

MINUTES OF FULL FACULTY AND
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 29, 2015

Prof. Fernando Guzman, Mathematics, called the Full Faculty meeting to order at 11:50 am in UU Old Union Hall. He welcomed senior administrators from Shenzhen University in China. This is their first day of a two-week program learning about how Binghamton conducts and manages its student affairs.

Prof. Guzman then welcomed President Harvey G. Stenger and turned the meeting over to him.

President Stenger began his report to the Full Faculty meeting attendees. See attached PowerPoint presentation for details. Presentation can also be found at <http://www.binghamton.edu/faculty-senate/documents-and-forms.html>.

Questions and answers:

Q: Prof. Howard Brown (History) – Prof. Brown thanked President Stenger for providing such a detailed presentation, thereby enriching discussions in the Faculty Senate. He also congratulated the senior administration for the recent increase, more or less across the board, in doctoral student stipends, which was not mentioned in the President's presentation. Finally, he noted that the data showing that 35 % of the hires over the past four years were affiliated with TAEs is incorrect; the TAE process has only been in place for the past two years of hiring, therefore, at least 60% of hiring in those years has been affiliated with the TAEs, which has posed some strain and should be curtailed.

A: Pres. Stenger responded that Prof. Brown was right to correct the data from the presentation, indicating that hiring related to the TAEs over the past two years would have been as much as double the 35%, or close to 70%, of the most recent hiring. TAE steering committees, deans, and the Provost will determine how to balance TAE hiring going forward.

Q: Prof. Guzman, Mathematics – The Health Sciences and Technology Park in Johnson City is dependent on the competition statewide. How will that affect the Pharmacy School?

A: Pres. Stenger noted that the Pharmacy School will be independent of this competition. This is not part of the URI. The Pharmacy School is safe; faculty hiring plan is in place. Property will be taken care of, but it will be better if we can get Upstate Medical and Decker School of Nursing in that building. We can renovate 48 Corliss and move some departments in, create new programs and new labs perhaps. We will continue to look at new opportunities.

Q: Prof. Ricardo Laremont, Political Science/Sociology – The Health Sciences and Technology Park in Johnson City will create synergy with Upstate Medical. Have you thought about housing for medical students coming down from Syracuse? This could be an important economic development for Johnson City.

A: Pres. Stenger said that 80 students are already there and have housing. One developer has announced housing renovation of an old Endicott Johnson factory.

Q: Prof. Serdar Atav, Decker School of Nursing – What is the intention of establishing a Master of Public Health Program?

A: Pres. Stenger said that we are studying that as a possible new graduate program. As we know, new programs take a long time to get through (SED approval, accreditation, etc.). The job market is strong and students would like to see such a program. We first need to do a full study and understand its potential, but this program does make sense.

Q: Prof. Thomas Sinclair, Public Administration – With SUNY Central putting the performance measurement system in place, how is BU positioned?

A: Pres. Stenger noted that he led this committee and the measurements read like our strategic plan (enhance research, graduation rates, accessibility, completion of degree, service learning). Chancellor Zimpher will continue to bargain with the Governor for new

money for new metrics. Next year we may find more exciting programs to submit to the Chancellor.

- Q: Prof. Robert Micklus, English – How is it possible that we can reach 6,000 graduate students by 2020? How imperative is it to hit this in the future?
- A: Pres. Stenger answered that although it is not a realistic goal by 2020, we can think about it for the next five years, positively growing our graduate education. This goal may be impossible but it is real. This allows us to be creative in our thinking about these goals. Opportunities we have never thought of that we could aspire to (example, a school of public health). We are not sure if the MALS program will be strong; the MBA and Accounting programs are very strong.

After no more questions, the Full Faculty meeting was adjourned.

The first Faculty Senate meeting of the 2015-2016 academic year was called to order by Prof. Guzman at 12:34 pm.

1. Minutes After no discussion, the minutes of the May 5, 2015 meeting were approved as submitted.
2. Obituary Notices Prof. Guzman notified the body that Prof. Peter Browne, Music; Prof. Jacob Fischthal, Biological Sciences; and Dist. Prof. Robert Isaacson, Psychology, passed away. Prof. Guzman asked for a moment of silence to remember these colleagues. As is established practice, notes of condolence have been sent to the families on behalf of the Senate.
3. New business
 - a. Agenda items for the Senate for 2015-2016 – The Faculty Senate planning meeting of September 1 reviewed possible agenda items for the upcoming year for the Senate and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to explore. Some topics brought up were:
 - Graduate program stipends -- Review of results of increasing stipends.
 - Review of possible consistent family leave across schools and departments – This would include a policy for faculty for pregnancy and small children in the family. We will hear about this from the Provost and the deans towards the end of the academic year.
 - Evaluation Coordinating Committee members will be finalized within the next few weeks and that committee will discuss revision of the guidelines for evaluation of administrators and will bring this to the Senate in early spring.
 - Faculty involvement in admissions process – FSEC will be reviewing this issue with administration.
 - Final exam policy and exam schedule – We will talk with administration about solutions.
 - Creation of a committee on diversity and inclusion – Some felt that a permanent committee is needed. Prof. Sinclair will report at the end of the semester on the SUNY-wide diversity committee and these types of committees at other SUNYs. This will then in turn become a discussion in the full Senate in the spring semester.

