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Whereas the President of the Senate at the College at Brockport, State University of New York, did charge the Ad Hoc Committee on System-wide and Historical Responses to Financial Crises with researching and reporting on the history and diverse practices of various SUNY schools during this and other financial crises, and

Whereas the committee did research the College at Brockport’s past experience during crises in 1982 and 1989, and did review the preliminary findings of reactions in institutions across the State University of New York system, and

Whereas the ad hoc committee did make a number of recommendations that might assist this body in the future,

Therefore be it resolved that the Senate of the College at Brockport does support the Ad Hoc committee’s recommendations.
Ad Hoc Committee on System-wide and Historical Responses to Financial Crises

Final Report

Members: John Daly (chair), Jim Haynes, Joe Balog, Elliot B. Weiningier, P. Gibson Ralph, Gabriel Prajitura, Steve Lewis

A.) Context of Crisis:

The Governor's budget and the Chancellor's Address have made it self-evident that SUNY campuses are to undergo significant structural, curricular, and programmatic reforms in order to successfully carry out their mission goals. While every campus is unique, it is also true that we share a common mission, a common institutional structure, a common culture based on shared values, and a common financial crisis. Our common College Senate system, mandated by the board of trustees, although limited in its powers to recommendations and consultation, has consistently played and will surely once again play a large role in our reaction to these changes. Below the Ad Hoc Committee on System-wide and Historical Responses to Financial Crises (henceforward “the Committee”) summarizes the current crisis, summarizes the crisis on other SUNY campuses, describes past crises at Brockport and how the Senate addressed them, and looks at the best approaches suggested by this information to possible changes such as program elimination, faculty workload, and increased class sizes. The committee interviewed a dozen past and present Brockport CGLs (Campus Governance Leaders) and summarized some of their input below (especially in section E).

B.) The Budget Crisis at Brockport:

The budget crisis is serious and growing. The 2011-2012 NYS executive budget foresees no changes in the SUNY budget allocation formula and anticipates a $3.1 million dollar reduction in campus budget 2011-2012. The Campus is reacting by reallocating $3 million of campus cash to campus reserves from April 2011 to June 2012 and plans to generate $2.5 million of permanent campus reductions in 2012-2013. (See appendix A)

The current financial forecast for The College at Brockport has us dangerously low on reserve funds at the end of the 2013-2014 budget year with an ongoing deficit at that time of approximately $2.5M. The budget model that arrives at this projection has the following baseline assumptions:

1.) The Governor’s Executive Budget is enacted by the State Legislature. The State Budget that was adopted retained the Governor’s cuts to the State-operated campuses, though other sectors of SUNY did receive some restorations.

2.) SUNY’s budget allocation formula remains unchanged. Previous changes to the formula have favored the University Centers over the other state-operated campuses like Brockport. Further changes to the formula may help or hurt us.

3.) There are no further reductions in state support. At this time, budget projections predict deficits for the following fiscal year, albeit smaller than this year--depending on economic conditions in the State.

4.) There are no tuition increases. The budget passed without the authority to implement SUNY’s 5-year tuition plan. There is some hope that the tuition issue may be addressed outside of the budget season.
5.) The College finds $3 million to borrow from reserve funds at other levels of the institution. The College-wide reserves graphed in Appendix A do not include funds in reserves at other levels of the College. This has been accomplished ($3.2 million projected).

6.) The College cuts $2.5M in permanent expenditures by the end of 2012-2013. These cuts have not been identified to date.

C.) Crisis across the SUNY System:

The financial crisis that has rocked the State of New York has seriously diminished the ability of the State University of New York system to provide the quality higher education generations of New Yorkers have benefited from. Across the system, at sixty-four campuses, administrators and faculty have struggled to maintain programs and related academic services critical to the viability of their institutions. At Geneseo and Albany, for example, programs have de-enrolled students, a possible first step to program elimination. This has created an atmosphere of fear across the SUNY system (see sections E and F below). President of the Faculty Senate Ken O'Brien has asked for reports of how the crisis is playing out on the various SUNY campuses and is in the preliminary stages of compiling material. (See recommendation in Section F, 1 below). It is too soon to tell what will happen across SUNY campuses, and for this reason, and the reasons below, College Senate leadership should be countering premature and unfounded fears of retrenchment, de-enrollment, or course load changes at Brockport.

At Brockport, the strong leadership and financial acumen of the administration has resulted in a reprieve from the pain other campuses are feeling. This reprieve promises to turn some of our challenges into opportunities, as the Provost’s generous funding of pilot projects to rethink our general education core demonstrates. Despite these promising possibilities, it seems unlikely that general education reform will produce the kind of savings necessary to close the looming budget gap. Thus we face a series of choices, none of them inherently desirable and certainly none undertaken outside of the context of the financial crisis. Still, some choices serve the goals of students and the academic community better than others. (See discussion in section E below and Appendix E)

D.) Senate Response to the 1982/1989 Retrenchment:

Brockport undertook retrenchment in the 1980s in two stages, both of which the Senate was involved in. In 1982 the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Allocation of Faculty Resources established criteria for retrenchment. They focused on program appraisal via: 1. Essentiality, 2. Demand and Potential Demand, 3. Quality, and 4. Cost. In 1989 the Faculty Senate Committee on Long Range Planning issued a Report on the Allocation of Faculty Resources that revised the 1982 criteria, but kept the same four part scheme and modified the definition of “essentiality” and under “Demand” clarified how student FTEs were counted.

In brief the Senate exhaustively established criteria for retrenchment but took no roles in decisions. Past and present CGLs in 2011 are divided about the legacy of 1982/1989. All, however, agree that Brockport is not seeing a repeat of 1982/1989 and retrenchment fear is overblown on campus—partly as a result of the legacy and damage done in the 1980s. Some recommend strongly that the Senate not even touch criteria for retrenchment with a ten foot pole and that it is a toxic issue for the Senate to take up. However, the consensus among CGLs and the finding of this committee is that in the very unlikely event of retrenchment being raised, the Senate not wash its hands of the process but carefully establish a few essential principles for how the process proceeds. The Senate should ensure that its role not be undercut by committees set up by the administration.

No one anticipates a repeat of the 1980s, and there were lessons learned from the 1980’s. Brockport’s reserve fund is one of them. The University Senate has proposed and system administration has accepted
the policy that no program is to be suspended or retrenched without acknowledgement that the governing body of the faculty at the institution in question has been consulted and been a participant in the process. (See discussion in section E, 1 below).

