

**MINUTES OF THE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
May 4, 2010**

The fifth Faculty Senate meeting of the 2009-2010 academic year was called to order by Prof. Sara Reiter (School of Management and Chair, Faculty Senate) at 11:55 a.m. in UU Mandela Room.

1. **Minutes.** A motion was made to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2010 meeting as submitted. On voice vote, the motion was approved.

2. **Announcements.** Prof. Reiter said she had no formal announcements but mentioned that a and b under new business were formalities that needed to be done at this meeting. If debate on old business continued for some time, she would call debate in order to address these items.

3. **Old Business.** a) Discussion and possible actions on report of SOOTs task force (attached to April 27 agenda). Prof. J. David Hacker (History) proposed an amendment to the recommendations in the report. He moved the following addition between the second and third recommendation thereby increasing the recommendations to nine: *“The Faculty Senate should seek to improve the validity and utility of SOOTs by formulating and implementing policies to require the use of SOOTs in all courses.”* The motion was seconded.

Prof. Richard Lee (Sociology and Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee [FSEC]) said the motion appears to be an action item. The SOOTs task force report is under discussion, no motions have been made. Prof. Peter Knuepfer (Geological Sciences and Parliamentarian) disagreed saying that he believes a motion was made when the FSEC sent the report with recommendations to the Senate. Prof. Hacker urged support for his motion saying that few faculty use the SOOTs evaluation unless they are going through the personnel process. He added that this action would create a good statistical comparative benchmark and evaluate possible biases in the form. He referred to the task force survey saying that Binghamton is in the minority since most of the schools surveyed require such evaluation.

Prof. Susan Strehle (English) said she is in favor of some sort of mandatory evaluation but against the amendment saying that there are two forms of evaluation, summative (SOOT) and formative (instructor created). The current University SOOT form is not course specific. Prof. Susannah Gal (Biological Sciences) agreed with Prof. Strehle and said she created her own form that includes questions from SOOTs and student centered learning questions specific to her course. Prof. Knuepfer spoke in favor of the amendment saying that the proposal if approved would be sent to a committee that will consider all issues including the form questions. This is an opportunity to revisit the question of whether to mandate an evaluation across the university and to evaluate the current instrument. Prof. Hacker said he is in agreement with the other recommendations in the report and urged that other evaluation instruments also be used.

Prof. Andrew Scholtz (Classics and Chair of the SOOTs task force) commented that the recommendations do suggest that the current form be examined and be made customizable to accommodate various disciplines. Prof. Rosmarie Morewedge (German and Russian Studies) said she would be in favor of the proposal if it included an implementation committee that would allow SOOT customization and questions to obtain qualitative responses. She also said that she agrees with Prof. Strehle about class time lost in completing two instruments. Prof. Gale Spencer (Decker School of Nursing) said that the current SOOT form does not allow practice disciplines to be evaluated. A fill in box is not adequate. Her school has designed an appropriate form.

Prof. Ross Geoghegan (Mathematical Sciences) spoke against the amendment saying that there needs to be more consideration of all issues by an informed small member committee before a vote can be taken. Prof. Clifford Kern (Economics) agreed saying that some smaller body needed to work out

details such as those raised today before submitting to the full Senate. He added that he believes the time used to fill out the SOOTs, 5-10 minutes, is not prohibitive.

Prof. Randall McGuire (Anthropology) said that it is time faculty took ownership of the evaluation procedure and therefore he supports the amendment. He emphasized the need for a valued statistical basis of evaluation. Prof. Hacker commented that a Senate committee should consider all the recommendations in the report.

A vote was taken on the amendment to the proposal to require mandatory SOOTs. The motion failed, 16 in favor, 21 against, 4 abstentions.

Prof. Strehle urged support for the original proposal saying that it moves the university forward to commit to better evaluation of teaching. Prof. Morewedge asked for clarification that the proposal includes the creation of an implementation committee to choose particular questions for the SOOT form with allowable customization. Prof. Reiter replied affirmatively saying that the FSEC motion recommended a committee. Prof. Lee said he would vote against the motion as he is uncomfortable voting for all eight recommendations together, recommendations 4 and 5 might require more discussion. Prof. Scholtz said that recommendation 5 is a result of discussion with Mr. Sean McKittrick, Assistant Provost, regarding digitizing SOOT results.

Prof. Wayne Jones (Chemistry) concurred with Prof. Lee's comments and said that faculty should have flexibility in SOOTs administration. He moved that recommendation numbers 4 and 5 be removed from the proposal. After a vote the motion carried, 29 in favor, 4 against, 5 abstentions.

A vote was taken on the motion to approve recommendations 1 through 3 and 6 through 8 in the proposal including the creation of an implementation committee to report to the FSEC. After a vote, the motion carried 37 in favor, 0 against, 3 abstentions. She invited those interested in being on the committee to contact her or the FSEC.

Prof. Lee moved to separate recommendations 4 and 5. After a vote the motion carried, 37 for, 1 abstention.

A vote was taken to accept recommendation number 4 and carried, 16 for, 15 against, 6 abstentions.

Discussion turned to recommendation number 5. Prof. Michael asked Prof. Scholtz for clarification. Prof. Scholtz replied that the intent is to recommend that data preparation be handled with more dispatch than it had previously. Prof. Lee asked if this action would include preparation of aggregate data and non-numerical data. Prof. Scholtz replied that his recollection is that it would include SOOT data only, not qualitative data collected elsewhere. Prof. Patrick Madden (Computer Science) also a member of the task force recalled that the intention is to provide the data electronically in a rational format.

