

11/27 Agenda

3:30-3:40 (Darren Chase)

1. Remarks
2. Review & approval of minutes

3:40-3:55 (Sacha Kopp)

1. CAS Dean's Report

3:55-4:10 (Ken Lindblom)

1. SPD Dean's Report

4:10-4:25 (Howie Schneider)

1. SOJ Dean's Report

4:25-4:35 (Camilo Rubino)

1. GSO Report

4:35-4:50 (Ayyan Zubair)

1. USG President's Report

4:50-5:00 (Laura Costello & Shafeek Fazal)

1. Open Educational Resources Initiative

Arts & Sciences Senate Constitution <https://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/senatecas/key-senate-documents/constitution.php>

A&S Senate Meeting

Minutes

October 23, 2017

I. Approval of the agenda: approved.

II. Approval of minutes from September 18: deferred until November meeting.

III. President's Report (D. Chase)

- Dean Kopp will be deliver a proposal to us probably early next semester on the combining of three CAS departments.

- I am not putting the minutes forward for approval today. I don't think we have enough time to consider what's on the minutes and to give everyone time to that and give everyone an opportunity to contribute any suggested changes. We are sharing this google doc with you that's on this agenda and Laurie will be sending it out again after the meeting. It's in suggestion mode so you can contribute your suggestions and comments up until Friday, November 17th. That's ten days before the next meeting and then we'll prepare that draft for consideration, review and approval for the 11/17 meeting.
- I want to take a moment to make a statement of commitment to our policies of promotion and continuing appointments. It's an instrument of our faculty governance and it's also linked to this document.

The Arts & Sciences Senate is committed to the **Promotion & Tenure Procedures of the College of Arts & Sciences** (<http://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/senatecas/key-senate-documents/ptc-guidelines.php>). The Promotion & Tenure Procedures are an instrument of faculty governance in accordance with the Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees.

The Arts & Sciences Senate affirms its commitment to section 1.2, Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment, and section 1.2.4, which reads:

“Assistant professors or instructors who have not previously been reviewed for tenure at the State University of New York at Stony Brook nor submitted a letter of resignation, must be reviewed for continuing appointment not later than the sixth year of service in academic rank.”

The Arts & Sciences Senate affirms the agency of a faculty person to initiate their candidacy, and the legitimacy and authority of an academic department to evaluate and put forward to the Arts & Sciences Senate PTC the candidate's file, as detailed in section 2, and specifically section 2.1.3, which reads:

“Except as noted in section 2.1.4, any individual faculty member of academic rank may with the approval of his/her department initiate his/her candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment at any time prior to either receiving notice of non-reappointment or submitting a resignation. This request must be communicated in writing to the chairperson by the candidate. The chairperson must then convene the department to consider the request. If the request for review is approved by the department, the candidacy file will be assembled by the chairperson in accordance with 2.1.1 above.”

IV. Curriculum Committee Report (M. Huffman)

- Dr. Huffman acknowledged the members and thanked them for their service on the committee. I will be giving a quick summary of our report from 16/17 which is compiled by Beth Squire, reviewed by the committee and then passed on to the Senate.

- New and revised majors: We approved a proposal for the new Bio BA which includes a required minor. We also discussed and ended up approving substantial updates or changes to a couple of majors for Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Environmental Studies, Coastal Environmental Studies and German. We also approved three new minors which are Health, Medicine and Society, Pharmacology and Professional Writing.
- In broader strokes, we review proposals for new courses or proposals that courses be certified as satisfying the SBC's for our general education requirement. We approved 36 new courses across the college. We had some updates to some majors and minors. We reviewed existing courses proposed to be offered online.
- I have a specific topic that the committee wanted to bring to the A&S Senate for further discussion. We have had some proposals for credit bearing classes that are not housed in a Department or a Program. One particular example the proposed course was also suggested to be used to satisfy the Stony Brook Curriculum Committee requirements. A Campus Recreation course and a couple more are coming down the line where in the Campus Recreation Department is already teaching courses that are giving students training that they need to receive a personal trainer certification. The proposal has been to make these courses credit bearing. We felt as a committee we really shouldn't be assessing the appropriateness of such a course for Stony Brook curriculum before considering carefully whether such a course should be offered for academic credit at all. The way the CAS Curriculum Committee works, we also review courses for other units and particularly with the Stony Brook curriculum that's our first assessment of courses. We are often giving our opinion of courses that are taught by other units. Now Campus Recreation isn't housed under College of Arts and Sciences yet it comes to us because this is what we do. I've put forward a list of some possible responses: Refer this to the University Senate. My concern is that if we approve certain kinds courses to be taught not housed under unit that is not staffed by academic faculty, then I think in my opinion is that we are losing one of the core values of the college which is of course should be administered, designed and implemented by the academic faculty. If such courses were approved for academic credit, there is a whole other set of questions that arise that also isn't fully up to us to decide. If Campus Recreation courses were offered for credit then someone is going to have to decide how many of them can count towards our 120 credits for a degree. We can affirm our conviction that courses in the college should be taught, or taught under the supervision of, academic faculty. Both of the above. Take no action at this time.

