

**FACULTY SENATE  
COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS**

**2013-2014**

Standing Committees

Budget Review (forthcoming)

Bylaws Review

Convocations

Educational Policy and Priorities

EOP Advisory (forthcoming)

Intercollegiate Athletics

Library

Professional Standards

University Undergraduate Curriculum

Joint Committees

Academic Computing and Educational Technology

Committee for the University Environment

Other

Committee on Committees

Evaluation Coordinating Committee

**Faculty Senate Bylaws Review Committee**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The Bylaws Review committee had no business to conduct during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Summerville, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Committee Chair

Committee members

William Heller, Political Science

Alistair Lees, Chemistry

Sara Reiter, School of Management

Andrew Scholtz, Classics

Douglas Summerville, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Committee Chair

Pamela Mischen, President's ex officio appointee

Kelly Wemette, Provost's ex officio appointee

**FACULTY SENATE CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The committee used its charge as the major guide for funding decisions: "bringing programs to campus that enhance and support the intellectual, cultural, and artistic aspects of the academic curriculum, and to focus our efforts toward as diverse a university community as possible". The committee traditionally has not funded events that did not fit the criteria above or requests for food, receptions, or parties. Publicity, speakers' fees, or transportation are items that were specifically funded. In addition, events that cater to a variety of groups on campus in general, and undergraduate students in particular, were looked upon favorably by the committee.

The funding came from the Presidents' Office (\$5,375) and the Student Association (\$5,375) for a total of \$10,750. Our available funds for the year, including the carryover from 20012-20013 (\$8,273) and new allocations, totaled \$19,023. Allocations this year totaled \$10,563 (excluding agency fee) leaving a remaining balance of \$8,460 forward into the 2014-2015 academic year.

The convocations committee is comprised of 4 faculty members, 2 administrative members, 3 Student Association representatives, and a Graduate Student Organization representative. Each new funding request is discussed during committee meetings. Final decisions are made through voting by the committee members. In a great majority of cases, decisions are unanimous. Student members' contributions are invaluable during discussions. As SA representatives, they are closely familiar with most events that request funding and provide unique perspective and insight that contribute to funding decisions.

The Convocations Committee supported 24 events in total. Allocations ranged from a minimum of \$100 to maximum of \$1,250. The committee denied five applications, because the committee unanimously felt that these particular activities did not meet the committee's criteria for funding.

A detailed documentation of funding sources and allocations is presented below.

**Convocations Committee Funding and Allocations  
Fall 2013 – Spring 2014**

Ambassador Joseph Melrose	\$100
BUGCAT 2013	\$756
Creative Writing Conference	\$300
Empire State of Mind	\$150
Gays vs Christians	\$100
Medical School Fair/Alumni Banquet	\$200
Moving forward....	\$500
Purim	\$575
Freedeman Lecture	\$632
International night	\$300
Shifting Tides - English	\$300
Black History Month Speaker	\$1,250
Crossing the Boundaries - Art History	\$400
Women's History Month- Caribbean Student Union	\$250
Universities Allied for Essential Meds	\$1,000
Think Tomorrows hope North Korea	\$500
Chabad 1500	\$475
Tedx	\$650
Meet the Artist: Di Cesate	\$400
Thurgood Marshall: Step	\$145
NAACP	\$330
Hillel at Binghamton	\$300
Sociology graduate student conference	\$100
International Fest	\$850

Respectfully submitted,

Benjamin Andrus, University Libraries, Committee Chair

**Convocations Committee Membership (2013-2014)**

Faculty

Benjamin Andrus  
Leslie M Vega  
Donald J Loewen  
Serdar Atav

SA

Derrick Conyers  
Bryan Delacruz  
Phillip M George

Admin

Jennifer Keegin  
Brian Rose

GSO

Guy Risko

**Faculty Senate Educational Policies and Priorities Committee**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The EPPC met six times during the 2013/2014 academic year to consider curricular and policy matters.

Here is a summary of the policy matters considered by the EPPC and their resolution:

Issue	Discussion	Resolution
The Provost expressed concern about the lack of a uniform final exam policy.	A number of courses were giving exams during the last week of classes instead of scheduling finals during exam week. This effectively shortened the semester and put an undue burden on students.	The faculty senate approved a change to section VII.C. 5. of the Faculty-Staff handbook providing a new universal final exam policy on March 25, 2014
The Vice Provost shared concerns that the federal and Middle States expectation for work load associated with courses was not widely known	There are expectations for the amount of class time and work students perform for each course credit. These expectations were codified by the Vice Provost and a set of statements to be included in syllabi were developed.	The faculty senate approved a policy on syllabus statements on credit hours and course expectations on March 25, 2014 to be implemented in Fall 2014.
The Student Congress asked the EPPC to look into increasing the number of internship hours allowed for degree credit.	The EPPC discovered that limits on internship hours are set at the college or school (and in some cases the department) level. These restrictions reflect considerations relevant to the degrees and programs offered.	The EPPC did not feel that pursuing a University-wide policy that would override the relevant considerations made by the units in deciding how much internship credit to accept was a good idea.
The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment asked the EPPC to consider changing the assessment of general education to streamline the process.	The EPPC worked with the OIR and the UUCC to develop a revised gen ed assessment policy and revised gen ed assessment procedures. These changes increase faculty and UUCC involvement in the process.	The faculty senate approved the Policy of assessment of General Education and Assessment of General Education on May 6, 2014
The UUCC and Vice Provost expressed concern with oversight of for-credit programs not belonging to department or academic units.	To provide more consistent academic oversight and support for non-departmentalized curricular initiatives, the establishment of a new oversight structure was recommended.	The faculty senate approved a Proposal for new Office of University-Wide Courses and Programs on May 6, 2014.

Here is a summary of the policies for faculty review of curriculum passed by the faculty senate in 2012:

Action	Item
No notification	Routine changes to existing majors, minors, certificates and degree programs that do not require SED approval
Notify EPPC FSEC and/or EPPC may undertake additional review if changes go beyond "routine"	Routine changes to existing majors, minors, certificates and degree programs require SED approval
Notify FSEC and EPPC FSEC and/or EPPC may undertake additional review	Combined degree programs (3-2, 4-1), Dual degree programs, new minors and local certificate programs (tracks)
EPPC acts as a curriculum committee	All proposals for certificates, majors, minors, or other programs that are not reviewed at the college or school level
Full faculty senate review process (starts with EPPC)	New degree programs, suspension or elimination of degree programs, new majors, new certificate-for-licensure programs

The following curricular matters were reviewed in 2013/2014:

<b>Routine changes requiring SED approval:</b>	EPPC	FSEC
HDEV BS revision	Discussed	Reviewed
Biomedical Engineering BS revisions	Discussed	Discussed
BMus, music performance revision	Discussed	Reviewed
Spanish major revision	Discussed	Reviewed
French major revision	Discussed	Reviewed
Theatre major revision	Discussed	Reviewed
Cinema major revision	Discussed	Reviewed
Biomedical engineering graduate program revision	Discussed	Discussed

<b>Combined, dual degree, new tracks</b>	EPPC	FSEC
Sociology BA/MA	Discussed	Reviewed
Nursing MPH_MSN Dual degree	Discussed	Discussed
History BA/MA	Discussed	Reviewed
Biomedical Engineering combined BS/MS	Discussed	Discussed
English MA/MPA	Discussed	Reviewed
English BA/MA	Discussed	Reviewed
New track in MA Anthropology	Discussed	Reviewed
New track in BA Art	Discussed	Reviewed
New track in Geography	Discussed	Reviewed

<b>New degrees, majors, deactivations, reactivations</b>	EPPC	FSEC	Faculty Senate
Creation of Pharmacy School	Discussed	Discussed	Approved March 25, 2014
Deactivation of the BA in Human Development	Discussed	Discussed	Approved May 6, 2014
Reactivation of the Bachelor of Arts in Fine Arts	Discussed	Discussed	Approved May 6, 2014
Creation of Russian Studies Major	Discussed	Discussed	Approved May 6, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

Sara Reiter, Committee Chair

Committee members

Sarah Reiter, Chair  
 Laura Anderson  
 Marilyn Gaddis Rose  
 Patrick Madden  
 Wendy Martinek  
 Erin Rushton  
 Al Vos

Philip George  
 Derrick Conyers  
 Donald Nieman  
 Susan Strehle

**Faculty Senate Intercollegiate Athletics Committee**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The Faculty Senate Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) met twice in 2013-14. The committee continued to monitor several matters, as described below, but did not initiate any significant actions or changes.

In both the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 IAC meetings, Ed Scott presented to the IAC academic reports describing the performance of student-athletes. Reports break down student-athlete academic performance by team for each semester, including overall team GPA, numbers of students falling below established thresholds, etc. Student-athletes continue to perform well academically. Scott updated the committee the new process for mid-semester academic progress reports from faculty. Receiving timely and complete reports remains an issue for all groups that solicit feedback through the common form, but the additional form basketball and wrestling has improved the situation for those sports.

The IAC heard updates from Dave Eagan regarding the process by which Athletics works with the Office of Student Records to certify student-athletes as eligible for competition. This process continues to be completed manually by Eagan and Scott, but we are moving toward DegreeWorks automating the certification process. We expect that this will augment and facilitate the manual process, not replace it. The committee will continue to receive updates on the certification process, but we do not expect to have to intervene further, as the Registrar's office, the Provot's office (via Dave Eagan), and Athletics are working together on the matter.

