

The University Senate will meet on Monday, April 7th at 3:30 p.m. in SAC 302.

Tentative Agenda
University Senate Meeting
April 7, 2003

- I. Approval of previous minutes
- II. Approval of meeting agenda
- III. President's report (S.S. Kenny)
- IV. Provost's report (R. McGrath)
- V. Presentation on NCAA self-study (G. Meyer)
- VI. Vice President Reports on implementation of budget cuts
 - R. McGrath
 - F. Preston
 - N. Edelman
 - W. Simmons
- VII. Resolution on tuition cuts (N. Goodman) (see below resolution below)
- VIII. Proposed constitution for PEG Board (A. Savitt)
- IX. Presentation on hidden disabilities (M. Perno)
- X. Notification of Faculty Survey (R. Kelly)
- XI. Presentation of written report from SUNY Faculty Senate meeting at Cornell.
- XII. Old business
- XIII. New business

Minutes of the University Senate 03-03-03

Recorded by Frank W. Fowler

The Senate President, W. B. Lindquist, called the meeting to order at 3:33 PM.

The minutes were approved followed by a clarification.

The Senate President noted that four Resolutions were on the agenda. Because of limited time he ruled that there would be a 15-minute time limit to the debate of the resolutions. There was no objection to this ruling.

A question was raised as to why the resolution "Against a war with Iraq" was not on the agenda. (see the minutes of the 02-03-03 Senate meeting) The Senate President stated that the Senate Executive Committee considered this resolution to be outside the bounds of the mandate of the University Senate. However, he also stated that any subject could be deliberated by the University Senate if it was supported by 2/3 of those presented.

The Senate President recognized a Mr. Driscoll who stated that he would like to address the University Senate. He was added to the agenda.

The University President was not present but her written report was accepted.

The University Provost submitted a written report and made a short oral presentation, mainly concerned with the budget. He has some ideas on how to cope with the projected budget and expressed the desire to consult with the Senate President and a few other members of the University community regarding these ideas.

The next item on the agenda was the tabled Goodman resolution on the proposed tuition increase (see minutes of 02-03-03 Senate meeting). The Senate President commented that Norman Goodman would not

be able to discuss his resolution at the Senate meeting because he was in the hospital. This tabled resolution did not get the necessary majority vote to bring it to the floor for consideration and remains on the table.

Lawrence Martin, as a member of the classroom utilization committee, made a presentation introducing a motion to change the class schedule. This change effectively increases the number of M, W two day class periods. The motion was seconded and after a brief discussion the motion passed with one abstention.

Robert Kerber presented a resolution from the Undergraduate Council on “Balancing Admissions and Resources.” This motion was modified from the document attached to the agenda: The “4th whereas” was deleted and the word “no”, line 1 of part (b), was replaced by “fewer”. This motion was seconded and, after a 15-minute discussion was defeated by one vote (15 for, 16 against and 4 abstentions).

Ms. Amanda Sammut from the Undergraduate Council moved agenda item #8 (change in transfer policy re. college courses taught in high school). This resolution was seconded and, after a short discussion, was passed with 1 vote in opposition.

A motion was made to consider the resolution “Against a war with Iraq”. This motion was seconded but it did not gain the necessary 2/3 vote and was not considered by the Senate.

Mr. Driscoll attempted to make a motion from the floor soliciting Senate support for the idea that the Student Polity Senate should represent the students. Because of the difficulty formulating a good motion from the floor the motion was made, seconded and passed that a motion on this issue be submitted, in writing, to the University Senate for consideration at a future meeting.

The University Senate adjourned at 4:44 PM.

(REVISED VERSION, March 20, 2003)

**RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED SUNY BUDGET REDUCTION AND
TUITION INCREASE FOR SUNY STUDENTS**

Whereas, the State University of New York is an institution of **public** higher education that is supposed to provide access to all its deserving citizens,

And whereas, the State University of New York is a major engine of economic activity in New York and its students and graduates are substantial contributors to the State's economic well-being,

And whereas, Governor Pataki has proposed a cut of \$187,000,000 in the 2003-2004 budget for the State University of New York,

And whereas, the increase of \$1,400 proposed by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York for the next academic year is a 41% increase or the increase of \$1,200 (a 35% increase) proposed by the Governor is designed to cover the \$187,000,000 budget reduction,

And whereas, the University Senate of Stony Brook University does not believe that the students of the State University of New York should bear such a major burden of dealing with the admittedly difficult budgetary problems facing New York State,

And whereas, the last time there was a substantial increase in tuition in 1995 that was about half the currently proposed amount, many could not afford to attend and enrollment in the State University of New York declined by about 8,000 students for the three years following the increase, and we should expect no less a dramatic drop in our student enrollments as a result of this proposed tuition increase,

And whereas, many students who will be able to continue at a SUNY campus will be required to work even more hours than they now do, which is academically unwise and unproductive,

And whereas, the Governor's budget proposes a 33% deferment of TAP funds to qualified students until after they graduate even those funds are necessary during the students' college years,

