

The University Senate meets on Monday, May 7th at 3:30 p.m. in the Student Union Auditorium.

Tentative Agenda
University Senate Meeting
May 7, 2001

- I. Approval of Tentative Agenda
- II. Approval of the Minutes from University Senate meeting of April 2, 2001 (to follow)
- III. President's Report (S. Kenny)
- IV. Provost's Report (R. McGrath)
- V. Resolutions from the Undergraduate Council: 1. Current Academic Standing Definition, 2. Q Grades and University Honors, and 3. Undergraduate Curriculum Cooperation (Ben Walcott) (attachments below)
- VI. Motion from the Campus Environment Committee on "Campus Forests" (Malcolm Bowman)
- VII. Report from the SUNY University Senate Meeting in Cobleskill (Arnold Wishnia)
- VIII. University Senate President's Report (B. Godfrey)
- IX. Old Business
- X. New Business
- XI. Adjournment

**Draft Minutes
University Senate
April 2nd, 2001**

Senate President Bill Godfrey opens a fair weather Senate meeting at 3:36 P.M.

I. Approval of the tentative agenda ... passed with minor changes. Agenda item VII changed to read "Approval of Asian Studies Department."

II. Approval of Minutes from University Senate meeting of March 5, 2001...passed

III. The President's report (see attached): The President is out of town, but copies of her report to the Senate can be found in the back of the room.

IV. The Provost's report (pending posting on the web): The Provost promised to be brief, having left copies of his report in the back of the room. Bob did want to mention that on Tuesday, March 27th, the SUNY Board of Trustees voted to appoint five Stony Brook faculty members to the rank of Distinguished Professor: Gilbert Kalish (Music), Israel Kleinberg (Oral Biology & Pathology), M. Christina Leske (Preventive Medicine), Donald Lindsley (Geosciences), and Peter van Nieuwenhuizen (Physics & Astronomy). All five were from Stony Brook so the SUNY ratio was just about right.

· Commencement activities are planned for May 17-18, and everyone is encouraged to participate in this special time of year.

New feature ... E-mail feedback from the Provost to the Senate President:

- 1) Running several searches ... Business Dean, plus new Chair for Asian Studies Department. Promised B. Lieberman re: national search for new Dean for CAS.
 - 2) Considering a report on the way we structure undergraduate studies.
 - 3) EOP/AIM Interim Director in place.
- Searches underway for Professional Education Program: English / SS ...re: accreditation issues

- 4) Another search for the Director of PEP.
- 5) Calendar issues re: Fall 2001 was discussed (tough to tinker with at this late date),, plus calendar committee will be getting together to discuss the next 5 year cycle.
- 6) FSA is working hard to find a new operator for the Bookstore, pursuant to the declaration of bankruptcy by the current contractor. FSA has backstopped textbook purchases to assure continued service to campus during the crisis.

General question from the floor: deep concern was expressed over the loss of trees “acres of them” during this latest round of campus construction. The Campus Environment Committee states that they are being ignored. They have repeatedly asked for an integrated plan and strongly stated that if this trend continues the unique nature of the campus will be damaged. A follow-up meeting will be planned with R. Mann.

V. Report from the VP of HSC/Dean School of Medicine (Norman Edelman) “Report from the Eastside”

The Dean started his comments by reflecting back to the original concept of the HSC where the Health Sciences students learned:

- Didactic component
- Health Care Law
- Ethics
- Problem based Education model
- Develop mutual respect among the professions by training together early on.

The HSC is reaching that maturity point (@ 27 years) where the original chairs of Basic Departments are stepping down. It is recruiting time as the HSC looks to strengthen their programs and develop new themes for the new millennium. They will look to nationwide searches to rebuild immunology and build upon the molecular genetics and microbiology programs. We need to concentrate in cancer related genetics and human genetics {light in these areas}.

The appointment of Dr. Kovach (new Cancer Research Director) and Dr. Trent (Human Genome project) are major signals in the direction we are heading in. Reorganization is going on in the Dean’s office with two positions becoming vacant.

Of note: Several Schools are thriving:

- 1) Dental School (good Clinicians – good Dean)
- 2) School of Health Technology and Management (BSHS)- Dean Lehman is doing a great job

Nursing School is struggling a bit: recruitment of students is difficult nationwide. Nurse shortage at the UH is a problem. Our program is scheduled for an accreditation review in 2.5 years; in preparation, an outside audit review of the program will be contracted.