E.) Possible Issues before the Senate and Best Approaches:

1.) Retrenchment/Program Elimination:

This appears unlikely and unnecessary under current conditions. Past CGLs interviewed unanimously did not see this as a current concern. No administrator has advocated it and the administration has communicated that it would damage the core mission of the College. The committee finds this option absolutely unacceptable. Brockport’s earlier retrenchment (see appendix B and C) resulted from a drastic decline in enrollment from about 11,000 to 8,000 with no reduction in faculty. Brockport in the 1980s was arguably overstaffed. Today, the College is underfunded and understaffed—a radically different situation. Despite de-enrollments of programs at a few SUNY campuses, talk of retrenchment is premature at the College of Brockport and only produces unnecessary fear.

2.) Increased Faculty Workload:

This option has also not yet been suggested and damages the core mission of the College and violates one of the institutions foremost principles: that teaching and scholarship are mutually supportive endeavours. A reduction in scholarship by moving to a 4-4 or 4-3 load assumes that somehow scholarship can be diminished without eroding teaching. This view is countered in the 1998 “Faculty Roles and Rewards Report” adopted unanimously by the Senate (see appendix D). The Senate should vigorously resist a change in workload (see arguments in appendix E). Faculty workload is covered by the contract with UUP. In particular, while things like class size and teaching load obviously are not contractually specified, the contract stipulates that policy changes which substantially alter faculty workload must either be implemented with faculty consent or must be negotiated with UUP. Faculty (individually, at the program level, or as a whole) may voluntarily assent to policies that significantly impact workload. However, such policies may not be imposed unilaterally without potentially triggering UUP intervention. (See Recommendation 5 below.)

3.) Increased Class Size:

The only reasonable option but one the Senate should approach carefully and negotiate vigorously. First, the Senate should first insist that the institution make heroic and continually creative efforts to use our physical resources wisely and efficiently. Second, the Senate should seek to insure that all full time tenure track faculty members teach a proportionate number of students, regardless of discipline or program or specialization. Unless the Senate establishes that principle, departments and faculty members may seek exemptions rather than devising ways to increase the overall efficiency of teaching across the campus.

4.) Shared and Proportionate Sacrifices:

Whatever changes the campus faces due to the budget crisis, the Senate should maintain the above principle.
F.  Recommendations:

1.) As this is a fluid situation--and early in a fluid situation--the committee recommends that its role be extended into the next year. In particular, the reports from SUNY campuses on the crisis in their institutions have just begun to come in and are being collected by President of the Faculty Senate Ken O’Brien. He has agreed to share this information with the committee and the committee will share them with the Senate.

2.) The Senate should support the cost cutting initiative coming out of the Budget and Resource Committee and Senate members should participate in and promote its call for creative cost cutting ideas.

3.) The Senate should consider a resolution modelled on the History Department report (Appendix F) on advocating class size changes and rejecting a change in course load. The committee, however, recommends that the Senate wait on such a resolution until further developments clarify the campus and SUNY-wide crisis. If the committee, as recommended above, continues into next year, it could be a vehicle for bringing such a resolution to the Senate floor.

4.) The Senate should consider a resolution that asks the administration to clarify the methodology it uses to determine the allocation of faculty and staff resources, especially when lines are frozen. Rubrics are important and departments should know what is expected of them so they can better plan to be in line with the criteria that the administration uses.

5.) Since workload changes, especially class size changes, may occur at the program or individual level, it would therefore be in the best interest of the Senate to be in continuous dialogue with UUP about these issues, as well as with individual programs and with the administration.
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1982 Report of the Faculty Senate on Resource Allocation

STATE UNIVERSITY OF New YORK College at Brockport

Faculty Senate Meeting: 5/11/82
Agenda Item VI. A. 1.
Foreword

On March 30, 1982 the Permanent Subcommittee on Resource Allocation was charged by the Faculty Senate President to evaluate the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Allocation of Faculty Resources. Specifically, the evaluation was to include 1... an identification of the strengths (if any) and limitations (if any) of the report,... and 2) an interpretation of Faculty response to the report." The Subcommittee was asked to respond, through the Long Range Planning Committee, to the Senate by May 11, 1982. The May 11, 1982 Faculty Senate agenda will include discussion on the report.

The Senate office provided all members of the Faculty with the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Friday, April 2, 1982. A Faculty-at-Large meeting was held on April 6, 1982 for the purpose of providing opportunity for the Faculty to respond to the Ad Hoc Committee Report.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Resource Allocation met on April 2, 1982 to discuss the Faculty Senate charge and to outline the process for meeting the charge. The Subcommittee decided on the following:

1. Open Hearings for all faculty and staff would be announced through the Brockport Statements. The dates of these hearings were Tuesday, April 20, 1982 from 1 to 3 p.m. and Wednesday, April 21, 1982 from 1 to 3 p.m. in Room 185, Student Union.

2. Meeting with all Deans and Unit Heads at their regularly scheduled meeting. This session was held on Wednesday, April 21, 1982 from 8 to 9:30 in Dailey Dining Hall.

The purpose of these meetings was to provide opportunities for all faculty members and staff to comment directly, orally or in writing, on the substance of the Ad Hoc Committee Report.

Following the four information-gathering sessions, the Subcommittee on Resource Allocation met on April 23 and 26 and May 3 and 1, to synthesize comments from the Faculty and staff and to evaluate the Ad Hoc Committee Report.
I. Reaction to the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Allocation of Faculty Resources

The Ad Hoc Committee Report contains two parts: 1) A description of criteria and factors important for program appraisal, including the criteria of Essentiality, Demand and Potential Demand, Quality and \(\sim\), and 2) Criterion Relations and Recommended Guidelines. Each of these will be stated in turn, followed by comments elicited from members of the Faculty and staff and Subcommittee observations.

Description of Criteria and Factors Important to Program Appraisal

A. Criterion of Essentiality

The function of this criterion is to determine whether or not a program is essential at the State University of New York College at Brockport. The criterion of essentiality is defined by three factors: 1) SUNY and Brockport Policy, 2) College Mission Statement and Extension to the Mission Statement and 3) Irreducible Core of the College.

