

Arts and Sciences Senate  
Revised Tentative Agenda  
September 24, 2007

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of the April 23, 2007 meeting
- III. President's Report (Georges Fouron/Cynthia Davidson)
- IV. Report of the College of Arts and Sciences (James Staros)
- V. Discussion of Changes to the Constitution and By-Laws Regarding Academic Units (Cynthia Davidson)
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business

---

Arts and Sciences Senate  
April 23, 2007

Meeting called to order by President Georges Fouron at 3:35 p.m.

I. Approval of agenda – approved

II. Approval of minutes from March 26, 2007 – approved with adjournment time changed to 4:50 p.m.

III. Report from the CAS Dean (J. Staros)

- Faculty recruiting – 23 tenured and tenure-track searches: 18 Assistant Professors, 10 searches in HFA, 7 searches in SBS and 6 searches in NSM. There were 6 searches through regular college funding (in addition to these 23 searches) for visiting faculty or lecturers
- funded (presidential) individual lines: 1 Sr. visiting appointment, 1 state line for the D'Amato Chair, 7 lines in HFA, 3 lines in SBS, 1.5 tenure-track lines and 1 lecturer line in NSM. Requests for 2 NSM and 1 HFA lines declined.
- Cluster Hires: NYCCF: 3 anticipated for CAS; CIDER: 3 anticipated for CAS; cDACT: anticipating 5 in CAS; EIP: 2 Neurosciences lines (filled)
- Faculty Recruitment Prospects for next year:
  - Cluster in Globalization, Migration and Diaspora
  - Cluster in Judaism, Islam and Christianity (bases for a new center)
  - Complete the cDACT cluster
  - Individual lines to support increased enrollments

IV. Curriculum Committee report (N. Tomes)

- Annual Report will be ready in fall 07
- Good Curriculum Committee Slate for the A&S ballot
- Working on the completion of the new courses for the major in Journalism. Thirteen new courses were approved
- Resolving the challenges represented by the 1.8 Mil. grant money from the Knight Foundation to create new course in News Literacy
- Approved curricular changes – Undergraduate Biology, Chemistry sequence, etc.



- Approved BA/MAT in Africana studies, MS/MAT in Mathematics (both 5-year combined degrees) and BS/MAT in Biology
- Two new interdisciplinary courses in Astronomy and English
- Curriculum Committee is strained with the increase in enrollment and also with the addition of Southampton. Concerned with the committee's ability to keep up.

#### V. Report on Stony Brook Southampton (M. Schoonen)

- Issues in hiring, curriculum and physical plant.
- Developing innovative set of majors (not competing with or duplicating Stony Brook).
- Within next five years we anticipate approximately 2,000-2,500 students with 50-60 faculty with tenure. There will be no departments.
- Middle states granted temporary accreditation for additional location status. Southampton can offer any major that is currently approved at Stony Brook.
- Next fall we will apply for branch campus status location to Stony Brook
- Recruiting students for Fall '07
- It will be approximately one year before new majors are set in place
- Decided with Provost to take four concentrations from Environmental Studies (approved major at Stony Brook with 10 concentrations). They are: Environmental Economics, Ecology, Public Policy and Marine Environmental Studies. The majors will be flexible
- Posted 12 jobs on the campus job opportunities
- Tenure issue: Southampton is more of an undergraduate college. Departments can consider affiliate status
- Physical facilities: one building is only 7 years old and has classrooms/labs that are fully functional. A number of other buildings have been renovated. There is also a 440 seat theatre.
- Dr Silverman questioned the status of governance at Southampton. For the time being, governance will reside with the Arts and Sciences Senate at Stony Brook
- Dr. Fred Walter asked if there is a plan to have a sufficient number of courses so that students do not have to come to Stony Brook. In response, there will be regular bus services between the two campuses. Dr. Bob Kerber suggested advanced teleconferencing which would be a great improvement over more busing.

#### VI. Report from the Academic Judiciary Committee (W. Moore)

- Focusing on reducing the time of reporting the hearing process by eliminating mailing of accusation letters to students. Students are now notified through their Solar System account.
- Students are aware of their rights, the accusation and the options that are available to them. They then decide if they want to waive their right to a hearing or go through the hearing process.
- The instructors are always kept informed of the hearing details involving their students
- In the fall of 2006 there were 107 accusations 69 of whom waived their rights to a hearing. Students have to immediately register for the Q course.
- Students receive help to prepare for hearing process
- AJC Committee members are kept informed of future hearings at least 1-2 weeks prior
- The number one accusation is internet plagiarism, the second is collusion, copying. Pilot Program on the internet called "Plagiarism Detection Program".
- Q course registration is for undergraduate students only but they have had guest graduate students sit in on the course.



- Collaborating with Library, English Department, Career Center, etc.