We are in heavy competition for nurses with local hospitals; our staff is in the bottom quartile re: clinical staff/ per bed (5.5) when compared with other hospitals. Supplements are needed for salary and amenities (scholarships for study.) Many other health care programs are competing with nursing for students. Professional autonomy and respect are more evident in such fields as Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Nurse Practitioner. 20% of nurses are now men. Gender sensitivity classes are an elective in health programs at the present time. Soon this elective will be mandatory, as a culture shift is needed, especially among physicians.

Biggest HSC/UH problems – facilities in need of a major make over, shortage of beds, and outdated equipment. In addition, the information system is in need of an overhaul. All of this work will take \$\$\$\$\$. Estimated budget needed to address these issues is placed at \$100 million. We need space (more Medical/Surgical beds, more Cancer/ Heart beds – more NICU beds .

Options under discussion: Move Administration off T-14, switch out 30 psychiatric beds for 60 regular patient beds, place our psychiatry patients in another facility .

Other budgetary issues:

Doing business in our system is very expensive; the primary care physicians lose money in our system even though they are needed for teaching and referrals. Revenue sharing is a must.

Optimize income – tuition, and Hospital support for Faculty. But Stony Brook is in a strong competitive position, with the reputation of being the preferred school for students.

The issue of the loss of good physicians was discussed and the efforts that are underway to attract and retain the good people we have. Dr. Edelman said that we have real workload problems that are serious. Bill Godfrey pointed out that our legislators need to be educated about how our clinical faculty is being supported and what the workload really is.

This led into the discussion of how difficult it is to transfer funds (soft \$) into other programs and how the research professorship is not valued by the culture.

Bottom line: the # of clinical faculty is lower than it was 5 years ago and the # of patients being treated is up by 30%.

N. Goodman suggested that the Dean follow-up with the following committees that may be able to help push the Dean's issues.

Edelman ended his remarks stating how unhappy he is with the market-based service model that currently prevails in health services. The system is not serving the poor or the middle class.

VI. PACGE and General Education (Norman Goodman)

Norman briefed the Senators on the outcome of the 3/16/01 meeting. A SUNY Wide paper was developed for review that clarified PACGE's role and made 7 specific recommendations. Program review was covered along with transfer issues, and it has been agreed that assessment should be part of the campus mission, and not performed SUNY-wide.

Highlight summary from March minutes:

- The job of PACGE is to look at programs and not courses.
- Campuses should be provided with the resources necessary to carry out an effective Gen. Ed program for SUNY. There was an attempt by the original plan task force to get a cost estimate of what implementation would take (\$29+ million).
- Provost Office, PACGE, Faculty Senate need to review the academic impact that reviews of Women's Studies courses and African Studies courses have had.
- Review contradictory statements in the Board of Trustees statement ... PACGE needs to review these statements and preserve the Faculty control of the curriculum on each campus.

Issue # 6: SUNY's National Reputation in General Education

Recommendation: PACGE should attempt to identify SUNY's best and most innovative approaches to delivering and assessing the learning outcomes of the general education programs; these best practices should be shared throughout SUNY and beyond through a variety of mechanisms. The natural evolution of PACGE should be to become a national forum for the review of scholarship and for discussion and debate of general education. This would be a way for SUNY to assert its leadership.

VII. Approval of Asian Studies Department

Hiring a Chair & 5 new faculty are planned for the next 3 years. In addition, other faculty currently affiliated with other departments are to be absorbed into this new department. The Senate Executive Committee and CAPRA have voted a recommendation for approval. Provost McGrath provided some background on the development of this department and mentioned the student interest and the opportunities that exist right now. \$320K for library resources are allocated to start the Department's collection.

President Godfrey calls for additional questions: none.

All in favor, the motion carried.

VIII. University Senate President's Report (B. Godfrey)

Bills promises to be brief and opens with news from Albany: this year's NYS budget looks to be the latest ever, perhaps arriving in August.

There was some discussion about the trend in SUNY re the increase in the number of P/T faculty hires. The Legislature will be pumping in additional funds for the hire of new Faculty for SUNY.

In closing, Bill wants the Senators to start thinking about committee assignments for next year. The response to calls for nominations has been anemic. Many Senators mentioned that they did not receive the communication.

