

MINUTES OF THE FULL FACULTY AND  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
March 29, 2011

Prof. Sara Reiter (School of Management and Chair of the Faculty Senate) called the Full Faculty meeting to order at 11:55 a.m. in UU Mandela Room. She welcomed Interim President C. Peter Magrath and turned the meeting over to him.

Interim President Magrath announced that he has agreed to stay on as president through December 31, 2011. The term "interim" will be dropped and his title will be President. He will continue working with all of us to keep the university moving forward in these tough fiscal times. He noted that Chancellor Zimpher will be working with the BU Council to restart the search soon.

Interim President Magrath stated that we are totally stable in current academic fiscal year and that 2011-2012 will be the same, but our future is unclear. We are hopeful that we will be in a solid secure position. We are strong and do valuable things with strong people involved in this university. There is an incredible amount of strength from faculty and staff. There have been negotiations with regard to state universities; \$86 million has been restored to SUNY; \$13 million to community colleges, and \$60 million to hospitals. The budget does not mention rational tuition. He believes there will be further conversations regarding state tuition. The Governor will be meeting with stakeholders regarding UB2020 and the special role of faculty senators. There will be discussion about tuition policy for all four-year schools with particular emphasis on University Centers. There will be establishment of regional economic councils and SUNY (and BU) will be part of this as we have a lot to contribute.

At this time, Interim President Magrath opened the meeting for questions.

Question by Prof. Timothy Perry (Music): As far as the budget issue, what can you tell us about the UB2020 rational tuition? How does this play out as far as unity of the University Centers?

Answer by Interim President Magrath: If UB2020 is suddenly amended to include the University Centers, he stated that he, of course, would be in favor of that. His guess is that if this bill is just focused on Buffalo only, he feels it will not "fly". This does open up discussion of the University Centers as this bill should be for all four University Centers. He believes Chancellor Zimpher's position is that this should be for all four University Centers. This would lead to real tuition flexibility, although he does not think we will get tuition flexibility in the immediate future. He does think there will be a tuition plan that will be predictable for the next five years and hopes it will increase tuition money that we need.

Question by Prof. Sandra Michael (Biology): Twenty years ago you were instrumental in getting an AAU provost to apply for BU's presidency. Do you see yourself as being instrumental in this search?

Answer by Interim President Magrath: He will help with the search by suggesting names from research intensive universities. It is beneficial for names to come forward. We can attract a pool of outstanding individuals.

Question by Prof. Fernando Guzman (Mathematics): When will we see the effect of budget cuts on BU? How long before we know the affect on different components of the university?

Answer by Interim President Magrath: In 2011-2012 we know what the impact is and generally what we have to deal with and we are in a position to deal with it. We do not know yet the impact on 2012-2013.

Question by Prof. Rosmarie Morewedge (German and Russian Studies): Can you comment on the regional economic development councils? How will this align us with other colleges and how will it create partnerships with entrepreneurial and/or academic organizations here, and is it anticipated it will have a seat on governance bodies here on campus?

Answer by Interim President Magrath: We will play a significant and major role in the economic development council for this region. Interim President Magrath has had conversations with Lt. Governor Bob Duffy who is heading the statewide effort and is enormously interested in us being involved. We have a lot to contribute with our academic strength and this will help us to strengthen our position as a major factor for the State of New York, economically and socially.

After no more questions, the full faculty meeting was adjourned.

The second Faculty Senate meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year was called to order by Prof. Reiter at 12:15 p.m.

