

Spring 2003-Faculty & Professional Staff Meetings: Agendas & Minutes

April 25

March 14

February 14

Agenda: Faculty and Professional Staff Meeting

April 25, 2003

Lecture Center 102

1. Call to order.
2. Reading and approval of minutes. (March 14, 2003)
3. Announcements.
4. Report of the Interim President. Questions and action items from the floor.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer.
6. Action items from Officers, Standing Committees, Ad hoc Committees and other agencies of the College Faculty and Professional Staff. Questions and action items from the floor.
 - a. Lynn Spangler, Central Committee on Educational Technology
 1. Depending upon individual technological needs, schools and departments should replace each faculty and professional computer every 3 or 4 years where appropriate.
 2. Whereas the faculty has identified the availability of email and Blackboard on a 24/7 basis as a top priority, we request that Computer Services implement this policy.
 - b. Ann Balant and Kelli Parmley, Assessment Review Committee
 - c. Glenn Geher, Academic Affairs: College Calendar
7. Unfinished business: Student use of 4 questions from the SEI.
8. New business.
9. Optional reading of reports of Officers, Committees and other agencies of the College Faculty and Professional Staff.
 - a. Simin Mozayeni, Organization Committee
 - b. Rose Rudnitski, General Education III
10. Adjournment

Minutes: Meeting of the Faculty and Professional Staff

Friday, March 14, 2003

1. **Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.
2. **Approval of the Minutes:** The minutes from February 14th and February 27th were approved as circulated.
3. **Announcements:**

Susan Kraat announced that the 175th anniversary of the college will begin in April. The 175th is occurring at the same time as the Village of New Paltz's 375th anniversary. There will be a birthday party in Hasbrouck Park in October. Keep your eye on the college website for upcoming events.

Frank Trezza and Emily Trapp announced that the annual Faculty and Staff Campaign has started. They stated that no donation is too small and that they are focusing on the percentage of faculty and staff that participate in the process. They stated that corporations and outside individuals look at the percentage of Faculty/Staff donation when deciding to donate to the college. There are many ways to make a donation. Payroll deduction is one option or you can give a one-time donation online. Faculty and Staff can give to many areas such as unrestricted giving, student scholarships, Dorsky Museum, faculty support, VLC, Learning Center, Friends of the Library, Humanizing Humanities, etc.

A drawing will take place April 30 at a donor recognition reception with great prizes such as gift certificates to Mohonk Mountain House and Great Escape. On March 29 there will be an early drawing for Hudson Valley Philharmonic tickets. For more information contact Lucia Mallardi, Frank Trezza or Emily Trapp.

4. **Report of the Interim President:** Interim President Steve Poskanzer began his report by reiterating the importance of the support for the Faculty and Staff campaign. He next discussed information from meetings he recently attended in Albany regarding the budget. He stated that it is clear that there will be a tuition increase. The real question is the amount. Current figure in the Governors budget is \$1200. The dollar value of the tuition increase is important because the budget begins with a cut and the only way that we get that back is through a tuition increase. The legislators that he spoke with hear the argument we are making about the importance of linking these two together. There is also a fair amount of resistance to the notion of indexing tuition-rather than having large increases. In addition, the lawmakers are not terribly receptive to settle what tuition is going to be early in the budget process.

In regards to TAP, Poskanzer stated that every bit of information he has heard indicates that proposals reducing the amount of TAP a student receives while a student are dead in the water. News is better in regards to EOP, the cuts do not seem to be as severe as originally thought. In regards to the capitol plan, the current thinking is that 2.5 billion will be allocated to campuses for rehabilitation and renovation. There has been some discussion that they are going to allocate to campuses based on their current square footage, which could cause concern.

Poskanzer concluded his remarks on the budget by stating that the budget dance is in early stages. At some point they will cut a deal that will become the budget. Some feel that this will be one of the latest years. Situation is serious, but he is not panicked about it. We have been very prudent about budgeting. Biggest issue is how tuition increases and budget cuts will play out.

Questions: A faculty member asked if we should be concerned about the effect of a tuition increase on enrollment. Poskanzer replied that he thinks the base we have built in the enrollment planning puts us in good shape. The numbers seem to indicate that freshmen and transfer applications are running ahead from last year. We have led all SUNY for the 12 consecutive years in the number of applications. We have finalized the number of spring enrollments and are one percent higher in number of students than we were in spring in 2002, which provides additional revenue for the campus.

Poskanzer also stated that the last couple of weeks we have been in the hiring season and have commitments in several departments. Several other searches are moving towards conclusion. Another search that is moving well is the Dean of Fine and Performing Arts.

Capitol Projects: A contract has been signed and approved for the VLC renovation and hopefully work will start in early April.

In addition, the Board of Trustees has approved our proposal to grant an honorary degree to Michael Badalucco-Emmy award actor and Alum.

Questions: none.

5. **Report of the Presiding officer.** Barbara Hardgrave reported that the Curriculum Committee has approved a B.S. in Environmental Science, English Minor, English Childhood Education (B-2 and 1-6) Major, English Adolescence Education Major and a Black Studies Major of Elementary Education (B-2 and 1-6). She also stated that there was a meeting of the Executive Committee and the members of the presidential search committee to talk about ways to facilitate some improvements. We recommended that a report from each search committee meeting be made to the campus community. Yesterday there was an email with minutes from the last meeting.
6. **Report of the Academic Affairs Committee:** Glenn Geher, Chair, reported that the Academic Affairs Committee recently passed three proposals from Ann Minnick. The first Proposal was to allow students to change to GE III. The newer GE is potentially more desirable. If there is a desire to switch to the new GE, we concluded the logistics were too unwieldy and voted against this proposal. The second proposal dealt with the s/u option. Currently, students on academic probation are not allowed to take the pass-fail option. That seems like a bad policy, as students who are on academic probation might be students who benefit from the s/u option. We voted unanimously to lift that ban. The third proposal was to eliminate Basic Algebra as a requirement for graduation. This proposal passed as well.