Comment: The Report of the M Hoc Committee recommends that the "Irreducible Core of the Curriculum below which our mission can be performed (see Presidentts charge to the Committee, Appendix A) is defined as the General Education Core, plus a sufficient number and kind of major and professional programs to be consistent with the essential nature of the institution\(\superscript{**}\) (p. 3) elicited the greatest number of faculty comments. Specifically, the Subcommittee questions:

1) the protected category status (meaning no elimination) of only those disciplines associated with the General Education Core;

2) the statement that only those disciplines presently associated with the General Education Core are essential only to the extent of their contribution to the General Education Core;

3) the definitions of and distinctions between disciplines Which are essential according to their relationship with General Education (meaning cannot be eliminated) and programs, the essentiality of which must be determined by their strength in terms of the three remaining criteria, Demand and Potential Demand, Quality and QQ..!!t; and

4) whether a General Education program which concentrates on basic literacy skills and a "supermarket" selection of breadthcomponent courses truly constitutes the irreducible core of this institution'.

B. Criterion of Demand and Potential Demand

This criterion provides the means to judge each program on the
present status and future potential for attracting reasonable number of competent students and for graduating them. The factors for such appraisal are:

1) Student Full Time Equivalents (SFTE's)
2) Current Drawing Power
3) Uniqueness of the Program
4) Placement of Graduates
5) Future Attractiveness

The Ad Hoc Committee Report stated that "...Brockport~ as a public institution that is enrollment driven, should give greater priority to the Criterion of Demand and Potential Demand than same private schools." (p. 14)

Comment: In allot the open hearings the issue of demand was raised. Questions were posed: 1) Is an enrollment driven institution necessarily also demand driven? 2) What mechanism is provided for in this criterion to adjust to changing demands? 3) How much weight is to be given to Quality versus Demand? 4) How will the College influence demand? 5) Can a quality liberal arts college be primarily responsive to demand and exist responsibly as a liberal arts institution? Specifically, each factor under the criterion of Demand elicited responses.

1) Student FTE's and Current Drawing Power. Present data on SFTE's by discipline may reflect the biases of the previous Administration in resource and budget allocation. Programs not permitted to develop in the past may be unfairly judged by this criterion of SFTE's.

2) Uniqueness of Program. Uniqueness in the absence of actual marketability may not be a valid criterion by which to judge a program.

3) Placement of Graduates. It is unfair to rank-order departments and/or programs, at the present time, on the basis of graduate placement. No systematic college-wide data are available by program or by department. Also, there is wide variability among disciplines in types/kinds of graduate placement.

4) Future Attractiveness. This criterion can only be of value when systematic and longitudinal data are available by program. Presently we have minimal data and are forced to take a "crystal ball approach" to documentation. Furthermore~ at the present time there is no Administration function for strategic planning, to allow the institution to effectively respond to a changing environment.
C. Criterion of Quality.

This criterion identifies quality of programs at the present time. The factors include:

1) Accreditation (where applicable) 2) Reputation of Program Faculty 3) Eminence and Regard for the Program

Comment:
1) Accreditation. "•••an official action taken by recognized and authorized agencies external to the College which, after assessing a program in relation to some set of standards, rates that program." (p. 9)

Accreditation by outside agencies merely sets minimum standards for a program and is not intended to be an index of quality. Accreditation, by its imposition of standards within a program, may also invalidate or control other criteria mentioned in the Report, such as demand (control of access by students), cost, qualifications of the Faculty, Student/Faculty ratio, curriculum offerings, levels of instruction, GPA's and graduation/certification requirements. There is, in short, little evidence to indicate that accreditation or certification is a valid indicator of the quality of a given program and may, in fact, be deleterious to the development of quality because of the imposition of a number of controls.

Most programs in a Liberal Arts institution, furthermore, are not associated with external agencies who would be in a position to either impose standards or evaluate them. Therefore Liberal Arts programs at Brockport are, in general, placed at a disadvantage if "comparatively ranked" against other programs at the College which do have accreditation/certification.

2) Reputation of Program Faculty. "Reputation of faculty refers specifically to recognition in the instructional and research domains of the subject matter of the program rather than recognition of faculty for activities which are not relevant to their instructional and research work in their subject matter." (p. 10)

There appears to be a contradiction in the definition of Reputation and the fourteen possible sources of data suggested for establishing Reputation. There is an implied scale of values assigned to sources 1 to 14. Although the definition of Reputation lists "recognition in instructional domain" first, it is not until item 7 on the 14-item scale that "consistent teacher effectiveness" is mentioned. Only two of the 14 items listed mention a faculty member's effectiveness in working with and/or relating to students. These items 1 through 14 appear to be rank-ordered and hierarchical, with emphasis on publication,
consultation, and governance external to the College at Brockport. Given the primary mission of the four-year multipurpose institutions of SUNY, which is undergraduate teaching, we question the cataloguing (at a 6 to 1 ratio) of professional academic qualities of faculty members more befitting a university center or research-based institution.

3) Eminence and Regard for Program.

Eminence and regard for a program defined in the Report as "...the recognition for academic excellence that a program receives, ...n (p. 11) may be a valid criterion of Quality. However, the suggested guidelines for identifying academic excellence suggested by the Ad Committee are fallacious in that 6 of the 7 measures cited could be influenced by factors other than the quality of a program:

1. Only one "program" at this institution has been recently recognized with an award, and that, properly defined, m not even qualify as a program.

2. Placement may be the result of many other factors, such as supply and demand in the marketplace.

3. Accreditation is directed toward establishing minimum standards, not excellence (as has been noted earlier).

4. The drawing power of a particular program may be influenced more by factors of cost, proximity to home, articulation, and the social milieu than by eminence.

5. Retention in a program may be due more to advisement, the marketplace, quality of campus life or academic standards, as much as to eminence.

D. Criterion of Cost

"This criterion identifies the measures [to be used] to analyze each program on its present cost to the institution." (p. 12) Factors include:

1) Cost Effectiveness 2) Number of Students in Class 3) Student Contact/Student Credit Hours 4) Resources Needed --Present and Future 5) Student/Faculty Ratio

Comment: Cost effectiveness data at Brockport is obtained by Course and Section Analysis (CASA). To compare programs for cost effectiveness~ there must be a standard of some sort against which programs and costs can be objectively measured. Credits and class
hours are not consistent across disciplines. The arts, performance and laboratory classes, and upper-division courses, have, by design, lower enrollments. These and other factors make CASA data insufficient for objective evaluation of comparative program cost effectiveness.