## VII. President's Report (G. Fouron)

- April 26<sup>th</sup> is the get together for faculty and staff given by the Dean Staros
- Ballots are online for elections
- This is Dr. Fouron's last meeting as A&S Senate President. Cynthia Davidson (as VP Elect) will be taking over as President this fall

## VIII. Old Business – Establishment of Promotion Review Committee to Sr. Lecturer

- Dr. Hugh Silverman: with respect to the A&S Senate, we are asking to simply establish a Senate review Committee parallel to the PTC, which will not deal with promotion cases but only promotion from lecturer to Sr. lecturer.
- UUP is the official legal representative for the faculty and staff for all of SUNY. Dr. Michael Zweig is VP for Academics for UUP, an elected union officer of the Stony Brook chapter and a delegate to the State-Wide Delegate Assembly
- Dr. Zweig reported that there have been numerous discussions with Lecturers over their concerns: Career ladder, more pay, having professional recognition for their work and the possibility of longer appointments.
- Report came out last fall from academic administration. The UUP Delegate Assembly has agreed to the language of the proposal and in our response particular to the creation rank of Sr. Lecturer.
- Part of what is being added to the mix from what the Administration suggested is the need for peer review among the faculty. Cooperation is essential with the A&S Senate to establish these kinds of procedures. Response also includes the university policies that a minimum of 70% of instructional faculty be on a tenure/tenure-track line. This is important with the establishment of career tracks so that we do not parallel faculty who are going to be brought in as Lecturers/Sr. Lecturers. Administration may turn around and say that that we do not need tenure-track faculty anymore. It is important to protect the integrity of tenure and the tenure process
- Dr. Silverman believes that we are now in a position actively to install this proposal
- Dr. Walter feels that this is still too premature, but it is important to move ahead with the position of Sr. Lecturer and that perhaps a statement should be issued by the Senate stating that we approve of the Sr. Lecturer position and think a peer review process should be involved. Once the position of Sr. Lecturer exists and is codified then we can set up committees.
- Dr. R. Geeta: Who will be involved in the peer reviews?
- Dr. Silverman: Will be done by the same process as the PTC. Departments have their own tenure committee which prepares the files and makes recommendations. This then goes to the PTC, Dean, Provost, etc.
- Dr. Joan Kuchner: There is clearly a whole cluster of issues in defining the review process for Sr. Lecturer that will need to be clarified for the guidelines in any review of promotion process. That is why we need to have a committee set up to spend the time working with the Faculty Rights Responsibilities Policy committee and working appropriately with the union on union issues to make sure this is well thought through so that the process (as long as we have the go-ahead from administration) can move forward. Because of this, lead time is needed. This is why we need the committee in place to represent the A&S Senate in this discussion.
- Dr. Silverman would like the senate to endorse the process. We still haven't actually committed ourselves to the formal committee



- Dr. Kuchner would like to take a vote for the peer review then seriously consider the formation of the committee
- Dr. Silverman thanked the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Policies for all their hard work during the year.

Motion: Promotion from Lecturer to Sr. Lecturer shall be subject to peer review conducted by governance. All in favor: Unanimous

Motion: To establish the Arts and Sciences Senate "Senior Lecturer Promotion Review Committee" (SL-PRC). All in favor: 8, Against: 2. Motion passed.

IX. New Business: No new business

Adjourned: 5:40  
Submitted by:  
Laurie Theobalt  
Secretary  
University Senate





**Stony Brook UUP Chapter Final Response to Administration's Proposal  
to Create Lecturer I and II and Senior Lecturer Positions  
April 21, 2007**

**I. Concerning the proposal to establish Lecturer I and II positions:**

UUP feels that this proposal is not well thought out and needs considerable reformulation before it is ready for further review. In particular:

- A. The anticipated pay differentials will dissolve over time as there will be no standard base rate for Lecturer I from which to calculate the salary of Lecturer II. Further, on hiring new faculty directly into the Lecturer II title, there will be no basis to calculate the higher salary due.
- B. There is nothing in the proposal to enhance the pay of those currently teaching a 4-4 load as they are promoted to the Lecturer II title when the ranks first go into effect.
- C. The proposal codifies an expectation that full-time lecturers have no research obligation. This degrades the expectations we have of faculty at Stony Brook, who are here at least in part to conduct research and publish. Stripping full-time lecturers of any expectation to do research only deepens the two-tier faculty system to the detriment of our colleagues' intellectual interests while seriously weakening the educational mission of our University.

Until these concerns are met, UUP does not agree to the proposal to establish the positions of Lecturer I and Lecturer II.

**II. Concerning the proposed establishment of the rank of Senior Lecturer:**

UUP finds this a welcome initiative. After a few questions are resolved we would support implementation of this proposal. In particular, we seek resolution of the following issues:

- A. The policy should be clear that promotion to senior lecturer would be considered in the seventh year of employment as Lecturer (in the first year of the third three-year contract).
- B. Recommendation for promotion to Senior Lecturer should be subject to peer review in the candidate's department and in a College-wide peer review system parallel to the existing PTC, as worked out by the College of Arts and Sciences Senate with the Dean. We note that these procedures should allow for proper review of Lecturers in pedagogy who have appointments in academic departments but do not teach in those departments (e.g. the Social Studies Teacher Education Program).
- C. Candidates recommended for promotion to Senior Lecturer by all levels of peer review and then denied by the Provost should have access to a review process parallel to that set out in Article 33 of the UUP contract with New York State, with the recommendation of the special review panel forwarded to the President with the file when it first is presented to the President.
- D. Once promoted to Senior Lecturer, subsequent reappointments will be considered in the first year of each contract to give the maximum stability to employment.
- E. The policy should be clear that a Senior Lecturer would be reappointed except in cases where there is documented non-performance of duties.
- F. The policy should have explicit provision for retired state employees who cannot have three-year contracts but must have one-year contracts with annual waivers.