The IAC also continues to inquire about the status of "special admit" student-athletes, the interaction between the Admissions office and Athletics, and the support of special admits after enrolling at Binghamton. Special admits are among student-athletes who arrive on campus during the summer prior to the Fall semester, for an orientation program designed and run by Ed Scott, to promote the student-athletes' success.

The IAC received brief updates from FAR Jim Stark and other members of the committee regarding the goings-on in Athletics. None were directly related to academics nor required follow-up action by the committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Lewis, Committee Chair

Committee members

Neil Christian Pages

Loretta Mason-Williams

Edward Corrado

Dhruv Sehgal (male undergraduate)

Samantha Wettje (female undergraduate)

Cindy Cowden (VP for Student Affairs designee)

Jim Stark (NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative)

Terry Kane (Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Board – ex officio)

Ed Scott (Assoc. Athletics Director for Student Services – ex officio)

David Eagan (Ex-officio member)

Patrick Elliott (Athletics Director – ex officio)



**Faculty Senate Library Committee**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The committee met on March 17, 2014 in Dean Meador's conference room. Dean Meador provided a copy on Library Space issues.

Topics regarding space discussed included 1) Carrels for doctoral students which are in high demand, 2) Student's request for study space within Libraries, particularly during exam weeks & 3) some faculty wishing to also have Carrels for scholarship.

Other topics include budget issues and demands. Budget constraints continue, cost of online access to large publisher's content is expensive. SUNY collaborative model of buying for the system does help.

Anne Larrivee, Reference Librarian brought an issue, proposal for copies of textbooks within the library, to the attention of the committee chair in May. This proposal is being discussed in the SUNY Student Life Committee but at the current time, has been sent back to committee. It has not gone forward as of this point in time but should be on the Library committee agenda for 2014-2015.

Dean Meador's move to another university (UAB) was announced in late spring. Biggest issues facing the library continue to be increasing costs, budget restraints and increasing resources demands from Library. As new initiatives such as the pharmacy school and increase in faculty hiring continues, the library resources of space and budget will need continued monitoring. Electronic access to content is an area where the library has made strides in the recent past and this type of resource is critical to support the level of research desired at Binghamton University. The committee recommends continued support in this arena. Just as types and modes of access to content have changed over the years, space allocation needs to be re-evaluated to assess how those needs have changed and the variance in space needs at different times during the academic year. The committee supported the need to continue to re-evaluate library space and resources.

Respectfully submitted,



, Committee Chair

Committee members

Rosemary Arrojo  
Kenny Chang  
Joseph Clain  
Pamela Stewart Fahs  
Scott Henkel  
Anne Larrivee  
Solomon W. Polachek  
Joshua Reno  
Lei Yu  
George Bobinski\*  
John Meador\*

Ex-Officio members\*

**Faculty Senate Professional Standards**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

The Committee received two cases.

The first involved matters more properly handled by the faculty member's Personnel Committee. The second it dismissed because the irregularities cited had already been addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Gaddis Rose, Committee Chair

Committee members

Marilyn Gaddis Rose, chair

Sharon Bryant

Robert Guay

Carol Miles

Caryl Ward

## **Report of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 2013 – 2014**

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the UUCC continued its work certifying courses that meet Binghamton University General Education requirements and deciding on student petitions related to General Education requirements.

Additional committee activities included:

- Based on our review of syllabi and discussions with faculty members last year, the UUCC revised the guidelines and learning outcomes for Composition courses to clarify expectations for the types of writing that can be used to meet the C requirement. This revision was passed by the Faculty Senate on May 6, 2014, and went into effect immediately.
- Because Degree Works requires that the use of Advanced Placement, CLEP, and International Baccalaureate (IB) scores for General Education be handled consistently across schools, the UUCC developed a university-wide policy for the use of AP, CLEP and IB for General Education. This policy was passed by the Faculty Senate on May 6, 2014, and will go into effect for students entering in Fall 2014.
- The UUCC met with Elizabeth Carter, Executive Director of Student Services and Debbie Clinton-Callaghan, Senior Associate Director of New Student, concerning the switch of the HDEV 105, Freshmen Year Experience courses to a UNIV 101 rubric. The temporary courses UNIV 180A through UNIV 180G were created for Summer 2014 and Fall 2014 while the new UNIV 101 course was being developed. The UUCC approved UNIV 101, College Students in Transition, as a two-credit course modeled on the HARP 101 courses. Effective Winter 2015, this course will be co-taught by a faculty member and a student affairs professional and will meet the Gen Ed O requirement.
- The UUCC met with the directors of several programs that fall under the rules for University-wide courses to discuss the current oversight of these programs. The committee met with the following programs: Global Studies Minor (GLST courses), Career Development Center (CDCI courses), and Outdoor Pursuits (OUT courses).
- The UUCC approved the new UNIV course, UNIV 380C, Of Wolves and Myths, proposed by George Catalano. This course was previously taught as part of the Binghamton Scholars Program and will be taught for Fall 2014 as part of the academic enrichment program in the residential college system.

The Chair and the committee would like to express its gratitude to Liz Abate, our coordinator of General Education and Assistant for Undergraduate Education, for the outstanding assistance and coordination she always provided. And the Chair would like to express his appreciation to the members of the committee who consistently worked through our agenda with collective acumen and good judgment.

Attached, as required, is this year's report on university-wide course offerings under the following rubrics: UNIV, SCHL, GLST, and CDCI.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mark Reisinger, Committee Chair

Committee Members:

Laura Anderson, Mathematics

Les Lander, Computer Science

Michael Lawson, Human Development

Ingeborg Majer-O'Sickey, German and Russian Studies

Sarah Maximiek, Library

Carolyn Pierce, Decker School of Nursing

Sara Reiter, School of Management

Jim Stark, Art

Olajumoke Atanda, undergraduate student

Liz Abate, Provost's Office

Lisa Hrehor, Health and Wellness Studies

Celia Klin, Harpur College Deans Office and Psychology

Don Loewen, Provost's Office and German/Russian Studies

Pamela Mischen, President's Office and CCPA

## **Report on University-Wide (UNIV) Course Offerings – 2013-2014 Academic Year**

Attached please find a complete listing of all courses offered during the 2013-2014 academic year under the following rubrics:

- Binghamton Scholars Program – SCHL
- Global Studies Minor – GLST
- Career Development Center Internships – CDCI
- University-Wide courses – UNIV

The UUCC met with the directors of several programs that fall under the rules for University-wide courses to discuss the current oversight of these programs. The committee met with the following programs: Global Studies Minor (GLST courses), Career Development Center (CDCI courses), and Outdoor Pursuits (OUT courses).

The UUCC approved the following new UNIV courses:

- UNIV 101, College Students in Transition, a two-credit course modeled on the HARP 101 courses. Effective Winter 2015, this course will be co-taught by a faculty member and a student affairs professional and will meet the Gen Ed O requirement. The temporary courses UNIV 180A through UNIV 180G were created for Summer 2014 and Fall 2014 while the new UNIV 101 course was being developed.
- UNIV 380C, Of Wolves and Myths, proposed by George Catalano. This course was previously taught as part of the Binghamton Scholars Program and will be taught for Fall 2014 as part of the academic enrichment program in the residential college system.

Term	Subject	Number	Title	Section	Enrollment	Credits	First Name	Last Name
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	01	12	4	Felicia	Moreira
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	02	12	4	Stephanie	Vlajic
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	04	12	4	Jeffrey	Horowitz
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	05	13	4	Erik	Colon
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	18	12	4	Felicia	Moreira
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	25	12	4	Courtney	Ignarri
Fall 2013	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	26	12	4	Courtney	Ignarri
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	02	15	2	Nicole	Sirju-Johnson
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	03	5	2	Nicole	Sirju-Johnson
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	04	15	2	Marissa	Zelman
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	06	15	4	Nita	Baldwin
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	07	15	2	Marissa	Zelman
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	08	15	4	Daniel	McCormack
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	09	15	4	Daniel	McCormack
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	13	15	12	Beth	Riley
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	17	25	4	Jazell	Johnson
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	20	20	2	Dara	Raboypicciano
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	21	15	12	Kevin	Wright
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	23	15	12	Allison	Alden
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	24	30	4	David	Hagerbaumer
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	30	20	2	Kimberly	King
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	34	15	4	Ryan	Yarosh
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	35	20	2	Stephen	Rebello
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	36	10	2	David	Hagerbaumer
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	37	26	2	Mark	Reisinger
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	38	54	2	Jeffrey	Barker
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	39	25	2	Anthony	Preus
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	40	15	2	Dara	Raboypicciano
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	41	8	4	Jessica	Krohn
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	42	2	2	Kerry	Cook
Fall 2013	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	44	15	2	Morgan	Appel
Fall 2013	CDCI	491	JC Mentor UG Teaching Asst	05	1	4	Erin	Jennings
Fall 2013	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	01	25	2	Karen	Cummings
Fall 2013	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	02	25	2	Joanna	Cardona
Fall 2013	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	09	25	2	Erik	Colon
Fall 2013	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	35	25	2	Daniel	McCormack
Fall 2013	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	40	25	2	Daniel	McCormack
Fall 2013	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	01	20	1	Natalia	Andrievskikh
Fall 2013	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	05	14	1	Natalia	Andrievskikh
Fall 2013	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	06	14	1		
Fall 2013	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	07	14	1		
Fall 2013	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	02	13	2	William	Pavlovich
Fall 2013	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	03	13	2	William	Pavlovich
Fall 2013	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	04	11	2	William	Pavlovich
Fall 2013	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	05	11	2	William	Pavlovich
Fall 2013	GLST	490B	Global Studies Capstone Sem	03	3	4	William	Pavlovich
Fall 2013	SCHL	127	Thinking Like Leonardo DaVinci	01	52	2	Peter	Nardone
Fall 2013	SCHL	127	Thinking Like Leonardo DaVinci	02	53	2	Peter	Nardone
Fall 2013	SCHL	227	Leadership, Proj Mgt, Service	01	15	2	Milton	Chester
Fall 2013	SCHL	280A	Of Wolves & Myths	01	20	4	George	Catalano
Fall 2013	SCHL	280B	The Way of Happiness	01	20	4	Donald	Glauber
Fall 2013	SCHL	280D	Tech & Impact of Solar Energy	01	19	4	Charles	Westgate
Fall 2013	SCHL	280E	Food Nature & Culture	01	16	4	Dale	Tomich
Fall 2013	SCHL	280H	The Encounter with the "Other"	01	19	4	Andrew	Walkling
Fall 2013	SCHL	327	Schlr 3: Worlds of Experience	01	60	0	William	Ziegler
Fall 2013	SCHL	391	Scholars Teaching Practicum	01	7	2	Peter	Nardone