Dean Kopp: Why on earth would this college or this senate, which oversees three colleges or schools, have any desire to start certifying courses that we don't within our faculty have any agency over? This resonates very strongly with recent conversations I've had about general education, curriculum and the SBC's. We're in the midst of discussing some of our greatest financial challenges. Someone asked well why can't we give the money to engineering and they could teach that course. I said if you can't fund us to do it why are you now willing to give the money to another college to do it. This just opens up a whole can of worms about where will the general education be delivered and what's the future of the mission of our college.

??: They would first have to get authority from the Senate. Units outside of the career center has a couple of internship courses. A faculty member must serve as the supervisor. I presume that units outside of the college would have to be approved by the University Senate. The only example like this that I know of is the Career Center has an internship course. They have a couple of courses they offer for academic credit. For the internships I know they require the faculty members serve as a supervisor. This is outside of the A&S Senate purview.

F. Walter: I believe the Undergraduate Council had a subcommittee working with the Provost's Office except things for the SBC.

M. Huffman: There is a committee which has met recently to consider adding elements to SBC. We do review courses that are being proposed for SBC first because we are looking at things in the context of the whole curriculum.

M. Schedel: I like both of the above. I think that it's important to say what we think and tell the rest of the university what we think.

P. Binghamton: Do you understand the interest groups specifically driving this particular request? Is this the Athletic Department?

M. Huffman: I think it is the recreation staff who are enthusiastic and are trying to be creative and make new things happen that benefit the people they work with.

P. Bingham: The recreation staff reports to who?

T. Tiso: Student Affairs. It has nothing to do with Athletics.

M. Schedel: I'm going to change my statement into a motion to do both of the above.

D. Chase: Motion then seconded. All in favor say aye. All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

V. Dean's Report (S. Kopp)

- Darren has already mentioned the forthcoming proposal which I hope will arrive in the senate by February about the merger of three departments. I will also mention there's another proposal I hope to have on that time scale which is for a future Center for Social Justice, Inequalities and Policy that has come from a number of faculty from across the Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Last week we had a very successful opening of the Center for Hellenic Studies thanks to a gift from Peter Tsantes and the Greek American community in Port Jeff.
- I recently appointed Pamela Block from the School of Health Technology and Management as the Interim Chair of the three departments to be merged. Pam is a cultural anthropologist by training and does work in Latin America.
- Departments are working through teaching assignments and course projections for next year. Those now make reference to a workload policy for faculty that was crafted earlier in the summer. I look forward to seeing that effort come to fruition.
- We launched a search for the next Director of the Humanities Institute.
- There is a town hall for all faculty and staff in the college tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. We will talk about a number of things related to the college budget.

M. Schedel: The Senate needs to approve the merger of these departments.

S. Kopp: The Senate needs to provide feedback.

M. Schedel: You've already gone ahead and created one person who is now in charge of three departments. Just explain the timeline behind that?

S. Kopp: As the faculty in these three departments have to come together and look at ways of governance and by-laws for this forthcoming department, I wanted an outside person, someone with administrative experience and someone who is not from one of those three to help sensitively lead those three faculties through the process.

???: This seems to not answer the meat of the question which is we have proposals for a center which rarely [indistinct], proposals for the union of three departments which has already come into being. What is the relationship between decanal action and senate approval?

S. Kopp: We have faculty appointments which would be placed in the center if it's approved and if not they will have to be placed in a department.

M. Bowman: I guess the question is If the Senate doesn't approve it what happens then?

S. Kopp: It's not a question of approved. It's feedback. It's an important distinction. There are a number of financial pressures that have led us to certain positions here and in an effort to restore a number of important HR positions we are trying to come up with all possible savings.

???: Did the members of the three departments in question have any say in who the new joint chair of these three departments would be?

S. Kopp: They were invited to submit names and I got one and that person declined. So the answer is yes.

???: I'm trying to understand the distinction between choosing a chair for these three departments who is not a member of any of the departments, who presumably has no familiarity with the workings of any of the departments, to run three different departments and Pamela's a wonderful colleague and this is not [indistinct] Pamela's qualifications, but she doesn't know anything about the history or the running of these three departments, so that in and of itself is a difficult job while she is [indistinct] in difficult negotiation without apparently much consensus from any of the departments involved. How is this not putting three different departments into receivership?

