

ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE MEETS MONDAY, 14 December 1998, 3:30 PM SHARP

=====

The third and final meeting of the Arts & Sciences Senate this Fall Semester will be held on Monday, December 14th at 3:30 pm SHARP, in Javits Room (2nd floor, Melville Library).

All Arts and Sciences Senators are kindly requested to attend.

The meetings of the Arts & Sciences Senate are open to all interested members of the University community.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 9th, 1998, attached.

III. Report of the Arts & Sciences Senate President (Hugh J. Silverman)
Announcement of New Senate Secretary: Robert Bloomer
Activities of the five Senate Standing Committees
Announcement of Name Change: The Writing Program to be renamed Program in Writing and Rhetoric
Conflict of Interest Policy Issue
Revision of PTC Guidelines
Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy Issue
Specification of Teaching Effectiveness in PTC Guidelines
Second Discussion of Membership on the Arts and Sciences Senate -- Constitutional Change

IV. Conflict of Interest Policy Issue

The Senate Executive Committee recommends that a member of an Arts and Sciences Standing Committee who is a voting member of a department in which the department, a program, a candidate, a colleague, a course, a student, or a case from that department is under consideration by the committee shall not be present for the discussion or vote in such instances. The Committee Member may be present and available for any questions or comments prior to the official discussion and vote.

V. Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy Issues:

1. POLICY ON PTC MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN DISCUSSION OF CANDIDATES FROM THEIR OWN DEPARTMENT

As in item IV (above), the Senate Executive Committee recommends that PTC members shall not review the file, be present for the discussion, or vote on any candidate from a department in which that person is a voting member. The current guidelines state simply that the PTC member shall not vote. Passage of this recommendation will effect the further specification in the PTC guidelines.

2. ADDITIONS TO PTC GUIDELINES CONCERNING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The Senate Executive Committee has adopted a recommendation from Dean Paul Armstrong which will further detail evidence of teaching effectiveness in Promotion and Tenure File Preparation. Therefore, the Senate Executive Committee recommends that the PTC Guidelines be revised as specified in the version supplied below.

VI. Constitutional Change: Membership on the Arts and Sciences Senate (second discussion)
Departmental and At-large members of the Arts and Sciences Senate shall hold seats on the University Senate (and not the reverse as currently formulated in the Arts and Sciences Senate Constitution).

VII. Old Business

VIII. New Business

HUGH J. SILVERMAN
PRESIDENT OF THE ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE

=====

ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE CALENDAR

Monday, 15 February 1999

Monday, 15 March 1999

Monday, 19 April 1999

All meetings are at 3:30 pm SHARP, in the Javits Room, 2nd Floor, Library

**College of Arts and Sciences Senate.
Minutes of Nov. 9 1998 Senate Meeting**

Secretary: Daniel B. Monk

Meeting called to order at 3:40PM

I. The Agenda was approved

II. The Minutes of the October 12, 1998 Meeting of the CAS Senate were approved, with the following revisions:

1. Joan Kuchner, Senate Vice-President, should be spelled properly .
2. N. Goodman noted that Item IIIA should specify that the SUNY Provost had put out for an R.F.P., but that his re-examination of General Education had not yet been carried out.

III. Senate President's Report (Hugh J. Silverman):

A. Standing Committees: the Senate President reported that all five standing committees were now up and running, with the most recently completed being the Graduate Programs Committee, which would begin its work very soon.

B. Curriculum Committee: Elizabeth Stone, Chair of the CC to report on last year's accomplishments and this year's focus. During the present academic year the CC will review the status of Interdisciplinary Programs.

C. PTC: Reported that the promotion and tenure committee was 'hard at work' reviewing cases. Noted that PTC guidelines stipulate only that a

member from the same department shall not vote. They do not state whether the member should be present or absent during the discussion. Question: "does the senate want to specify further what the abstention clause means?" The various options were reviewed with a handout specifying these option. He then mentioned that the PTC requested that no vote be taken on this item at this time, but indicated that a preliminary discussion could nevertheless take place.

D.Membership in the A&S Senate: The Senate Constitution stipulates that membership in University Senate constitutes membership in the A&S Senate. President stated that this is contrary to logic: membership in the A&S Senate should necessarily mean membership in the University Senate. He asked if the constitution should be revised to record the inverse? He further noted that the constitution stipulates that no changes of this sort can be voted on without it being placed on the agenda for two prior meetings of the Senate.

Responses: N. Goodman agreed that this makes sense, but stated that the change would have to also have to be made at the University Senate level as well. R. Kerber stated that he thought this was probably just a matter of aesthetics. ...

IV. Dean's Report: [Paul Armstrong, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences]
Dean Armstrong circulated a report entitled "College of Arts and Sciences Accomplishments, 1996-1998" in which he outlined achievements and budget considerations affecting the College of Arts & Sciences. Working through financial tables for the past two years, the Dean outlined an enduring budget deficit in A & S, which he has been reduced substantially by budget cuts, and principally through a reduction in the size of the faculty. He presented his 2-year plan to get allocations in line by reducing search lists, rotating freeze when positions are vacated. Following this, he reported a further[?] 3% reduction in faculty, and an anticipated surplus or balanced budget in the 2000-2001 academic year.