Fall 2013	SCHL	397	Scholars Independent Study	01	10	4	William	Ziegler
Fall 2013	SCHL	427	Scholars 4: Capstone	01	60	0	William	Ziegler
Fall 2013	UNIV	380A	The Binghamton Microcosm	01	25	4	David	Wilson
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	11	12	4	Felicia	Moreira
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	12	12	4	Felicia	Moreira
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	14	12	4	Kori	Tompkins
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	15	12	4	Veronica	Ogeen
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	16	12	4	Erik	Colon
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	18	20	4	Scott	Bennett
Spring 2014	CDCI	385	Prof Internship Pgm Oral Comm	20	13	4	Courtney	Ignarri
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	01	13	2	Nicole	Sirju-Johnson
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	03	15	2	Dara	Raboypicciano
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	04	15	2	Marissa	Zelman
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	05	10	12	Kevin	Wright
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	06	15	2	Nicole	Sirju-Johnson
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	08	15	4	Daniel	McCormack
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	09	15	4	Daniel	McCormack
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	12	10	4	Jessica	Krohn
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	14	2	2	Kerry	Cook
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	17	25	4	Jazell	Johnson
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	18	15	4	Wendy	Neuberger
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	19	15	4	Ryan	Yarosh
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	20	20	2	Dara	Raboypicciano
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	22	26	2	Mark	Reisinger
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	25	15	2	Marissa	Zelman
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	26	30	4	David	Hagerbaumer
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	27	15	4	Nita	Baldwin
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	31	15	12	Allison	Alden
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	33	15	12	Beth	Riley
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	34	20	2	Kimberly	King
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	36	20	2	Stephen	Rebello
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	37	10	2	Erin	Jennings
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	38	10	2	Jeffrey	Barker
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	41	10	2	David	Hagerbaumer
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	44	15	2	Morgan	Appel
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	45	18	2	Anthony	Preus
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	46	20	4	John	Vassello
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	47	20	4	John	Vassello
Spring 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	48	50	2	Harvey	Stenger
Spring 2014	CDCI	491	JC Mentor UG Teaching Asst	05	1	4	Erin	Jennings
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	02	24	2	Karen	Cummings
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	04	25	2	Joanna	Cardona
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	07	25	2	Steven	Knepp
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	08	25	2	Erik	Colon
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	35	25	2	Daniel	McCormack
Spring 2014	CDCI	496	Johnson City Mentor Program	36	25	2	Daniel	McCormack
Spring 2014	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	01	16	1	David	Gerstle
Spring 2014	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	02	16	1	David	Gerstle
Spring 2014	GLST	392	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	03	16	1	David	Gerstle
Spring 2014	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	01	12	2	David	Gerstle
Spring 2014	GLST	490A	Global Studies Capstone Sem	02	14	2	William	Pavlovich
Spring 2014	GLST	490B	Global Studies Capstone Sem	01	3	4	David	Gerstle
Spring 2014	SCHL	227	Leadership, Proj Mgt, Service	01	15	2	Peter	Nardone
Spring 2014	SCHL	227	Leadership, Proj Mgt, Service	02	15	2	Peter	Nardone
Spring 2014	SCHL	227	Leadership, Proj Mgt, Service	03	15	2	Peter	Nardone
Spring 2014	SCHL	227	Leadership, Proj Mgt, Service	04	15	2	Peter	Nardone
Spring 2014	SCHL	280B	Project Management	01	22	4	Chad	Nixon

Spring 2014	SCHL	280D	Ghosts in American Culture	01	23	4 Elizabeth	Tucker
Spring 2014	SCHL	280G	International Business	01	22	4 Anna	Addonisio
Spring 2014	SCHL	280H	Philanthropy & Civil Society	01	16	4 David	Campbell
Spring 2014	SCHL	280I	Higher Education & Athletics	01	20	4 Brian	Rose
Spring 2014	SCHL	280J	Evolutionary Psychology	01	24	4 Joseph	Morrissey
Spring 2014	SCHL	327	Schlr3: Worlds of Experience	01	60	0 William	Ziegler
Spring 2014	SCHL	391	Scholars Teaching Practicum	01	7	2 Peter	Nardone
Spring 2014	SCHL	397	Scholars Independent Study	01	10	4 William	Ziegler
Spring 2014	SCHL	397	Scholars Independent Study	02	10	4 Joseph	Morrissey
Spring 2014	SCHL	427	Scholars 4: Capstone	01	60	0 William	Ziegler
Spring 2014	UNIV	380B	The Binghamton Microcosm	01	25	4 Kevin	Wright
Summer 2014	CDCI	200	Bridging Academics to Careers	01	15	2 Holly	Horn
Summer 2014	CDCI	200	Bridging Academics to Careers	02	15	2 Wren	Fritsky
Summer 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	01	35	12 Laura	ONeill
Summer 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	02	35	12 Erin	Jennings
Summer 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	04	40	2 Robert	Danberg
Summer 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	05	10	12 John	Vassello
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	01	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	02	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	03	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	04	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	06	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	390	Intro Cross-Cultrl Experiences	07	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	392	Cross-Cultural Immersion	01	15	1 David	Gerstle
Summer 2014	GLST	392	Cross-Cultural Immersion	02	15	1	
Summer 2014	GLST	392	Cross-Cultural Immersion	03	15	1	
Summer 2014	GLST	392	Cross-Cultural Immersion	04	15	1	
Summer 2014	UNIV	180A	College Transit-D1 Athletes	01	20	2 Heather	Miller
Winter 2014	CDCI	200	Bridging Academics to Careers	01	15	2 Erin	Jennings
Winter 2014	CDCI	200	Bridging Academics to Careers	02	15	2 Wren	Fritsky
Winter 2014	CDCI	395	Professional Internship Pgm	01	30	12 Laura	ONeill
Winter 2014	GLST	390	Study Abroad Pre-Departure Sem	01	15	1 David	Gerstle
Winter 2014	GLST	390	Study Abroad Pre-Departure Sem	02	15	1 David	Gerstle
Winter 2014	GLST	390	Study Abroad Pre-Departure Sem	03	15	1 David	Gerstle



## 24 Format for Developing New University-Wide (UNIV) Course Proposals

Instructions: Course proposals must follow the proposal format presented below. A draft syllabus or list of topics, representative readings, and learning exercises should be submitted with the proposal. The deadline for submission of Fall semester UNIV courses will be January 15 of the preceding academic year; the deadline for submission of Spring semester UNIV courses will be August 15, prior to the Fall semester of that academic year.

UNIV course submissions should be directed to:

University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
c/o Liz Abate, Assistant for Undergraduate Education  
Office of the Provost, AD 708

1. Date: 24 April 2014
2. Course Proposal Submitted By: Dr. George D. Catalano, Professor of Bioengineering and Faculty Master, Apartments Community
3. Credit Value: 4 credit hours
4. Course Title (30 characters maximum): Of Wolves and Myths
5. General Education Designation(s) Requested: Please include information on how the course meets the specified requirement(s). Gen Ed H Rationale:
6. Instructor(s): Please submit a copy of the instructor's vita. A graduate degree or its equivalent in a related field is expected.
7. Frequency: Every fall semester
8. Contact Hours Planned (per week): 3 contact hours
9. Bulletin Description: According to Thomas Dunlap, in *Saving America's Wildlife*, "Myths are shorthand, the things that we never learned but we all know. Every culture has its own set and conspicuous among them are the ones explaining the natural world and mankind's relations to it." We shall explore the myths of science in the West that have signaled our sense of Nature from the Middle Ages, through the Renaissance and the Age of Reason up to the modern quantum era.
10. Grading Limitation: Normal
11. Type of Space: None
12. Anticipated Enrollment: 300 level
13. Rationale: Why is this course being proposed? What needs will it meet? Will this course replace another course or will other courses be offered less frequently? Support the academic enrichment program in the residential college system on campus.

