SOE/PS Faculty Meeting  
Wednesday, September 15, 2004  
Satterlee 301  
12-1 pm  


1. Approval of Agenda

Linda Seramur called the meeting to order at 12:03 p.m. A motion to approve the agenda as written was made by Sandy Chadwick, seconded by Eileen Raymond. Motion carried.

2. Approval of Minutes – 2/18/04

With no additions or corrections to the minutes of 2/18/04, a vote was taken to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

3. Report from Moderator

Linda reminded faculty of the Schedule of Submission Dates for Contract Renewals, Leaves and Promotions form and noted faculty should follow the blue form. The Personnel Committee is requesting the department chair send the dossier to the Dean’s Office by the deadline listed on the blue form. The chair of the Personnel Committee should be notified of any delays. She also reminded SOE/PS committees to send the name of committee chairs to Martha as well as to review their charges.

It was noted the Department of Business Administration should be added to the by-laws. It is not necessary to have a vote on this; Linda will charge the dean that Business Administration appear in the by-laws.

Linda reported she had discussed the associate dean position and job description with the dean. It is anticipated this will be a local choice with an internal search. The dean intends this to be a faculty line not MC.

The final exam policy and e-mail from the Provost was discussed. Concerns about the beginning date for summer school and summer registration and advisement dates were also discussed. If registration for summer school is not concurrent with fall registration this creates problems.

4. Reports from Committees

Scholarship & Awards – Edd Schneider

Edd reported he will chair the committee again this year. Joe Timmerman will represent the Business Administration Department. The committee has met to determine the winner of the new Davis Scholarship and plan to meet during the next couple of weeks.
Academic Affairs – Bob Vadas
Bob reported the committee was unable to come to consensus on when to meet. They are still in the process of getting everyone together.

Personnel Committee – Linda Seramur
Linda reported they are trying to streamline the process for submitting recommendations regarding personnel actions. She noted chairpersons do not need to send a separate recommendation to the Personnel Committee. The formal written recommendation will appear in the faculty member’s dossier. It is important to provide a lapse time for the faculty member to respond before the next step. Departments may need to align their departmental personnel policies and by-laws.

Linda stated the dean plans to have workshops for chairs and faculty on expectations of and preparing materials for personnel actions. It is also planned to have review faculty mentoring programs. The dean has been asked to communicate to departments about the 2+2+1+1+1 administrative practice in reappointment. She has discussed with him the need for clarifying clinical faculty performance programs and expectations. She has also discussed the need for communication regarding the availability of faculty development money.

5. Old Business

SOE/PS Personnel Policies – Peter Brouwer
Peter gave a brief history regarding the personnel policies and the dean’s evaluation section. A decision needs to be made as to how to move forward. The School was charged with the development of personnel policies and the Personnel Committee worked on the draft to bring to faculty. Open meetings were held with the dean’s evaluation section (section 5) receiving the most debate. This was sent to the dean in early March. The Provost asked Faculty Senate to look review/recommend dean’s evaluation processes/policies.

Tim reported the dean’s evaluation was raised in a Faculty Senate executive committee meeting with the Provost. It was agreed by executive committee and the Provost to form an ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee met and made a recommendation in May that went to senate. The recommendation is similar to the SOE/PS; it has a little more detail and calls for a 3-5 year cycle. Peter has the recommendation if anyone is interested.

The dean then received a memo (8/23/04) from the Provost and President approving the Personnel Policies if faculty omit section 5.

Peter noted he had talked with Dr. Madden and indicated to her that faculty would like a voice in the process. Dr. Madden has discussed this with SUNY Central and a lawyer who determined this is a union issue. Members cannot be in position of evaluating management and administrators. Faculty Senate will receive a similar response. The School of Arts & Sciences will also need to change their policies.

Peter said he has talked with Ed Alfonsin and Ed believes this is not a union issue. It is faculty opinion, a piece of the process. It has happened on every campus in the SUNY system and is past practice. Peter has a call into Martin Coffey but has not heard back from him yet. He noted the dean volunteered to do an evaluation last year with which the Personnel Committee assisted. The dean released the results of this to faculty.
Peter stated faculty need to decide how to proceed with Personnel Policies and suggested three options: 1. Vote to accept (omit Section 5) and handle this in another way; 2. Stand by original vote and try to press administration to reconsider and pursue if this is a union issue; 3. Do nothing and see what happens with faculty senate.

