

Michael J. Grant Campus

Academic Assembly

## **April 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

1. Alexander Kasiukov called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.
2. Announcement from SGA Vice President Allie Domingo.
   1. Greener Grant Week is April 22-26 all of the information is in the April Calendar. There will be activities all week about keeping our Campus clean and beautiful. Please mention Greener Grant Week in your classes.
3. Approval of [February 26, 2019 meeting minutes](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-02-26/assembly-2019-02-26-minutes-draft.docx) - approved without correction unanimously.
4. [Chair's Report](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-04-09/index.html" \l "Grant-Campus-Academic-Assembly) (Alexander Kasiukov)
   1. Please see the online Chair’s Report for all of the recent developments and updates.
   2. This is the time to nominate your colleagues for SUNY Chancellor Award for Excellence and for Governance Awards. The deadline for the Governance Award is April 19.
   3. The Governance Calendar draft for next year is posted.
   4. Please see the SUNY “White Paper” about Distance Education and the SUNY “Green Paper” about Gen Ed requirements. The College is formulating its response to the Green Paper and you can submit your comments before May 1st.
5. Resolutions from the [College-wide Curriculum Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/index.jsp):
   1. [Resolution 2019-02-[02]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-04-09/assembly-resolution-2019-02-%5B02%5D-bio-151-course-revision-proposal.docx) Approving the [*BIO151 - College Biology II - Organismal Biology* Course Revision Proposal](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/college-curriculum/documents/2018-2019/bio151-course-revision-proposal-revised.docx) (Thomas Gordon, Janet Simpson) Approved [27-1-2]
6. Resolutions from the [College-wide Academic Standards Committee](https://www.sunysuffolk.edu/governance/academic-standards/index.jsp):
   1. [Resolution 2019-02-[03]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-04-09/assembly-resolution-2019-02-%5B03%5D-part-time-student-deans-list.docx) Extending Dean's List Eligibility to Part-Time Students (Art Lundahl, Karen Dovell, Jill Malik) Approved [30-2-0]
7. Discussion and vote on the [Resolution 2019-02-[04]](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-04-09/assembly-resolution-2019-02-%5B04%5D-approving-gcb-for-2019-2020.docx) Approving Operations of [Governance Coordinating Body](http://kasiukov.com/assembly/updates/2019-04-09/governance-coordinating-body-proposal-2018-09-25.docx) for 2019-2020 Academic Year (Paul Basileo, Laurey Buckley, Alexander Kasiukov) Rejected [6-31-5]
   1. The responses from the governance survey that was handed out at the Assembly and at the Professional Development Day, were somewhat mixed. On the one hand, the majority of responses supported the Task Force proposal, but on the other – many responses were internally contradictory, indicating that the respondents did not have a clear idea about what exactly they were supporting. At the same time, significant number of responses indicated faculty interest in other possible arrangements for College-wide governance, as well as reservations about the structure being proposed. With this in mind, the three governance leaders came up with a compromise resolution, calling for a one year adoption of the GCB. If the resolution passes, there would be a review at the end of the year and then a vote would be taken after each campus assesses the effectiveness of the GCB year.
   2. Maria. Alzugaray – Who interacts with the CGB? Alex Kasiukov – the chairs of the College-wide committees were not ex officio members of the committee in the first drat, but are in the second draft. It was designed with the focus on trying to avoid appearing like the CGC but it reality became a pale version of it.
   3. Marc Fellenz – I have previously expressed my reservations about the proposal online and at the Assembly and do not support this resolution. The Task Force should have looked at what the faculty want for shared governance. It should have conducted open discussion, considered different models and solicited ideas for what we see for our governance future. Instead, the Task Force went into a silo for a year and developed this proposal without soliciting ideas from faculty. Unfortunately, the CGB keeps all of the weaknesses of the CGC without adding any additional strengths. It is these weaknesses that allowed the East Campus to withdraw and bring the CGC to a standstill. We can’t have effective governance if one campus effectively has veto power of College-wide governance issues. Each member of the faculty to should have an equal regardless of campus. I recommend that we vote against this resolution.