Prof. Michael asked who would have access to the data if it were put on the web or would it be BU accessible only. Mr. Daniel Rabinowitz (undergraduate representative) also a member of the task force reported that he is leading the undergraduate effort and creating a website that will have open access. He understands that the current program does not allow release of data unless individual instructors give permission. He added that he had been waiting for the Senate to take action during the academic year and urged support for the motion. He said if the Senate votes in favor he will hold release of the website.

Prof. McGuire commented that if the information is legally public then debate is useless and release is inevitable. Prof. Strehle asked if there had been a change in procedure, her understanding is that data is released if FOILED. Provost Mary Ann Swain acknowledged that there had been some technical problems and concurred saying there has been no change, the university is obligated to release the

data by law. Prof. Geoghegan summarized that a yes vote means the issue needs to be addressed and the impediments need to be removed with dispatch. A no vote means either the issue does not need to be addressed or the impediments should not be removed with dispatch or both. Prof. Scholtz said if recommendation 5 is not clear perhaps it should be eliminated.

A vote was taken to accept recommendation 5 and carried, 31 for, 4 against, 5 abstentions.

4. New Business. a) Approval of degree candidates. Prof. Reiter explained that approval is a formality signifying the faculty role in granting degrees. A motion was made to approve the lists of degree candidates contingent on completion of requirements for respective degrees. On voice vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

b) Election of 2010-2011 Faculty Senate Procedures Committee. The slate is Vice Chair – Luiza Moreira; Secretary – Karen Bromley. Prof. Reiter will complete the second year of her two-year term as chair in 2010-2011. A motion was made to approve the slate. On voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

c) Report of Faculty Senate Executive Committee ad hoc committee on academics and athletics (attached to agenda). Prof. Madden, chair of the ad hoc committee, gave background information saying the committee considered questions about Division I athletics as charged by the FSEC. One of the questions addressed was the cost. The figures were obtained from the NCAA. The cost for Division I in 2008 was about \$17.7 million; revenue was about \$17.3 million. He said the cost is comparable to peer institutions. The university provided \$3 million in direct support and \$5.5 in indirect support. According to the NCAA, losses across all Division I schools have been growing; those though with football programs had positive 'net generated revenue'.

Regarding the impact on the academic program, Prof. Madden said the committee looked at a number of metrics and found no evidence that Division I athletics has caused any sort of degradation of the academic quality of the university.

Prof. Reiter said there are no motions attached to the report, it is a report of facts and statistics.

Prof. Clifford Kern (Economics) asked for clarification of the revenue sources from the university. Prof. Madden said the numbers are from an NCAA report. Vice President for Administration James VanVoorst explained that the NCAA report is an attempt to put all Division I campuses on an equal playing field. Because the university does not have a financial statement a CPA firm calculated the indirect costs using a formula that includes employee fringe benefits, utilities used, etc. The direct support is appropriation from the state, used mostly for salaries.

Prof. Morewedge asked for information about the net generated revenue and financial information for 2009. Vice President VanVoorst replied that net generated revenue is revenue generated by the operation such as ticket sales, concession, novelty sales, etc. The statistics for 2009-2010 will be available at the end of the fiscal year in June. The revenue is expected to be about the same although the trend in the self-generated revenue has substantially increased. Prof. Madden said the NCAA report indicated a growing gap between expenses and revenue, approximately \$6.6 million to \$8 million negative net generated revenue for Division I schools with basketball programs. Vice President VanVoorst added that the trend is the same throughout the nation; the costs are allocated for the purposes of the report although the expenses are not necessarily allocated to the athletic departments.

Prof. Lee noted the 435 student athletes who are making academic progress and who have had their university experience enriched by Division I athletics. He spoke in favor of Division I athletics saying it is a part of this campus and the undergraduate experience at BU.

Prof. Michael reported that Kathy Bowman, Faculty Senate Secretary, would soon be retiring and asked for an acknowledgement of her years of service to the faculty.

The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.

Present: Josephine Allen, Katharine Bouman, Louis Braiotta, Karen Bromley, Andy Cavagnetto, Heather DeHaan, Shelley Dionne, Randy Friedman, Susannah Gal, Ross Geoghegan, J. David Hacker, Norah Henry, Douglas Holmes, Sharon Holmes, Angelique Jenks-Brown, Wayne Jones, Jonathan Karp, Clifford Kern, Kelly Kinney, Peter Knuepfer, Karen Kozlowski, Kenneth Kurtz, Richard Lee, Leann Lesperance, Michael Lewis, Patrick Madden, Marcin Mazur, Michael McDonald, Roy McGrann, Randall McGuire, Sandra Michael, Luiza Moreira, Rosmarie Morewedge, Ravi Palat, Sara Reiter, Thomas Sinclair, Antonio Sobejano-Moran, Gale Spencer, Susan Strehle, Mary Ann Swain, Gary Truce, Kevin Wright, Daniel Rabinowitz

Excused: Zu-Yan Chen, Scott Henkel, Jim Stark, Srinivasa Venugopalan

Absent: A. Serdar Atav, Karen Barzman, Herbert Bix, Benjamin Brewster, David Davies, Lois DeFleur, John Fillo, Mark Fowler, Ariana Gerstein, Joseph Graney, Albrecht Inhoff, R. Kevin Lacey, Ricardo Laremont, J. Koji Lum, Sarah Maximiek, Nagendra Nagarur, Haim Ofek, Qinru Qiu, Steven Scalet, Paul Schleuse, Steven Tammariello, M. Stanley Whittingham, Lisa Yun, Kimberly Avery, Susan Lewis