

ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE MEETS MONDAY, April 17th, 2000, 3:30 PM SHARP

The third and final meeting of the Arts & Sciences Senate this Spring Semester will be held on Monday, April 17th, 2000 at 3:30 p.m. SHARP, in Javits Room (2nd floor, Melville Library).

All Arts and Sciences Senators are kindly requested to attend. The meetings of the Arts & Sciences Senate are open to all interested members of the University community.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the Senate Meeting of March 13th, 2000
- III. Report of the Arts & Sciences Senate President (Hugh J. Silverman)
 - Nominations for Upcoming A&S Senate Elections
 - Update on Academic Judiciary Committee Issues (Ad Hoc Committee on AJC)
 - Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Retirements: Issue of Academic Appointment Terminology
 - General Education Requirements Response – Report from Albany

IV. ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE (APC)

The Academic Planning Committee shall be a standing committee of the Arts and Sciences Senate concerned with: (a) encouraging cross-disciplinary and extra-disciplinary programmatic planning and development in Arts and Sciences areas, (b) cultivating linkages across departments and programs, (c) generating and reviewing proposals for new cross-departmental programs, research institutes, centers, and constellations, (d) maintaining the purview of the faculty in programmatic decision-making, (e) promoting research and connections between graduate and undergraduate programs, (f) responding to changing academic needs and profiles, and (g) identifying model programs and supporting the successful dissemination of new ideas in academic program development in Arts and Sciences areas.

V. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES (Everett Waters, Chair, PTC)

- Proposal: REVISE Guidelines Section 4.1 to read (underlined passages are proposed additions):

“After completing its deliberations, the Committee will forward the file together with its own recommendation to the Dean for the administrative review of the file. The Committee shall include with its recommendation a collectively signed written statement of its vote to concur or not with the departmental recommendation. The Committee will communicate its recommendations to the department chairperson or program director after fourteen days or when the President’s action (see Section 6) is known, whichever occurs sooner. The department chairperson or the program director will communicate the Committee’s recommendation to the candidate.”

- Proposal: Add (as a new section 7 after “Action by President”):

“REVISIONS TO THE GUIDELINES:

These Guidelines shall be reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Senate on a regular basis. The Senate may make revisions to the Guidelines at a regular meeting of the Senate as long as the proposed revisions have been announced in advance of the meeting. All changes shall be reported by the Senate President to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for implementation. Any changes to the Guidelines which impact upon the President, Provost, or Deans in its constituency shall be sent to each of these administrative officers for their review and agreement. In cases of disagreement, the Senate shall revisit the changes to determine whether it wishes to maintain its decision to change the Guidelines. If it decides to maintain its decision, that action shall be reported to all three administrative officers.”

VI. REPORT OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR CURRICULUM (Mary Rawlinson)

“STONY BROOK : A STUDENT-CENTERED RESEARCH UNIVERSITY”

- Problems
- Strategies: pursuing a process of research and collaboration in curriculum development
- Implementation
 - Learning Communities Project
 - University Writing Program
 - Math Advisory Committee
- Results
- Continuing Challenges

VII. OLD BUSINESS

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

HUGH J. SILVERMAN PRESIDENT OF THE ARTS & SCIENCES SENATE

**Arts & Sciences Senate
Minutes from Senate Meeting
March 13, 2000
Secretary: Robert Bloomer**

The Meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. **Agenda.** The tentative Agenda was approved.

II. Minutes of the Senate Meeting on February 21st, 2000. These Minutes were approved.

III. Report of the A&S Senate President (Hugh J. Silverman). In his brief report, the President gave an overview of today's business and then reminded those present that Senate elections will take place this Spring. He suggested that anyone interested in serving on Arts and Sciences Standing Committees should let him know. He also asked that we encourage other people to express their interest in serving on Committees. Also, if our terms are coming to an end as Senators, either Departmental or At-Large, he encouraged us to run again for our positions.