IX. Old Business ... none

X. New Business ... none

XI. Adjournment at 5:10 P.M.

Respectively submitted,

Edward John O'Connell
Senate Secretary

Undergraduate Council Resolutions

Current Academic Standing Definition:

"Students who are validly registered at Stony Brook and whose current academic standing remark is "academic probation" are considered to be in good standing for purposes of enrollment certification and participation in athletic and other co-curricular activities". This statement is to go at the end of the section on "Probation" in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 63, 1st column.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR COOPERATION

Preamble:

Interdisciplinary undergraduate academic programs are increasingly important and sometimes do not fit within the traditional academic organization. Courses taught by one academic unit (school or college) may be used to satisfy the specific requirements of programs in another one. Some programs may depend extensively on the courses taught by another academic unit. Each academic unit has its own legislative review procedures (curriculum committees) to evaluate undergraduate courses and programs within its own unit, but no review body or procedures exist for evaluating courses or programs that cross boundaries of academic units. To provide coordination over curricula that cross these boundaries, the following procedures have been developed. These procedures are designed to ensure consultation in the development or significant modification of any undergraduate course, program (including major or minor) that crosses the boundaries between colleges and schools and not to diminish any committee's authority.

Proposals for Significant Revisions to Existing Courses:

A department in one academic unit proposing to significantly change (including prerequisites) an existing course that is required by or which has significant numbers of students enrolled in it from a program in another unit must simultaneously submit the request to both its own curriculum committee and the curriculum committee of the other academic unit.

Proposals for New Courses:

If a new course is proposed in one academic unit that significantly overlaps that given in another unit, the proposing department must notify both curriculum committees of the potential overlap.

Proposals for Deletion of Courses:

A department proposing to delete a course that is required by another unit's program/major/minor must inform the curriculum committee of that department's academic unit before the course is dropped.

Proposals for New Programs, Majors and Minors:

An academic unit proposing a new program, major or minor that requires courses from another academic unit must simultaneously inform both its own curriculum committee and the committee of the academic unit that offers the courses.

The curriculum committees of all academic units (schools and colleges) recognize that, despite good faith efforts, it is not always possible to recognize cases in which courses, new, revised, or deleted, affect programs in other academic units. In such cases, as soon as the impact is perceived, affected units must be informed and, where possible, accommodations made.

Q Grades and University Honors

Current Policy:

Bulletin (2001-2003)

"A grade of Q is assigned to a student found guilty of academic dishonesty. The Q remains on the transcript and is computed in the g.p.a. as a grade of F. Students who have a single finding of dishonesty may have the Q replaced by a letter grade determined by the instructor after satisfactory completion of a non-credit seminar addressing the issues of academic dishonesty unless the applicable academic judiciary committee determines otherwise. Rescinded Q grades may be reinstated if there is a new finding of academic dishonesty."

Senate Resolution of 1997:

The University Senate passed a resolution that prevents a student who has ever had a Q grade from receiving University Honors on graduation. This, therefore, is the current practice and it affects 5-6 students each semester who would have graduated with honors except for having a Q grade on their record. The registrar maintains two records; a public record that the student can see and that is sent out as the official transcript and an internal record that the University keeps that would show a Q grade if

assigned. It is this second record that is used to generate the list of students currently ineligible to receive honors.

Background:

The original concept of the Q grade came from the belief that many students were unaware of what constituted academic dishonesty and that receiving the Q grade and taking the seminar course would serve as sufficient penalty and as an education tool. In most cases, the act of dishonesty was deemed not be sufficiently blatant to warrant further punishment and so the Q grade would be removed and replaced with the grade assigned by the instructor. The Q grade notation, however, would be retained on the Registrar's system (internal record) so that if a new case of academic dishonesty occurred, the first Q grade would reappear.

The Issue:

Students are told that if they take the seminar and their Q grade disappears, their conviction of academic dishonesty will have no further effect on their academic record. But in fact, due to the Senate resolution, they are prevented from earning University Honors. This represents a contradiction that must be resolved.

Proposal:

After much discussion and in consultation with the executive officers and the chairs of the two west campus academic judiciary committees, the Undergraduate Council recommends the following policy:

"Any graduating students who have a "Q" grade and/or remark 31 (or other notation of academic dishonesty) currently on their official transcript will be ineligible to receive University honors. Students who have previously received a "Q" grade or remark 31 (or other notification of academic dishonesty) that has been removed from the transcript but is maintained on the internal record will be reviewed by the appropriate college academic judiciary committee in the semester before graduation to determine their eligibility for University honors"

=====
Annual Report of the University Senate Library (Services) Committee
Academic Year 2000-01

The 2000-01 academic year has been an active one for the Library Committee, which has met once every month (except January) beginning in September. The main single issue that occupied the Committee's attention was the University bookstore. There were several other items of serious discussion and consideration.