14. Exceptional Budgetary or Resource Requirements: Please make explicit all anticipated costs associated with offering the course, including salary expectations for the instructor. Detail funds, staff support, library, computer use, laboratory needs associated with this course; if none, provide a statement to that effect. Also, please provide a statement of the resources that the sponsoring office or department can allocate to meeting these needs.
  
15. Human Subjects Research: Does the proposed course involve human subjects research? (Types of activities involving human subjects include: interviews, questionnaires, observations, etc.) If so, the instructor must be advised to obtain permission from the University's Human Subjects Research Review Committee prior to commencing research.

**UNIV XXX: On Wolves and Myths**  
**Fall 2014**

According to Thomas Dunlap, in *Saving America's Wildlife*, "Myths are shorthand, the things that we never learned but we all know. Every culture has its own set and conspicuous among them are the ones explaining the natural world and mankind's relations to it." We shall explore the myths of science in the West that have signaled our sense of Nature from the Middle Ages, through the Renaissance and the Age of Reason up to the modern quantum era. Additionally we shall consider possible new myths at the start of the new millennium such as the science of chaos and speculate about the impact of such a paradigm upon our understanding of Nature. Throughout this journey, we shall focus upon not only the myths but also the resultant impacts on our sense of ethical responsibility towards the natural world. The history of our attitudes towards the wolf will serve, as the focal point for the exploration for no animal at least in the West has been more vilified or glorified.

**Required Readings:**

1. Barry Lopez, *Of Wolves and Men*, Scribner, 1978.
2. R.D. Lawrence, *North Runner*, 1989
3. Gary Wocker, ed., *Comeback Wolves: Western Writers Welcome the Wolf Home*, Johnson Books, 2005.
4. Mech, *Wolves – Behavior, Ecology and Conservation*, UCP.
5. J. London, *White Fang*,
6. Rick Bass, *Ninemile Wolves*, Mariner Books

**Grading**

Course Administration:

• Reflection essays	400
• In Class Activities	100
• Art Project	100
• Teacher for a Day	200
• Final exam	200

---

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>
--------------	-------------

**Assignments:**

**I. Essays & Final Exam**

- a. The essays are to be professionally done with proper grammar, spelling and syntax using software word-processing package (i.e. Word)
- b. You should read your compositions out loud or have a friend read them out loud prior to submitting so that the quality is at its highest possible level.
- c. After I review your first draft, you must submit a revised version.
- d. The grading rubric is shown below.
- e. Minimum length for each essay is 500 words.
- f. The final exam must be at least 1000 words

**Art Project**

Individually you are responsible for creating a work of art that captures your feelings about the wolf.

**Teachers for a Day**

In teams of two students, you will be responsible for presenting the material for the assigned readings for that particular section. Your presentation is expected to be both critical and creative as well as fully engaging. Your presentation should take up the entire class period. At the end of your presentation, you are expected to create a quiz that covered the material you presented. Your team will grade the quizzes and give them back during the following period with feedback.

### Grading Rubric for Essays:

The rubric below is designed to help you understand the standards which will be used to grade your essays.

The "A" essay achieves all the goals of "C" and "B" essays, plus it relates the issues and arguments to your own personal experience. It states your views on the issues and how they apply in your own life.
The "B" essay achieves all the goals of the "C" essay, plus it compares and contrasts the positions of the authors. It expands and extends the authors' ideas beyond what is explicitly stated in the readings.
The "C" essay demonstrates you did the reading, understand the issues involved and grasp the authors' positions on those issues. It explains the supporting reasons and arguments for the positions on both sides of each issue. Therefore, it <i>explains</i> both what the authors believe (their positions) and why they believe it (their reasons and arguments).

There are four general standards which must all be observed:

1. Your writing must be clear: Be sure to say exactly what you mean. It is not sufficient to hint or suggest your meaning. You must state your points explicitly so there is no doubt about your meaning.
2. Your writing must be unambiguous: Although this is closely related to clarity, it is so important that it deserves separate mention. Your writing should not be open to multiple interpretations.
3. Statements that are too general can cover too much ground. Poor grammar or poor word choice can confuse meaning. You must communicate your ideas so there is no doubt about your meaning.
4. Your answers must be complete: Partial answers deserve only partial credit. To get full credit, you must answer the entire question, not just a part of it, and certainly not some other question. Multiple-part questions require multiple-part answers. Giving a complete answer to the specific question asked demonstrates your mastery of the material.
5. Your answers must be accurate: Being clear, complete, and unambiguous does not count for much unless you are also accurate. Silly mistakes or oversights can rob essays of their accuracy. Unless you re-read your essay for accuracy, you run the risk of letting little mistakes rob your writing of its intended meaning. Take the time to review your work for accuracy.

## **Format for Developing New University-Wide (UNIV) Course Proposals**

Instructions: Course proposals must follow the proposal format presented below. A draft syllabus or list of topics, representative readings, and learning exercises should be submitted with the proposal. The deadline for submission of fall semester UNIV courses will be January 15 of the preceding academic year; the deadline for submission of spring semester UNIV courses will be August 15, prior to the fall semester of that academic year.

UNIV course submissions should be directed to:

University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
c/o Liz Abate, Assistant for Undergraduate Education  
Office of the Provost, AD 708

1. Date:
2. Course Proposal Submitted By: Include both name of person proposing course and sponsoring office or program.
  - Dr. Elizabeth Carter, Executive Director of Student Services, Division of Student Affairs
    - Faculty sponsor for HDEV 105 (offered through spring 2014, and UNIV 180A, being offered for fall '14)
  - Debora Clinton Callaghan, Senior Associate Director, FYE, Emerging Leaders Program and Public Speaking Skills Lab, Office of New Student Programs
    - Course coordinator for HDEV 105
3. Credit Value: 2 credits
4. Course Title (30 characters maximum): College Students in Transition
5. General Education Designation(s) Requested: Please include information on how the course meets the specified requirement(s).
  - "O" Designation:
    - Classes are limited to 20-25 students per section
    - At least 50% of the course includes an oral communication component, with required presentations and critiques providing feedback about presentation skills.
    - Students must give at least 2 presentations
    - These components provide the opportunity for students to incorporate both listening and speaking skills, and more than one required presentation provides the opportunity for students to improve their oral communication in response to critiques.
    - Approximately 50% of the grading for the course is related to the O components.

6. Instructor(s): Please submit a copy of the instructor's vita. A graduate degree or its equivalent in a related field is expected.  
Copies of instructor vitas/resumes are attached in the original UUCS proposal.
7. Frequency: Indicate whether it will be taught regularly (indicating at least once a year), each semester, spring only, fall only, or Summer only.
  - Fall only for first-semester freshmen students
  - Fall and spring for first-semester transfer students
  - Summer for first-semester freshmen/transfer athletes
8. Contact Hours Planned (per week): 2 hours per week
9. Bulletin Description: Provide a complete, precise and concise course description (maximum approximately 60 words). Include prerequisites, if any.

**Course Description (single instructor sections, if a faculty member is not confirmed to teach a section):** UNIV 101 – “College Students in Transition” is a 2-credit seminar course for first-semester new students to assist in their transition to the University. Students will explore campus resources, identify academic planning tools and potential majors, and develop skills in oral presentation, critical thinking, and time management. *NOTE: Students may not register for multiple sections of UNIV 101. Additionally, students will not receive credit for taking both UNIV 101 and HARP 101 (credit is given for only one of these courses).*

**Course Description (team-taught sections):** UNIV 101 – “College Students in Transition” is a 2-credit seminar course for first-semester new students to assist in their transition to the University. This course is team-taught, with one credit devoted to an academic topic identified by the faculty instructor and the other focused on student transition, taught by a Student Affairs professional. Students will learn about the academic topic, explore campus resources, identify academic planning tools, and develop skills in oral presentation, critical thinking and time management. *NOTE: Students may not register for multiple sections of UNIV 101. In addition, students will not receive credit for taking both UNIV 101 and HARP 101.*

10. Grading Limitation: Note if restricted to Pass/Fail option.  
Normal grading option – letter grade
11. Type of Space: Are any special facilities required?  
Due to multiple student presentations, multi-media (laptop ready) rooms are required. Students are encouraged to use technology in their presentations and instructors regularly incorporate different technology components into their classroom instruction.

12. Anticipated Enrollment: Indicate the anticipated enrollment for this course and the levels of students who will enroll. Describe how these determinations were made. Indicate if it has been taught previously under another rubric and the enrollment results.

- First-semester freshmen students: 20-25 students enrolled in 20-25 sections per fall
- First-semester transfer students: 20-25 students enrolled in 2 fall semester and 2 spring semester courses
- First-semester freshmen and transfer student athletes: 20-25 students enrolled in one summer session

13. Rationale: Why is this course being proposed? What needs will it meet? Will this course replace another course or will other courses be offered less frequently?