IV. Report of the College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Operations (Eugene Katz). Dean Paul Armstrong asked Eugene Katz to focus on his function as Associate Dean for Operations. He was also asked to comment on the current structure of the College of Arts and Sciences versus its previous structure when there were four academic area Divisional Deans rather than a single College Dean with three functional Associate Deans. Dr. Katz described the old structure as vertical, where each of the four Deans had the full range of responsibilities (curriculum, budget, operations, personnel) in their areas. The new structure is horizontally integrated, with a Dean of Arts and Sciences and Associate Deans who have responsibilities that go across all of the Departments of the College of Arts and Sciences. This is also true for the Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Associate Dean for Personnel as well as the Associate Dean for Operations. Dean Armstrong has chosen Associate Deans from each of the traditional academic divisional areas.

Operations covers equipment and space. Space is horrible because to find it they have to take it away from somebody else, and currently there is no way to expand the space we now have. A number of rehab projects over the past year have involved cutting up offices into smaller ones in order to accommodate new faculty. The situation with equipment is a little better since some new money is available so that it is not necessary to take funds away from somebody to provide money for somebody else. Every year a certain amount of money comes to the College for equipment. The main source is AER (Academic Equipment Replacement) monies, which is specifically given by the state to provide replacement equipment for departments. A certain amount is allocated to the Campus. The Provost receives his share, and then the Provost allocates certain amounts to each of the units within his area (Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Marine Sciences). He does this proportionate to faculty FTEs, but he also reserves a certain amount called the "Central Pool" which each college has to compete for. Meetings are held to split up those funds. The problem is that the amounts of money are grossly insufficient relative to needs. For the College of Arts and Sciences this year, the basic allocation is \$160,000, which comes to Eugene Katz to be allocated within the College. But he had to immediately return \$75,000 to the Provost in order to balance the College budget this year. Of the remaining \$85,000, they are planning projects along the order of \$20,000 to \$30,000. So now they are down to some \$40,000 to \$50,000 to be distributed to all of the 32 units within the College of Arts and Sciences. This is done by asking the Chairs to provide a list of requests for the use of funds. The requests that they got this year totaled over \$400,000, which is typical, and now they are down to \$50,000. But this is not completely available because there are certain initiatives that take place each year. This year, the President provided some money for

faculty computers. But this has to be done on a matching basis of 50%. If they filled all of the requests that they have for computers, the \$50,000 would not be enough for a match. But not all of this money can be used for this purpose because there are departmental needs, such as xerox machines, that simply have to be met. So relative to the needs in the College, the amount of funds available is unfortunately very small. The situation for rehab projects is about the same, as some 30 projects this year will remain unfunded. Overall, it has been frustrating because, relative to the needs, the resources available are inadequate.

V. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Retirements (Sarah Fuller, Committee Member). Sarah Fuller noted that many departments already have by-laws, and one of the striking things about them is how much they differ. In order to establish more consistency in by-laws throughout the College, the CFRRR recommends that departments planning to create new by-laws or to review and revise existing by-laws consider several areas in establishing operating policies and procedures for the department or program. In general, the committee recommends that guidelines address questions of departmental membership, departmental governance, operations of the department, and other areas such as workloads, allocation of resources, and retirements as well as formal procedures for amending by-laws. She drew our attention to a written outline of these areas, which is preceded by a preamble that includes a paragraph on the advantages of by-laws. Some of these advantages are: 1. Protection of faculty against arbitrary decision-making; 2. Clarification of faculty rights and responsibilities within the department or program; 3. Specification of standard procedures for a variety of practices, such as selection of a chair; 4. Determination of the status of members with "combined" (i.e. divided budget line), "joint" (single budget line with shared academic responsibilities), "affiliated" (delimited responsibilities to another department), or "adjunct" (temporary term or per course) appointments; 5. Articulation of procedures for promotion, tenure, and contract renewal review, for hiring new faculty, for discretionary fund recommendations, for grievances, etc.

Following some discussion, the question was taken that departments consider establishing by-laws as outlined in Item #5 of the Agenda. The question was called without objection. The vote was nearly unanimous in favor of the recommendation, with one opposed and one abstention. The President added that this information will be sent to departmental Chairs and will be posted on the Arts and Sciences Senate Webpage.