Be it resolved that the University Senate of the Stony Brook University roundly rejects the proposed level of budget reduction and tuition increase,

And be it further resolved, that recognizing the financial straits of the State of New York the University Senate of Stony Brook University would reluctantly support a modest tuition increase in the range of \$600 for the coming year (all of which should be returned to the State University of New York) and strongly supports linking future tuition increases to a relevant index such a regional version of the Higher Education Index,

And be it further resolved, that the proposed \$187,000,000 cut in the SUNY budget be reduced by half to accord with a similar reduction by half of the proposed tuition increase,

And be it further resolved, that the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York revise its budget accordingly and use its political influence with the Executive and Legislative branches of State Government to reduce both the proposed reduction in the SUNY budget and the tuition increase by half,

and to maintain the full TAP award to qualified students during their college years rather than afterwards, thus exercising its legal fiduciary responsibility to the State University of New York.

Adopted: 4 April 2003

**Constitution of the Professional Employees Governance Board (PEG Board) of
The State University of New York at Stony Brook**

Article I: Name, Purpose and Responsibilities

1. This body shall be known as the Professional Employees Governance Board (PEG Board) of the State University of New York at Stony Brook.
2. The Professional Employees' Governance Board shall operate, in accordance with the policies set forth by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York, as a recognized part of the University's governance system with authority to make studies, reports and recommendations on all governance matters which have a significant bearing on professional employees.
3. The general membership, as defined in Article 3, Section 1, elects senators to the University Senate and academic unit senates, and committee members to standing committees of the University Senate and academic unit senates, and to other committees as appropriate.
4. The PEG Board elects officers and proposes and approves amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws of the PEG Board.
5. All other rights and responsibilities of the general membership shall be discharged through the elected PEG Board.

Article II: Definitions

1. "University" – State University of New York at Stony Brook.
2. "Professional employees" – As defined in Article III: Constituency and Board Representation.
3. "Academic unit senates" – The Arts & Sciences Senate (A&S Senate), the Health Sciences Center Senate (HSC Senate), and the College of Engineering & Applied Sciences Senate (CEAS Senate).
4. "Business days" – Excludes weekends and all days the University is officially closed.

Article III: Constituency and Board Representation

1. The constituency of PEG Board shall consist of all professional employees of the State University of New York at Stony Brook in positions that carry no designation of academic rank (see Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York, Article III, Sec. 1(l)). The following categories are excluded from the Professional Employee constituency: ex officio members of the University Senate, interns, residents, and post-doctoral fellows.
2. PEG Board shall consist of (a) professional employees who have been elected as senators to the University Senate, or to one of the academic unit senates; and (b) professional employees who have been elected to standing committees of the University Senate or an academic unit senate, and to other committees as appropriate.

Article IV: Structure

1. PEG Board shall consist of elected representatives as set forth in Article III Paragraph 2, each with one and only one vote.
2. PEG Board shall provide for such officers, agents, and committees as are deemed necessary to carry out the business of PEG Board.

3. The business of PEG Board shall be to act as the responsible, representative voice of the concerns and needs of its constituents and to investigate, discuss, report, and make recommendations on those issues that are consistent with the purpose of the Board.
4. PEG Board shall establish a calendar of regular meetings and forums for the purpose of conducting its business. These meetings will be conducted in a manner which allows access to interested constituents and guests.
5. PEG Board shall provide for the recording of all business; the documentation of all official meetings of the Board as a whole or in committee; and the retention, safekeeping, and accessibility of these records to the constituents or those permitted by the Board. No constituent shall be denied access to the record of the PEG Board's business.

Article V: Power and Areas of Influence

PEG Board shall be the officially recognized representative of professional employees within the University governance system. PEG Board does not claim to be, nor does it desire to be, the collective bargaining agent for professional employees and disclaims any individual's intent to identify it as such.

Article VI: Provision for By-Laws and Organization

1. PEG Board shall establish By-Laws for the effective and efficient conduct of its business.
2. PEG Board shall establish its internal organization through its By-Laws.

Article VII: Amendment Procedures

1. **Amendment Proposals**

Proposals to amend the Constitution may be presented as motions to be considered by the membership by either: (1) A signed petition of at least ten percent of the members of the constituency; or (2) a majority vote of the PEG Board.

2. **Deadlines**

Such proposed amendments must be submitted to the elected Secretary at least 20 business days prior to a regular or special meeting of the PEG Board. They will be circulated to the PEG Board at least 15 business days prior to the scheduled meeting.

3. **Voting**

Within ten business days after the meeting at which amendments were proposed, all members of the constituency will be mailed ballots via email to the members' official campus email addresses. All ballots must be returned by campus mail to the office of the Secretary of the University Senate within 15 business days of mailing and shall be counted within two business days from the date the ballots were due.

4. **Implementation**

Amendments shall become a part of this Constitution if approved by two-thirds of the members voting. Amendments shall take effect immediately after ballots are counted unless a specific effective date is provided within the amendment.