First Year Experience (FYE) courses are offered at hundreds of colleges and universities. National research has been conducted which highlights the benefits of such courses, including positive impact on student retention, success and satisfaction with their college experience. (Association of American Colleges and Universities). For this fall, Binghamton University's former HDEV 105 FYE course will shift to the UNIV 180 rubric, providing the opportunity to continue to offer approximately 400 "O" oral communication seats. The UNIV 180A designation is for this academic year only, which means that we will be without a sponsor after the spring 2015 semester. Offering the course as a designated UNIV (UNIV 101) would be a way to continue to provide an "O" course option without additional cost to the University.

This course offering is in line with the recommendation of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education in the Digital Age (April 2011), included under the listing of "very important initiatives" within the "Connecting Students" theme. Specifically the Task Force recommended that the University "provide a new-student course for all incoming freshmen and transfers during their first semester" and that "this small class would introduce students to University resources and college research and study habits . . . offering a common experience to all new students building identity and community and ensuring that they have a common skill set." Building on HDEV 105, the Task Force stated that expanding this type of course "offers a way to ensure that every student is brought into the Binghamton University culture in a meaningful way." *Binghamton University Task Force in Undergraduate Education in the Digital Age* (April 2011) pages 19-20.

UNIV 101 also ties to two the goals of the Road Map, through both the "Advancing Learning" team, specifically, the "core competencies" recommendation and the Philanthropy team, through "developing a culture of philanthropy among students" through the "providing students more enhanced service and giving opportunities through course work" recommendation. *Road Map to Premier 2013: A strategic plan for our future*, (April 2013) pages 11, 13.

- Regarding the "core competencies" recommendation, the seminar format and experiential-based pedagogy inherent in this course provides an opportunity for students to not only learn about campus resources and make connections with faculty and staff,

but also regularly reflect upon their competencies and their future goals. Providing tools for students to engage with the campus community and build a pathway for academic, co-curricular and future success is an underlying theme UNIV 101 and fits as a component of the Road Map plans for “providing a transformative learning community that prepares students for advanced education, careers and purposeful living”.

- Regarding the “providing students more enhanced service and giving opportunities through course work” recommendation, specific mention was made of “building student philanthropy into specialty courses such as First Year Experience, where learning about civic participation may be a focus.” Exposure during a UNIV 101 experience could enhance students’ views on ways to impact on the community throughout their college years, including a possibility for a cohort-based community engagement experience during their second semester.

Assessment results were collected for the HDEV 105 classes each year, with overall results remaining positive, and students frequently including comments about why they believe the course is valuable. Through meetings with the UUCC during the fall of 2013 and winter of 2014, support for an FYE course was maintained, and the original proposal to move to UNIV from HDEV was accepted through the temporary UNIV 180 designation. The UUCC asked that the course incorporate a team-teaching structure, with faculty and Student Affairs professionals teaching the sections. The recommended structure has been incorporated into this proposal, and is listed in the course description (above). Faculty will be recruited through the Provost’s Office and partner instructors will be matched through the Division of Student Affairs.

Since the course in its format as UNIV 180A will no longer exist after the next academic year, offering the course as a new UNIV 101 rubric would provide a way to continue to have a positive impact on the incoming students’ experiences. UNIV 101 is connected to present and future focus areas of the University, and offers a small-class seminar format that can continue to contribute to the success of the University’s newest students.

14. Human Subjects Research: Does the proposed course involve human subjects’ research? (Types of activities involving human subjects include: interviews, questionnaires, observations, etc.) If so, the instructor must be advised to obtain permission from the University’s Human Subjects Research Review Committee prior to commencing research.

There is no human subjects’ research involved in the course.



## **Faculty Senate Academic Computing & Educational Technology (ACET) Committee Annual Report 2013-2014**

In 2013-14 the ACET committee met monthly. A summary of the committee's deliberations and recommendations follows.

### **ACET charge**

At its initial meeting, the committee reviewed the ACET charge and noted that it contains several outdated terms and could use revision. Committee members who have participated on the committee for extended periods noted that the committee's focus has tended to concentrate more on Academic Computing than on Educational Technology, and that the ACET committee's role has not always been clear. The committee agreed to actively engage various issues across the full range of its purview in order to provide ITS with advice on key issues.

### **Blackboard**

A major upgrade for Blackboard Learn was completed at the end of the Fall 2013 semester. Special messaging efforts were initiated to help inform all campus users about the planned upgrade, which was the first significant upgrade in an extended period. There were some initial issues that were discovered and addressed in the first days of the 2014 Winter session. By the time the Spring semester began, most instructors had a chance to familiarize themselves with the various new features. Another upgrade is planned for August 2014. Implementing this upgrade will bring our Blackboard Learn software to current status.

Blackboard usage continues to grow both in the number of user logins and in the system load as instructors develop multimedia files to share with their classes. A study of Blackboard best practices will be undertaken in 2014-15 to review current Blackboard practice and future directions.

### **High-Performance Academic Computing**

At several of its meetings the ACET committee discussed the adequacy of campus support for faculty high-performance computing needs. Several committee members have used the XSEDE high-performance computing facilities, but the committee agreed that campus awareness of this resource is limited. M. Reale, the campus coordinator for XSEDE was invited to present to the committee and numerous suggestions were given to help raise campus awareness. ITS will need to find a new campus coordinator for XSEDE in Fall 2014 but the committee would like to see significant outreach efforts to faculty about the computing services offered and the application process that will lead to access. ITS plans to develop a broader awareness of the XSEDE computing capacity.

### **Policies for adoption of software on campus**

The committee discussed various issues related to campus software needs, including how to identify broadly needed software and the funding sources to acquire and support the software. ITS provided an initial list of software currently used in departments and as enterprise software. The committee recognized the need to compile a more comprehensive list and ITS is working to do this so that the committee can provide further feedback about ways to use resources more effectively. At the time of writing this report, the list was not yet available so the committee will pick this item again in the 2014-15 academic year.

The committee also discussed procedures for requesting adoption of a particular software product; no formal procedure is currently in place to provide specific guidelines for centrally implemented as opposed to departmental or individual implementation. No conclusion was reached and the discussion will carry forward into 2014-15.

### **ITS reorganization**

A task force was convened by President Harvey Stenger in June 2013 to evaluate the University's information technology needs and the way in which Information Technology Services could best meet those needs. The committee's report was submitted in mid-September 2013.

Although the ACET committee was not directly involved in the task force's work or in reviewing its findings and recommendations, the task force's report and subsequent changes within ITS are closely linked to the committee's mission so this report will provide a brief summary of the report and its implications; further information can be found in the full report (<http://www.binghamton.edu/president/pdfs/its-report-complete-10-30-13.pdf>).

To quote from the report's summary: "Change management, innovation and customer service all rose to the top as the key themes for the task force. It was obvious there was a broad, unmet need on campus for an innovative and quick-turnaround IT response. The task force decided that dedicating a group of staff to serve as an Innovation Team would be necessary in any IT organization that wants to be responsive and innovative. The task force agreed that such a group would need to be free from daily maintenance and service work, allowing it to focus instead on fast-turnaround, innovative work that would both respond to stakeholder requests and also recommend new and leading-edge solutions to campus. The team would consist of a few professional staff and a number of students supervised by faculty. The Innovation Team also includes customer response and interface professionals. The task force identified 20 percent of the ITS budget to be dedicated to the formation of the Innovation Team. The remaining 80 percent of the current ITS group would focus on the mission-critical, day-to-day and operational needs of the campus." (p. 3)

In addition to this special emphasis on innovation, the task force also recommended that the Educational Communications office should be moved into Academic Affairs; this was subsequently done, with Educational Communications now incorporated into the Center for Learning and Teaching.

JoAnn Navarro was appointed by Pres. Stenger as interim Chief Information Officer; in this role she joined the ACET committee and subsequently explained changes within ITS and described new directions planned for ITS. In keeping with the task force's recommendations, a change in organizational structure within ITS will provide resources for faster and more innovative responses to campus needs. Requests for ITS support (either to work with existing software or to design new software) will now begin with a request to a Technical Advisory Board (TAB) in a process that is designed to have a much faster response time than the AISRC model which it replaces. The innovation teams will draw on Computer Science student and faculty expertise as feasible to assist in software development and design.

### **Classroom renovations and upgrades**

Regular upgrades and renovations to classrooms continue. From Summer 2013 through Spring 2014, work was completed in 17 classrooms at a total cost of \$580,000. In most cases this included both new classroom seating and audiovisual upgrades. Considerable additional work is planned for 2014-15.

In addition, in conjunction with the enhanced Center for Learning and Teaching a new "learning studio" is planned. The learning studio will be located within the CLT and will provide

an opportunity to test both new learning technologies and new pedagogical approaches. The furniture/seating and the technology are being developed in collaboration with one of the major manufacturers of classroom furniture; the new space will allow Binghamton to participate in research into new teaching approaches and learning environments. Several classes will be taught in the newly renovated space, and opportunities will be provided to other instructors who wish to experiment in the learning studio.