VI. Report of the University Senate Committee on Administrative Review: Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences (Paul Wortman, Committee Chair). This Committee has been trying to determine how the change from the previous structures of four deans compares to the new so-called "superdean" office headed by Paul Armstrong. They are in the process of developing a survey instrument that contains a number questions, e.g. how effective has the new Dean's office been in conducting department business?, and a list of people who should answer them. The survey will be conducted by phone, though the questionnaire and the organizational charts will be sent to departmental Chairs, who will be asked to name a second administrative person, e.g. the undergraduate director, to participate in the survey. Paul Wortman estimates that there will be some 30 to 35 closed questions along with three or four open-ended ones to provide qualitative data on issues.

Following a lengthy discussion, a motion was proposed that A & S Senators be considered as a resource and that they also be surveyed in this process. The motion was seconded without further discussion. 10 senators were in favor, four were opposed, and there were three abstentions. Therefore, the motion passed.

VII. Discussion of the Formation of an Arts and Sciences Senate Academic Planning Committee [for discussion only]. This was the second discussion of a Committee on Academic Planning. Committee would focus on academic planning in the Arts & Sciences Senate Constituencies and would make recommendations to the three Senate Constituency Deans and to the Provost. Among others, its tasks would be to: 1. Encourage cross-disciplinary and extra-disciplinary initiatives and development; 2. Respond to changing needs and profiles in the CAS, MSRC, and PE&A; 3. Recommend new programs and initiatives; 4. Review proposals for new ideas in programmatic development and configuration, research institutes, centers, and constellations.

Some reservation was expressed during the discussion, in part because it was thought that it might be difficult to find people to serve on this Committee, but Hugh Silverman commented that this would be a committee that might be attractive to a number of colleagues. He also pointed out that there are only five A&S Senate standing committees currently and that none of them cover the general area of academic program planning.

VIII. Old Business. None

IX. New Business. None

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE VACANCIES
beginning Sept 1, 2000

ACADEMIC JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HFA 2
NSM 1

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING AND APPEALS
NO VACANCIES

GRADUATE PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

HFA 1
NSM 1

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

HFA 1
SBS 2
NSM 1

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

SBS 1
NSM 1

ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE VACANCIES
At-Large Senators

HFA 3
SBS 3
NSM 3

NOTE: This report has been presented to and received by the Arts and Sciences Senate Executive Committee (with praise). However, it is still subject to further discussion by the Executive Committee and will ultimately have to be approved by the Arts and Sciences Senate.

Report of the AJC Review Committee

April 21, 2000

Preamble

Following the retirement of Bill Weisner, the long-time Executive Officer of the Academic Judiciary Committee, the Executive Committee (EC) of the Arts and Sciences (A&S) Senate has established this committee to review the policies and procedures of the Academic Judiciary Committee (AJC).

The AJC is a standing committee of the Arts and Sciences Senate. The AJC "... shall adjudicate and take appropriate action in cases originating in areas in the Senate Constituencies and which involve charges of academic dishonesty by a student, or unfair treatment of a student by a faculty member¹."

Responsibilities of the AJC are not specified further.

The AJC works with the Executive Officer, an employee of the Dean of CAS, in hearing appeals of accusations of academic dishonesty. In addition, the hearing board rules are used in common with the College of Engineering. In this matter, there should be no conflict between the interests of faculty governance and the university administration: the fight against academic dishonesty is in everybody's self-interest.

Based on our review of the current operating procedures and policies of the AJC, this committee makes the following recommendation to the A&S Senate.

- [Guidelines](#)
 - [Membership of the AJC](#)
 - [Duties of the AJC](#)
 - [Duties of the Chair of the AJC](#)
 - [Scheduling of AJC hearings](#)
 - [Role of the Executive Officer](#)
 - [Role of the Hearing Officer](#)
 - [Hearings](#)
 - [Conflicts of Interest](#)
-

1. Guidelines

The A&S Senate shall direct the AJC to establish a set of Guidelines for the AJC. The recommendations included in this report may serve as a basis for those Guidelines. ([click here for explanatory comments](#))

2. Membership of the AJC

The voting membership of the AJC shall consist of 9 members of the teaching faculty, two

professional employees (including the Executive Officer), three undergraduate students, and one graduate student, as specified in the CAS Senate Constitution. In addition, there shall be a pool of at least 3 other undergraduate students and 2 other graduate students (9 students total) to serve on hearing boards. These students shall be selected as specified in the Constitution of the A&S Senate. ([click here for explanatory comments](#))