1. Minutes A motion was made to approve the minutes of the November 2, 2010 meeting as submitted. On voice vote, the motion was approved.
2. Obituary Notices Prof. Reiter read a list of former faculty who had recently passed away: Prof. Peter Hilton (Mathematics), Prof. Donald Quataert (History) and Prof. Michael Middlestadt (Classics). As is established practice, a note of condolence has been sent to each family on behalf of the Senate. A moment of silence was observed.
3. Reports
  - a) Chair Sara Reiter spoke of the Task Force on General Education Issues and its submitted report (attached to agenda). Prof. Reiter wanted to draw everyone's attention to several links in the report to information about transfer students on campus, how they do, what level they come in at, how many transfer students there are, etc. A motion that came out of that report will be discussed later in this meeting.
  - b) Prof. Peter Knuepfer (Geological Sciences and University Faculty Senator) amplified comments from Interim President Peter Magrath on the budget. It is important to understand that for the \$130M cut from support to the teaching hospitals in the SUNY system, the agreement restores \$60M of that, which leaves a cut of \$70M to the hospitals. In a meeting with University Faculty Senate executive committee, we were told that the SUNY system administration was very strongly of the opinion that they cannot allow the hospitals to sustain these cuts. If these cuts were not restored, this amount would be covered through the SUNY budget, which basically means that the cuts will be doled out to the campuses, resulting in a additional cut on top of the Governor's budget. That could add up to \$150M total cut to the campuses. It is unclear what that will imply for us. James VanVoorst, Vice President for Administration, stated that the distribution of the final budget to campus will come in a month or two, but our financial plan for this campus is set with a \$4M reduction over the next year. We are watching what is happening in SUNY but are committed to the financial plan we have established.

- c) The University Faculty Senate held its January plenary meeting here at BU. A thank you to Peg Kelly who handled the logistics for this meeting to make sure the meeting was run well.

One concern was voiced by SUNY System Provost David Lavallee on what he calls "credit creep". He is suggesting that students at SUNY campuses are graduating with far more than the required number of credits. The concern is that on a number of campuses, there are increasing demands on students for courses they need to complete their requirements for graduation, leading to increased number of credits. System Administration is looking at convincing campuses to not add additional requirements.

Program discontinuance at some campuses has moved forward; Albany has retained minors in French, Italian and Theatre, but dropped majors in those areas. It is interesting that when the SUNY Board of Trustees was here last week, a presentation to them talked about program discontinuance at Albany, Geneseo, and at other campuses. What this will imply in the long term, we do not know, but Prof. Knuepfer does not think this will affect this campus.

There is continuing implementation of system feasibility of transfers. There is now a website for students who are at community colleges where they can check what courses will transfer to other SUNY campuses towards their major. For most cases, as many as six courses would be guaranteed transferred whether accepting campuses like it or not. Prof. Knuepfer expects that this will have some impact on a number of our programs and our majors as we are basically being told by the System to accept certain courses toward the major requirement.

Question by Prof. Thomas O'Connor (Romance Languages): Is there any concern being expressed in the University Faculty Senate for procedures for presidential searches, specifically any changes that may occur once a search does not reach fruition?

Answer by Prof. Peter Knuepfer (Geological Sciences and University Faculty Senator): There has been long term concern in University Faculty Senate about the way searches are being conducted in the SUNY System. Recent searches have ranged from an open search in Binghamton to a closed search in Buffalo, to a search in New Paltz with candidates' names being announced only when they came to campus. The SUNY Board of Trustees has a set of guidelines that calls for a closed search until finalists come to campus, but John O'Connor reminds the University Faculty Senate that these are guidelines and applied as guidelines, so they basically can be ignored. Chancellor Zimpher has pressed BU Council to be far more closed in the continuing search here at BU.

#### 4. New Business

- a) Resolution regarding proposed revision to the General Education appeals policy.

*Current text of the appeals policy*

*Binghamton University students must successfully complete all General Education requirements as a condition of graduation. Generally speaking, General Education requirements are not waived for any students. However, we are aware that some students with special circumstances feel their situation warrants a waiver of one of the General Education requirements. Appeals of General Education requirements*

*are considered by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC), the committee which oversees Binghamton's General Education program. The UUCC's decision regarding an appeal is final.*

Proposed revision

*Strike the sentence "The UUCC's decision regarding an appeal is final." and add the following text:*

*Appeals of petitions denied by the UUCC are made to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. If the decision of the UUCC is appealed to the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, the UUCC will provide the Vice Provost with all documents related to the student's petition, including the original petition and the committee's decision. The decision of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education is final.*

How the information would be made available to students

*The text of the appeals policy as listed on the website would stay the same, except the last sentence would be deleted. The text as listed in "Proposed revision" would be provided to students only after they had inquired whether there was a second level of appeal; it would not be publicized.*

This motion comes unanimously recommended by FSEC. To paraphrase the motion, this allows appeals of petitions denied by the UUCC to be made to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. If the decision of the UUCC is appealed to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the UUCC will provide the Vice Provost all documents related to the decision, and the decision by the Vice Provost is final. There has previously not been an appeals policy. Prof. Les Lander, chair of UUCC, is here to answer questions.

