISION OF MOJORS and PROGRAMS – SECOND READING

Minors in Business Studies and Economics: Applicants must have earned a cumulative GPA of 2.75

English major: The revision is to add a second track in Creative Writing to the major

Public Relations Minor: Change in the title, requirements and description

Motion carries.

Undergraduate Policies Committee chair Jeff Over: No report.

Graduate Academic Affairs Committee chair Dale Metz presented the following to the senate for vote.

REVISED COURSE – FIRST READING (Bulletin #10, pp 90-96)

CDSc 443, Advanced Articulation and Phonology Intervention
CDSc 445, Severe Language Impairment
CDSc 582, Clinical Practicum in Speech-Language Assessment
CDSc 583, Clinical Practicum in Speech-Language Pathology
CDSc 585, Advanced Clinical Practicum in Speech-Language Pathology
CDSc 587, Graduate Internship in Communicative Disorders

Motion carries.

NEW COURSE – FIRST READING (Bulletin # 10, pp90-96)

New course CDSc 420, Advanced Clinical Intervention
New course CDSc 528, Augmentative and Alternative Communication (ACC)

Motion carries.

PROGRAM REVISION – SECOND READING

Program revision for the M.A. in Speech-Language Pathology to include a 599 Directed Study course (Bulletin #7, pp 63-64)

Motion carries.

Student Affairs Committee chair Kim Davies: There will be a meeting on February 15 in Milne 213 from 4-5pm.

Faculty Affairs Committee chair Bill Gohlman: No report.

Old Business

None

New Business

None

The next senate meeting is on February 22, 2005.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Savi Iyer
Department of Physics and Astronomy