3. Duties of the AJC

The responsibilities of the elected members of the AJC shall include the following:

- o To elect a chair who will serve as liaison between the AJC and the EC, and between the AJC and the Executive Officer. The chair will serve a one year term.
- o To review and, if necessary, recommend changes in the Guidelines to the CAS Senate on an annual basis.
- o To review and, if necessary, recommend to the A&S Senate modifications to the "Policies and Procedures Governing Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty" pamphlet, on an annual basis.
- o To maintain a web page under the web page of the College Of Arts and Sciences, detailing the responsibilities of the teaching faculty when confronted with a case of academic dishonesty, and the rights of the students when so accused.
- o To construct and maintain a web page under the web page of the of the Arts and Sciences Senate, detailing the policies, procedures, and Guidelines of the AJC, and the responsibilities of the elected members of the AJC.
- o To serve on a regular basis on hearing boards.

([click here for explanatory comments](#))

4. Duties of the Chair of the AJC

The duties of the chair of the AJC shall include the following:

- o To call meetings of the AJC.
- o To present an annual written report to the A&S Senate.
- o To serve as a member of the Executive Committee of the A&S Senate, or to designate another member of the AJC to serve in his/her stead, in accordance with the Constitution of the A&S Senate, article E.1.
- o To serve as Hearing Officer, or to designate a Hearing Officer from among the elected faculty and professional members of the AJC, when the Executive Officer is unable to do so.
- o To inform all parties of the decisions of the Hearing Boards.

([click here for explanatory comments](#))

5. Scheduling of AJC hearings

This committee recommends the following:

- o That the number of student members of the AJC be increased, as stated in section 1.
- o That each semester the Executive Officer, in consultation with the elected members of the AJC, set aside times of the week for hearings and assign elected members of the AJC to those times. When an appeal is made, the hearing will be scheduled for one of these pre-assigned times.
- o If the accuser is a member of the teaching faculty, the hearing time should be set so as not to conflict with the the accuser's teaching schedule.
- o No member of the AJC should be scheduled to attend more than one hearing per week.
- o That the supplementary faculty pool be abolished.

([click here for explanatory comments](#))

6. Role of the Executive Officer

The Executive Officer is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and so is not subject to the decisions of the A&S Senate. Nonetheless, in the interests of the clarifying the roles of all parties, this committee recommends that the responsibilities of the Executive Officer be formally established to include:

- o Setting up hearing times at the start of each semester, in consultation with the elected members of the AJC
- o Receiving appeals.
- o Scheduling hearings.
- o Making supplementary materials available to the Hearing Board in advance of the Hearing.
- o Presiding at hearings as Hearing Officer.
- o Reporting the decision of the Hearing Board the chair of the AJC, who will then relay the decision to all parties in a timely manner.

[\(click here for explanatory comments\)](#)

7. Role of the Hearing Officer

- o The Hearing Officer presides over the Hearing.
- o The Hearing Officer will adjudicate all procedural issues, and ensure that the hearing follows proper procedures.
- o The Hearing Officer will tally the votes of the Hearing Board.
- o If the Hearing Officer is not the Executive Officer, the Hearing Officer will report the outcome of the Hearing Board to the Executive Officer.

8. Hearings The hearings shall proceed in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures Governing Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty" pamphlet, except where superseded by the Guidelines of the AJC.

We recommend the following changes in the operating procedures of the Hearing Boards:

- o A hearing board shall consist of the Hearing Officer, two university employees (teaching faculty and professional staff) and two students. All hearing board members shall be elected members of the AJC.
- o The Hearing Officer presides over the hearings, but shall not have a vote.
- o A minimum of three votes are required to find the accused guilty.

[\(click here for explanatory comments\)](#)

9. Conflicts of Interest

This committee recommends the following:

- o That after a hearing board is established, the Executive Officer shall inform the members of the hearing board of the names of the accused and accusing parties, so as to avoid potential conflicts of interest.
- o No one shall sit on a hearing board when either the accused or accuser is in the same academic department or program as the potential hearer.

