

Faculty Assembly
March 24, 2016

Meeting Materials

Academic Affairs

February Report

The Academic Affairs Committee was unable to meet in February. Our next meeting will be March 3, 2016. We continue to work on the process for posting information about textbook and course material prior to registration. We are hoping to complete the recommendation at the next meeting.

The next issue we are examining deals with transfer credit for General Education courses. There is some concern that students are not being treated in a consistent way when the General Education transcripts are evaluated.

March Report

At our last meeting we continued to work on the process for posting information about textbook and course material prior to registration. And roughed out a procedure. I met with Book store manager and found that a lot of our concerns have already been met and are consistent with the plan we will propose. I also found out that there is a web-based form for faculty to fill out that automatically sends the information to the bookstore to be placed on the web. That procedure will be included in our final recommendation.

The second item we dealt with was the transfer credit for General Education courses. This policy that was passed by the Faculty Assembly in 2014 but never made it into the Catalog. As it was about to be entered in the new catalog, the registrar noticed that the way it was stated was unclear. The concern was that it is unclear whether or not local SUNY POLY students and transfer students are being treated in a consistent way when the General Education transcripts are evaluated. We are currently working on clarifying this issue.

At the last Faculty Assembly meeting the Academic Affairs Committee was asked to examine SUNY Poly's (Utica site) position on allowing competencies to replace course credit. We developed a partial list of issues that need to be addressed and will continue this discussion at our next meeting.

The next item we will be taking up is the question of Administrative withdrawal of students who appear on class rosters and never attend classes or participate in on-line classes. There are institutions that automatically withdraw a student after a period of time if there is no student activity.

Academic Quality

Three things...

1) Attached is the SUNY Poly internal review cycle for programs prepared by the Academic Quality Committee. Here's a quick overview of the changes we made:

- An additional sheet archiving the previous version has been created. The intent is for future revisions to be created on additional sheets to ensure the history is maintained regardless of whether an editor's revision tracking is enabled in their spreadsheet software.

- Modified document name... SUNY IT—>>Poly
- Made separate undergrad and graduate tables
- Removed programs no longer admitting students
- Added new programs
- Added Disability Services as an academic support service needing review
- Added accrediting agency abbreviations to programs with third-party accreditation
- Updated most recently “Submitted” fields to the best of our knowledge
- Added new field for the semester the Academic Quality Committee should initially contact each program's coordinator to ensure ample time before any data collection begins for the faculty of the programs to interact with the committee in preparation for their review period. Our intent is for the calendar to establish more than just review periods as it develops. We would prefer it provides detailed timelines similar to those faculty receive in preparation for reappointment/tenure. This is only a first step.
- Standardized columns across all tables
- Identified the two consecutive semesters covered by each upcoming program review
- Identified the specific semesters by the conclusion of which the committee expects to receive the completed reviews
- established a 5-year cycle of program review, first based on previous review dates and secondly to balance the number of programs, Gen Ed areas, and support services reviewed by the committee each semester. Given 10 semesters in a 5-year cycle and 44 identified areas for review, we kept the number of areas reviewed by the committee around 4–5 per semester. We tried to keep areas managed by the same department scheduled for the same review period to reduce the load on those departments with multiple programs. We did not try to keep a department’s grad and undergrad areas on the same schedule because their required courses are unlikely to overlap.

2) After discussions with the provost and the executive committee regarding the use of IDEA evaluations, Personnel Committee has been asked to consider the value of continued use of the IDEA evaluations. AQ will investigate course-targeting student opinion options that might be used specifically to improve academic quality, and not for faculty evaluation.

3) Additionally, my term as chair is concluding, and a new chair will need to be elected.

SUNY Polytechnic Institute
Assessment of Programs Review Cycle
Updated Fall 2015

Assessment in the Major (Standard 14)