Geher next went on to discuss the Academic Calendar for 2004-2005. The main issue pertains to the religious holidays. The committee voted to take out the holidays. A lot of the issue has to do with pragmatics such as three Mondays in a row would be holidays with Labor Day, and religious holidays. There was also a strong consensus on the committee that substitution days are not desirable as it has implications for peoples work schedule. Other reasons arose as well. Yoav Kaddar raised the issue that including select holidays is disrespectful of the diversity that we are trying to promote. Deb Miller was thus charged to come up with a calendar that omitted the religious holidays. The calendar that went forward to Academic Senate does not include religious holidays and has only one substitution day on Oct. 18, and includes a mid semester break during Columbus Day weekend. A very different discussion and voice occurred at the Academic Senate meeting. The discussion was polarized and the final vote was 8-7. A lot of people feel the omission of the Jewish holidays was going to be problematic. The committee met the Tuesday after the meeting and consulted with the President and Barbara about how to proceed. Based on this process we plan on putting two calendars forward and will have full faculty vote on both calendars.

The first three items were voted on as a package and supported unanimously at the Academic Senate. A motion made by Rose Rudnitski to approve the proposals. The motion was seconded.

Discussion: A question was raised regarding the s/u proposal: does that change what courses they can take for s/u? Glenn replied no.

Rose withdrew her motion and a motion was made to address each proposal separately.

Discussion on Proposal #1: A faculty member made the point that in the issue of fairness; perhaps students should be able to choose. Rose stated that it was a logistical nightmare in scheduling and advising. It might prolong the existence of GE II. When people come in they agree to a GE that is in place when they come here. Another faculty member stated that we are going to go through a transitional period and we don't know how long it is going to be. The point was also made that if we are trying to be student centered, why pass a policy that is for our administrative convenience. David Blankenship stated that the committee discussed the logistical implications very thoroughly and in the end those in favor of the proposal voted against after hearing the logistical aspects. Rich Bodenschatz called the question. Debated ended. Motion passed.

Discussion on Proposal #2: A faculty member asked if a student is on probation, how is an s/u calculated in GPA? She also stated that if a student is on probation then the GPA gets them off probation, so they are taking courses that don't count toward the GPA. A member of faculty clarified that there is a limit of 4 credits per semester. Reality of s/u is that it doesn't stay that way, only counts as an elective. Question was called. Debated ended. Motion passed.

Proposal #3: No debate. Question called. Motion passed.

Glenn concluded his remarks by stating the committee will be back in April to present the calendar.

Report of the Assessment Steering Committee: Kelli Parmley reported that since the last faculty senate meeting there have been three town forums, many one on one discussions, and a few emails. Throughout our three meetings we had over 60 people attend. The underlying theme is the basic question of why we should do assessment. The committee focused on what would make sense for SUNY New Paltz. As we went around we learned a lot about what is currently going on in departments in the area of assessment. What we did not provide in the original document is what the external affairs organizations want in the assessment process. There seems to be a misperception about who the external organizations are and what they are asking for. Middle States adopted in the Spring 2002 new guidelines that include 14 standards for the campus. Two of the standards are specific to assessment and cut across academic and student affairs areas. The standards are not specific, but simply call for the organization to be involved in assessment. Second entity is SUNY Central their requirements are specifically geared to academic areas.

The Assessment Committee presented the following *Resolution* that was put forward to the Academic Senate, and was approved. No action was taken but questions were answered.

Resolution of the Assessment Steering Committee
(Proposed at Academic Senate March 7, 2003; passed unanimously)

Whereas the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) has been charged with determining the underlying philosophy and principles, the pertinent organizational levels, the priorities, and the resources necessary for creating a comprehensive assessment program at SUNY New Paltz;

And whereas the ASC has articulated an underlying philosophy of assessment that is aligned with the mission and goals of the campus;

And whereas the ASC has issued a report with recommendations for assessment efforts within General Education, the Academic Major & Program, and Administrative & Academic Support that are consistent with this underlying philosophy and congruent with the requirements of external agencies;

Be it resolved that:

- 1 the philosophy and principles of assessment in each area outlined in the ASC report be adopted.*
- 2 a General Education assessment plan be developed by the GE Board, in accordance with the principles set forth in Section V of the ASC report, and be presented to faculty governance for approval.*
- 3 **the Provost and the Deans be charged by the President with implementing a process for determining faculty representation on the Assessment Advisory Council be developed by the Organization Committee and incorporated into Faculty By-laws.***
- 4 resource recommendations be made annually by the Assessment Advisory Council for a budget to be allocated by the administration to support assessment efforts across the campus.*
- 5 assessment system within each of the Schools, in accordance with the principles set forth in Section VI of the ASC report.*

Questions: A faculty member asked how would a timeline be established. Kelli replied that when Middle States comes back for mid-term evaluations, it would be ideal that assessment in several departments are underway. As long as we can show we made progress then we will be in good shape. It is important to not overwhelm campus and also important to show progress.

A faculty member stated that he feels this substitutes bureaucratic process with genuine improvement, and in times of budget crisis, should the money be used in administrative rather than real teaching and learning?

A faculty member asked about resource recommendation under section five. Would the budget be coming from resources we already have and be redirected, or additional monies from the state? Provost Lavalley stated that it would depend on the magnitude. What we have been doing historically for new initiatives such as the Writing Board is derive budgets from summer session revenues. We don't receive a budget from the state for these activities.

Report of the Curriculum Committee: David Hobby, chair of the committee thanked members of the committee and those that are writing course proposals. In terms of course approvals under the new guidelines, 21 are approved while 40 are in the process of being approved. There are 100 more courses that might be coming. Since we have to finish this by May, it sounds scary, but on the positive side, we have had the important discussions already. Hopefully we can increase pace. There doesn't seem to be a problem of upper divisions courses being submitted. We did reject a course and it is important to remember that courses should be accessible to the general campus population. If the course requires PI, upper division, only for majors, or if enough things are excluded, the committee votes against it.

Questions: none.

Unfinished business: A faculty member asked about the status of the resolution that was tabled at the last meeting regarding academic freedom. The faculty member who made the original motion was not present so the motion remained tabled.

Other Unfinished business: Took off the table the motion regarding SEI publication that was passed by the Academic Senate. Matt Geller, student representative on the Academic Senate, originally made the motion:

I motion that the Student Evaluation of Instructor statements #s

- 3. Contributed towards making me a more educated and informed person*
- 11. Stimulated student interest in the subject matter*
- 12. Treated students with fairness and concern*
- 22. Overall was an effective instructor*

be made available to the campus community on Blackboard. This will be a one-year voluntary process that will begin the Spring of 2003.

Discussion: Glenn Geher spoke on the motion. He stated that he has experience as a student at an institution where the information was available and was helpful in choosing classes. A faculty member asked for clarification on whether the publication of the information was mandatory. The Academic Senate approved motion states that it will be a voluntary process with a one-year trial period. (The motion that was read at the beginning of the discussion was not the true wording of the motion that was passed by the Academic Senate, so a motion was made to replace the motion that was up for discussion with the actual motion that was passed on November 22. The motion to replace was approved. The correct version is the one that is stated above in italics.)