[To the top of the Report](#)

[To the Appendices](#)

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of April, 2000, by the ad-hoc AJC review committee,

A. Fedi

P. Gratton

A. Lokshina

E. Waters

F. Walter (Chair)

Appendices to the Report of the AJC Review Committee

April 21, 2000

-
- Appendix 1: Explanatory Comments
 - Appendix 2: Contrary Opinions from the AJC
-
-

Appendix 1: Explanatory Comments

Section 1: We suggest that the Guidelines be based on the recommendations of this committee, and incorporate material from the "Policies and Procedures Governing Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty". The AJC is free to disregard any of our recommendations, but the Guidelines must be approved by the full Senate.

Section 2:

We recommend a pool of student AJC members at least as large as the pool of faculty members for the purposes of staffing hearings. As we seek equal numbers of students and faculty on each hearing board, and as the students' schedules are often less flexible than those of the faculty, it seems prudent to enlarge the student membership. We retain the current size of the voting membership, with its 9-4 majority for the faculty.

We leave it up to the relevant bodies to decide how the student members are to be chosen, and which of them are voting members of the AJC.

If it turns out that this number of members does not sufficient to simplify the scheduling of hearing boards, the Senate may wish to address the question of optimal committee size. We recommend against continuation of the volunteer faculty pool.

The CAS Senate Constitution defines the Executive Officer as a professional employee. As specified in the A&S Senate Constitution, the Executive Officer is a voting member of the AJC. The A&S Senate Constitution does not prevent the Executive Officer from being elected chair of the AJC. If the Senate is of the opinion that appointees of the Dean should not be eligible to chair standing committees (and sit on the Executive Committee), the the Senate should amend its Constitution.

Section 3:

- The AJC web page does a good job of presenting the options available to faculty who wish to report academic dishonesty, and to students who wish to appeal or to file a grievance. The AJC link from the A&S Senate web page merely consists of a list of the members of the committee. Of the 5 standing committees of the A&S Senate, only the Curriculum Committee has a web page that describes the purview of the committee and presents Guidelines.
- We use the word "liaison" to describe the role of the chair of the AJC with respect to the EC. Although the Constitution clearly states that the chair of the AJC is a member of the EC, with commensurate responsibilities, some members of the AJC opine that this need not be so. It is true that the AJC has a peculiar function in the faculty governance structure, in

that its primary role is to provide a pool of jurors for hearing boards, and has not been to set policy.

Should this remain a point of contention between the membership of the AJC and the EC, we recommend that the Senate reconsider the role of the AJC in the context of faculty governance. Since academic dishonesty is not unique to CAS, it may make sense for the AJC to operate under the aegis of the University Senate.

- There is often a problem with continuity of leadership. We suggest that the AJC meet at the end of the spring semester to select a chair for the following year. It is often advisable for a chair have some previous experience serving on the committee prior to ascending to the chair.

In the absence of a duly elected chair, the president of the Senate may appoint an elected member of the AJC as chair *pro-tem* for the sole purpose of calling to order, and presiding over, a meeting of the AJC to select a chair.

Section 4:

The letters which currently go out to the parties in the hearings bear the signature of the Executive Officer. As the hearings are an important function of the AJC, a standing committee of the CAS Senate and an arm of faculty governance, we feel it important that the decisions also carry the full weight and authority of the Faculty. This can be conveyed by having the letters signed, or co-signed, by the chair of the AJC.

We do not envision any substantial change in the role of the Executive Officer, or any significant increase in the workload of the Chair. The Executive Officer, or the Executive Officer's staff, will continue to write the letters. The only difference is that the letters will now be signed (or co-signed) by the Chair of the AJC. The letters should state clearly that all questions and appeals should be directed to the Executive Officer or the appropriate member of the Dean's staff, and not to the Chair of the AJC.

Section 5:

While it is commendable to try to accommodate the accuser and accused first in scheduling the hearings, this has apparently lead to difficulties in getting elected members of the AJC to attend hearings, and has necessitated a large supplementary pool of hearers. This committee recommends that hearing times be set in advance, based on the availability of the Executive Officer and the members of the AJC, even if this causes some hardship on the part of the appellant. With 10 university staff and 9 students in the permanent pool, we would expect that 3-5 two hour long hearing times could be set aside each week, with pre-assigned jurors.