**Online Learning**

The first round of approved Road Map proposals included a proposal about online learning; the approved proposal included numerous ideas for change but received no direct budget allocation; instead, budget allocations elsewhere (in particular, those made through the Road Map process and the Provost to the CLT) are intended to assist in carrying out recommendations associated with this Road Map proposal. In late Fall the Provost convened an Online Task Force to assess the current state of online learning at Binghamton University, to assess current trends and potential future developments, to identify local issues that need to be addressed, and to provide concrete recommendations for the improvement of Binghamton's online learning initiatives.

Several ACET committee members served on the task force and the committee had an opportunity to participate in reviewing a number of the task force's draft recommendations, particularly those related to infrastructure. The committee had considerable feedback related to technical support for students and instructors, as well as infrastructure requirements.

Subsequently, the task force's report was completed and submitted to the Provost, who will assign implementation responsibility for many of the recommendations in the 2014-15 academic year. (Report attached)

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Loewen, 2013-14 Committee Chair

Committee members (includes partial-year members)

Anna Addonizio	James Pitarresi
James Burns	Norman Quinn
Ken Chiu	Frank Saraceno
Jim Conroy	Andrew Tucci
Edward Corrado	James Van Voorst
Brandon Evans (student)	Bruce White
Karen Kozlowski	Stephen Zahorian
Tongshu Ma	
Cheryl Monachino	
JoAnn Navarro	

# Report of the Online Learning Task Force - Spring 2014

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
National Trends and Context .....	2
Local Context.....	3
Recommendations	
Pedagogy .....	4
Policies.....	4
Infrastructure .....	6
Future Directions.....	8
Appendices	
Appendix A: Members of the Online Task Force.....	9
Appendix B: Subcommittee Reports .....	10

## Introduction

The Online Task Force was created in support of the "Online Learning" project in University's strategic plan, *Roadmap to Premier 2013*. Online learning was identified in that plan as an important vehicle to help the University strengthen undergraduate and graduate education; the Center for Learning and Teaching (CLT) has been expanded; given additional resources to support faculty innovation in teaching, including online teaching; and tasked with developing a strategy for online education. The Online Task Force was formed to review the state of online education at Binghamton and assist the CLT in developing a strategic plan for distance learning.

The Task Force's charge was to:

- Review current distance education programs, policies and practices at Binghamton University, as well as the infrastructure used to support them (hardware/software/network/technical and academic student support).
- Evaluate established and developing distance learning trends in higher education (e.g., MOOCs).
- Identify best practices for online/distance learning.
- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of distance education at Binghamton University.

For the purposes of this report, the Task Force defined online learning and hybrid courses as follows:

- Online learning is a model of course design in which the learning and teaching is created and delivered solely through the Internet, traditionally through a vendor-created or "homegrown" learning management system (e.g. Blackboard, Instructure Canvas, Desire to Learn, Google Class).
- "Hybrid" learning, which is synonymous with "blended" learning, is a model of course design that promotes the beneficial attributes of both in-class and online pedagogical concepts and techniques. One approach to this model would be a 50/50 structure in which a traditional Tuesday/Thursday class would have 50 percent of its learning and teaching online and the other 50 percent in-class. In creating the learning for this example, 50 percent of the course design would take advantage of in-class pedagogies while the other 50 percent of the course design would focus on online pedagogies. One hundred percent of "hybrid" course design should focus on the relationship between the learning that can happen between both the in-class and online design.

Following an organizational meeting in December 2013, the Task Force met throughout the Spring 2014 semester. Task Force discussions were guided by the following principles:

- Our guiding principles are academic rigor and responsibility in all of our teaching; online approaches are no different.
- Administratively, online course development and oversight need to be within the regular governance structures.
- We recognize the value of centralized coordination and collaboration as well as individual curricular innovation. The CLT should become the University's central resource for the development of our online learning initiatives.
- Curriculum and oversight committees need to be knowledgeable about best practices in online course development within the relevant discipline(s).
- The University needs to encourage innovative thinking and rigorous assessment in online course/program development.

- The University's strongly residential identity is not in question, but this should not discourage us from innovation in online learning.
- The University needs to appoint an advisory group for online learning to ensure that our approach continues to be forward-thinking.
- As should be the case with high quality face-to-face instruction, all online courses should articulate and measure desired student learning outcomes.

### **National Trends and Context**

Online education is here to stay, and surveys that capture the sentiments of academic leaders point to its growth. Increasing number of educational institutions now see online learning as a critical component of their strategy. According to the [Babson Survey Research Group's](#) 11th annual report on the state of online learning in US higher education, 66 percent of educational institutions currently consider online learning to be critical to their long-term strategy, compared to less than half in 2002. The current figure dropped from 70 percent in the previous year; this drop is accounted for by institutions that do not have any online offerings. It appears that institutions that don't offer any online courses are assuming an even harder stance against online learning. The same survey reported that the number of additional students taking at least one online course has grown at a faster rate than the increase in enrollments. In 2013, the online enrollment growth rate was 6.1 percent (the lowest in a decade), which represented 411,000 additional students taking online courses. Currently, there are 7.1 million students who have taken at least one online course, representing 33.5 percent of the total student population. The general belief among academic leaders is that the number of students taking online courses will grow, with the majority of higher education students taking at least one online course in five years' time. An online course is defined as one in which at least 80 percent of the course content is delivered online.

Despite the press coverage regarding MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), according to Babson Survey Research Group's latest survey, only five percent of higher education institutions have implemented MOOCs, and that has been on an experimental basis. A MOOC has been defined as a course of study made available without any college credit or fee to a large number of students not registered at the university offering the course. While one-third of institutions have no plans to offer MOOCs, 53 percent are still undecided about MOOCs. However, an increasing proportion of academic leaders (63 percent in 2013 versus 55 percent in 2012) are concerned that certifications provided for completing MOOCs will cause confusion about higher education degrees. Though a limited number of higher education institutions offer MOOCs, the number of courses offered in this way, coupled with the very large number of students who take them, indicates their increasing significance in the educational landscape. According to Class Central, a site that aggregates MOOC offerings, 128 MOOCs are starting in April 2014 alone. Udacity and Coursera, two of the popular MOOC platforms, have decided to stop offering free certificates of completion. This is largely in response to concerns about identity verification of those taking these courses. A nominal fee will be charged to those who seek identity-verified certification. It appears that institutions that have implemented MOOCs are doing so not to develop a new source of revenue but for other purposes. Cornell University, for instance, sees MOOCs as a tool for public relations and enhancing community outreach. At Yale, recording classes for online delivery is seen as a way to immortalize teaching. Additionally, once videos are prepared for MOOCs, they can be assigned as homework to students in traditional courses to improve the classroom experience. Although MOOCs were meant to offer college education to more people for less, they are emerging as a tool mainly for the elite. Penn State surveyed students taking MOOCs offered by the university and found

that instead of reaching those who could not afford or access quality college education, MOOCs were being taken by those who already have some level of higher education (80 percent of students had a 2- or 4-year degree and 44 percent had some graduate education) and are reasonably well off (80 percent of the students came from the wealthiest and most well-educated sector of the countries represented by the students).

According to the New Media Consortium's (NMC) 2014 Horizon Report (<http://www.nmc.org/pdf/2014-nmc-horizon-report-he-EN.pdf>), "Education paradigms are shifting to include more online learning, blended and hybrid learning, and collaborative models. Students already spend much of their free time on the Internet, learning and exchanging new information. Institutions that embrace face-to-face, online, and hybrid learning models have the potential to leverage the online skills learners have already developed independent of academia. Online [and hybrid] learning environments can offer different affordances than physical campuses, including opportunities for increased collaboration while equipping students with stronger digital skills." In addition, the 2013 "Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning" report ([http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/EEG\\_KP2013-lr.pdf](http://kpk12.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/EEG_KP2013-lr.pdf)), an annual review of State-Level Policy and Practice in K-12 schools (equivalent to the NMC's higher-education focused "Horizon Report"), indicated that "as customers, schools [K-12] are aiming for a wide range of virtual, blended, part-time, full-time, and mobile offerings. Multiply this by thousands of districts, private schools, education agencies, and all 50 states, and the source of the proliferation becomes clear." Hybrid/blended learning environments continue to grow, and with the rise of experiments in MOOCs, both in higher education and K-12, there is much speculation about how the MOOC can be used in these learning environments. A 2013 article in the Educause Review Online ("Rethinking Online Community in MOOCs Used for Blended Learning," <http://www.educause.edu/ero/article/rethinking-online-community-moocs-used-blended-learning>) suggests that "if MOOCs for blended learning are to fully realize the potential of online communities, we must investigate alternative forms of community that are more loosely coupled to content sequence and more distributed in terms of power." Hybrid/blended learning environments are also trending through recent "flipped classroom" course design initiatives and will continue to grow roots into the foundation of education.

### Local Context

A survey was developed and sent out by the Data Analysis subcommittee to gather information about current practices and concerns across the University. The subcommittee's report, with detailed survey results, can be found in Appendix B. Survey results were returned from the College of Community and Public Affairs, the Decker School of Nursing, the Graduate School, the School of Management, the Watson School, Educational Communications, and the Libraries, as well as 17 departments in Harpur College. Of the units responding, 75 percent offer some online courses, 63 percent offer hybrid courses, and only four percent have a fully online degree plan or plan to pursue one.