Report on SUNY University Faculty Senate meeting at Cornell University
134th Plenary Meeting of the University Faculty Senate
Cornell University
April 3-5, 2003

President Joe Hildreth called the meeting to order and introduced host William Sonnenstuhl and President Hunter R. Rawlings III, who welcomed the Senators to the meeting.

In his report to the Senate, President Hildreth announced that the University Faculty Senate was celebrating its fiftieth anniversary. The first meeting of the Senate took place in Albany in April 1953. President Hildreth reported that the Senate sponsored exhibitions of art by SUNY students at the State University Plaza in the fall and spring. There will be an exhibition of the best student work from the fall and spring exhibitions this summer, and Chancellor King will award three students each a scholarship for \$1000. The report of the Senate's Task Force on Rational Fiscal Policy was presented to the chairs of the New York State Senate and Assembly Higher Education Committees. Senator LaValle is interested in the report, and Joe Hildreth will be meeting with his staff. The University Faculty Senate will be represented on the Board of Trustees. The General Education Review Group (GEAR) will be sponsoring a conference on best practices on November 13-14 in Albany. Among the issues of concern mentioned by President Hildreth in his report was the American history course produced by the Global Education Network and offered through Hudson Valley Community College. The Senate, which expressed its opposition to this at last year's spring plenary session, needs to develop an appropriate course of action. The Board of Trustees has initiated Rethinking SUNY 2. The goal is to identify ways of achieving increased efficiency. A survey has been sent to officers at System Administration. Joe Hildreth was reelected to another term as President of the University Faculty Senate.

During the sharing of concerns, the Senators from the University Centers discussed the implications of the tuition increase on graduate funding. There are no plans for increasing graduate tuition scholarships. Another concern was the cost to campuses of implementing the new immigration policies for foreign students. This is another unfunded mandate. The Senators from the University Centers will compare the different formulas for distributing IDC funds to help evaluate policies. They will also examine the organization of campus research offices.

Brian Stenson, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business, gave the System Administration budget report. New York's deficit for 2003-2004 will be \$11.5 billion. The legislature and the Governor have agreed on a revenue estimate. Mr. Stenson believes that the budget will be done by June. There will be no significant collective bargaining increase in 2003-2004. The retirement incentive continues, and campuses are being urged to be cautious in filling positions and extremely restrained in filling non-faculty positions. System Administration has not imposed targets on individual campuses, but it is interested in how the campuses are managing their budgets. Campuses are asked to report on a monthly basis. There are no plans to make wholesale changes to BAP. System Administration is trying to lay the groundwork for a rational tuition policy starting in FY 2004-2005. One problem is that state law prohibits changes in the tuition schedule until the state budget is enacted. The effect of a tuition increase of \$1200 for resident undergraduates on a system-wide basis would be a flat budget, but in terms of need it would be a 2-3% reduction. Mr. Stenson believes that System Administration is in a stronger position than during past budget crises. The budget situation is stronger, and demographics are strong. Academic programs are stronger, and students are better prepared. The Governor has proposed a second five-year capital plan.

Joseph DeFillipo, Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning, gave a report on SUNY enrollment and planning. He stated that his office performs a coordinating function. The campuses submit their enrollment plans to the System Office of Institutional Research, which gathers the data and produces a form for the review process. The Enrollment Planning Group considers the campus request and makes a recommendation for funded enrollment. The criteria for the review are the campus mission review and budget. The caps for increases in funded enrollment are 1.6% for doctoral centers, 1.2% for comprehensive colleges, and 7% for technology colleges.

The Friday afternoon session ended with a discussion of university-wide assessment. The Chancellor has requested a meeting on this topic. James Chen began the discussion by stating that faculty should have control and ownership of the direction, design, and use of assessment, just as they have control over the curriculum. Assessment will not succeed if it is imposed from above. Norman Goodman pointed out that the recommendation in 1996 was that general education be campus based; therefore, assessment of general education must be campus based. It was clearly demonstrated at the 1998 Senate meeting that system-wide assessment was pragmatically, academically, and fiscally unwise. Vince Aceto stated that the purpose of assessment is to improve learning, which requires a team effort on campus with feedback from students and reflection from faculty. The proposed university-wide assessment is not assessment. Its intent is not to improve learning, but to compare campuses. Each campus has its own mission review document, and it is there that assessment should be addressed. Joe Hildreth summarized the concerns of the Executive Committee. There could be public disclosure of the results. It could lead to an unhealthy form of conformity. It works against diversity, which is one of SUNY's strengths. The campus-based plans have been designed, and campuses have begun to implement them. It is premature to do system-wide assessment without giving the campus plans a chance. Since there is the possibility of a resolution by the Board of Trustees, the Senate needs to act immediately. The Executive Committee will form a task force to develop points of information and plan for a presentation to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees in support of campus-based assessment.

The meeting ended with committee reports.

Daniel Kinney
April 6, 2003