

ARTS AND SCIENCES CHAIRS' COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

11/6/06

Members Present: M. Prus, K. Alwes, S. Asumah, L. Ellis, L. Gatto, H. Haines, N. Helsper, M. King, B. Mattingly, D. Miller, J. O'Callaghan, T. Pasquarello, T. Phillips, K. Russell, S. Steadman, P. van der Veur, R. Wheeler, K. Zimmerman, A. Zipp, W. Sharp for S. Gutman

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. by M. Prus.

I. Announcements

The faculty show is coming up in Dowd Fine Arts.

University of Oklahoma – has announced a prize for creativity in motion.

S. Asumah thanked everyone for attending the Gospel Festival that was held last night.

II. Associate Dean's Report

FERPA – the registrar's office keeps a standard form for students who wish to release FERPA protected information to parents etc.

Next Joint Chairs' Council will include an update and demonstration of the revised CAPP (reflecting the new GE program).

Reminder in Feb. – banner will switch to the new GE program -- so that advising in Spring can be based on the new regime. An archived version of the CAPP for all students, under the existing GE program, will be kept for reference.

III. Budget

See the Vice President of Financial Management's handout from the Admin. Conference.

U/G tuition revenue increase will mean more transfer students in January
Expect demand for new classes and calls from the Dean in December and January

IV. Curriculum

Bulletin: GE committee's assessment report has been endorsed by the Faculty Senate: assessment of critical thinking will be applied in the current GE7 category

The Faculty Senate endorsed retirement process regarding five-year-old courses, a k a "hibernation." To reactivate – a minor-minor change is needed.

V. Facilities

The funding for the Science Building has been received. The next step is seeking an architect.

OM windows are now in the “design phase” – to be followed by the bidding process.

The renovation of Moffett is still in the programming phase. Now awaiting a report on hazardous materials.

A proposal from M. Prus has been sent to E. Davis-Russell and the Registrar assigning classrooms in OM to particular departments and encouraging a flattening of the schedule.

VI. Personnel

The President’s letters on performance for DSI are out today. E. Davis-Russell has decided the inequity issue too. DSI is now done.

M. Prus on 11/28/06 will give a talk (Sandwich Seminar) on Inequity Analysis. Approx. 240 full-time tenure track will be analyzed. 84 received Inequity Adjustment, averaging about \$1,000. Twenty-four out of 28 departments on campus received some inequity.

Promotion Criteria

Provost Davis Russell and Provost Salins discussed this in MR II context (handout). In MR II we’ve indicated that in promotion from Associate to Professor, we would require external review. Discussed in Provost’s Cabinet: 9/27/06 – Draft distributed from the three deans and A. Henderson-Harr. This will go to the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate with a view of getting it into the Handbook.

A comment on the draft: it’s more work for department chairs, lacking time and expertise to create a list of specialists.

A second comment on the draft: What has Provost Salins said since 3/05? Faculty opposition back then.

M. Prus: Recall that the Memorandum of Understanding is a letter between the Chancellor and the President.

Comment: Recall that the system was not happy with our response in 3/05; system has pushed back.

Comment: This is advisory form of Peer Review – normal in academia – not such a bad thing.

Question: Is this the norm for SUNY?

M. Prus: Yes, for example, New Paltz uses it for continuing appointments and promotion to Associate or Full Professor.

Comment: Provost Salins is gone, so let's not go full bore.

Comment: Can we request to see the communication from System about this?

Typically reviewers are not paid for review.

Comment: Problem of interdisciplinary studies. Faculty member should be able to suggest review.

Question: How many others have it?

Comment: instead of onus on the chair, why not put it in the hands of the Department Personnel Committees?

Comment: The current proposal is too tight. It needs flexibility. More information about the dialog is needed.

9/27/06 Minutes of Provost's Cabinet: The mandate of The Memorandum of Understanding is for external review. It is not open to debate, but the "how" of the implementation is to be discussed.

Question: Does the candidate control their faculty folder or is it without their knowledge?

M. Prus: This is not done without their knowledge. Candidates will see it.

Comment: The last paragraph of the proposal raises several issues. This is an open process but no need to prevent a collaborator from being a reviewer. Chairs are free to ignore candidates' list.

M. Prus: This is a draft only – still to be decided on by the Provost's Cabinet. I'm okay with candidates submitting names.

Comment: What if the reviewers don't come across? This could stall the entire process.

The exclusion of collaborators raised concern. Suggestion: Candidates in consultation with department chairs will offer a list of recognized peers.

Perhaps a counter proposal – a revised draft will be offered by L. Gatto, S. Steadman, N. Helsper, and K. Alwes. The goal is to keep the process fair to the candidate and the institution and state we are supportive of external review.

M. Prus: Recalls nothing in current process prevents a candidate from seeking external review.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome O'Callaghan

-