

**SUNY/ COLLEGE AT OLD WESTBURY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

**Friday, March 26, 2004
12:30 - 2:40 pm**

Present: K. Velsor, C. Sawyer, E. Linger, J. Edelson, L. Cox, J. Conforti, M. Colaneri, I. Ahmed, A. Martinez, A. Barbera, C. Mirra, D. Quarless, C. Hobson, M. Keefe, G. Snedeker

Visitors: E. Ewen, S. Kaufmann, P. O'Sullivan, H. Catchen, W. Lupardo, E. Bever

Report of the President of the Faculty Senate K Velsor:

1. Dr. Butts is in the process of his fourth-year review. His fifth-year review will be next year and will involve faculty participation.
2. Due to the Bylaws revisions, one new faculty elected committee has been established, General Education. (Up to this time, the General Education Committee has been an appointed committee)
3. New elected committees: One is the General Education Committee - Ten KSA (knowledge/skills areas). The other is the Auxiliary Services Corporation Board of Directors, which has been dormant since 1992, but now is being revived as part of the preparation for the Middle States evaluations. This group keeps up with auxiliary services including vending services, etc.
4. At the beginning of the semester, we created an ad hoc steering committee regarding OSSD. April 16 we will have that report.
5. Salary Committee has been meeting and the discrepancies are across the board. The Committee has now come to some tentative approach to resolving the discrepancies.

Corrections to the 2-27-04 minutes:

1. page 1: Anthony Barbera should be included on the list of those present.
2. page 3 (top): Delete "Director or Assistant Director." Immediately following that, a clarification on the business agenda as it relates to the criteria for the Honors program, should read, "Business curricula in the sample program needs to be changed for the Honors criteria to reflect the change that already took place."

Minutes for February 27, 2004, were approved as corrected.

Report from Academic Vice President L. Cox:

1. New scheduling has been presented that allows a regular Common Hour to be scheduled from 1:30pm-3:10pm M/W and 3:20pm-5pm T/R.

Discussion:

Question raised by Dean Patrick O'Sullivan that 45 % of the Business School students attend evening classes and 40-45% of its classes are scheduled in the evening; its students are usually able to begin classes only at 6 pm. Discussion on whether to have two or three classes in the evening, perhaps moving the time slot to a later time (e.g., 5:10pm-6:50pm), or whether or not to split the evening schedule, and responses regarding the need for all departments having the same schedule.

Question: Why does the Common Hour need to be longer than one hour or an hour, 5 minutes?

Response: In the past people did not find one hour sufficient. For current programs, student club meetings usually take more than an hour as an overall case.

Key issue is to make a schedule that could attract the new markets that might be out there; besides Business and Computer Science, we also need other evening classes.

The two time periods for Common Hour are aimed to have a time for both day and night students to attend some club meetings and other programs. One way would be to maintain the proposal for a MW 1 hour 40 minutes Common Hour and change the TR schedule to a one hour Common Hour from 5:10pm to 6:10pm.

Business School and other classes need to be in sync for business students to take other requirements. Question about the survey in the Business School – perhaps we should wait for the results of this survey. Last survey showed that 50% were attending class all 4 nights per week.

Under the current system, there is a prohibition against scheduling academic meetings or office hours during the Common Hour. The prohibition would remain in effect during the times when Programs are scheduled.

There is no “exactly the right thing” – changing the schedule will tell us by market demand whether or not it is good for both students and the College.

Having evening classes begin no earlier than 5:30pm seems to be agreeable to most departments. Proposal to use the survey and allow the Business School to decide the hours for evening classes was discussed.

2. Middle States schedule of the 5-year review is coming up in 2005, and the NCATE schedule is in 2006.

Discussion: A question was raised on the nature of Mission Review II Summary statement. There is an external deadline of July 1, 2004. This is a short turn-around time frame for a document stating overall goals. Departments should be planning their goals.

Report from the Academic Standing Committee by D. Quarless:

There were attempts to move the hearings in the summer, but there are logistical problems with early June for both students and faculty. Summer (later) dates infringe on faculty time. Once that was changed to a time closer to the beginning of the fall semester, there were another round of problems. The snows of January had a serious impact on the hearings and the committee decided to extend the time.

Of those suspended or dismissed, the Committee reinstated roughly 85% of the cases.

Question: What % of students dismissed or suspended request a hearing?

Response: We don't have the data. From the past, about 50% used to request a hearing.

There was a “wrinkle” by which some students, those with 32 credits, could be “straddling the line”. If they are in jeopardy, they now MUST go see the Academic Standing Committee. Having the Academic Standing Committee sessions closer to registration, with an amended mailer that gives more specific information for students who need to go before the Academic Standing Committee, has probably helped improve the rate.

Aug-Sept group had 39 appeals and reinstated 35-37, although not all were full-time students (FT maybe 60%). The January group heard 35 appeals and reinstated 33 students.

Actual hearings and time allocated to each student was problematic due to committee members acting as defenders of students and extending the time limits. For future hearings, the Chair will ask the presiding member of each to observe time limits. Discussion on continuing appealers – one earning only 30 credits in 8 years was once again reinstated.

Committee realizes the need to get some institutional research regarding how successful the students are once they are reinstated, but there is a deeper issue of confidentiality issues that would hinder certain kinds of research.

DSI report from Dr. Cox:

The equity is a separate process but it is tied to the merit issue. Of the 1% funding involved, there is not enough to bring everyone up to equity. The committee of faculty recommended the DSI merit raises for 86% of the 64 candidates who applied.

Discussion: There should be some way of informing faculty that they will not be eligible for DSI pay unless the Discretionary Salary Awards Committee approves the person for merit.

Reading by K. Velsor of the passed resolution from the Faculty Senate Minutes from May 14, 1999. The resolution was to break the past pattern of linking DSI and equity and that faculty members not submit DSI proposals until the inequities are addressed.

Discussion: The motion was never really implemented because it was just for that year. We may need to set up a Faculty Senate Committee to investigate the workings of the DSI, and recommend how to move toward less inequity.

There are egregious disparities that cannot change in our present means of functioning.

There will be no DSI next year because a negotiated contract provides a flat 1% increase.

The Executive Committee could ask the President to have representation in the decisions on merit.

Motion to set up a faculty advisory committee of the Faculty Senate to consider how DSI is awarded and to work toward equity. Motion passed - 14 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

UUP report by B. Hillery:

We have a tentative agreement with the state and should be receiving a tentative guide of the issues. May 7 is the date to begin ratification; the union will try to get the ratification over quickly on or before August deadline so that part-timers can get their share of the \$800 signing bonus.

Discussion of the DSI - This July for professionals and September for academics, a 1% across the board (making it 3 1/2% over the contract), then next year we will have to go through the DSI routine again.

Old business: None

New Business:

A student with cerebral palsy created a challenging situation for Dr. Harvey Catchen.

Most times, after 7 pm there is only one instructor in the Natural Science Building and we, as individuals, have no experience dealing with such emergencies.

Discussion: Need to look at all the health and safety issues in the College and determine how to get the equipment, i.e. defibrillators, and educate ourselves on their use. Defibrillators have been ordered for each building on campus, as well as other health and safety equipment.

Motion approved by voice vote to extend the discussion another ten minutes.

We have a group of regular students from the Cerebral Palsy Center, and have worked to help integrate those students into campus life. Bill Lupardo reports that the Cerebral Palsy Center has been addressed about the issue of having some competent person to care for the students in case there is an emergency.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.