The advantages of this proposed scheduling system are:

- it would ease the burdens of the Executive Officer and the Executive Officer's staff.
- By ensuring that the small number of elected members of the AJC serve on all hearings, continuity and even-handedness are assured.
- With the same members of the AJC attending many hearings, problems or patterns not evident to the occasional supplemental pool member will be noticeable, and can be reported to the full AJC.

The main potential disadvantage of this proposed scheduling system is that, with fixed juries, one might end up with certain times each semester that get reputations for either consistently more lenient or more strict decisions. To mitigate against this, we recommend that the time slots be chosen such a minimum of 3 university staff and 3 student members of the AJC are available. This also provides some flexibility in the case of planned absences from campus. Since the time slots, and the assigned jurors, will change each semester, we do not see this as a problem.

Section 6:

Note the distinction between the Executive Officer, who is the appointee of the Dean who

oversees the appeals process, and the Hearing Officer, who presides at a Hearing Board. In general the Executive Officer will act as Hearing Officer.

Our recommendation that the Hearing officer not have a vote is predicated on the possibility that the accused could perceive a conflict of interest on the part of the Hearing Officer, if serving both as judge and jury.

Section 8:

- We presume the existence of a set of Guidelines. Since the Guidelines and the "blue book" are both to be written by the AJC and approved by the Senate, there should be no conflict between the two. We recognize that it makes eminent sense to have a single set of guidelines across the university for the Hearing Boards, hence we do not recommend any substantive changes in the "Policies and Procedures Governing Undergraduate Academic Dishonesty" pamphlet. However, there may be situations where the pamphlet and the AJC Guidelines are in conflict. If so, the AJC Guidelines will take precedence in cases involving the CAS.
- In the interests of fairness to the accused (usually students), we recommend that the hearing board consist of equal numbers of faculty/professionals and students. We feel that if the case of the accuser is sufficiently weak that it results in a tie, the accused should be found not guilty. In this way, a conviction cannot be obtained without at least one student and one faculty/professional vote to convict.

To Top of Appendices

To Top of Report

Appendix 2: Contrary Opinions from the AJC

On 5 April 2000 the AJC met to consider the draft recommendations contained in this report. We thank M. Lerdau, chair of the AJC, for conveying the opinions of the AJC. The AJC agrees to much of the language in this report. Based on their concerns, we have modified and clarified some of the language. There remain points on which this committee and the AJC are in disagreement. Those are:

1. The AJC disagrees with our recommendation that the faculty pool be abolished. They make the following recommendations:
 - That the members of the pool be re-selected annually.
 - That the method of selecting of board members be revised. At present, the first respondents to a request are chosen. This system has the potential for abuse, as those who are quick to respond to their e-mail are preferentially selected. The system should be changed to permit sufficient time for a large number of potential jurors to reply. Then those with the longest interval since past service would be selected.
 - The number of elected AJC members be increased from 3 to 4 per area, for a total of 12. This would lessen the dependence on the supplemental pool.
2. The AJC feels strongly that the decision of the hearing board should be communicated by the Executive Officer, and not by the Chair of the AJC. The primary reason is that all subsequent communications and appeals are directed to the Executive Officer, and not to the AJC. It was felt that this could become particularly burdensome for the Chair, and that the Chair should be insulated from what is essentially an administrative task.
3. The AJC does not concur with our recommendation that hearing time slots be set aside in advance. They do not believe that the current system is particularly burdensome. They are concerned that students may identify certain time slots, or certain board members as more or less lenient, and therefore may burden this system.

[To Top of Appendices](#)

[To Top of Report](#)

Footnotes

1 From the [Arts and Sciences Senate Constitution](#), as revised 15 March 1999.

**STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK
ARTS AND SCIENCE SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The next meeting of the Arts and Sciences Senate Exec. Comm. will be held on Monday, April 10th @ 3:30- 5:00 p.m. in the Senate Conference Room, Psychology B (Room 126).