Based on faculty responses to a survey, the subcommittee identified the following common issues and concerns:

- **The impact of online teaching on many aspects of the campus.**
  - Campus IT systems must be capable of supporting online instruction in terms of appropriate bandwidth and connectivity.
  - Campus Libraries will need to provide adequate access to materials remotely
  - Off-site students may have different needs than on-site students.
  - What are the costs of e-books versus traditional materials?
  - What is the impact on physical infrastructure?

- What is the impact on laboratories, research spaces, and office spaces?
- Financial implication and cost benefit analysis of implementation versus risk of not investing needs to be considered
- **Concerns regarding course content quality and adequate instructor preparation.**
  - Online courses are largely offered in Winter and Summer Sessions and are primarily taught by graduate students, who are often new instructors
  - Regardless of who teaches courses, training and support is needed to maintain the high quality of programs.
  - Assistance with instructional design is required.
- **Financial trade-offs.**
  - Face- to-face courses during Summer and Winter often have low enrollment and attendance.
  - Is financial aid available for Winter and Summer Sessions?
- **Ensuring security, authentication, academic honesty, and intellectual property.**
  - Some courses may require “in class” testing or test proxies at remote locations.
  - Student may be inappropriately distributing teaching materials.
- **Disparate use of tools.**
  - Over 15 tools were mentioned in survey responses, including Blackboard, echo 360, Facetime, IChat, Skype, BB shockwave, Turn-it-in.com, Audacity, Camtasia, Proctor.
  - We need to establishing a technology roadmap that provides a common tool set to enable economies of scale in licenses, training, etc., while providing the tools that instructors want and staying flexible and responsive as technology is rapidly changing.

### **Recommendations – Pedagogy**

Recognizing that not all courses are adaptable for online teaching, instructors who are considering teaching an online course, whether a new course or an adaptation of an existing course, should consult with the CLT’s instructional designers in the early stages of planning the course. Some of the questions that instructors should work through with instructional designers are found in the Pedagogy Subcommittee report in Appendix B. As technology and research continue to develop the field of online teaching, these questions will, by necessity, change.

### **Recommendations – Policies**

- **School/college policies:** We recognize that, in a number of the following areas, the level of policy development may vary widely across academic units. Some of the following recommendations are the University level; some are at the level of school/colleges or individual units. Each school/college should review its policies in light of the following recommendations and develop policies if they are not already in place. To facilitate conversations between academic units, as well as compliance with accrediting bodies, a central record of policy development across the University should be developed. The CLT, on behalf of the Provost Office, will develop the central repository for all policies related to online education.
  - As academic units develop relevant policies, they should forward final versions to the CLT for inclusion in this repository.
- **Course development, approval and designation:** In keeping with its identity as a residential university, the vast majority of courses currently taught at Binghamton University in the Fall and Spring semesters are taught in a traditional face-to-face format; in the Winter and Summer, a



greater proportion of courses are taught online. This means that we need to develop an awareness of best practices and standards for online course development, and we need to think strategically about situations when the use of fully online courses may be advisable during the Fall and Spring semesters.

- We recommend that the CLT provide all colleges' regular curriculum review structures with guidance for reviewing online courses. This will include information about best practices and about sources for additional information concerning legal and policy requirements.
- We recommend that all fully online courses or course sections be designated with the "DI" indicator in Banner and that an indicator be developed for hybrid courses.
- We recommend that every academic unit develop school/college-level curriculum approval procedures for allowing fully online courses to be taught during the regular semester.
- **Instructor training and compensation:** Given the complexity of designing effective online courses, and to make sure they are comparable in depth and breadth to traditional face-to-face courses, it is appropriate to provide training in this kind of instruction. Because the time and effort required to adopt curricula for online delivery is substantial, it needs to be tangibly supported by the University.
  - We recommend that the CLT develop and implement the University-wide training program for all instructors of online courses or sections, with an appropriate incentive for participation. These incentives should not be merely symbolic, but substantive.
  - We recommend that the training opportunities extend to experienced instructors to facilitate continuing awareness of new technology and pedagogy. These will be based on best practices in the various disciplines.
  - We recommend that the University review best practices for instructor compensation and adjust current faculty stipends as appropriate.
- **Branding, course guidance and online success:** Current research indicates that online success is strengthened when students are able to navigate a course with ease.
  - We recommend that a Binghamton course shell/template be implemented for all online courses. This template will be developed by CLT to incorporate best practices in online learning and will become the "base template" for all Binghamton online courses. In addition to featuring standard setup and design for the course site, it should include a link to a general overview/orientation (prepared and updated by CLT instructional designers) on the supported technologies, software and hardware requirements, etc. Individual course syllabi should reference this orientation.
  - All faculty using supplemental/alternative software/technologies will provide their students with a necessary orientation to these technologies.
  - A student resource should be developed for online courses, including a "Student's Bill of Rights," giving students a clear idea not only of the things that are expected of them (e.g., standards for "cyber-department"), but of the institution's commitments in setting up this course, including contact information for instructors and departments, standards for faculty availability, etc. The handbook will include information about what it will take to succeed, available resources, information about technology, etc., and how this relates to the Student Code of Conduct.
- **Academic honesty:** Online courses, whether fully online or hybrid courses, are subject to the same identity verification and academic honesty policies that pertain to traditional face-to-face courses, but the special issues that apply to online courses are not always addressed by policies that have been established for the traditional academic setting. In order to comply with

accreditation requirements and in order to provide clear direction for faculty and students, these policies should be examined and amended as necessary.

- We recommend that the CLT facilitate the establishment of University-wide policies to ensure that Binghamton's identity verification and test-proctoring for online courses conform to the requirements established by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the accrediting agency for Binghamton University.
- We recommend that all schools explicitly integrate on-line courses into their established academic honesty procedures. Issues to consider include remote access to hearings and procedures and the time frame for actions if courses are being delivered in the Winter or Summer Sessions.
- **Accessibility:** Online courses are subject to the reasonable accommodation guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.
  - We recommend that the CLT identify and share ADA-compliant course-building principles and that these be expected for creation of online courses.
  - We recommend that a central contact/support be identified to help with course-specific needs as they are identified.
- **Intellectual property:** SUNY's statement about intellectual property rights for faculty members could reasonably be construed as applying to Binghamton University, but few instructors know what this policy is or where to find it. Explicitly adopting the SUNY policy and educating instructors about its implications will provide Binghamton's faculty with important information about their rights and responsibilities.
  - We recommend that Binghamton University officially adopt the current SUNY policy on intellectual property (if it has not already done so). The following is an excerpt from the policy: "With respect to faculty materials used on the web for instruction, under the current SUNY policy, copyright ownership is treated no differently than faculty materials produced for the classroom. That is, faculty own the copyright under the academic work-for-hire exception embedded in SUNY's copyright policy. Alternatively, SUNY and faculty may enter into work-for-hire written agreements relating to materials produced for on-line use in which the parties may agree to vest copyright in either SUNY or the faculty and to provide for related licenses." This is excerpted from a series of SUNY Trustee documents and legal interpretations available on the SUNY web site: <http://system.suny.edu/academic-affairs/faculty/faculty-ownership/>
- **Innovation and development:** Even though Binghamton University is committed to its residential identity, the University should continuously encourage and incentivize innovation and experimentation with online and hybrid learning models. Not only will this help the University to encourage an atmosphere of continuous improvement for existing online courses, but it will also help to encourage ongoing innovation in traditionally-taught and hybrid courses.
  - We recommend that the University develop an appropriate means to facilitate faculty exploration of new approaches in online instruction. It will work closely with faculty who teach online courses, helping them to explore new ideas, assess their impact, and develop ways to extend the impact of the ideas that are most successful.

### **Recommendations - Infrastructure**

We recommend that the initial implementation phase for online learning at Binghamton University be one of improvement of operations, offerings, and efficiencies. It is important that a clear definition of what constitutes "online learning infrastructure" be developed and used consistently throughout the

University. This will allow for clear and common reporting of financial impacts, growth opportunities and ongoing needs. This document defines “online learning infrastructure” as personnel, physical and logistical resources (as well as administrative polices) that support online teaching and learning.

In order to identify the specific infrastructure impacts, an operational framework for online learning should be clearly identified. In order to take full advantage of the efficiencies and opportunities of online learning, a quickly scalable infrastructure is required. This infrastructure should be capable of serving the full continuum of online learning offerings, from flipped classes to fully online degree programs. A nimble infrastructure will help to ensure that new programs do not lack critical infrastructure components and that we are not inefficiently spending capital on unused resources.

The scope and definition of online infrastructure were divided into three categories: learning management, content creation, and support services. These categories, plotted against the roles of the users of this infrastructure, provide the full ecosystem of online learning (Figure 1, Infrastructure Subcommittee report). The Task Force recommends that online infrastructure needs should be considered based on the role of the user rather than on a specific product. This will allow the University to plug in technology to fill the needed roles, or see where there is system overlap, rather than trying to stay current with one particular product (Figure 2, Infrastructure Subcommittee report).

