

L.Cox: Let record reflect that faculty asked for Deans! Many answers do not address the question asked. We have had 6 major changes of the documents. Many answers are defensive. Academic sub-committee will do final revision.

M. Dolan: There are issues that are not only relevant to Academic Division: there is disconnect between Campus Capital Plan, resource planning, use of dorms, implications of new BAP and many other substantive issues. How will these issues be addressed?

L.Cox: We do not have a strategic plan, but for the purposes of this document we need to answer the questions asked and all of these other issues will have to be addressed some where else.

S. O'Connor: Who exactly is on this Academic sub-committee? For purposes of accountability on the part of Administration (to incorporate concerns of faculty) maybe all input from faculty be made public?

A.Barbera: Middle States committee takes comments and puts out revised drafts. Co-Chairs of the Middle States Committee co-wrote drafts and also final document. Clearly this is not the process that has been followed for this document.

Chair: Proposed two questions for Senate's consideration with regard to the MR II draft:

1. Is it a credible document?
2. Has faculty governance been sufficiently involved in the process?

Motion to extend time for Senate meeting proposed and passed without dissent.

M.Dolan: It is important for faculty to see comments from other faculty, but there are substantive changes that need to be made in Guidance document that have to do with coherence with MOU, Planning documents etc. that cannot be addressed by just making faculty comments public.

R. Mukherji: May be what we what we need is a time-line from AVP to make sure that there is time and opportunity to make the necessary edits. Should I ask AVP for timeline? (AVP had left room briefly, and question was posed to him when he returned)

L.Cox: Time line for preparation of document [Chair writes out on blackboard]:

*Monday November 1:* Steering Committee meets

Ed Bever and Cox will make some corrections.

*Friday November 5:* Academic subcommittee meets. This is deadline to send me comments from Faculty.

*Wednesday November 10:* Completed document to be e-mailed to Faculty

[Chair adds: *Friday November 12:* Next Senate meeting.]

*Monday, November 15:* Guidance Document to be mailed to Albany

C. Hobson: Proposes motion:

That the Senate directs the Executive Committee forward to the Office of the AVP, a compilation of the issues raised on the Senate floor today;

And further, the Senate recommends that the AVP incorporate these issues and those other input from members of the Senate, and other governance bodies of the faculty that reach the Office of the AVP by Friday November 5, 2004, into the Guidance document;

And, lastly the Senate requests that the AVP ensure that the final form of the final form of the Guidance Document that is sent to the Office of the Provost, reflect these specific and substantive issues as raised by the Faculty.

Motion seconded by R. Mukherji.

Motion passed without dissent.

R. Mukherji: The schedule for getting the Guidance document in shape is very tight; the real deadline is December 15, not November 15. Faculty are sending their input to your office individually and we are going to send you our comments from the Senate floor. How are you going to make sure that these issues are incorporated into the final document? And how will we know that the Guidance document reflects the issues that have been raised?

L.Cox: I am going to be meeting with Ed (Bever) and I'll e-mail document to faculty.

R. Mukherji: But meeting with one person isn't consultation with governance.

Couldn't we extend the deadline?

L.Cox: I will ask President to consider sending Guidance document on December 15.

Senate was adjourned at 2:55.