Discussion: A faculty member stated that the SEI's we are using are problematic and that is of concern. The teacher's work would be reduced to those four questions, which doesn't seem like a comprehensive overview. My problem is not with the intent, but with the vehicle.

Jonathan Amoia, Student Association President, stated that he understands the history of the SEI, but stated that it was chosen because it was faculty generated. He also reiterated that it was a one-year trial process to see how it goes.

Lewis Brownstein stated that the we have recognized for a long time that SEI is not a good way to evaluate faculty. He also wanted to remind the faculty of the history of the instrument. When it was originally created it was purely voluntary but was transformed into something that is required because of DSI, reappointment or tenure. The consequence of adopting this current motion is to put additional pressure to institutionalize a flawed instrument. Students should put together a way of assessment themselves. Would much preferred to see a resolution to not use SEI at all.

Phyllis Freeman stated that twenty years ago when we were first discussing assessing teaching we wanted to create an instrument to improve teaching. SEI has moved into the area of evaluation. A snap shot or one time evaluation of anyone's teaching is a poor way of evaluating behavior. One time look will label a professor. When evaluations are used in a public format, people's teaching changes and they teach to the instrument.

Hadi Salavitabar stated that this instrument has only been used for 11 years. Before that they had SEI's in the 70's. We worked hard and for many years in developing the instrument and received approval from faculty and staff. It is very hard to create an instrument and that is why we don't have a new one. We should set aside our feelings about the instrument and focus on the motion.

Kimberly Lavoie mentioned the student nature aspect of the institution and reminded that it is a voluntary process. We should applaud the students for coming forward to ask. If we talk about being student centered we should put action.

Jonathan Amoia stated that we have been working on this since September. Asked to push issues of SEI aside and move forward. The students could have created their own document but they wanted to involve faculty.

The Question was called. A quorum was called. Only 62 eligible voters were present, thus there was no quorum.

Meeting adjourned at 5:03

Respectfully submitted,
S. Craig Mourton

* * * * *

Agenda: Faculty and Professional Staff Meeting

March 14, 2003

Lecture Center 102

1. Call to order
2. Reading and approval of the minutes of the Feb. 14 meeting and the Feb. 27 special meeting.
3. Announcements
4. Report of the Interim President. Questions and action items from the floor.
5. Action items from Officers, Standing Committees, Ad hoc Committees and other agencies of the College Faculty.
Questions and action items from the floor:
 - a. Report of the Presiding Officer
 - b. Report of the Academic Affairs Committee
 - c. Report of the Assessment Steering Committee
 - d. Report of the Curriculum Committee
6. Unfinished business.
7. New business
8. Adjournment.

Minutes: SUNY New Paltz Faculty and Professional Staff Meeting

February 14, 2003

1. **Call to Order:** The Meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes:** Minutes approved as corrected.
3. **Report of the President:** Interim President Steve Poskanzer reported on the following:

Budget: There are four main components of the budget that has been presented by the executive branch of the government:

1. SUNY would be taking a 178 million or 16 percent budget cut which will be off set by a \$1200 tuition increase.
2. Proposed changes to TAP—the amount the student receives while in school would be reduced to 2/3 of the total allotment. When the student graduates, they would get the remainder.
3. Also proposed is a cut of 50 percent to the EOP program.
4. New 5-year capitol plan.

1. Tuition increase: This reflects a \$200 decrease from what the trustees proposed. Opposition is high from students and community. It is important to keep the context of tuition in mind and keep perspective. Even with the increase, SUNY will be among the lowest priced of public institutions in the northeast. This is the first increase in seven years. It would have been rational to have a rational tuition increase-- something predictable and reliable. Unfortunately, tuition has been a political issue. Now whatever tuition increase that does happen, the fear is that it will just fill a hole that is created by the decrease in state support.

2. TAP: Every year for the last 5-6 years there is a proposal to revamp TAP. This year's proposal assumes you can defer 1/3 of payment until graduation. This proposal is different in that there are no deadlines for graduation. These changes in TAP will be problematic for students who do not have borrowing capacity and for parents who do not have the savvy to find alternative funding.

3. EOP: Our EOP program is one of the largest and most successful programs in SUNY. The retention and graduation rate has been higher than non- EOP students. The loss of the stipends to EOP students will be difficult on the most financially strapped students and is of great concern to us.

4. Capitol Budget: There will be funding for another 5-year multi-million-dollar capitol plan to address facility needs on campuses. Campuses will be given additional control on how the money is spent.

It is important as we go into tough negotiations about the budget that we remember that this campus is in good financial shape. All of our advocacy must focus on all of the issues.

Questions on budget: A faculty member asked about the outlook for lines. Poskanzer stated that the budgets don't talk about lines, the campus decides. We believe that there are critical faculty and search process that we are continuing and will continue. If they roll back the tuition increase and they don't reinstate cuts in funding, then we will have to halt some searches. When a position becomes vacant on campus, we are asking offices to keep the position vacant for 30 days. A faculty member also mentioned that Step and C-Step has been removed from the governor's proposal and he encouraged all to advocate for that as well

Enrollment: Registrations from fall to spring have continued to be robust and show an increase in retention. Final figures from fall 2001 to fall 2002 are 84 percent, which is a new record. In 1996 we were at 67 percent. Some of the most selective colleges are at 88-90 percent. We have continued our practice of no new freshman for spring semester. A little early in the game to predict a new class, but currently we are 4 percent ahead of where we were last year in applications, while transfer applications are up 5 percent from this time last year.

Capitol Projects: *Athletic center:* We have a contractor and a signed contract. Ground will move in April.

VLC: The contract has been approved with the bids coming in lower than the contract price. Construction fund only gave 8 million to an 11 million project. In order to start the VLC project,

dominoes had to fall. Our facilities and alterations crew did an excellent job. The last part of this was the Counseling Center moving into the old infirmary. The Counseling Center will have a grand opening of Feb 21. We are getting ready to move the Health Center back into the building. This work is to be completed in the spring and summer.

The plaza between Haggerty and the SUB: Most of the pavers are in and if the weather warms up, they will finish the project soon.

Annual Fund: The fund is up 28 percent, with the total giving up 67 percent. The number of gifts are up 20 percent more than all of last year. The development staff and foundation board are working well together. We are still at a baby step in the development stage.