With this in mind, specific recommendations for online infrastructure follow:

- We recommend Binghamton University be mindful that in an online learning model, the student, the instructor, and the support personnel may be performing their roles remotely and in locations where the technology infrastructure may be limited. Remote and guest lecturing to on-campus students can greatly improve with a fully realized online learning infrastructure. The University should explore additional support opportunities, such as third-party help desk services or external library services.
- We recommend that ITS services closely monitor data transmission speeds and increase capacity as required to assure a reliable connection for streaming media originating from off-campus. Internal campus communication runs on a quasi-gigabit network with 100 to 1,000 MBPS transmission speeds. This is extremely well-suited for on-campus delivery of materials. The commodity internet connection, with respect to the dorms, runs well below this threshold at certain times of the day. The average data connection speed is around 5.5 MBPS, dropping to around 2 MBPS in the late evening hours. With compression technology lowering the successful delivery speed of HD content to around 4 MBPS (and an average of closer to 10 MBPS), increasing this commodity internet connection for students in dorms will provide a more reliable connection to off-campus streaming media.
- We recommend that the University assess the need for and availability of help desk support for online teaching and learning outside of current operating hours, especially during the periods when the most online courses are offered. Currently, the help desk hours are 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. Monday through Thursday and 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Friday. Help desk support functions can be augmented by developing and maintaining a comprehensive website with support information and up-to-date system documentation.
- We recommend the addition of an “Online Specialist” help desk role to provide advanced-level assistance to faculty, staff and students. This is a key component in helping to ensure online students have access to the same level of support options that traditional students enjoy. This role also provides necessary support to faculty to ease the transition to and adoption of online learning technologies.

- We recommend the Libraries continue integrating digital content to help ensure online students have the best possible access to materials for research and study. Policies, practices, partnerships and consortia with other libraries will prove fruitful for getting physical resources to a geographically distributed student body.
- We recommend that University Tutoring Services leverage collaborative technologies, allowing local tutors to connect with students regardless of their location. This eliminates numerous local (physical) barriers to tutoring opportunities as well as expanding the future reach of the tutoring service.

### **Future Directions**

Given the rapid pace of change in the development of new technologies and in the development of new pedagogical approaches to improve teaching and student learning, it is essential that the University strive to remain current in these areas. Doing so will require ongoing effort and the establishment of appropriate practices and policies.

- We recommend that an additional survey be created with the guidance of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) and distributed widely across the University, with the goal of establishing campus baselines with regard to technology and software and providing a gauge for benchmarking adoption of online learning both internally and externally to peer institutions. The survey should be administered periodically to monitor and gauge Binghamton University's online learning environment.
- With the uncertainty surrounding Open SUNY, we recommend that the University should continue to monitor the future direction of this statewide initiative.
- We recommend the establishment of a high-level campus advisory body to provide broad input on the range of issues affecting online teaching initiatives and emerging technologies.
- We recommend that academic units adopt policies to address the policy gaps identified in this report, and that they continue to assess existing policies to determine whether these adequately address curricula delivered online.

## Appendix A – Task Force Members

### Co-Chairs

Don Loewen, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education/ Harpur College - German and Russian  
Mark Reisinger, Harpur College - Geography

### Members

Ben Andrus, University Libraries  
Scott Craver, Watson School  
Alison Dura, Decker School of Nursing  
Suronda Gonzales, Languages Across the Curriculum/ Global Studies  
Surinder Kahai, School of Management  
Celia Klin, Associate Dean of Harpur College/Harpur College - Psychology  
Matthew McConn, Graduate School of Education  
Cheryl Monachino, Watson School  
James Pitarresi, Assistant Provost and Executive Director of the CLT/Watson School (ex-officio)  
Tom Sinclair, Community of College and Public Affairs  
Drew Tucci, Educational Communications

### Staff Support

Liz Abate, Provost's Office  
Murnal Abate, CLT  
Shannon Hilliker, CLT  
Eric Machan Howd, CLT  
Paula Russell, CLT

**COMMITTEE FOR THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT**  
**ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014**

The Committee held four meetings this year. Our major business this year included:

1. **Deer Overpopulation on University Property** CUE's last several annual reports have addressed the problem of an overpopulation of deer in the Nature Preserve and Natural Areas. The Committee had recommended a cull of the deer, but this action was stayed at the last minute in December 2012 by a lawsuit. President Stenger, new in January 2013, had asked for and funded an infrared survey of deer populations, which was completed in March 2013. On this basis, the Committee asked for the cull to be carried out in December 2014. This request was denied by the Administration on the basis of lack of certainty of its effectiveness and the perception that it would generate major negative publicity.
2. **Mowing Plan** A plan to reduce mowing on Campus and allow more wild areas, for reasons of biodiversity, aesthetics and education, was advanced. A map of suggested reductions was prepared and submitted to the Grounds Department in 2013. A reply was received in 2014 that included none of the recommended areas, and suggested a few areas that were already not mowed or behind housing complexes in peripheral parts of Campus. The plan was abandoned.
3. **Pesticide Use on Campus** Physical Facilities has presented a plan for pesticide use annually for many years. The plan has consistently proposed use of herbicides in most areas of Campus except around housing units. The Committee this year decided to ask the Administration if the University could move to a "no-pesticides policy" on Campus. The Committee was informed that the appearance of the Campus is an important issue for Admissions and Enrollment, but received no clear response to the request for abolition of pesticides, despite arguments from the Committee that abolition could create a positive image for the Campus.
4. **Tree Care** The Committee has long noted the problem of damage to the base of trees by mowers, as a little damage each year will eventually kill trees and has in fact done so. The Committee recommended to the Grounds staff that the mowing staff be held accountable for damage they inflict, and suggested that more careful mowing by an increased staff might balance the cost of replacing damaged trees. The Committee did vet and approve a plan from the Grounds supervisor to remove about 30 problem trees (dead or threatening), but asked that the CUE's Landscaping Policy for replacing lost trees be followed.
5. **Campus Appearance** The Committee appreciated the improved appearance of the Campus grounds over the last many years and sent a letter of commendation to Associate Vice-President Lawrence Roma.
6. **Gift of Senior Class of 2011 for a Pavilion for the Nature Preserve** Plans had been advanced for the pavilion, but there had been no action on this gift, apparently due to the expense exceeding the gift. At a meeting with Lawrence Roma in late spring, suggestions for a design emanating from Professor Jaussi's class on innovation were reviewed with the Campus Architect. The latter promised to work with this proposal and come up with a final design, perhaps by the end of the summer.
7. **Project Approvals:**
  - a. **Ropes Course in the East Gym Woods** A proposal from Outdoor Pursuits for a ropes course and zip line with trails between stations was approved by the Committee, with the proviso that it be built with minimum disruption of the Woods, and that it be done in the southern portion of the Woods, which is younger and harbors less biodiversity. Its impact will be monitored by members of the Committee.
  - b. **New Buildings at the ITC Site** The Committee reviewed plans for a new building, for which ground was about to be broken. The plan entailed removal of some medium-aged maple and other trees, several to be removed to allow relocation of the ITC access road. The trees will be replaced by new trees to be located around the new and older buildings. Plans were promised for a pedestrian/bicycle path through the area that will connect the main Campus to University Plaza.

Respectfully submitted,



Julian Shepherd, Chair

Active members included Anne Clark, Lee Cummings, Joseph Graney, Kim Jaussi, Ralph Miller, Carolyn Pierce, Julian Shepherd (Chair), (faculty members), James VanVoorst (VP Administration and Vice Chair), James Brice (Residential Life), Jennie Bruns (Professional Staff), Dylan Horvath (Natural Areas Steward), Sally Oaks (Physical Facilities), Ben Eisenkop (graduate student), Katherine Leenig and John Maine (undergraduate students).

Invited guests were: Don Williams (Grounds Manager), Dorothy Farrell, Gavin McClelland, and Louis Semanchik (undergraduate students).

**Faculty Senate Committee on Committees**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

Most committee assignments for the 2013/14 academic year were complete when the fall semester began. The committee chair filled any vacancies that arose during the fall and early spring from the results of the *Survey of Faculty Interest in Serving on Committees*. This included positions on the Excellence Awards, Council/Foundation awards, ACET, and Professional Standards committees and several Assessment Category Teams. The ACTs continued to be difficult to fill; this problem was addressed in the motion presented to the Faculty Senate 5/06/14 entitled **Policy for Assessment of General Education at Binghamton University (revised 2014)**.

The committee met in April to fill vacancies for the upcoming year and forwarded names to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Caryl Ward, Committee Chair

Committee members

Manas Chatterji  
Beth Burch  
Ruth Van Dyke  
Leslie Lander  
Ariana Gerstein  
Stephanie Hess

**Faculty Senate Evaluation Coordinating Committee**  
**Annual Report 2013-2014**

During the academic year 2013-2014, the Evaluation Coordinating Committee (ECC) conducted the evaluation of two administrators: Joyce Ferrario, Dean of the School of Nursing, and S. G. Grant, Dean of the Graduate School of Education.

Although it required a considerable amount of meeting time, the committee was able to conduct two separate evaluations simultaneously, releasing a survey for both administrators on April 7<sup>th</sup>. A minor complication to this process was the late occurrence of Spring break the following week, which led us to keep the survey open until the 25<sup>th</sup>. Final summary reports for both surveys were sent to the Provost and respective administrators on May 27<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Craver, Committee Chair

Committee members

John Baust

Mark Blumler

Donald Boros

Scott Craver

Jill Dixon

Jennifer Gordon

Michael Lawson

Sara Reiter

Gary Truce