Professor Weixing Zhu (Biology) voiced his concerns that if the UUCC is too busy, and the UUCC decides to send the case to Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, that is fine. The proposal revision actually states is that if the committee makes a decision, then it still can be appealed, then the Vice Provost can overrule and have the final say. Prof. Zhu does not see any logical connection between the proposed revision and the rationale being proposed. Prof. Les Landers (Computer Science and chair of UUCC) responded that the UUCC carefully reviews every appeal, and often faculty committees have recommendations that go forward to university administrators. If a student needs to appeal, it makes sense that it go with the UUCC's recommendation to the designated administrator. UUCC does not meet with students that have appeals, which has been a long standing policy of UUCC. Prof. Zhu states that this may be a misunderstanding on his part. He does not understand why the Vice Provost decision is final. Prof. Lander stated that this has been an unwritten practice of the UUCC for many years (that appeals could go to Vice Provost) but it was not a written in the procedure.

After no other discussion, a vote was taken to endorse the resolution and it carried, 35 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

b) Resolution regarding proposed revision to the Student Academic Honesty Code

**Revised code**

The entire Student Academic Honesty Code can be viewed at this link:

[http://www2.binghamton.edu:8080/exist6/rest/lists2010-11/2\\_academic\\_policies\\_and\\_procedures\\_all\\_students/academicPoliciesAndProcedureAllStudents.xml?\\_xsl=/db/xsl/compose.xsl](http://www2.binghamton.edu:8080/exist6/rest/lists2010-11/2_academic_policies_and_procedures_all_students/academicPoliciesAndProcedureAllStudents.xml?_xsl=/db/xsl/compose.xsl) - top

Revisions to several sections of the code are presented below:

*Interpretation of the Code*

Violations of the code vary in severity, so that the appropriate punishments vary. Some violations (Category I) may be handled by the instructor and student(s) involved. However, violations requiring more severe penalties (Category II) are appropriately dealt with by the Academic Honesty Committee of the relevant school in accordance with procedures laid out in the Rules of Student Conduct. Category I violations are serious but may be dealt with by the instructor. Category II violations may result in letters of reprimand, probation, suspension or expulsion from the University, **transcript notation, and/or revocation of degree or honors**. Behavior explicitly permitted in a course syllabus or explicitly permitted by the instructor for a specific assignment is not a violation of the code.

*Cheating on Examinations*

This may be either a Category I or Category II violation, depending on the level or amount of unauthorized help given or received on the examination and the degree of premeditation. Category I includes looking at another's examination or collaborating on a small portion of the examination. Category II violations involve **significant cheating on an most or all of an entire examination — for example, providing a copy of an examination to another student or allowing another student to take an examination in one's place.** Category II violations and may involve more planning and premeditation.

*New final paragraph:*

**Violations Concerning Honors Projects, Theses and Dissertations**

**In cases of alleged violations of the academic honesty code in honors projects, theses or dissertations, a faculty member who was not part of the original honors, thesis or dissertation committee may be appointed by the head of the academic unit to investigate. The investigation will be conducted in accordance with the policies stated above for Category II violations and under the guidance of the detailed procedures developed by each unit. In addition to possible sanctions mentioned above, there may be other sanctions as deemed appropriate, such as notation on the transcript; requiring students/graduates to revise and resubmit honors projects, theses or dissertations for approval; and/or revocation of the degree or honors.**

Prof. Rosmarie Morewedge (German and Russian Studies) noted that a professor at another campus lost his position when one of his students cheated on his dissertation. She questioned how well dissertations are monitored. Can dissertations be monitored at midpoint and during production as well as at completion? Dean Nancy Stamp (Graduate

School) responded that Graduate Council has not been asked in the past to discuss dissertation review before the dissertation is defended, but will take this as a suggestion.