Poskanzer also mentioned that Kit French and Patty Phillips were both recognized at a Chancellors dinner recently.

This is SUNY New Paltz's 175th birthday, which coincides with the village's 325th. Over the next year there will be a series of events to commemorate it and it is important to note what we have preserved.

Questions: A faculty member asked about the number of students called up for reserves. Vice President Eaton stated that he knows of at least one. Any student called up for reserves will be administratively dropped from courses and held harmless from that and financial responsibility and are allowed to return. We are legally bound to hold jobs for you as well.

Another faculty member stated that the quality of incoming students is getting better and we are admitting fewer applicants. Maybe it is time to enhance our image as an academically selective school. Vice President Eaton replied that the guidance community is aware of what we are looking for.

4. **Report of the presiding officer:** No report, no questions.
5. **Unfinished business:** Glenn McNitt made a motion that the motion on academic freedom remain tabled until the next meeting. Seconded. The motion to table passed.
6. **New Business:**

Report of the Assessment Steering Committee:

Anne Balant and Kelli Parmley gave a brief overview of process:

The President convened an assessment steering committee. The charge to the committee was to develop a proposal for campus-wide assessment that "makes sense" for New Paltz.

The committee was divided into three sub groups: general education, assessment in the academic major, and administrative and academic support areas.

Each of these three areas deliberated, researched and generated sub reports. The report is online at www.newpaltz.edu/assessment

Ann next discussed a distilled list of qualities that they agreed upon for an assessment system:

- Evaluate student learning and student development as a whole, not individual contributions.
- Assessment will be most effective when done at the program level.
- The assessment process should be clear and include all that need to be involved.
- We do need resources-faculty resources, and assessment should be viewed as service. Assessment will require support at all levels
- An assessment system needs to be assessed itself. We need a mechanism to evaluate assessment and ways to decrease duplication of efforts.
- Wherever there are systems in place, we should capitalize on these.

Rose Rudnitski discussed the Assessment of GE: One of the things we did to assess GE II was go around to the departments and asked for feedback. We got similar responses and these informed the development of GE III. We can't just take people's word, we have to have evidence. One of the reasons we have to do this is for external forces such as Middle States. When they return we will have to have more concrete data to present to them and have learning goals and objectives. We thus need methods and measures for assessing progress. We are making every effort to allow faculty to come up with assessment tools. The best way to assess is to do it onsite in one place. We want to improve our program-this is our first goal. Also identify time frame for assessment and how it will be used. Learning outcomes should be put into the GE course approval guidelines. Assessment information should be garnered from existing sources when possible. Reporting should be done in aggregate form. We are assessing the program outcomes, not the outcomes of every course. Insert program outcomes in the class syllabi. GE board should be given a budget for assessment. Institutional research should be a part of this.

Assessment in the academic major and program was next discussed with the following key points:

- Faculty in each department should decide how to divide the task.
- We should design assessment systems that are done with best practice .
- The proposal system should undergo review.
- At the deans office level we hope there will be effort to coordinate the different majors.
- We hope to use the academic department reports to report the progress
- Departments develop systems collaboratively and coordinating at the deans and provost level.
- More professional development will be needed, as well as addition staff support at the level of the deans office and a lot of help form IR

Ray Schwartz next discussed the assessment of administrative and academic support: It was very important to the committee to assess the campus as a whole and that everybody takes part in the process of continued assessment. Ray mentioned the following key points.

- Clearly identified program goals need to be created if not already in place.
- We will work on identifying objectives, activities and outcomes, and performance objectives.
- We will develop benchmarking and assessment tools.
- A process for collecting and analyzing data will also be developed.
- The committee also decided on the establishment of a short-term implementation committee. Because of the diversity of what administrative and academic support does, a committee should be formed with a representative from each division in order to minimize duplication of efforts and move forward to develop assessment practices that help the most constituents.
- It is also important to identify, and in some situations provide professional development opportunities. Support from IR will also be key.

One of the things the group noticed when they looked at other campuses assessments programs was a coordination of efforts. We need to insure that somehow we can report progress. Thus an assessment advisory council should be created. This council would assess the process as a whole, identify a stronger process, and determine assessments role in the Middle States process. The council would represent interests across the three areas mentioned earlier.

The committee will also have three town meetings to engage the community:

February 20 at 10 a.m. International Program Conference room

February 26 at 3 p.m TLC

March 5 at 5:30 p.m. College Terrance

Questions: A faculty member questioned the need to add FTE in Institutional Research with the current budget difficulties. Other comments focused on whether the process could be simpler so that it would not be an additional demand of time and resources.

Another faculty member pointed out that assessment was discussed as curriculum research. Perhaps assessment could then be classified as scholarship rather than service.

A question was also asked about the imperative that Middle States has given us and why it is imperative to do assessment.

Provost Lavalley replied to these questions by stating that any program should have a way of knowing if they are doing a process well. What we are supposed to be engaged in is deciding for ourselves how we assess and if we are doing what we are supposed to be doing well.

Kristen Rauch made the suggestion that the town meetings might be a better place to further the discussion.

Other New Business: Glenn McNitt made the motion to pass the following resolution:

Whereas SUNY New Paltz has been without a president since the departure of Roger Bowen in September 2001, and

Whereas the Presidential Search Committee is now in its second year of attempting to fill this vital campus executive position, and

Whereas the Presidential Search Committee and the College Council, as directed by the Trustees, have already presented a list of unranked candidates to the SUNY Trustees for their consideration, and

Whereas the Chancellor and the SUNY Trustees have indicated their unwillingness to select a president in the absence of a consensus that has coalesced around any one candidate,

Now be it therefore resolved:

That the Organizational Committee of SUNY New Paltz Faculty conduct a non-binding, informational written poll of the Faculty, in which members can rank by secret ballot their top three choices from among the final list of Presidential candidates previously submitted to the New Paltz faculty and professional staff.

This poll shall be conducted at the earliest practicable time by secret mail ballot sent to all members of the SUNY New Paltz Faculty and Professional Staff, accompanied by brief biographical sketches of all candidates.

The results of this poll shall be transmitted upon tabulation by the Organization Committee to the Presidential Search Committee, the College Council, the Chancellor, the SUNY Trustees and the general College Community.

The resolution was seconded.

Discussion: Glenn McNitt stated that if in fact that the Chancellor and Trustees were unable to choose because they didn't know what the preferences were, we could provide that information to them if there is a consensus.