| Level | Primary Service Location | Program | Assessment Type | Submitted | Next Submission Review Period | Next Submission | Early Academic Quality Notification |
|-------|--------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| UG | Utica | ACCOUNTING (AACSB) | Major | 2015 S | 2020 S-2020 F | 2020 F | 2019 F |
| UG | Utica | APPLIED COMPUTING | Major | 2012 S | 2016 F-2017 S | 2017 S | 2016 S |
| UG | Utica | APPLIED MATHEMATICS | Major | 2008 S | 2015 F-2016 S | 2016 S | 2015 S |
| UG | Utica | BIOLOGY | Major | 2014 F | 2019 S-2019 F | 2019 F | 2018 F |
| UG | Utica | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (AACSB) | Major | 2015 S | 2020 S-2020 F | 2020 F | 2019 F |
| UG | Utica | CIVIL ENGINEERING | Major | 2014 F | 2019 F-2020 S | 2020 S | 2019 S |
| UG | Utica | CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (ABET) | Major | 2015 S | 2019 F-2020 S | 2020 S | 2019 S |
| UG | Utica | COMMUNICATION & INFORMATION DESIGN | Major | 2014 F | 2018 S-2018 F | 2018 F | 2017 F |
| UG | Utica | COMMUNITY & BEHAVIORAL HEALTH | Major | --- | 2017 S-2017 F | 2017 F | 2016 F |
| UG | Utica | COMPUTER ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (ABET) | Major | 2015 S | 2020 F-2021 S | 2021 S | 2020 S |
| UG | Utica | COMPUTER INFORMATION SCIENCE | Major | 2012 S | 2016 F-2017 S | 2017 S | 2016 S |
| UG | Utica | COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS | Major | 2012 S | 2016 F-2017 S | 2017 S | 2016 S |
| UG | Utica | ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (ABET) | Major | 2015 S | 2020 F-2021 S | 2021 S | 2020 S |
| UG | Utica | ELECTRICAL/COMPUTER ENGINEERING (ABET) | Major | 2015 S | 2020 F-2021 S | 2021 S | 2020 S |
| UG | Utica | HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (CAHIIM) | Major | 2014 F | 2019 S-2019 F | 2019 F | 2018 F |
| UG | Utica | INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES | Major | 2014 F | 2020 S-2020 F | 2020 F | 2019 F |
| UG | Utica | MECHANICAL ENGINEERING | Major | --- | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |
| UG | Utica | MECHANICAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (ABET) | Major | 2015 S | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |
| UG | Utica | NETWORK COMPUTER SECURITY | Major | 2012 S | 2017 S-2017 F | 2017 F | 2016 F |
| UG | Utica | NURSING (CCNE) | Major | 2016 F | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| UG | Utica | PSYCHOLOGY | Major | 2010 S | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| UG | Utica | SOCIOLOGY | Major | 2008 S | 2015 F-2016 S | 2016 S | 2015 S |
| UG | Albany | NANOSCALE ENGINEERING | Major | --- | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| UG | Albany | NANOSCALE SCIENCE | Major | --- | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |

Assessment in the Major (Standard 14)

| Level | Primary Service Location | Program | Assessment Type | Submitted | Next Submission Review Period | Next Submission | Early Academic Quality Notification |
|-------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Grad | Utica | ACCOUNTANCY | Major | --- | 2020 S-2020 F | 2020 F | 2019 F |
| Grad | Utica | COMPUTER INFORMATION SCIENCE | Major | --- | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |
| Grad | Utica | FAMILY NURSE PRACTITIONER | Major | 2014 F | 2019 S-2019 F | 2019 F | 2018 F |
| Grad | Utica | INFORMATION DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY | Major | --- | 2016 F-2017 S | 2017 S | 2016 S |
| Grad | Utica | NETWORK COMPUTER SECURITY | Major | 2012 F | 2018 S-2018 F | 2018 F | 2017 F |
| Grad | Utica | NURSING EDUCATION | Major | 2014 F | 2019 S-2019 F | 2019 F | 2018 F |
| Grad | Utica | TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT | Major | --- | 2020 S-2020 F | 2020 F | 2019 F |
| Grad | Utica | TELECOMMUNICATIONS | Major | 2012 F | 2018 S-2018 F | 2018 F | 2017 F |
| Grad | Albany | NANOSCALE ENGINEERING | Major | --- | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| Grad | Albany | NANOSCALE SCIENCE | Major | --- | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |

General Education Areas/Competencies Assessment (Gen Ed)

| Primary Service Location | Area/Competency | Assessment Type | Submitted | Next Submission Review Period | Next Submission | Early Academic Quality Notification |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Utica | American History (History) | Gen Ed | 2014 S | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |
| Utica | Basic Communications | Gen Ed | 2013 S | 2018 S-2018 F | 2018 F | 2017 F |
| Utica | Critical Thinking | Gen Ed | 2013 S | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| Utica | Foreign Language | Gen Ed | 2014 S | 2019 F-2020 S | 2020 S | 2019 S |
| Utica | Humanities | Gen Ed | 2012 F | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| Utica | Information Management (Competency) | Gen Ed | 2011 S | 2017 S-2017 F | 2017 F | 2016 F |
| Utica | Math | Gen Ed | 2012 F | 2017 S-2017 F | 2017 F | 2016 F |
| Utica | Natural Science | Gen Ed | 2013 S | 2018 S-2018 F | 2018 F | 2017 F |
| Utica | Other World Civilizations (History) | Gen Ed | 2014 S | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |
| Utica | Social Science | Gen Ed | 2015 S | 2020 F-2021 S | 2021 S | 2020 S |
| Utica | The Arts | Gen Ed | 2015 S | 2020 F-2021 S | 2021 S | 2020 S |
| Utica | Western Civilization (History) | Gen Ed | 2014 S | 2019 F-2020 S | 2020 S | 2019 S |

Academic Support (Standard 7)

| Primary Service Location | Area | Assessment Type | Submitted | Next Submission Review Period | Next Submission | Early Academic Quality Notification |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Utica | Disability Services | Ac. Support | --- | 2017 F-2018 S | 2018 S | 2017 S |
| Utica | Learning Center/Learning Commons | Ac. Support | --- | 2016 F-2017 S | 2017 S | 2016 S |
| Utica | Library | Ac. Support | --- | 2018 F-2019 S | 2019 S | 2018 S |

Curriculum

The committee will meet on Tuesday, March 1st. Next scheduled meeting is on Tuesday, April 5th. Curriculum action forms for April meeting are due on Tuesday, April 29th.

Distance Learning

1. A Director of Distance Learning has been hired. It is expected he will start work on April 7.
2. The SUNY Poly Governance Council approved a revised version of the Distance Learning Policy. It was returned to Ron Sarnier for action by the Faculty Assembly. The Executive Committee is currently trying to determine the best way to process policy recommendations from the Governance Council.
3. The Committee attended webinars on two proctoring technologies that have discounted pricing agreements with SUNY. There are two more technologies to investigate.

Evaluation of Academic Administrators

The CEAA did not reach quorum at its Feb meeting, but will meet in March, approve the final version of the Interim Deans surveys, digitize it, and disseminate it to the faculty in early March.

Graduate Council

Personnel

Personnel worked on a revision for the portfolio guidelines that will come to the next faculty assembly meeting. That's our only news for now.

March meetings have dealt with processing individual personnel cases.

Planning and Budgeting

We only had one meeting and the main topic was the balance in allocation of resources between teaching and "research". We have info from Strategic Plan, Self-Study, and discussion with the provost. We'll deal with this some more next Tuesday. We will also (re)-introduce discussion of the high demands associated with graduate student activity and what seem to be excessive demands on graduate faculty (at least in CS) at the Utica site. Related to this, we will attempt to generate some statement regarding the appropriate emphasis on graduate versus undergraduate efforts.

Technology

No meeting.

University Faculty Senate

Budget Report by UFS President Peter Knuepfer:

I am attaching an analysis prepared by Stacey Hengsterman's staff that compares the proposed Executive Budget with the one-house Assembly and Senate budgets that have been released today. The way this particular dance works--Albany's version of March Madness--is that the two houses prepare their own budget statements as negotiating positions for final discussions with the Governor. In essence, this is the basis for the "three men in a room" deals that will be hammered out over the next couple of weeks (assuming they converge on an on-time budget). As Stacey notes in her message to the Presidents, there is some good news and some bad news, as viewed from the position of our State-operated campuses. There is money (especially in the Assembly version) for a true maintenance of effort, and apparently language to make that permanent. But this is countered by a freeze in tuition for up to five years, which frankly could lead to the same problem we've had in the past--no tuition raises until a big jump finally happens down the line. SUNY's position is that we need the authorization to control tuition so that it doesn't jump all at once, but that we're very happy to hold tuition stable if the State makes up the difference (even though we've got a long way to go to return to the financial position SUNY was in before the recession). So I urge you to continue advocacy--such as I did last week with Assemblymember Glick and this week with Senator LaValle, the respective chairs of the Higher Education committees.

Note: The document referred to (Hengsterman's analysis) is appended after page 7 of this document.