   4. Scott Votke – Being a new faculty member I would like to know when was the last time the CGC was authorized to act? How were they authorized to act? Marc Fellenz – basically the purpose behind the CGC was to act where there was a disagreement between the campuses on particular policies so that the administration didn’t step in and decide policies on faculty governance issues. The CGC was the mechanism to provide a shared voice, so that administration couldn’t divide and concur the campuses. The CGC stepped in for SUNY 64, developing Institutional Learning Outcomes for Middles States, so instead of just mediating the CGC evolved into a more leadership position. Members of the East campus took exception to this evolution.
   5. Dr. Gosine – Marc you used the word “silo,” who operated within this silo and what would you like to see? Marc Fellenz – A few years ago, when the problems arose we had a resolution calling for a College-wide governance conference. Each campus would elect 3 representatives and those representatives would solicit ideas from the faculty members about what we wanted our college-wide faculty governance body to look like. However, the group worked in isolation for a year without soliciting ideas from the faculty. I would like this proposal to be rejected and then have the governance leaders solicit from the faculty members what our governance should look like. I am also suspicious of the 1 year sunset clause. That indicates that this is a bad idea but minimizes the damage of it with the sunset clause.
   6. Karen Dovell – I have an issue with the part that says that the teams will conduct an assessment 2 weeks before the last governance meeting. That assessment should be ongoing all year and should be more inclusive.
   7. Maria Alzugaray – We meet as an open Assembly, how would it work at Ammerman where they have a representative body? Alex Kasiukov – The idea would be to have open discussion forums for all of the campuses.
   8. Janet Simpson – I want to express my appreciation for the members of the Task Force that volunteered their time to get this proposal together. Although I find flaws with the proposal, I would not be as informed without it. I will oppose the proposal. It doesn’t address the issues that brought CGC down. Shared Governance means it is shared between the faculty and the administration. If we have a body that has built into it a method to implode when personalities conflict, then we put the governance of the college on administration and that’s not appropriate. Administration is not there to decide on academic freedom or faculty initiatives in curriculum development – that’s our job. If we are going to vote in a body that has a built-in self-destruct mechanism, I think it’s a mistake and a waste of time. That’s why I oppose this proposal. We need to find a way to work together and discuss the future of shared governance. To suggest that the FA would step and mediate when we disagree it is not appropriate because is not a contract issue. The final proposal needs to give us a clear understanding of the by-laws and not be left open to interpretation, which is not clear in this proposal. Finally, this is an important issue which has become very clear as I serve on the College Curriculum Committee. Getting the shared governance set, we present a unified voice to the administration.
   9. Melissa Adeyeye – If this proposal is opposed what will happen? What is the timeline? Alex Kasiukov – The governance chairs are prepared to continue the informal arrangement with VP Beaudin as we start the forums and discussions in working toward the shared governance model that we finally establish. We will work with this arrangement for as long as needed. It will not be done before the end of the semester, but in the fall we can start to consider different proposals and start the discussion.
   10. Davorin Dujmovic - Is there anyone here from the Task Force that would like to speak about the proposal? Bruce Seger – there were many meetings to produce a proposal with unified language that was acceptable to each campus. I am happy with it. The Task Force did what it thought was best.
   11. Maria Alzugaray – Alex Kasiukov what is your opinion? Alex Kasiukov – I would like you decide on the merits but if you want my opinion I will give it. Maria Alzugaray – Please do. Alex Kasiukov – I think it is a neutered version of the CGC, which keeps all the weaknesses of its older cousin while adding almost no additional strength. In addition I view the inclusion of the FA in mediation as inappropriate. Faculty Governance should stand on its own and resolve the issues through its internal procedures. Another part I find objectionable is the insistenece on the inclusion of anonymous opinions in the conflic resolution process. How can we in good conscience to ask for tenure that allows us to voice our opinions without fear of retribution on the one hand, and then insisit on anonymity in our own conflict resolution process – on the other? If you ask how I would vote, I would vote against it.
   12. Tat Sang So – I agree with Alex Kasiukov in that this proposal codifies all of the weakness of the CGC.
   13. Alex Kasiukov – We should not have a system that can be taken down by a single disagreement. We need a system that can fail gracefully; its failures need to be compartmentalized so that they do not cause the entire system to fail.