Programs vary widely by cost; many programs (e.g. The Sciences) are high-cost by their very nature, making an equitable assessment of cost tenuous if at all possible. The Cost criteria suggested by the Report do not adequately acknowledge the large number of variables which affect program cost.

In the final analysis, there are three reasons why we feel that Cost probably is not a valid criterion in this case:

1. Cost factors are all manifestations derived from other criteria such as demand, accreditation, nature of disciplines, level of program, quality of the Faculty, etc.; and

2. The College does not have a suitable process for utilizing the data-base by which these factors can be equitably evaluated; and finally

3. Cost appears to be completely irrelevant as a criterion for program evaluation given a set of circumstances in which Quality, Demand, and Essentiality have already been determined.

Criterion Relations and Recommended Guidelines

The Ad Hoc Committee Report identified "...twenty-seven logical relations possible with respect to the comparative judgments of the three criteria of demand, quality and cost...It is the recommendation of the Committee that Brockport, as a public institution that is enrollment driven, should give greater priority to the Criterion of Demand and Potential Demand..." (p. 14)

The Subcommittee believes, for reasons expressed throughout the preceding section of this report, that Demand should be given no greater priority than Quality, and that Cost, as the least valid of the three criteria, be treated as subordinate to the others.

The Subcommittee wishes to note that the Report fails to recognize the need for guidelines to effect a reduction in support services, which should be concomittant with the reduction of Faculty resources. We realize that this was beyond the Ad Hoc Committee's charge but wish to make the point regardless.

More within the Ad Hoc Committee's purview, however, is the lack of any specific consideration of criteria as they might affect graduate programs. It is our view that these must be recognized and defined in different terms, and with different evaluative criteria, than under graduate programs.
Finally, although the Ad Hoc Committee refers to the Mission Statement Extension as a principle document guiding its deliberations, there is little specific recognition of points 3 and 4 of the Extension contained in the Report. (Point 3 refers to the strengthening of the upper-division program as College policy; point 4 refers to increasing initiatives in the public service sector.)

II. Recommendations

The basis for these recommendations is twofold: 1) thorough analysis of the Ad Hoc Committee's report by the Subcommittee and 2) faculty, staff and administrative comments.

Recommendation 1:

Irreducible Core of the Curriculum: The essentiality of the General Education Program should be determined by the strength of relations among the Criteria of Demand, Quality and Cost. The General Education Program must be subject to the same tests of essentiality as are all other programs.

Recommendation 2:

A clear definition of "program" must be provided to the Faculty Senate, Deans, and Unit Heads prior to resource allocation and reduction.

Recommendation 3:

The criterion of Demand should carry a greater priority than the criterion of Quality.

Recommendation 4:

The criterion of Quality must be expanded to include factors attentive to contributions made by programs to the quality of student life on campus and to the attractiveness of campus life, such as programs which provide significant extracurricular opportunities for student fulfillment - art, music, dance, theatre, sports, etc.

Recommendation 5:

The Criterion of Quality, specifically, Reputation of Program Faculty, and the 14 sources of data must emphasize a balance among the qualities of teaching effectiveness, student advisement, campus governance, and scholarship, publication and external governance.

Recommendation 6:

Criterion of Cost: Cost is the least valid of the three criteria and should therefore be treated as subordinate to the criteria of Demand and Quality.
Recognizing that the following three recommendations go beyond the substance of the Ad Hoc Committee Report, it is nevertheless the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Resource Allocation that:

Recommendation 7:

The Faculty should be informed of the process followed in identifying programs for elimination, reduction or addition to include:

1. the criteria used,
2. the application of the criteria,
3. the degree to which the reductions or additions were proportionate to the rankings of "essentiality" and "desirability," and
4. a list of programs according to their criterion relationships and essentiality.

Recommendation 8:

The Administration, in consultation with the Faculty, explore all possible avenues to ameliorate or reduce the financial and psychological impact caused by faculty reduction, including the establishment of a voluntary fund to which members of the Faculty could contribute.

Recommendation 9:

Each program faculty is encouraged to consider its resource needs in light of the resource pool created by its to-be-retrenched colleagues, and to urge the Administration to identify and support voluntary retraining to meet existing campus needs. STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK College at Brockport
Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Resource Allocation based on the Ad Hoc Committee Report as follows:

Recommendation 1:

Irreducible Core of the Curriculum: The essentiality of the General Education Program should be determined by the strength of relations among the Criteria of Demand, Quality and Cost. The General Education Program must be subject to the same tests of essentiality as are all other programs.

Recommendation 2:

A clear definition of "program" must be provided to the Faculty prior to resource allocation and reduction.

Recommendation 3:

The criterion of Demand should carry no greater priority than the criterion of Quality.

Recommendation 4:

The criterion of Quality must be expanded to include factors attentive to contributions made by programs to the quality of student life on campus and to the attractiveness of campus life, such as programs which provide significant extracurricular opportunities for student fulfillment—art, music, dance, theatre, sports, etc.

Recommendation 2:

The Criterion of Quality, specifically, Reputation of Program Faculty, and the 14 sources of data must emphasize a balance among the qualities of teaching effectiveness, student advisement, campus governance, and scholarship, publication and external governance.

Recommendation 6:

Criterion of Cost: Cost is the least valid of the three criteria and should therefore be treated as subordinate to the criteria of Demand and Quality.

Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Resource Allocation based on the Ad Hoc Committee Report as follows: -2
Recommendation 7:

The Faculty should be informed of the process followed in identifying programs for elimination, reduction or addition to include:

1. the criteria used,
2. the application of the criteria,
3. the degree to which the reductions or additions were proportionate to the rankings of "essentiality" and "desirability," and
4. a list of programs according to their criterion relationships and essentiality.

Recommendation 8:

The Administration, in consultation with the Faculty, explore all possible avenues to ameliorate or reduce the financial and psychological impact caused by faculty reduction, including the establishment of a voluntary fund to which members of the Faculty could contribute.