Robin Cohen discussed emails and conversations that were put out during the process. The consensus that she witnessed was that there was no candidate that all were in support of. We all had an opportunity to

submit evaluations. This resolution is proposing an election ballot that is superficial. Being frustrated about Albany's ambivalence after the committee was ambivalent is unfair.

Another faculty member pointed out that the search committee worked very hard to produce the work they produced. The bottom line is that the candidates that were put forward were deemed unacceptable. He urges that the search committee continues the process and that it is not proper at this time to rank the candidates or provide evaluation when we already had the chance.

David Blankenship: We don't all know all 5 candidates. There was only an hour and half designated for each candidate. Some can speak to some but to not all. We evaluated the candidates that we were able to see. What lies behind the motion is dissatisfaction on how the search turned out. One of the assumptions was that there was a violation by the Chancellor. It is conceivable that under his evaluation that there is not a clear choice and the search should continue and that it should continue under changed rules that could perhaps yield a result.

Paul Zuckerman: He heard that they are not lacking consensus in our choice but that they themselves could not reach a consensus. I don't think a vote will help. What if a lower ranked person gets the position. We shouldn't do this.

Another faculty member stated that one of our concerns is that there might not have been consensus among the committee due to the fact that there was a push to have the interim president as a candidate. The fact that the interim president did not issue a statement could have had an influence on the college council or chancellor and that this tainted the process.

Someone else pointed out that this proposal is actually redundant and less helpful than the evaluation forms. The committee looked at these forms extensively. No guarantee that people who fill out this ballot saw all five candidates.

A question was asked as to why not reconvene search committee and ask for their first choice. The guidelines require that they not be ranked and that three have to be sent forward.

A further point was made that this is not going to help the process and could bring out divisions in the faculty.

Rich Bodenshatz called the question. Vote to close the debate passed. Motion in favor 2, all others were opposed. Motion failed.

7. Committee Reports

Tenure and Re-appointment Committee:

Fall 2002: Two candidates for continuing appointment. Committee recommended both. Administration agreed on one and disagreed on the other

Fall 2002: Three candidates from the library for reappointment: Agreement on all. Two candidates for reappointment in LAS: Agreement on all.

Spring 2003: *Business*: 6 Assistant Professors and 2 Lectures-reappointment
Education: 3 Lectures and 2 Assistant Professors- reappointment
2 Associate Professors-continuing appointments
F&PA: 2 Lectures and 5 Assistant Professors-reappointment
2 Associate Professors-continuing appointment
LAS: 6 lectures and 21 Assistant Professors-reappointment
3 Assistant Professors-continuing appointment.

Questions: none

Promotional and Discretionary Salary Increase:

The committee has met in order to organize and approve the documents for promotion and DSI. The committee did not support the document for baseline increases.

There were 150 DSI applications, 146 awards were made. This shows 93 percent agreement between central committee and administration.

The committee had greater concerns under the area of promotion. The committee considered eight files and granted all eight. The administration granted 5 promotions and 3 were negative. This reflects a 62 percent agreement.

Reminders about this years applications, in particular DSI. You need to provide complete information on cover sheets. You must include annual faculty report and current SEI's. The committee also asks that you carefully consider how much information to include. What we consider is about 150 DSI a year. We examine 30 a week. It takes a lot of time to review these files. When you are putting together a folder, take this into consideration.

Questions: A question was asked about the baseline document for salary increases. The committee discussed it and could not endorse it. So is the inference that the committee is not going to follow those guidelines? Yes that is correct.

Awards and Leaves: Barbara read the following report from Steve Vinson:

In the fall of 2002, the Committee on Research, Awards and Leaves considered 12 sabbatical leave requests: 9 of these were for half-year sabbaticals, and 3 for full-year sabbaticals. All were approved by the committee and by the Provost.

Educational Technology Lynn Spangler offered the following report:

1. Created Student Computer Access Program (SCAP) subcommittee
 - a. CCET dispersed information about grants.
 - b. SCAP subcommittee reviewed applications and made recommendations to Jon Lewitt, Assistant Vice President, Technology and Information Services on December 18, 2002.
2. Computer lab access for students.
 - a. Some labs are underused and should be open to all students; some should not because of special uses.
 - b. Motion passed requesting "Computer Services review policies on accessibility of computer labs and confer with departments as appropriate."
3. Faculty computers-proposed policies:
 - a. Depending on individual technological needs, schools and departments should plan on replacing each faculty and professional computer every 3 or 4 years.
 - b. The CCET has identified the availability of email on a 24/7 basis as the top priority of Computer Services to faculty and professional staff.
 - c. The CCET requests that Computer Services have applications such as Power Point Viewer available on all classroom computers.
4. Issues still to be addressed this year.
 - a. Revision of SCAP guidelines for next year per recommendations of SCAP subcommittee and what to do about departments who don't report results.
 - b. Email and BB security
 - c. Criteria for evaluating submissions of established courses to be taught online.

Other business: Kristen Rauch called for an additional emergency faculty meeting to discuss the presidential search committee. Barbara has put a call into Nancy Cook, who is the consultant to the search

committee. She would be able to give advice whether or not this is a continuing search or if it is a new search. Barbara encouraged people to email her and she would set up an emergency meeting.

8. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

S. Craig Mourton

Minutes: Special Meeting of Faculty and Professional Staff

February 27, 2003

The meeting to consider Prof. Glenn McNitt's following resolution was called to order at 11:32 a.m. by Presiding Officer, Barbara Hardgrave.

Prof. McNitt proposed that the resolution be forwarded to the College Council, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees; the motion was seconded:

**FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH**

Whereas, after months of research, interviews, deliberations and the expenditure of a significant amount of money, the SUNY New Paltz Presidential Search Committee, in November of 2002, recommended several well-qualified candidates for President of SUNY New Paltz,

Whereas, this followed a process outlined by SUNY System Administration and the Chancellor,

Whereas, this diverse committee utilized an inclusive, democratic search process that involved extensive consultation with all constituency groups including faculty, professional staff, classified staff and students as the basis for its recommendations,

Whereas, the failure of the College Council and the Chancellor to select one of the recommended candidates undermines the work of the Search Committee, the will of the college community, and the collaborative governance process so vital to public higher education,

Whereas, in late December of 2002, 125 faculty and professional staff called for the following steps to be taken,

Whereas, we have not received a response from the Chancellor or Board of Trustees,

Be it resolved that the College Council, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees:

1. Reconsider their decision, or
2. Provide to the New Paltz College community the specific reasons why each of the recommended candidates was rejected, and

Moreover, be it further resolved that, in the absence of such action from these bodies, we call upon the Presidential Search Committee to resubmit its original recommendations.