After no other discussion, a vote was taken to endorse the resolution and it carried, 39 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstentions.

- c) Resolution regarding Global Interdependency (G) requirement. This resolution was proposed by the UUC.

*Previous language:*

*G courses must focus on how one or more of the regions of the world have influenced and interacted with the West and with one another, and how the West has affected and been affected by the distinctive cultures and civilizations of the world, either in the course of world history as a whole or the history, institutions, economy, society, culture, etc., of one or more non-Western civilizations.*

*A major portion of the course content must focus on broad, foundational aspects of the long-term development of distinctive features of Western civilization in Europe and North America.*

*A major portion of the course must focus on the distinctive features of one or more non-Western civilizations, such as those of Asia, Africa, or the indigenous peoples of the Americas.*

*Proposed new language:*

*The primary focus of Global Interdependencies (G) courses is to study how two or more distinctive world regions have influenced and interacted with one another and how such interactions have been informed by their respective cultures or civilizations.*

After no discussion, a vote was taken to endorse the resolution and it carried, 36 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

- d) Resolution regarding Foreign Language requirement for transfer students

*Given that the General Education Transitional Plan (June 24, 2010) affects only new transfer students for the 2010-2011 academic year, the Faculty Senate reaffirms that the General Education Policies in effect in Fall 2009 should be applied for Fall 2011 and beyond. The Faculty Senate reaffirms its policy passed 3/5/2002 and amended 5/3/2005 that transfer students will have to meet the same General Education foreign language requirement as students who enter as freshmen in Fall 2013.*

*The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will appoint an implementation task force with joint faculty and administrative representation to prepare a report for the Faculty Senate by December 2011 detailing the costs and feasibility of this requirement. If the implementation task force concludes that implementation in Fall 2013 will not be possible, the Faculty Senate will reconsider the foreign language requirement for transfer students. It is not tenable to continue the long-standing situation of having a requirement that cannot be implemented. (Unanimous motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee).*

After no discussion, a vote was taken to endorse the resolution and it carried, 30 in favor, 1 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

After no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

Present: Josephine Allen, Laura Anderson, Anne Bailey, Anne Brady, Karen Bromley, Frank Cardullo, Andy Cavagnetto, Jill Dixon, Mark Fowler, Donette Francis, Monika Furch, Leslie Gates, Sharon Holmes, David Klotzkin, Peter Knuepfer, Ricardo Laremont, Richard Lee, Alistair Lees, Michael Lewis, C. Peter Magrath, Sarah Maximiek, Marcin Mazur, Randall McGuire, Jean-Pierre Mileur, Luiza Moreira, Rosmarie Morewedge, Nagendra Nagarur, H. Richard Naslund, Thomas O'Connor, Carolyn Pierce, Solomon Polachek, Curt Pueschel, Daniel Rabinowitz, Sara Reiter, Erin Rushton, Karen Salvage, Paul Schleuse, Thomas Sinclair, Timothy Singler, Gale Spencer, Jim Stark, Jennifer Stoever-Ackerman, Gary Truce, Srinivasa Venugopalan, Karl Wilson, Weixing Zhu

Excused: Bat-Ami Bar On, Scott Henkel, Norah Henry, Kimberly Jaussi, Sonja Kim, Kelly Kinney, Lisa Tessman

Absent: Kimberly Avery, Karen Barzman, Christopher Bishop, Herbert Bix, George Catalano, Lubna Chaudry, , Ross Geoghegan, Peter Gerhardstein, Ariana Gerstein, Christof Grewer, J. David Hacker, Douglas Holmes, Albrecht Inhoff, Jonathan Karp, Clifford Kern, Kenneth Kurtz, R. Kevin Lacey, Michael McDonald, Karin Sauer, Pamela Smart, Leigh Ann Wheeler, Lijun Yin, Nan Zhou