**UUP proposes that the following policies be added to the final document:**

- G. To extend the Lecturer career ladder backward as well as forward, it should be stated policy that part-time lecturers/adjuncts should have first consideration for full-time Lecturer positions as they open

up in a department. The department will hire outside personnel only when existing part-time faculty are not suitable for the position. Such a commitment is contained in a Memorandum of Understanding between Administration at SUNY Cortland and the UUP chapter there. Contract provisions recently negotiated by the Professional Staff Congress and CUNY Administration created 100 "conversion lines" dedicated to such promotions. Fifty long-serving CUNY Adjuncts were recently promoted to full-time Lecturer positions. Fifty more will be promoted for the fall 2007 semester.

H. It should be University policy that a minimum of seventy percent of instructional faculty be tenured or on tenure-track lines.

-  
UUP welcomes further discussion with management to resolve these issues so we can move quickly to implementation of the Lecturer II rank



*Office of the Dean  
College of Arts & Sciences*

September 21, 2007

*To:* CAS Chairs and Program Directors

*From:* James V. Staros  
Dean

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James V. Staros".

*Subject:* CAS Budget Guidelines

The Provostial Area Budget Guidelines distributed on September 5, 2007 require that units end the year in compliance with the existing campus policy. Units not in balance at the end of the budget year will be assessed any final deficit in the following budget year. The College is currently projected to be in deficit at the end of the 2007-2008 budget year. In order to balance, CAS must adopt the following guidelines:

1. All salary savings from leaves and departures must be recaptured without exception. I remind all chairs that full departmental teaching loads must be met and that chairs are accountable for assigning a teaching load to each member of his/her faculty consistent with approved levels for the Department, recognizing approved reductions for service (e.g., Chair, DUG, Graduate Program Director). Any request to return salary savings beyond supporting teaching replacements at adjunct rates requires not only my approval, but that of the Provost, as well.
2. Recruitment of non-tenure-track faculty or staff, whether new or replacement, requires not only my approval, but that of the Provost, as well.
3. I must obtain approval from the Provost for any retention offers. Recommendations for retention offers must be fully justified.

My staff is working cooperatively with the Provost's staff to complete the budget analysis rapidly, so that we have full understanding of our financial condition in preparation for Eric Kaler's administration.

*xc:* Acting Provost W. Brent Lindquist  
Provost-Designate Eric W. Kaler  
Associate Vice President Daniel Melucci  
Associate and Assistant Deans, CAS  
Assistant Provosts Denise Johnson and Jeri Schoof



**Basic Budgeting Rules:**

1. Balancing budgets – All Provostial units are expected to balance fiscal year budgets consistent with the existing campus Surplus/Deficit Policy. As such, identified positive balances at year end will be retained by deans and directors with a goal of returning a portion of said balances to departments as appropriate. Over expenditures at the dean or director level, if any, will be assessed at the start of the following year.
2. Appropriate Reimbursement of State Costs – As a general rule, if state funded personnel are released from state service, reasonable reimbursement (in accord with campus policies) should be made to an appropriate account.
  - Proceeds from fellowships and buy-out agreements should, at a minimum, support the costs of replacing teaching effort or other services lost to a department.
3. Salary recovery via offset or rate structures should be maximized
  - Salary recovery from awarded research grants and contracts should coincide with the percentage of effort specified and the corresponding budgeted salaries. Recognizing that financial conditions and management practices have differed across campus, all deans should provide a written description of policy and procedure for salary recapture in their units including guidelines for use of such resources.
  - To the extent that an employee's time is recoverable through rates or fees, that effort must be recovered consistent with campus IFR policy. Salary recovery should coincide with the percentage of effort spent on the activity and specified in approved rate structures.
4. When evaluating departmental requests for additional resources, Deans will consider all fund sources available to the unit.

**Enhance Revenue Generation Through Enrollment Management:**

1. Summer Session enrollment should grow in size consistent with the Summer Session Incentive Plan to:
  - a. Expand summer course offerings/enrollments to increase revenue to academic departments and the campus.
  - b. Supplement academic course offerings as part of a four semester curriculum approach.
  - c. Explore new course offerings, alternative methods of course delivery, and development of innovative teaching and learning methods.
2. Winter Session enrollment should grow in a manner consistent with summer guidelines above.

To encourage summer and winter enrollment growth, the revenue sharing model is being revised to return a greater portion of revenue directly to academic departments.

3. Evaluate/cancel low enrollment courses and redeploy teaching resources as appropriate.