   14. ?? Have you gotten any feedback from how the other campuses feel about this proposal? Alex Kasiukov – at best it is mixed, but I cannot speak about what I have heard privately without permission from those who shared their opinions. But you should make your decision about the proposal based upon its merits.
   15. Scott Votke – How many members on the CGC versus CGB? CGC had 3 per campus, the CGB would be 4, 3, 2 – a proportional representation.
   16. James Keane – my rhetorical question would be are you putting a roof on a house without stable walls? Have the college faculty ever gotten together to go through an organizational process of what the campus structure should be and what the leadership process should be? You are trying to put the top of the pyramid on but there seems to be a lot of other pieces to consider.
   17. Alex Kasiukov – I agree completely and have thought of this since I served on the Computing Committee which was an echo chamber where no decisions were made. I am hoping that this process will allow us to look at the campus governance structures and decide what will work best for the College. To have 3 different campus governance models contributes to the campus rivalry.
   18. Marc Fellenz – One college, one set of academic policies, one faculty – that should be our strategy, our philosophy. Campus representation is not what’s important – preserving each faulty voice in equal representation is.
   19. Davorin Dujmovic – I have an issue with the involvement of the FA in the proposal. The FA has many issues to deal with and it is not appropriate for the FA to be involved here.
8. Update and discussion on Faculty Authored Textbooks (Karen Dovell)
   1. We are revising the Faculty Authored Textbook policy to comply with SUNY ethics mandates. We are putting together 2 forms: 1 from the faculty-author, and 1 for the chair. Next Assembly we hope to have the forms and be able to vote. Please email me if there are any concerns.
9. Update on the 'W' Grade Proposal (Jill Malik)
   1. The subcommittee has drafted a rough proposal regarding the “W” grade based upon the research that we have looked at and the statistics from OPIE. The policy hasn’t changed since the 1970’s. In 2016, 41.6% of the Ws assigned were initiated by the drop down menu, i.e. by faculty and not by students going to the registrar for the W form. Similar numbers are for part-time students. The subcommittee is looking at removing the W from the drop down menu and making the students responsible for initiating the process for a W grade after the enrollment verification period. For some students, where the W is faculty initiated, there are unintended consequences. There are financial aid implications, which may need to be paid back. Ws can also harm retention. By removing the W from the drop down, push back the withdrawal date to the 2/3 in the semester and we would be in line with our 30 Community College cohort. By having the W in the drop down, the W means different things: non-attendance, student initiated withdrawal and faculty initiated withdrawal. For disappearing students we may add a different designation. After the 2/3 of completion the student can petition to the VP of Academic Affairs and petition to withdraw. So the W is still available in more extreme circumstances. The INC may be more appropriate and pedagogically sound.
   2. Lynn Liebert-Marx – As chair I have always encouraged my faculty to give the students the grade that they earned. Are your saying that we should exercise our academic freedom and assign them a grade that is different from what they earned?
   3. Jill Malik – The student would earn the grade that they earned at the end of the semester. But in extreme situations the student could withdraw or give the student more time with an INC grade to finish the work and complete the course and help retention. The statistics show that when students are given an INC grade 1/3 of them receive a passing grade in the end.
   4. Maria Alzugaray – How does the X grade get interpreted by other colleges? Jill Malik – there would be a note just like there is for other designations. It would indicate that the X was given because the student stopped attending. In researching the issue we have found that there are faculty members that give the W when students just stop attending.
   5. Alyssa Kaufman – Would I be forced to give an X if I think that they should fail? Jill Malik – No it just gives you the option instead of giving an F. Alyssa – So this gives some more leeway to the faculty member.
   6. Melissa Adeyeye - How would this effect enrollment verification? Jill Malik – Enrollment verification is federal, but if after enrollment verification they stop attending you have the option to give the X designation instead of the F. The X indicates that they failed the course because they stopped attending.
   7. Kevin Reilly – If the X is like an F does it factor into the GPA as a 0? Jill Malik – Yes otherwise it’s just another W.
   8. Sharon Niggemeier – I don’t understand why you wouldn’t give an F if the student stopped attending? Jill Malik – This comes from the feedback we’ve received from faculty from SCCC and other campuses to qualify the F because the student disappeared.