Paul Zuckerman made a motion, as a substitute to McNitt's motion; Zuckerman's motion was seconded. Said motion reads:

The Faculty and Professional Staff call upon the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to provide the Search Committee with an explanation as to why the candidates presented were not acceptable.

The motion was defeated.

A motion was made, and seconded, to amend the resolution by substituting #2 of the listed responses with Zuckerman's proposed motion. A vote was called, and the motion passed.

Another motion was made, and seconded, that the resolution be further amended by dropping the last paragraph that began, "Moreover.....". A vote was called, and the motion passed. The amended resolution reads as follows

FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

Whereas, after months of research, interviews, deliberations and the expenditure of a significant amount of money, the SUNY New Paltz Presidential Search Committee, in November of 2002, recommended several well-qualified candidates for President of SUNY New Paltz,

Whereas, this followed a process outlined by SUNY System Administration and the Chancellor,

Whereas, this diverse committee utilized an inclusive, democratic search process that involved extensive consultation with all constituency groups including faculty, professional staff, classified staff and students as the basis for its recommendations,

Whereas, the failure of the College Council and the Chancellor to select one of the recommended candidates undermines the work of the Search Committee, the will of the college community, and the collaborative governance process so vital to public higher education,

Whereas, in late December of 2002, 125 faculty and professional staff called for the following steps to be taken,

Whereas, we have not received a response from the Chancellor or Board of Trustees,

Be it resolved that the College Council, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees:

1. Reconsider their decision, or
2. The Faculty and Professional Staff call upon the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to provide the Search Committee with an explanation as to why the candidates presented were not acceptable.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ardis Marcotte
Secretary pro tem

* * * * *

Agenda: Faculty and Professional Staff Meeting

February 14, 2003
Lecture Center 102

1. Call to order
2. Reading and approval of minutes (November 15, 2002)
3. Announcements
4. Report of the Acting President
Questions and action items from the floor
5. Report of the Presiding Officer
Questions and action items from the floor
6. Unfinished business: Prof. Hauptman's motion regarding
academic freedom
7. New business: Assessment Steering Committee report
8. Committee reports: Tenure & Reappointment; Promotion &
Salary Increase: Research, Awards &
Leaves; Educational Technology.
9. Adjournment

Minutes: Faculty/Professional Staff Meeting

November 15, 2002

1. **Call to order:** Meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m.
2. **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** The minutes were approved with the following changes: Under the president report, the word fiscal should be changed to physical. Barbara Hardgrave's email was incorrect it should read hardgrab@newpaltz.edu

3. Announcements:

Barbara Hardgrave, Presiding Officer, announced that Professor Margaret Wade Lewis and Chuck Lynch will be recognized at the annual Alumni Award Ceremony which will be held next week on November 23rd in the Purple Lounge at 3:30 p.m. Faculty are invited to attend. There is also an upcoming event at the Culinary Institute for alumni faculty. An invitation will be sent via email.

Glenn McNitt, Chapter President of UUP, asked for special privilege to suspend the order of business in order to present a motion after the presiding officers report. The order of business was changed.

McNitt also announced the following:

The professional development applications should be announced this week, with materials submitted through January. Applications will be read on the Feb 15th and decisions made shortly thereafter. The members of the committee are Marda Reid, Becky Aday, Cliff Meador, Larry Hauptman, Gwen Havranek, and Jan Schmidt. Discretionary Salary Increases will be announced before Thanksgiving. The first payment of DSI should be December 4th. McNitt also asked all to consider increasing amount deducted for vote-cope. We are entering a negotiating period in our contract and it is important to be able to have funds to advocate.

The negotiations team met last weekend at Lake George to evaluate and discuss all applications and issues raised by members across the state. Information was gathered through a survey that went to everyone in the membership; 29 campus visits with the members of the negotiation team; and a website. All three

sources were used by all of the subcommittees that were trying to prepare our package to the state next year.

Nancy Schniedewind, Educational Studies, announced a lecture on 11/21/02 at 7 p.m. in LC 102 by Dale Kovel. The title of the lecture will be The Machine that Makes War: Understanding US Militarism at All Levels.

4. Report of the President:

Interim President Poskanzer began his by reporting that there was a fire in Bouton Hall a week and half ago. No one was injured. It has been determined that the fire began when a visitor put a lit cigarette in a trashcan of paper. The room was virtually destroyed, but the cinder block construction contained the fire well. The incident has already begun to stimulate talk about why we allow smoking in residence halls. RHSA has been asked to think about the issue. There is also a series of discussions occurring on campus whether or not we want to make modifications in smoking policy in general. In particular, to ban smoking within a corridor of space around buildings. CSEA has raised a concern that people are walking through a veil of smoke getting into buildings. CSEA, UUP and other bodies on campus are looking into drafting a policy.

Enrollment: Poskanzer stated that we are at new highs in undergraduate and graduate enrollment. All triples in the residence halls have been given opportunities to move to doubles. It is still early in admission cycle to see 2003 enrollment projections. Last weekend we had 1600 students and 5000 family members attend Open House. Thanks to faculty and professional staff for manning booths and to Admissions to a well run and productive event. In regard to applications, freshman applications are nine percent ahead of where we were this time last year. Early Action applications are up 91% over last year. Transfer applications for the spring are up ten percent.

Construction: The Awasco Group has been named as the contractor for the Athletic Center. We are waiting for a date for ground breaking and hope to start digging before the ground freezes.

The Van Den Berg bid packets have been made available and are due on December 14th. Renovations of the Counseling Center portion of the Health Center are on track so they can move out of Van Den Berg before January.

The Art History offices are now open in Smiley Poskanzer offered thanks for being patient in the delay due to air conditioning units and for moving in over the Columbus Day weekend

The Trio program is moving to Old Main so that more Humanities space is open.

Reconstruction of the SUB Plaza is nearing completion. We also just awarded a contract to redo Humanities windows to Cortland glass.

Poskanzer stated that construction updates are placed on the web once every two weeks at www.newpaltz.edu/construction.