Recommendation 9:

Each program faculty is encouraged to consider its resource needs in light of the resource pool created by its to-be-retrenched colleagues, and to urge the Administration to identify and support voluntary retraining to meet existing campus needs.
Appendix C:
1989 Faculty Senate Committee on Long-Range Planning
Report on the Allocation of Faculty Resources

OUTLINE
Introduction
Part 1: Description of Criteria and Factors Important to Academic Program Appraisal
   A. Criterion of Essentiality
      1. SUNY and Brockport Policy
      2. College Mission Statement
      3. Irreducible Core of the Curriculum
   B. Criterion of Demand and Potential Demand
      1. Student FTEs
      2. Drawing Power
      3. Uniqueness of the Program
   C. Criterion of Quality
      1. Accreditation (where applicable)
      2. Reputation of Program and Faculty
   D. Criterion of Cost
      1. Present and Potential Costs (faculty teaching lines, support lines, operational costs, other program requirements, capitalization, and perceived future needs)
      2. Program Outcomes (instruction and student services, scholarship/research, and service)
Part II: Criterion Relationships and Recommended Guidelines Resolutions and Recommendations

Introduction Historical Perspective
In the Fall of 1988, Governor Mario Cuomo, SUNY Chancellor D. Bruce Johnstone and SUNY College at Brockport President John Van deWetering made public statements about New York State's budget crisis and the strong possibility of a significant reduction in resource allocation to the SUNY campuses. In response to these statements~ lynn Parsons, President of the Faculty Senate at Brockport recommended on November 21, 1988 (as reported in the Executive Committee's minutes), that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee of the College at Brockport explore what the stance of the Senate should be with regard to (this) long-range problem, and indicated three possible options, including: 1) taking no role; 2) taking advantage of precedents and deciding how to adjust them to current conditions; and 3) starting from scratch.

At the Faculty Senate meeting on January 23, 1989, President John Van de Wetering expressed his concerns about the possible effect that a reduction of resources might have on the College and suggested that the guidelines for retrenchment used in 1982 be reviewed to determine whether they are still applicable in 1989," In reaction to Lynn Parsons' and John Van de Wetering's recommendations, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee held a lengthy discussion on January 30, 1989, to decide how the Faculty Senate should be involved in the issue and process of resource allocation. The Executive Committee decision was to direct the Committee on Long-Range Planning to examine the 1982 report of the "Ad Hoc Committee on the Allocation of Faculty Resources" and have the Committee on Long-Range Planning report back to the Executive Committee by February 13, 1989, with its recommendations. On February 13, 1989, Joseph Balog, Chair of the Committee on Long-Range Planning, distributed a statement from the Committee regarding its initial review of the 1982 report on resource allocation. In this statement, the Committee on Long-Range Planning said it was appropriate to review the 1982 document on resource allocation. The Committee also noted that several significant changes have taken place within SUNY and the College since 1982. As a result, these changes might require the Committee to revise portions of the 1982 report. The Executive Committee urged Joseph Balog and his Committee to move with all deliberate speed. In addition, Lynn Parsons suggested a draft report be presented to the Executive Committee by April 10, 1989.
The Committee on Long-Range Planning began its deliberations on the 1982 report sensitive to the difficulties, cautions, and responsibilities associated with faculty and professional staff involvement in the process of reviewing, revising, and recommending guidelines for resource allocation. The Committee was impressed with the 1982 document and with the thoroughness and thoroughness of the 1981-1982 Ad Hoc Committee's work.
However the Committee on Long-Range Planning thought that some alterations and additions needed to be made to the original report because of changes that have taken place within SUNY and the College since 1982. Some of these changes include: 1.) a new mission statement for the College; 2) a new SUNY benchmark methodology; 3) new General Education Requirements; 4) increased use of adjunct faculty; 5) consequences from the 1982 reduction and . . reallocation process; 6) a growing adult student population; 7) the advent of funding for credit-bearing courses; and 8) the recently enacted flexibility legislation.

Not all of these changes impacted on the revisions made to the 1982 document, but they provided the impetus to closely review, discuss, and recommend changes to the report where it was thought to be appropriate. Planning for Resource Allocation The projected New York State budget crisis which precipitated the need to review the 1982 report on resource allocation focused the attention of interested parties on the themes of resource reductions and retrenchment. The Committee on Long-Range Planning, however, rejected this posture and decided to view its task as one of creating a planning document for resource management. The Committee believes there is always a need to conduct longrange planning, regardless of the presence or absence of budgetary crises. As a result, the Committee reviewed and revised the 1982 report with the intention of creating a planning instrument for resource management. In regard to this point of view, the Committee made the following main points:

1. While the basic format of the "Allocation Report" has remained the same, there are some fundamental differences in the current situation facing the College and in approaches to resource allocation. Institutional reduction was the primary use of the 1982 document, because of a steady decline in enrollment and the need to reduce an oversupply of faculty lines. The situation is now reversed, with overenrollment of students and insufficient faculty lines, according to the SUNY budgeting models. This suggests that the main focus of the current report and subsequent administrative decision-making and action, should be on reallocation of existing resources to meet the most pressing current and future demands of the College. Even though the total number of faculty lines may have to be reduced or vacancies increased to meet short-term State budget difficulties, this major distinction in outlook should be emphasized.

2. The 1982 "Allocation Report" focused upon planning, implementing and surviving a short-term, but severe, faculty reduction. The current. report indicates that a need exists for long range resource planning process that uses the criteria of Essentiality, Demand, Quality, and Cost to make reallocation decisions as faculty positions become available due to retirement, resignation, etc~

3. The development of new academic programs currently is very difficult to accomplish due to the general state of overenrollment and the lack of specific objectives relating to the reallocation of faculty resources. as they become available. The Vice President for Academic Affairs should be charged with developing and widely distributing a five-year plan that would identify specific goals and objectives for academic programs and the need for resource reallocation. Decisions about faculty lines should then be made according to this plan and in accordance with the guidelines continued within this report. . .

4. It is the Committee's hope that the current situation with the State budget crisis will not adversely impact the SUNY system or the College at Brockport. Similarly, it is our hope that, regardless of the outcome of the budget negotiations, these guidelines form the integral part of the decision-making process to shape the nature of our academic programs and faculty resource requirements for the 1990s and beyond. Overview of Revisions Made to the 1982 Report on Resource Allocation In regard to the body of the 1982 report, the Committee elected to maintain the same form, major sections, and the four principal criteria of Essentiality, Demand, Quality, and Cost which were important to program appraisal in the 1982 report.

5. However, within these four principal criteria, alterations and additions were made. These revisions are summarized below:
1. In the section on Essentiality, the present report emphasizes that the delivery of certain curricular content and disciplines are essential to the nature and mission of a comprehensive college, but this does not imply that any existing or future structure for delivering essential curricula will be viewed as being essential to the College.