Faculty Assembly Response to Proposed IT Security Policy

The Executive Committee adopted and transmitted the following statement on behalf of the Faculty Assembly:

The Utica Faculty Assembly Executive Committee finds the proposed IT Security Policy unacceptable. It is overly complex and convoluted; it is not just a policy, but a policy, plan, and program consolidated into a single document. Our Executive Committee independently came to the same conclusion as an IT Security expert at a federal agency who was asked to review the draft and who summarizes his review as follows:

This is not a policy document. Whatever it is, it is poorly written. It is vague to the point of being able to circumvent much of what is intended to be requirements. It tries to be all encompassing but in the end only covers (poorly) a small portion of what should be addressed in a successful information security program. The federal governments (sic) National Institute of Standards and Technology, a component of the Dept of Commerce, provides excellent guidelines for developing an information security program.

The Faculty Assembly Executive Committee therefore respectfully requests that the policy components be distinguished from the other parts of the current proposal, that they be reframed and redrafted with the resulting statement resubmitted to the governance bodies for consideration.

Faculty Assembly Response to the Proposed Acceptable Use Policy

The Executive Committee adopted and transmitted the following statement on behalf of the Faculty Assembly:

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly can not recommend approval of the proposed Acceptable Use Policy. The draft reviewed by the Executive Committee is seriously flawed in numerous ways. There are instances of language that is so vague that reasonable people reading the same text would come away with vastly different interpretations of what is permissible and what is impermissible. The document fails to distinguish between differing classes of authorized users; for example restrictions that may be reasonable and necessary to protect intellectual property in a research setting are clearly inappropriate for students who desire to engage in playing networked games in the residence halls. As written the policy could be subject student (and faculty) owned equipment such as tablets and cellphones to inspection raising significant issues of denial of constitutionally protected rights of free speech. Restrictions requiring pre-authorization for the use of common tools such as flash drives or publisher-provided software may make it difficult to impossible for students and faculty to meet the educational objectives of the institution.

We have examined parallel documents for other research-centric institutions in New York, none of which restrict the behavior of the academic user community to a degree similar to the proposed SUNY Poly policy. Moreover all of these institutions explicitly acknowledge the multifaceted nature of their missions to include education, research, and public service in addition to their business functions. The proposed SUNY Poly policy stands apart by almost exclusively focusing on the security issues

attendant to its business functions largely ignoring the centrality of its educational mission.

Accordingly, we can not recommend approval of this draft. The defects are too numerous and too broad to be rectified by simple editing of the existing text. We urge that policy development begin afresh, explicitly recognizing the needs of the various constituencies and crafting an environment that balances the elements of the institutional mission, providing for each constituency restrictions that are appropriate to the level of risk while facilitating creativity and innovation.

In developing a new document we have two specific recommendations:

Recommendation #1

Develop a multi-tier environment with security and acceptable use appropriate to that environment, for example:

- Tier I - Research environment in which intellectual property must be protected - requiring high levels of security.
- Tier II - Business environment with direct access to business and/or student records (such as native Banner access or access to state financial systems) also requiring high levels of security.
- Tier III - Protected environment with direct access to health records protected by HIPPA requiring compliance with federal regulation.
- Tier IV - Business environment with access to business or student records only through controlled and restricted web interfaces. Lower levels of security and restrictions are required.
- Tier V - Educational environment with access to student records only through controlled and restricted web interfaces. Faculty need to be able to select and install the tools that they deem appropriate for their educational environment without a bureaucratic approval process.
- Tier VI - Student owned equipment - few restrictions other than registering devices and mandating up to date anti-virus and similar tools.

Recommendation #2

Explicitly state that staff will not monitor or inspect the activity, accounts, or content of communications of individual users without express written authorization of the chief information officer, with such authorization to be granted only upon presentation of probable cause, and with the scope of the examination limited to addressing the specific issues at hand, and with written logs kept of all such authorizations.

As evidence of the problems with the extant draft we offer the following two (among many possible) examples:

- "Installing, downloading, or running software on dedicated computers and or workstations...that has not been approved following appropriate security, legal, and/or IT review". This

restriction makes it almost impossible for most faculty to meet their educational responsibilities.

- "Occasional and incidental personal use ofis permitted." For students using their own computing devices in residence halls or using college-provided devices in open laboratories this use is neither occasional nor incidental - it represents a significant portion of network activity. This illustrates the need for the policy to differentiate between classes of users.