Also related to construction, He has been working on a process to decide which projects we are going to build. To this extent, a capitol planning council has been formed. This council is chaired by the provost, and includes staff and expertise from design and construction. Poskanzer feels that it is necessary to have a body that can balance and make decisions for the whole campus. Significant input will come from Deans and Vice Presidents. Each Dean and Vice President will know about projects that come up within their own division to them. We are going to ask the Deans and Vice Presidents to take on the role of advocate to the project and make the case for the project. The council is in the position to weigh each of the options and to make recommendations to the President. In the next few weeks the process and submission date will be announced for a round of projects for next summer and fall. Periodic times of the year a call letter will go out. Poskanzer hopes that this will make the process more transparent

Development: In addition to the \$300,000 gift, we have received a \$102,000 gift from Karen Dorsky to endow the Samuel Dorsky Museum of Art. The combine total of these two gifts make this makes it the third largest in New Paltz history.

Unrestricted giving is at \$167, 000 for the current year compared to \$67,000 last year.

Academic Developments: ABET has just approved the Electrical and Computer Engineering program for the first time.

The Assessment steering committee delivered an excellent report that is going to elicit discussion on campus. The committee did a terrific and thoughtful job.

In a Conversation with President meeting this week, there were a lot of questions about the budget. There is a lot of uncertainty across the State about what it looks like for next year. The budget finished in the black this year, not every SUNY can say this. Budget for the year that we are in now is a balanced budget as well. Given the uncertainty of years ahead we have to be prudent and frugal, but have advertised for 13 faculty positions (9 new and 4 replacements.)

Other News Items:

- We had a terrific ground breaking for Lenape Hall. Last month we had the grand opening of the language lab.
- Also had a terrific Parents Weekend and successful Alumni Weekend.
- Lloyd Axelrod has been named the new Director of Public Affairs. Most recently he has been the Chief Public Affairs officer at the University of Kentucky.
- Our Women's Tennis team won its first ever SUNYAC
- Grace Pell will be announcing the diversity grants competition soon.
- At the annual Mid-Hudson Pattern for Progress dinner, the award for Development of Regionalism went to Jerry Benjamin.
- At the Chancellor recognition dinner, Maureen Morrow was recognized.

Questions: A question was asked regarding faculty development funds and the possibility of more being available. Poskanzer replied that the institution has a duty to support development and is in the process of identifying prospects for donors to support faculty development. He asked that faculty and staff share names of successful students who might be willing to give.

5. Report of the Presiding Officer:

Barbara began her report by stating that the list of committee members will go up on the web site next week. Other items:

- Last week the Academic Senate met. The major item on the agenda was a motion that called for the publication of four of the questions from the SEI for students to use in course selection. The motion was tabled in order consult more with constituents. Please let your representatives to the academic senate know your views on this. Also on the agenda was the 2002-2003 academic calendar, which was approved by the senate and will be presented later in the meeting.
- Gary Kitzmann, University Faculty Senator now has a website. To view this site, faculty and staff must have New Paltz email. The site includes reports, committee reports and resolutions.
- A motion from Fine and Performing Arts regarding the charging of a one dollar parking fee for visitors to attend events in the evening was going to be on the agenda. This was upsetting to those who sponsor concerts and other events for the public. It now appears that the motion will not be necessary. Chris DeLape is on the parking committee and during a meeting yesterday, it was stated that the parking fee will be required only 8-6 p.m. weekdays.
- The Curriculum Committee has approved a revision in the International Business major.

Questions: A faculty member asked where was the machine that sells the temporary parking permits. It is over by the campus police department and is going to be moved to make it available from your car. Another faculty member asked what was the justification for installing the permit machine. Johanna D'Aleo replied that in the past visitors had to come into the HAB to purchase a visitor permit from telecommunication. We put in the machine in to make it easier. The only way to enforce parking permits is if everyone buys one. We have agreed to send out five special permits to anyone who wants them to send out to special visitors. It was also asked if more machines will be installed. Johanna replied that the machines are expensive and at this point not looking to buy more. If you are having a conference or special events let us know and we will send you enough.

6. Motion by Glen McNitt:

Whereas the food service employees at SUNY New Paltz are attempting to organize a union

Whereas it has been the past practice of SUNY to maintain neutrality in relation to union campaigns and refrain from practice that coerce or intimidate employees, and

Whereas the College Auxiliary Services is currently engaged in negotiation with Sodexo Marriott for the food service contract,

Therefore be it resolved that the faculty strongly urges College Auxiliary Services to include in any contract with Sodexo Marriott an agreement to recognize the union if a majority of its food service employees indicate that they want union representation and to pledge to maintain neutrality during the organizing process. If Sodexo Marriott refuses to make such an agreement, we urge College Auxiliary services to choose a company that is willing to operate in a manner consistent with the past practices of SUNY and the principle that employees have a right to organize free of intimidation.

The motion was seconded by Judy Dorney.

McNitt introduced the motion by stating that at a recent UUP meeting the executive board was presented with information regarding CSEA's attempts to assist the food service employees in organizing. It was decided to draft a resolution to present at the next faculty meeting. The key clause is that we want to recognize the union if the majority indicate they want a union. McNitt then when on to explain the process of card checking: employees sign a card that indicates they wish to organize. These cards are then validated by a neutral third party. This motion is urging CAS to make it clear to Sodexo Marriott that they not attempt to intimidate this process.

Discussion: A question was asked about maintaining neutrality and if this resolution is stating that if the management of Sodexo has reason to speak against the union they will be breaking the neutrality. McNitt stated that this is the case and added that the relation between an employee and employer is not an equal relation. Asking the employer to remain neutral is allowing for free discussion amongst employees.

A question was also asked regarding if this practice was consistent with labor relations law. McNitt replied that the card check neutrality process is legal and recognized and is the fairest way in determining whether or not workers want a union. Irwin Sperber stated that the card check procedure avoids drawn out and indefinite processes. This procedure is used all over the country and allows workers to form a union in their own lifetimes.

David Blankenship asked if this motion is to support the card check process and if so why is not in the motion? McNitt stated he would accept a motion to add "by card check" after the word indicate. Hal Jacobs made a motion to amend the resolution to include this phrase.

Gary Kitzmann called the question with the amendment. Susan Lehrer seconded. Rich Bodenschatz requested quorum. 100 voting members were counted. A vote to end discussion was held and discussion was closed. The amendment to the motion passed unanimously. Judy Dorney called the question on the motion with the passed amendment. The motion passed with three opposed and two abstentions.