3. In the section on Demand, the present report presents an additional clarification on the definition of student FTEs. This clarification emphasizes the need to categorize separately major, non-major, and service students FTEs in order to improve the identification of where workloads fall in programs. In the section on Demand, the present report eliminates "Placement of Graduates" and "Future Attractiveness," which are in the 1982 report. This deletion is made primarily because the existing information in these areas is inadequate to help in determining demand.

4. In the section on Demand, the present report specifies that the item of "Drawing Power" should be viewed over a period of five years, not just in the present year of an evaluation. In addition, this item should take into consideration the number of students electing courses within a program, the number of transfer students electing a program, and the number of students participating in activities such as athletics, dance, art, and media functions which are related to a program. These activities, as well as the number of inquiries about a program and the number of students completing a program, should be viewed as indicators of drawing power.

5. In the section on Quality, the present report integrates the College's discretionary salary increase (DSI) criteria into the item on "Reputation of Program and Faculty." This was done to more appropriately reflect the current expectations and responsibilities of the faculty in the three areas of teaching, service, and scholarship. The section on Eminence and Regard for Program was incorporated into other sections of this report.

6. In the section on Cost, the present report replaces the past emphasis on cost effectiveness which was measured by a low student/faculty cost per unit ratio with a new emphasis on identifying the resource requirements and usage of a program. The present report reflects the ideas that much of a program cost is "outside" the control of a program and that cost effectiveness is better evaluated by looking at the total resource usage that is necessary to produce certain outcomes.

7. In the section on Criterion Relationships, four additional points are made which address the impact of reallocation on: 1) affirmative action programs; 2) the ability to implement the College mission concerning global interdependence and cultural diversity; 3) future trends in employment opportunities; and 4) long-term resource planning.
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Faculty Roles & Rewards Committee Final Report

DECEMBER 7, 1998

Assumptions:

1. Our answers to each of the questions in the President's charge assume that the college faculty will have teaching loads that allow them to teach effectively, maintain scholarly productivity, and meet their service responsibilities. Thus, faculty pursuing an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities would normally teach no more than a 3/3 course load or its equivalent (see Question 6, paragraph 2).

2. We seek to construct a framework within which each department develops policies and procedures. To construct such a framework we must first come to an understanding as to the nature of our common responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service so that departments and individuals will know whether or not they are contributing below, at, or above expectations.

3. We seek to empower faculty rather than to discipline, punish, or eliminate them.

4. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes one model of roles and rewards. We recognize that the proportion of time and energy each faculty member devotes to teaching, scholarship, and service varies from discipline to discipline, individual to individual, and changes over an individual's career. still, to promote equity among faculty we must have some common understanding about department and individual productivity standards. The following document represents our efforts at articulating a common framework within which departments will maintain a great deal of autonomy.

Question 1: How should we define teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?

Teaching/learning: Encompasses promoting, guiding, facilitating, and evaluating student learning. Faculty members are catalysts for creating and adapting learning environments in and outside the classroom that stimulate students to learn, to be curious, to be critical thinkers, effective writers and speakers, and creative problem solvers. Effective teaching and learning are dependent upon faculty utilizing a variety of teaching techniques and designing and revising curriculum to produce student learning outcomes. Included within teaching/learning are the professional development processes of attending workshops and conferences and efforts necessary to maintain mastery of subject matter and teaching methodologies. Also included are the teaching-related activities of independent study and thesis supervision, field supervision, mentoring of students, and student involvement in research.

Scholarship/Creativity: Encompasses producing an identifiable product subject to systematic internal and external evaluation by professional peers and resulting from:

1. The creation of new knowledge or artistic expression within the discipline (Discovery). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: original research as reported in articles, books, and presentation of papers; performances; grant proposals; inventions and patents; software development.
2. The synthesizing of existing knowledge or creative work within one or more disciplines into new patterns and/or for new audiences (Integration). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: publication of interpretive studies or criticism; critical reviews or editing of scholarly work; development of public policies or of interdisciplinary programs.

3. The utilization of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems (Application). Examples of identifiable products include but are not limited to: development and implementation of innovative clinical practice or public school programs; environmental impact analyses; consultant work in the public or private sector based on the faculty member's discipline-based knowledge and expertise.

Service: Encompasses governance of the department, the school, the college, the university, or the profession, as well as discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the community that are not included in Scholarship. Examples of governance include but are not limited to:

- **Department** - department meetings and committees, advisement, registration, Saturday Information Sessions, and peer review.

- **School** - grade appeals, Deans' committees.

- **College** - Faculty Senate, college-wide committees, collegewide student organizations.

- **University** - University Faculty Senate, SUNY Ad Hoc Committees.

- **Profession** - leadership and other service in discipline based organizations at local, state, national, or international levels.

- **Community** - work related to faculty member's area of professional expertise or to the mission of the college.

These three areas will be referred to hereafter as teaching, scholarship and service. It is understood, however, that teaching is teaching/learning and that scholarship is scholarship/creativity.

**Question 2: Should teaching and learning be regarded as the most important responsibility of SUNY Brockport's teaching faculty? And what is the place of scholarship and service?**

Yes, teaching is our most important function. In our role as college professors we strive to create high quality learning opportunities for our students. Excellence in teaching is our first and foremost responsibility. This excellence is demonstrated, among other ways, by the quality of instruction and student learning outcomes.

Sustained scholarship is essential to quality teaching. It adds to the body of knowledge within the discipline, keeps us current in our fields, exemplifies for our students the intellectual skills we want them to learn, and provides them with opportunities to participate in intellectual discovery as they prepare for the world of work and advanced studies.

Service within the department, the college, the university, the community, and the profession supports the advancement of learning and the enrichment of campus culture.

Through teaching, scholarship, and service, the faculty shape and achieve the goals of the college.

**Question 3: What expectations should we have of teaching faculty (with reference to reappointment, tenure, and promotion) in the areas of teaching and learning, scholarship, and service?**
Teaching: Faculty must demonstrate continued successful teaching which includes consideration of student learning outcomes to support recommendation for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate to each rank.

Scholarship: Faculty must demonstrate continued successful scholarship to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement within the three modes of scholarship.

Service: Faculty must demonstrate continued successful service to support recommendations for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Service may be in one or more of the following areas: the department, the school, the college, the community or the profession. Departments should define the expected levels of achievement appropriate for each rank.

**Question 4. How should faculty performance in these areas be assessed? Who should be involved in assessment of performance?**

**Annual Review**

The Chair of a department is responsible for evaluating individual faculty members as part of the formal annual review and more frequently if circumstances require it.