S. Kopp: I guess I don't agree with the terminology and I did ask and I found someone I thought who had good administrative experience and some knowledge of the area studies of part of the college.

???: I don't know if you made clear that this is an interim chair and they will be able to follow up in electing a new chair in the future.

S. Kopp: Yes, that is correct. It is an interim appointment.

???: What degree of difficulty will it be to actually get a chair who actually is a not just a good administrator but somebody competent enough in this enormous variety, diversity of specialties that have been unified in this program. What is the name of the program?

S. Kopp: We haven't decided on it formally. That is something the faculty will come together to discuss. I [indistinct] this measure to provide some administrative savings. This is probably going to look like a more federated department than others in the college and I can see where it might have one single administrative structure but there may be somewhat separate curricular decisions happening within subgroups of the faculty. This is stuff that has yet to be worked out and would be in a document that would come to this body for your to review because that is part of faculty governance.

?: Is that person going to end up being a Dean and are there chairs for each part of the federation?

S. Kopp: There wouldn't be a Dean. That person will be a Chair and you would have to come up with the proper names to go underneath.

D. Fleschler: There has been an economic rationale to save money. You have talked about this criteria of academic excellence. That is the criteria by which some departments have been chosen to be supported, to keep growing and some other departments don't. Hispanic Languages and Literature is a nationally ranked program. It is an outstanding department and we want to be able to [indistinct] in a fair and transparent manner and we believe if we are able to [indistinct] the real objective numbers taken into consideration, we don't think that downgrading our department to a program, which is what's going to happen, we'll become the Program in Hispanic Studies or something like that in a bigger department. It's going to hurt our national ranking and our students.

S. Kopp: I don't agree with the term downgrade. It's precisely because of discussions of academic excellence that we maintain the staffing and the existence of the programs that you all openly spoke about. Whether it is its own standalone department or one of several programs within a larger administrative unit, I still believe there are plenty of ways for this to successfully continue and I look forward to working with all of you to communicate that the program still exists and is fully staffed as it was rather than saying it's been erased, which it has not and yet that seems to be what we are communicating to the outside world. That would be a fortunate characterization because it would surely lead to the very kind of negative consequences that you just articulated.

A. Drees: What were the criteria of excellence that led you to consider closing Hispanic Ph.D. program in the first place?

S. Kopp: I don't know if we were productive to continue this discussion so I think I'm not going to answer it because we decided not to do it because of the very kinds of metrics and data that you all provided. We are trying very hard to maintain the staffing and the student support and all the infrastructure needed to continue that program at both the graduate and undergraduate level.

Lori: In the strategic plan you talk about raising the visibility of department of Hispanic Languages.

S. Kopp: I think we are getting into a longer discussion about tomorrow. Yes I would like to see us raise the visibility and formulate better plans around various small departments more broadly not just that department because that's not the only one singled out in that [indistinct].

P. Gootenberg: The one concept that hasn't been raised once is the intellectual rationale for this merger. There is a concern about yes, we have an interim person who is going to help somehow with this process but after that what? A lot of us feel the responsibility raising these questions ahead of time

S. Kopp: We are raising them ahead of time. We are using this academic year to think this through.

Katie: The question is why you have the answer already set and now we're going to have all of this discussion instead of having the discussion and debate about what intellectual combinations make sense and then coming to the decision at some point in the spring.

S. Kopp: I can perceive that some of these discussions will take us in a slightly different direction but I need a working model now because I'm already working on next year's budget.

Katie: We fully understand that there is a severe budget issue and that cuts have to be made and we have felt cuts on the administrative staff side. The problem has been the acceleration of this plan. From the beginning I've tried to argue and tried to argue when I was part of the group of chairs that we're working in a very reactive way and that faculty ingenuity, brain work and time is being directed toward fighting on what is perceived as measures that are not productive and not functional rather than directing energies and time to coming up with what's drawn faculty input and talent from the beginning.

D. Chase: I've skipped ahead. I had prepared to share with you some data on the Promotion and Tenure's committee work for the last seven years and I've included a link here. Laurie will share it with everyone. The Promotion and Tenure committees have done excellent work over the past seven years.

M. Schedel: Does the PTC-S have a full membership?

D. Chase: There is a majority so they are able to do their business. The appeal to have a full member from a HFA department still stands and would greatly appreciated.

VI. New Business: no new business.

VII. Old Business: no old business.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by:

Laurie Cullen
Secretary