7. Report of the Academic Affairs Committee: Glenn Geher, chair of Academic Affairs Committee presented the calendar for the next academic year that was approved by the Academic Senate the previous Friday. Geher stated that the committee met two times about the calendar. Deb Miller, Registrar put forward two templates that represented two extreme ideologies regarding the calendar. Template One had all federal holidays off, no religious holidays off and fewer substitutions. Template Two had all federal, all religious, more substitution days and later end dates for the semester. There was a lot of discussion over two meetings. Some members of the committee were concerned about incorporating religious holidays at a state school; others feel that we have always had these religious holidays. In the past, Columbus Day has been included as a wild card; students also like to have an intersession in the fall semester. We ended up coming up with calendar 2a; the vote for this calendar was 7-2. This template has religious holidays, omits Columbus Day and the Tuesday after Yom Kippur, and has only one substitution day on December 9. The date for grade submission is Dec 22. This was a compromise; we reduced the number of substitution days but still included important dates. The Spring 2003 calendar has two substitution days and is a little more involved. For Passover, there is no classes after 3 p.m., and no classes on Tuesday.

Comments: A faculty member stated that scheduling labs for Monday has been difficult in that the Monday labs gets behind when there are two Mondays off in the first five weeks of class. A suggestion was made by David Lavalley that we may want to have an alternative time in the Monday students schedule that would be a second time block in which they could take the lab in the same week. A question was also asked about classes after 3:00 p.m. on Thursday September 25th. These classes will not be made up.

The calendar passed with three opposed.

8. Report of the Budget Goals and Plans Committee: Peter Brown, co-chair of Budget Goals and Plans stated that the committee has a budget process that we worked out with cabinet in 1999. As part of this process, the Vice-President of Administration is to present the budget at October meeting. We did not have an October meeting so it is being discussed at this meeting. Times are rough budget wise, but it is important to know what the administration is doing and dealing with the shortfall.

Johanna D'Aleo, Vice President of Administration showed a summary by school and by Vice President of where initial allocations started out this year. She explained codes and clarified who falls within in each school, particularly academic affairs. In this years budget we had to deal with 2.5 million difference between need and supply. 1.8 million was from negotiated salary increase. Because of this, OTPS went down 5%, we reduced the utilities budget, and PSR and temp. service is budgeted tightly.

David Lavalley, Provost, spoke about the preview of what we might see in the Spring. We don't anticipate hiring any full time this spring we do anticipate having some retirements in the spring and because of this we will be shifting funds from PSR to PST to cover classes. We may need to add to searches in the fall based on who takes early retirement in the spring.

Questions: A question was asked about retirement incentive in the spring. Lavalley stated that there will be December retirements, and activities will need to be picked up for the semester and we will then hire full time in the fall. A question was also asked about Summer budgets. Lavalley replied that they went out last week. Last year we were not able to fully fund the Summer formula. This Summer we were able to offer 15 more sections of distance courses that generated 400 enrollments and thus we have full funding for Summer.

A question was also asked about Mid-year budget cuts. Lavallee stated that we haven't heard anything. We developed a budget for this spring that kept most categories the same as last year. Right now we have looked at how people have spent their money and everyone for the most part is spending according to plan and if we don't get a cut we are fine.

David Blankenship stated that this is the last year of contract and asked what is going to happen to promotion and discretionary increases. Jerry Benjamin stated that absent a contract employees will not receive merit and discretionary increases. After the contract has been negotiated they will be retroactive.

9. Unfinished Business: none

10. New Business: Larry Hauptman read the following resolution that was seconded by Glen McNitt:

Whereas, the presentation of exhibitions, performances, and conferences is within the purview of the faculty and professional staff of the university,

And whereas, such utterances and performances are the essence of Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression,

And whereas, the use of the criterion of "balance" may be utilized by the Administration to restrict and/or deny sponsorship of events, and thereby substitute its perspective of appropriate content recommended by the professional organizers of an event,

Be it therefore Resolved that,

The faculty demands that the Administration cease from infringing upon academic freedom in determining the sponsorship and funding for exhibitions, lectures, performances, and conferences at the New Paltz campus.

Glenn McNitt introduced the resolution by stating that this resolution addresses the use of the question of balance in denying funding for events. He also stated that by removing the ability of faculty to decide on content of events challenges academic freedom at its core. This resolution notifies the administration that we want to retain for ourselves the academic and professional staff right to decide the content of events.

Discussion: Irwin Sperber stated that because of the academic excellence and dedication to creative teaching he has felt comfortable at New Paltz. A key to this was the understood support of academic freedom. He feels that when the concept of balance is being imposed, the quality of scholarship and teaching declines and that a chilling effect imposes on the quality of discourse. Thus he strongly endorses support of the resolution

Jerry Benjamin, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences stated that this resolution makes the presumption that the administration infringed on academic freedom. He went on to state that there is no entitlement under academic freedom to have conferences funded and quoted from the AAUP website definition of academic freedom. No one was denied a forum, no individual was barred, no facilities were denied, and security was provided. By AAUP definition, academic freedom was not violated. The point of balance has been raised. The decision to fund this conference was not his to make. Ideological criteria were not introduced by him, but rather by the organizations planning the conference. Two categories of issues are raised: one, the nature of the controversy in the Middle East, and two, the nature of the university in its mission. Anyone is entitled to address themselves on these matters. No one has been denied the opportunity to express themselves. We are talking about an issue of funding. An implied condemnation of the decision on the grounds of the resolution would indicate a profound misunderstanding of academic freedom.

Peter Brown called the question. Twenty Four voted to close discussion, 29 voted against and thus discussion continued.

President Poskanzer stated that a bunch of different concepts are being talked about: academic freedom, first amendment, and subsidized free speech. Academic freedom and first amendment rights are not the same thing as ruled by the Supreme Court. The First Amendment gives specific rights to citizens but does not give anyone the right to subsidize free speech. This resolution says that there has been a violation of academic freedom. There has not been an infringement of academic freedom.

David Blankenship stated that there was an event that was supposed to start at 5:00 p.m. that many present are involved in and thus made a motion to table the resolution. The motion passed with one opposed.

Kristen Rauch made the following motion:

In recognition of the thoughtful, dedicated, and vigilant effort by faculty and staff in the presidential search process and with the commitment to the preservation of the principles and practices of faculty governance, we move the formal expression of appreciation to all members of the Presidential Search committee, with particular recognition to our representatives: Gerald Benjamin, Jamie Bennett, Marie Dunne, Karl Heiner, Nancy Kassop, Keqin Li, Christopher Raab, Stuart Robinson, and Spencer Salend.

The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
S. Craig Mourton

* * * * *