**Term Renewal, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion**

Thorough evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service shall take place when making personnel decisions of term renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.

Chairs and APT committees should work with their departments to develop formal procedures for evaluation of all aspects of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The extraordinary diversity of our programs precludes agreement on any single model, but within broad limits we recommend the following:

**TEACHING:**
In order to give teaching the stature it should have, its evaluation for term appointment, continuing appointment and promotion must be rigorous. It must involve some form of student evaluation, peer review of a teaching portfolio and may include peer observation of classroom performances. The teaching portfolio may include the following: teaching philosophy; student learning outcomes; grading practices; assignments, requirements, and assessment methods; advisement, mentoring, independent study projects, and supervision of theses; accomplishments of present and past students when directly related to the educator's influence; quality and effectiveness of pedagogical strategies; development and use of instructional technology; innovation for the purpose of improved learning productivity; and evidence that the course content is current.

Scholarship: Each department should develop a system for evaluating the scholarship of its faculty members consistent with the principles outlined in this document.

Scholarship should be evaluated according to these six criteria*, as described by Ernest Boyer in Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I. (1997). Scholarship Assessed. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 22-36:

1. clarity of goals
2. adequacy of preparation
3. appropriateness of methods
4. significance of results
5. effectiveness of presentation
6. reflective critique where appropriate

*(See appendix A for a brief description of the criteria. Entire text is on reserve in the Library).

Application of these six criteria will ensure uniform evaluation of scholarship across disciplines.

Service: Faculty members should play a service role commensurate with their rank and the changing needs of their various constituencies. Faculty will prepare a statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual's responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the faculty member's disciplinary expertise or to the central mission of the college.

In those instances where service ranks as a major responsibility and is a key component in the evaluation and assessment of the individual faculty member's rewards, departments should develop a set of criteria for evaluating that service which is equally as rigorous as that used in evaluating teaching and scholarship.

Question 5: What system of post-tenure review would be appropriate?

Faculty development and enrichment is an important process in any educational institution. Therefore, this committee strongly supports strengthening the current system of annual faculty review, with the goal of throughout a faculty member's career.

By policy and practice, Chairs are responsible for the annual review of all faculty members, including those with continuing and term appointments. Thus, the Academic Council should create a training system for Chairs and program directors to help them understand their responsibilities regarding faculty review, the proper procedures for meeting those responsibilities, and the types of institutional support available. Also, Deans and Chairs shall ensure that each faculty member has a clear sense of his or her responsibilities, expected standards, and methods of REVIEW, in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, under policies established by each department. The annual review should include a thorough evaluation of the faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, and may involve a meeting between the Chair and the faculty member. At this time, the Chair should take the opportunity to point out to faculty members areas of strength, as well as any areas for possible improvement. If areas for improvement are identified, a written action plan should be developed. This action plan may include referral to an employee assistance program (EAP), if appropriate, or formulation of a professional development plan, with specific goals, expected outcomes, time frame, and monitoring of activities. The faculty member would have the option of working in consultation with the departmental Chair, both the Chair and the departmental APT committee, or the Dean, to formulate this development plan. Institutional support for implementation of the plan may be provided, when appropriate. If, after implementation of the development plan and sufficient time for remediation, improvement does not occur, the faculty member would become subject to appropriate actions, under procedures outlined in the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, and the current UUP agreement with SUNY.

The proposals contained in the Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee's response to Question 5 are covered by Article XII of the Policies of the Board of Trustees of SUNY, Articles 19 and 49 of the current UUP agreement with SUNY, and Chapter 122 of the SUNY Brockport Faculty Handbook.

Question 6: When actual assignments of work responsibilities are made, what framework (one which must be consistent with resource constraints) would be most appropriate?
The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards is cognizant of the emerging educational practice of measuring work load in terms of learning outcomes rather than teaching inputs, and understands that this academic community is currently exploring the potential for increased learning productivity inherent in such a shift. Until that examination is complete, however, we recommend the following policy:

The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship as defined by individual departments and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. The Faculty Roles and Rewards Committee recognizes that variability among disciplines and teaching styles, as well as historic patterns, may lead individuals and departments to deviate from this norm. Nonetheless, we see it as the norm around which particular variation will occur.

Chairs should make individual work assignments within the department in accordance with procedures and principles adopted by the department and in such a way as to ensure that:

1. Each department meets the curricular and educational needs of its own students as well as those of other students who depend upon it as agreed upon by the Department, the Dean, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

2. Each faculty member has sufficient time:
   a. to teach well and to promote student learning
   b. to complete scholarly undertakings
   c. to meet service obligations

In addition, Chairs should expect those faculty who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship to contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service.

1. The blend of teaching, scholarship and service may change from year to year and over a life-time career as long as departmental responsibilities are met on an annual basis.

2. Any release time beyond the normal 3/3 course load shall be reported to the VPAA and publicized annually.

3. An important consideration in granting faculty release time should be to ensure that the total departmental effort is not compromised and that other faculty within the department are not required to take on an unfair load. Accomplishing these goals may require that the Administration provide the department with sufficient resources for support staff and replacement faculty depending upon the nature of the release.

Question 7: How should reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?

We should re-structure reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures to dovetail with these proposals in the following ways:

Departments/Programs

1. Each department must develop, publish** (see page, 10), and obtain school-level approval for its policies and procedures to distribute the work-load and to evaluate personnel.

2. These policies and procedures must be consistent with the principles articulated in this document, as well as with the needs of the School and the College as defined in the strategic plan.

3. These policies and procedures should include at least the following:
a. An explicit means for evaluating teaching that is rigorous and includes both peer review of a teaching portfolio and student evaluation of all faculty members.

b. An explicit identification of the kinds of scholarship most appropriate to the discipline and the levels [quantity and quality] appropriate for each rank.

c. An explicit system of weighting the relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service for the evaluation of individual faculty members. All systems developed must conform to the following formula: 

**Teaching > Scholarship > Service** where Teaching \( \sim 50\% \) in assessing and evaluating faculty performance.

d. Departments that give considerable recognition to Service must devise an explicit method of evaluation that is as systematic and rigorous as methods used to evaluate Teaching and Scholarship.

e. An explicit definition of total department teaching load consistent with the needs of their majors, students in other programs who depend upon that department, and the General Education program.