TENTATIVE AGENDA

- I. Approval of Agenda
- II. Approval of Minutes from February 28th Executive Committee Meeting
- III. Report of Promotion and Tenure Committee, including recommendations for revision of PTC Guidelines at next Senate meeting. [Everett Waters]
- IV. Draft Report of Ad Hoc AJC Review Committee [Fred Walter]
- V. Report of CASA Activities in 1999-2000 [Marci Lobel]
- VI. Agenda for April 17th Senate Meeting
 - a. PTC Guidelines
 - b. Report of AJC Review Committee
 - c. Academic Planning Committee
 - d. Report of CAS Associate Dean for Curriculum (Mary Rawlinson)

**College of Arts and Sciences Senate Executive Committee
SUNY Stony Brook
Monday, February 28th, 2000
Minutes of Meeting #8
Joan Kuchner, Vice-President**

In attendance:

Hugh Silverman (HJS), President
Joan Kuchner (JFK), Vice-President
Ruth Ben-Zvi (RBZ)
Kathleen Breidenbach (KB)
Peter Gratton (PG)
Marci Lobel (ML)
Bernie Maskit (BM)
Fred Walter (FW)

The Meeting was called to order at approximately 3:40 p.m.

I. Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved. PG made motion for approval and ML seconded.

II. Minutes: The Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting on February 14, 2000 were approved with spelling of Fred Walter's name corrected.

III. Brief Committee Report on committee to propose wording and mandate for new ad hoc committee on the Senate Constitution: Discussions have started and alternative suggestions were presented by BM to this committee (BM, JFK & EW).

IV. Discussion of Title change for member of A&S Executive currently referred to as Secretary. Title change would require change in constitution. PG suggested bringing question to A& S Senate. BM moved to table issue. Issue tabled.

V. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Retirements by Kelly Oliver: JFK asked if Committee was dealing with issues of non-teaching professionals. The answer was that this was not in the province of the committee. However, it was acknowledge that there may need to be a committee to consider these issues for non-teaching professionals in the future.

The main focus of the presentation was on departmental by-laws. The committee reviewed by-laws of a number of departments and presented an outline of the key components of departmental by-laws based on their review and committee discussions. The pros and cons of departmental by-laws were discussed. A repeated theme was the potential of departmental by-laws for protecting junior faculty, women and people of color. It was recommended that the Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Retirements (CFRRR) present a report on their deliberations on the guidelines for departmental by-laws to the A&S Senate. It was requested that the report include an estimate of the distribution of departmental by-laws throughout the university and a description of the pros and cons of departmental by-laws. PG recommended that if a department is going to enact or revise their by -laws that they use the guidelines. BM presented a motion that the CFRRR report on its work to the Senate and if approved, ask that the guidelines be put up on the A&S Senate web site. Motion seconded by RBZ.

Unanimously supported.

ML moved that A& S Senate Executive recommend that departments hold discussions about the value of by-laws or that they review their own existing by-laws. Motion carried. 4 in favor with 2 abstentions.

It was recommended that the document with the guidelines be distributed to A&S Senate prior to the meeting.

VI. Report of Ad Hoc AJC Review Committee, chaired by Fred Walter. New to the EC this semester, ML requested a history of ad hoc committee. This was provided by FW. FW pointed out that the ad hoc committee was established by the A&S Senate Executive Committee. It includes a graduate and an undergraduate student. The charter of the ad hoc Committee was to review the roles and duties of AJC particularly participation on hearing boards and the value of a stand-by pool of faculty. The Review Committee was also to look into alternative strategies for scheduling hearings. And it was to come up with Guidelines for the smooth and effective operations of the AJC.

HJS noted that the “blue book” is periodically revised by the Senate and that the Senate has jurisdiction over any revisions made to this document.. The Policies and Procedures for Academic Dishonesty apply to both the CAS and CEAS. The latter has its own judiciary committee as well.

FW pointed out that the Hearing Officer is currently a member of the teaching faculty as well as an employee of the Dean’s office. This is a new situation which may increase the likelihood of a conflict of interest. Any change in the guidelines for the AJC would need to be approved by the full A&S Senate.

VII. Discussion of the Formation of a Standing Committee on Academic Planning.

This discussion was an outgrowth of a suggestion made by Acting Provost McGrath. It was proposed that the creation of such a committee be placed on the agenda for the A&S Senate.

VIII. Old Business: None.

IX. New Business: None.

The Meeting was adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