THE BOOKSTORE. Large portions of several committee meetings were devoted to this topic. In October, the committee met with managers of the bookstore Julie Masone and Angela Corry, as well as Del Ifafore of the Provost's Office, to review Bookstore policies and discuss possible improvements where needed. All aspects of Bookstore policy were discussed. In subsequent meetings the committee returned to this topic, concluding that, while the Bookstore performed adequately in providing texts to students and had introduced several policies to make its services more easily and attractively available to students, some changes were still needed. In particular, the Committee concluded that the Bookstore should constitute a more conspicuous presence as an intellectual center on the campus, offering more trade books, scholarly journals, and other commodities that are normally associated with a university book establishment. The committee realized that to accomplish this it may be necessary to move the Bookstore to a more prominent location on the campus and to subsidize some of its operations for a few years. In the spring, the committee wrote a letter outlining its complaints and suggestions to the President of the University Senate, who subsequently brought the committee's concerns to the attention of the Provost. (This was done before the announcement of Barnes and Noble as the new management, with which the Committee was not in any way involved.)

OTHER ITEMS. In addition to the Bookstore, the committee devoted much attention to several other items of importance:

1. Improvement of services to faculty and students: The committee discussed and recommended the establishment of lockers in which library users could place their coats, bags, and other paraphernalia while using the library; the setting up of a book return facility on the first (or main) floor of the library; the provision of plug-in facilities for laptop computers in the library stacks; and the provision of a service for delivering documents and other materials directly to faculty offices.

2. Continued digitalization of the library: The implications of the planned installation of *Ex Libris* and other electronic facilities occupied much of the committee's time. The committee expressed its concern that some students, and perhaps some faculty, will require special notification and instruction when the new system comes into effect. The Committee also discussed the implications of the digital library for economizing on space. While some have argued that the electronification of the library will save needed space, especially that occupied by hard copies of science journals (which are increasingly accessible on computer), traditional paper bound books and journals are still the norm in the humanities and social sciences.

3. The Library budget: The Committee was aware that the Library is still feeling the effects of budget cuts in the early 1990s and devoted time to discussing the necessity of maintaining and perhaps even improving the Library's funds for acquisitions and staff expansion. Library Director Christian Filstrup kept the Committee fully informed on this topic, while listening closely to its concerns.

Finally, this year the Committee welcomed the new library Director, Christian Filstrup, who, throughout the year, provided the Committee with all the information and assistance it requested and was thoroughly cooperative and helpful.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Myers
Chair of the Library Committee

Motion #2 made to the Stony Brook University Senate 7 May 2001

Preamble: This motion is to authorize the Environment Committee of University Senate to begin discussions between administration, faculty, staff, students, legislators and community representatives to establish a steering committee to form a campus unit entitled *Environment Stony Brook* whose purpose it is to hold, manage, protect, and enhance the natural forests, planted trees and developed horticultural and landscaped areas of the university campus.

This proposal is based on the concept of *Cornell Plantations*, a unit formed in 1940 to manage and protect the extensive lands and plantations of Cornell University and over 2,000 acres of nature preserves and miles of nature trails in surrounding Tomkins County. In addition to its management function, Cornell Plantations manages a botanical garden, arboretum, offers non-credit courses, classes and workshops, volunteer programs, campus nature tours, a magazine, newsletter, botanical and birding guide books, wildscience tours for schools, and alumni and public membership. It is strongly supported by the Cornell Alumni, who have an abiding interest in helping preserve and maintain a beautiful campus environment.

1. *Environment Stony Brook* will be created by the university administration to deal with the management of campus natural and horticultural areas.

2. The unit will be given authority to protect natural areas against encroachment from development.

3. The unit will identify ways in which the areas managed by *Environment Stony Brook* will be of value to the academic program of the university, through the use of these lands in support of research, teaching, continuing education, outreach, or some combination of these.

4. The unit will have a mission statement, a plan for staffing development, a clear link to the university administration, and an oversight board.

5. The unit will receive direct financial support from the university, and will also develop a plan for reaching out to alumni. It must be recognized by the central development office of the university as the appropriate body to manage campus development insofar it impacts natural areas and plantations.

Therefore it be resolved that the Environment Committee of University Senate, with power to add, be authorized to enter into discussions with administration, faculty, staff, students, local legislators and community representatives, with the purpose of developing a steering committee and plan for the creation and operation of Environment Stony Brook.

_____ End of motion _____