At this time, Prof. Guzman suggested an open discussion on the role of service in tenure and promotion personnel cases. The Provost's Guidelines mention service in a number of places, what could qualify, and what role service plays in tenure and promotion cases. At this time, Prof. Guzman invited Senators to the microphone for discussion.

- Prof. Hoe Kyeung Kim, GSE – There have been some cases recently where faculty were asked to be on a search committee over the summer, which is a lot of work. We need clear guidelines on what service faculty should participate in. It is hard to draw the line when faculty are forced or pushed to serve.
- Prof. Sharon Holmes, CCPA – We are a research university and if we are to compare ourselves to others, service is not considered. Are we going to step outside the lines to be different? There are other institutions where some groups do more service than others and may not be recognized for that service. Is service a part of being premier?
- Prof. Dennis Lasser, SOM – We need to separate service from tenure. As good citizens, we do service. Promotion to full professor focuses on service when perhaps it should focus on leadership.
- Prof. Ricardo Laremont, Political Science/Sociology – We need a differential to raise the service requirement to full professor. Women are pushed into service more and put at a disadvantage, so this could become a gender argument. A differential is clearly required to send a message to associate professors so a burden is not put on them to serve.
- Prof. Sandra Michael, Biological Sciences – When she was chair of the department, she counseled assistant professors to limit their service outside the department. Scientists, engineers and others in technical fields at research intensive universities must come up with grants and develop labs; there is little time to serve on outside committees. She does agree that more service could be expected to be promoted to full professor, but still research must be the dominant factor for promotion to full professor at a doctoral campus.
- Prof. Sharon Holmes, CCPA – This is a gender issue. We still have faculty who are going from assistant to associate professor who perform a lot of service. Some are being burdened with service. This is a gender issue and a diversity issue. We need to look at everything during our conversations about this.
- Prof. Lisa Tessman, Philosophy – If we don't do service, our departments are underrepresented on committees. If service is not counted, some may not serve. Service should count. Some feel they have been pressured to serve.
- Prof. Jay Newberry, Geography – Service is a sense of obligation versus being pressured. Service is good to help learn more about the university and comes down to standards and how much you are required to do.
- Prof. Benita Roth, Sociology volunteered to do a workshop on service to the Senate. There is a sense of obligation and pressure. There are Provost Guidelines for tenure and promotion, but this should come from the Senate.
- Prof. Heather DeHaan, History – We are a research institution. We are talking about service which is essential to our programs and our infrastructure. There is a discrepancy between people doing service and those who are not.
- Prof. John Starks, Classical and Near Eastern Studies – We need to be very sensitive to recognition of service in small departments. It is necessary to further programs in small departments and there may not be capacity to serve. There needs to be flexibility and understanding for small departments to handle the business of operating their department along with doing service.
- Prof. Thomas Sinclair, Public Administration – There is a consensus that this is an important topic and how we might construct some guidelines for untenured faculty and what the initial expectations would be for someone moving from associate to full professor. Prof. Sinclair makes a motion that the Senate form an ad-hoc committee to look at these issues more fully and work with the Provost to draft guidelines for the Senate's consideration. This motion was seconded. After no discussion, the motion was approved by a vote of 46 approved, 1 opposed,

and 3 abstentions. Prof. Guzman asked Senators who wish to volunteer for this committee to send him an email.

After no more business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Present: Benjamin Andrus, Serdar Atav, Jeffrey Barker, Christopher Bartlette, Anne Brady, Cassandra Bransford, Howard Brown, Kenneth Chiu, Scott Craver, Heather DeHaan, Carmen Ferradas, Mikhail Filippov, Leslie Gates, Brandon Gibb, Joseph Graney, Robert Guay, Fernando Guzman, Christopher Hanes, Sharon Holmes, Courtney Ignarri, Hyeyoung Kang, Jonathan Karp, Hoe Kyeung Kim, Ricardo Laremont, Dennis Lasser, Sandra Michael, Robert Micklus, Jay Newberry, Donald Nieman, Neil Christian Pages, Carolyn Pierce, Florenz Plassmann, Dmitry Ponomarev, Xingye Qiao, Sara Reiter, Joshua Reno, Bonita Roth, Edward Shephard, Thomas Sinclair, Pamela Smart, John Starks, Harvey Stenger, Sandro Sticca, Masatsugu Suzuki, Lisa Tessman, Cyma VanPetten, Adrian Vasiu, Bogum Yoon, Stephen Zahorian, Hong Zhang

Excused: Manoj Agarwal, Rosemary Arrojo, Junghyun Cho, Cynthia Connine, Vincent Grenier, Colleen Hailey, Leslie Heywood, Gretchen Mahler, Mark Poliks, Omowunmi Sadik, Hiroki Sayama, Sara Wozniak, Chaun Zhong

Absent: Anne Bailey, John Baust, Nicole Cameron, Frank Cardullo, John Cheng, Murali Jagannathan, Marla Mallette, Natalija Mijatovic, Titilayo Okoror, Dillon Schade, Bruce White, David Wilson, Lei Yu, Shengsheng Zhou