Responses: R. Kerber expressed concern that the budgetary figures presented by the Dean will look far worse if the economy were to turn downward, if further budget cuts could be anticipated from Albany. He asked what flexibility the Dean had built in to account for this? Dean Armstrong stated that his figures presupposed not being hurt, but also not being helped in upcoming budgets. He stated that there was reason for optimism because of the SUNY Provost's RAM formula, which would help Stony Brook. N. Goodman stated that his sources informed him that trustees might ask for an increase in the SUNY budget. Concern was expressed that more students were leading to more income for the school, but that this went to hire adjuncts, and thus a deterioration in the quality of the college. Dean Armstrong: agreed with this, and hoped that in succeeding years we will benefit more from additional students. J. Kuchner asked the Dean to explain the gap between the Dean's 25 lines on the search list and the 86 lines university-wide. Dean Armstrong stated that this year there would be 27 [not 25] lines in the A & S budget, plus 5 diversity appointments. The rest were in Health Sciences, Engineering. Hugh Silverman asked how T.A. Allocations were affected. Dean Armstrong responded that these were separate allocations and were cut for other reasons, and were down by 12. He stated that his effort was to allocate more to Ph.D. than MA's, but stated that there were still nowhere near enough. Present numbers: 544. Hugh Silverman noted that for many years we had been in a stable state of 640 T.A. lines for the whole university but since only a small

portion of those were outside the CAS, the total number of TA lines has dropped significantly in the past five to ten years..

V. Annual Report: Curriculum Committee 1997-98. Elizabeth Stone presented a summary of the 97-8 accomplishments of the 23 meetings of the CC. Among these were: approval of 2 majors, approval of new courses, review of the AIM program, reorganized the Biology major. She also reported on issues of concern to the CC in the present year and future. Principally, in relation to the Interdisciplinary Majors. The committee has begun data gathering, has met with the Dean and Associate Dean Mary Rawlinson, has produced a questionnaire for students, and will meet with students. In its preliminary discussions the CC has begun to ask "why two majors", instead of a specific major for tightly focused interdisciplinary research? The Committee would also like to find a way for the faculty as a whole to be involved, and it would like to understand the needs of the majors. She also stated that the second long-term goal was a review of the Honors College, and to formulate policy vis-à-vis film and video.

Responses: B. Kerber stated that he was impressed with the turn-around time in the committee, and offered his congratulations to what he considered to be a 'real' CC. E. Stone responded that much of its success had been achieved by taking routine administrative issues off the table.

VI. PTC Report for 1997-1998 [Mark Aronoff, Past PTC Chair reporting]

Working with a handout entitled "Summary of 1997-1998 PTC Actions" Mark Aronoff presented a table of the 33 cases in the last year. Various members of the Senate had difficulty interpreting the table, and Aronoff clarified matters.

Responses: B. Kerber asked about the standard recommendation letter to reviewers. "Why doesn't it deal with teaching?" Hugh Silverman stated that this was a subject that would be taken up at the next senate meeting. Dean Armstrong stated that his office had been preparing some revisions to the PTC guidelines concerning teaching and that he hoped these would be brought before the Senate at its next meeting.

VII. Constitutional Change: Membership on the Arts and Sciences Senate [first discussion]. See Item IIID above. Hugh Silverman reviewed the issue.

Discussion: B. Maskit asked H. Silverman to clarify wording in the Constitution. Hugh Silverman stated that if a program or department has six or more faculty, then they get a representative in the Senate. The Senate Constitution simply makes reference to A & S Senators. N. Goodman confirmed that the situation was backwards, exactly as Hugh Silverman presented. B. Kerber stated that presently the University Senate has to undertake the responsibility of carrying out election of senators. If the proposed change were to take place then the A&S Senate would have to do it. N. Goodman stated that it is not inconceivable that the University Senate would still do it. B. Maskit: stated he is generally opposed to [making changes to] things that make no difference. Hugh Silverman stated that this was in fact a practical and conceptual difference.

VIII. Old Business. No old Business

IX. New Business: No new Business

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

PTC Guidelines

Section 2.4.4.2: (current language)

This division of the file will also contain a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, based on material gathered annually for all faculty members and including both undergraduate and graduate opinion.

The department should make systematic inquiry into students' perceptions of the candidate's teaching, including their sense of what they learned, its relation to their other skills, work in the field, or personal growth. Descriptive and analytic observations will be more useful than general qualitative labels. When tabulations of responses on student questionnaires are submitted, they should be plainly legible and indicate the course number and title, the semester in which the course was offered, the number of students registered (and the number actually studying with this instruction), and the number of responses. A copy of the questionnaire and a brief description of the course and its place in the program, whether required or elective, for majors or non-majors, etc. should be attached. Solicited signed letters on teaching will be in the Special Evaluative File.

Section 2.4.4.2: **(suggested revision)**

This division of the file will also contain a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, based on material gathered annually for all faculty members and including both undergraduate and graduate opinion, if applicable. The department should make a periodic and detailed inquiry into students' perceptions of the candidate's teaching, including their sense of what they learned, its relation to their other skills, work in the field, or personal growth.

To this end, the documentation of teaching should include the following:

1. Numerical summaries of all op-scan forms from courses taught since the faculty's hiring or last promotion. These summaries should be clearly labeled with the course number and title, the semester in which the course was offered, the number of students enrolled in the course, and the number of responses to the questionnaire. A list of the course evaluations provided in the file should include a brief description of each course and its place in the program; whether it is required or elective; whether it draws majors, non-majors, or both; whether the candidate taught the whole course or only part of it; whether there was TA assistance and in what form.
2. Copies of individual op-scan forms with student comments. For small courses, all available copies should be provided. For large classes, representative samples should be taken.
3. Syllabi and other sample course material, such as exams and projects.
4. At least two reports of peer observations of classroom teaching. Both observers should be acceptable to the candidate.
5. Written reports from present and former students. Solicited signed letters on teaching will be placed in the Special Evaluative File.