   9. Maria Alzgaray – So F is 0, W is nothing. Faculty was giving the W in order not to hurt the student. But using the X isn’t different than the F. We voted against dropping the W because faculty wanted to give students the option to not have the course count. You’re not helping the student by giving them the X. Jill Malik – But the student that stops attending the 10th week or later, the student has actually failed and by using the W it’s dishonest. Maria Alzugaray – I’m not in favor of the W – it’s a status not a grade - but taking away the W and replacing it with an X that is like an F is not going to get the proposal to pass. Jill Malik – We can remove the X designation and the W and have nothing for the faculty except the F.
   10. Al Hagerty – Does it have to nothing or do we put it in the student’s hands to explain why they stopped showing up? Jill Malik – In this proposal the student can initiate the W by going to the registrar.
   11. Lynn Liebert-Marx – The problem with the W at the end of the semester is the faculty member is speculating why the student stopped attending. But even if you give an F, the course can be repeated or the INC can be changed into a passing grade if they finish the work or it converts to an F if they do not. There is no reason to give a grade that doesn’t reflect the student’s performance.
   12. Alyssa Kaufman – If a student asks for a W at the end of the semester because they didn’t show up for the final or complete, I say no and have been told more than once that another professor did it for me. I explain that a course can be repeated. We need to have consistency.
   13. Maria Alzugaray – I don’t want the W in the drop down but I want to be able to give a student a W if they come to me and explain what has happened to cause them not to attend or not complete the work. Jill Malik – The W is available but must be done through VP of Academic Affairs. Maria Alzugaray – But that’s is not always possible if there is something personal (domestic violence).
   14. Alex Kasiukov – Please email Jill Malik with any suggestions or concerns. There are several problems the subcommittee is trying to solve, including the financial concern. Keep in mind that this also takes away faculty discretion. We need better education to get better understanding of the impact of issuing a W.
   15. Lynn Liebert-Marx – The W is not a grade it is an enrollment status and therefore not a faculty issue and not subject to faculty discretion. As faculty we must give a grade that has been earned. It opens us up to accusations of fraud.
10. Campus Update (James Keane)
    1. The College is trying to look at the financial status of the College, we are in about a $3 million deficit. Many meetings have been about saving positions. We are looking at how overtime is assigned, College Aides, PAs. There’s a new committee looking at standardization of supplies, etc. EVP Petrizzo is listening and trying to make sound decisions.
    2. Lines are on a case-by-case basis. Several searches are taking place and we are trying to keep them going forward.
    3. The State has given $100 FTE and we are asking the County for 3%. The next Board Meeting will be very important.
    4. I want to recognize the Nursing Dept. for getting a 100% passing rate on the NCLEX after assessing the falling passing rates, addressing it and creating a safety net for students.
    5. Graduation - 2 ceremonies. The faculty session for the 10am closed within 4 minutes, but the 4pm is available.
    6. We have decided to cancel Convocation. It costs a lot to run it and it isn’t well attended. We will have an opening ceremony at each campus.
    7. Chairs Homework – coming up with new programs using our current resources, engagement and retention efforts. Some good ideas have come forward and I will announce them when we are ready. Some great grassroots efforts, recognizing Lynn Liebert-Marx for changing a course she had been teaching for years to have students visit her in the first 2 weeks which has helped form a connection with her students and it has made a positive impact in the grades the students receive.
    8. Thank you to all who attended the Open House, we are up about 200 applications for the fall, but we have a long way to go as students go through the process. I’ve asked Dr. Rogers, Theresa Saladino and Theresa Dereme to have 2 things in place for us: 1. We lose a lot of students between their app and when they come for testing, so we are going to invite students and their parents to come and learn about the college, the programs and majors, the resources to work with the parents and student. Looking at different initiatives in the enrollment area. 2. I will ask you to do as well, I’m having Student Services look at students that have not registered and find out why, just didn’t want to register, they forgot, transferring. We get binders in the middle of July which isn’t helpful so we are doing it now.
    9. We have Take Back the Night this Friday. 400 students are registered and if you can attend this Friday it will be a great event. Wednesday at 1am is the Student Art Opening.
11. For the Good of the Assembly
    1. Volunteer Day is 4/10/19
    2. Dodgeball Tournament is 4/11/19
12. Motion to Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.