Sandy Chadwick suggested faculty take what Provost has offered and accept it and deal with evaluation internally. She believes faculty should keep in mind that it may be a good idea to stay on the administration’s good side.

Eileen Raymond stated she agreed with the sense of what Sandy was saying, however, Faculty Senate seems like an appropriate place to decide this issue. Since this was the one item that drew the most conversation and faculty has the least amount of agreement on, it might be another reason to stay with what faculty feel very sure of and leave this issue for Faculty Senate.

Al Januszewski stated the Personnel Committee has been working on this for some time and asked if the committee members have thought about this to the point where they could make a recommendation to the body.

Peter stated the Personnel Committee wants to hear from the faculty. The consensus at the committee level is to wait and see what Faculty Senate does. Tim noted he does not have a sense of what will happen at the Faculty Senate level.

Linda stated the implication seems to be to wait on this and review faculty files in the same manner as last year.

Peter felt this would keep it as an open issue. The question will possibly come up at the next NCATE review.

Bob Vadas stated faculty should be wary about adopting policies to be on good side of administration and should determine what is in best for faculty as professionals.

Ron Bretsch made a two part motion:

1. To accept the Provost’s approval of the School’s Personnel Policies, including deletion of section regarding evaluation of dean.
2. School charges the Personnel Committee with designing a draft regarding evaluation of the school’s dean for consideration by the school’s faculty.

Motion seconded by Sandy Chadwick.

Linda stated it would be a stand alone policy not part of Personnel Policies.

Ron stated we as a school can have a policy or practice that does not have to have administration’s approval.

Personnel Committee would bring a draft to faculty as a statement of intent. This may be a good way to keep momentum going.

Anjali Misra stated she is concerned if faculty go ahead and vote with deletion, the issue will die. She believes this conversation should be pursued with Peter’s second option. She feels clarification is needed of Provost’s rationale and that we have already done what Ron suggested. She suggested not approving but continuing dialogue with Provost.

Don Straight expressed a concern whether our action would be of benefit or harm to Faculty Senate process and if the best course of action would be just not
address this now. He asked if accepting the Provost’s proposal would deflate momentum.

Tim noted it would be difficult to say what the Faculty Senate response will be. Faculty Senate makes recommendations to administration; there may be a call in senate to revisit this issue. He would like to separate that out from this discussion. He felt Ron’s proposal makes sense to him as a faculty member. His sense is there is nothing wrong with that and it may make it easier and would not have the aura of an official policy or procedure.

Sergei noted it is important to have by-laws in place and would like to leave options open.

Eileen stated she is in favor of Ron’s motion which would allow faculty to get on with business by having personnel policies for protection of faculty and provides notice to administration that this is not a dead issue. This would allow faculty to go forward.

Lucille called the question.

Linda asked for a vote in favor of calling the question. Vote taken. 17 – Yes; 7 – No; 2 – Abstentions. Motion carried to call the question.

Linda asked for a vote in favor of Ron’s two-part motion. 19 – Yes; 6 – No; 1 – Abstention. Motion carried.

Linda noted the Personnel Committee will take part 2 of the motion and bring to the faculty a recommendation. As moderator, she does not have charge to take up final exam policy. This would be under the jurisdiction of Academic Affairs Committee.

Tim suggested it should go to Faculty Senate APCC.

Linda asked that the Academic Affairs Committee to take up the summer schedule issue and the final exam policy.

Anjali stated it would be helpful if departments could present issues and send them to the Academic Affairs committee. Chairs should forward information to Academic Affairs.

Linda noted, according to the by-laws, it is only required that the faculty meet within first two weeks of the start of school. In the school re-structuring, it was intended in the by-laws not to develop another layer of governance requiring additional/excessive meetings. However, she invited faculty to send her feedback; she does not want to drop the ball on important discussion.

A motion to adjourn was made by Eileen, seconded by Mike. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.