**Schools**

Each School must:

1. Develop and publish** its procedure for reviewing and validating departmental policies and procedures.
2. Develop and publish** the specific departmental policies and procedures that have been validated.
3. Develop and publish** specific policies and procedures for the annual evaluation of Chairs.

**College**

The President or the President's designee must:

1. Review and validate each School's proposed procedures for reviewing and approving departmental policies and procedures.
2. Review and validate the actual departmental policies and procedures that each School has approved.
3. Publish** the School policies and procedures it has validated.
4. Allocate the resources and devise the policies and procedures necessary for training Department Chairs in developing personnel policies and procedures according to the guidelines of the Board of Trustees, the College, the UUP Contract, and these proposals.
5. Bring its current "Guidelines for Faculty Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, and Performance at Rank" into line with the principles articulated in this document, with the requirements of the strategic plan, and with the School policies and procedures it has approved.
6. Replace the current IAS with a reliable and valid vehicle for measuring student evaluation of individual faculty and establish legitimate procedures for its utilization.
7. Publish** the reassignment of faculty [released time] and provide departments with appropriate replacement resources.
8. Publish** brief summaries of the teaching and scholarly accomplishments of the faculty who have been granted appointment, re-appointment, tenure, and promotion.
**Publish: "To publish" means to make public, i.e., to make available [in printed or electronic form] to members of this academic community.**

**Question 8: How should other kinds of recognition (both monetary and non-monetary) be structured so as to dovetail with the institutional stance on faculty roles?**

Recognition of faculty on either a monetary or non-monetary basis should include faculty accomplishments in the three principal faculty roles: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The purpose of merit pay and/or non-monetary recognition is to reward those individuals who have made particularly valuable contributions to SUNY Brockport and its mission.

**DISCRETIONARY SALARY INCREASES (DSIs)**

If and when negotiated by the UUP, monies made available to reward faculty for exceptional performance in one or more of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service shall be awarded individually or to a group, and shall be added to each recipient's base salary.

1. **One-Year Individual DSI**

   Individuals with exceptional Teaching, Scholarship, or Service, and performance at least at rank in the two other areas, may be nominated for a DSI based on a one-year period of review. The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards urges the administration to distribute DSI awards among the three areas in accordance with the relative weight assigned to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service [see above, Question 7]. We also encourage establishing award levels that will ensure DSIs will be greater in number for a smaller amount of money (example: $800-$1,000) rather than fewer in number for a larger amount of money.

   Faculty members wishing to be considered for DSI will submit their annual reports and the supplemental documentation for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service to their department APT committee. The APT committee will review the reports and make recommendations to the department Chair. Chairs will add their own recommendations and then meet as a group with their respective Dean and recommend DSI recipients each year. Monetary compensation for Chancellor's Awards, promotions, and salary inequity adjustments, will not come from the DSI pool. A maximum of twenty (20) percent of the DSI teaching faculty funds will be reserved distribution by the College President. The remaining teaching faculty funds will be distributed to Schools based upon the number of full-time equivalent faculty, including those on leave, in each School. DSIs for department Chairs will be paid from the discretionary fund held by the President.

2. **Multi-Year Individual DSI**

   Faculty members who have not received a DSI in the previous three consecutive academic years would be eligible to apply at the beginning of the 4th year for a DSI that considers work completed over the previous three-year period. The application process and the criteria would be the same as the current DSI process the one-year review except that the money will come from the President's share of the DSI fund, and will not exceed the amount awarded for a one-year Individual DSI.

3. **Group DSI**

   Groups of two or more individuals whose collective achievement in Teaching, Scholarship, or Service is exceptional may be nominated for a Group DSI by the Dean(s) of the School(s) to the College President. Recipients of a Group DSI may be nominated based on collective achievement that spans one to three years.
Membership in a group recognized for a Group DSI does not preclude an individual from being awarded a One-Year or Multi-Year Individual DSI based upon exceptional achievement one or more areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, with performance at least at rank in the other roles. Faculty may not be awarded a DSI as an individual and as a member of a group for the same exceptional achievement. The application process and the criteria would be the same as the current DSI process Individual Awards except that the money will come from the President’s share of the DSI fund.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT**

In addition to existing faculty development incentives, we strongly recommend:

1. University Fellows

   In order to foster faculty development and to promote excellence in Teaching, the College should establish at least six University Fellowships, with a minimum of one Fellowship from each School. The Fellowships will carry half-time teaching responsibilities for one academic year. Open to all full-time faculty, these Fellowships would be used primarily for the improvement of individual teaching, significant training, curriculum development, or for experimentation with team-teaching and/or new technology. University Fellows would be required to share the results of their work with the College community.

2. Conference/Seminar Fund

   In an effort to assist faculty in keeping current with developments in their field and to encourage their professional growth, the College should establish a permanent fund to pay up to $1,000 of expenses for attendance at conferences/seminars. The grants should be rotated on a yearly basis so that no person receives a second grant from this fund before all other qualified applicants have had the opportunity to do so.

3. Team Teaching

   The College should actively promote faculty development in the area of interdisciplinary teaching/learning. One way to encourage this is through interdisciplinary team-taught courses. The College should establish a fund to allow a limited number of faculty each term to receive full credit, in terms of contact hours, for full participation in an interdisciplinary team-taught course. If these courses are to be taught properly, they typically require more than a part-time commitment by participating faculty. For example, a 3-credit course being instructed by two faculty should demand three hours of classtime from each team member each week, plus full participation in grading and lesson preparation.

   Faculty wishing to participate in this program would develop an interdisciplinary course proposal and submit it to their appropriate Chair(s) and Dean(s) for approval. The number of proposals that could be supported during a semester would be contingent upon available resources.

4. Document Preparation Fund

   Recognizing the important role of the faculty in contributing to the creation of new knowledge through research and writing, the College should create a document preparation fund to provide individual faculty members up to $500 to be used by the faculty exclusively for the purpose of paying support personnel to prepare manuscripts for publication, or to cover the incidental expenses incurred in the publication of manuscripts. Reimbursement to faculty would require submission of a paid billing statement from the support personnel, a copy of the prepared manuscript, and the proposed transmittal letter to a publisher.

**Conclusion**

The members of the Committee have systematically reviewed the roles and rewards of faculty. This report provides a unifying guideline for assigning and evaluating faculty workload. At the same time, the Committee
recognizes the diversity of this campus and has intentionally included parameters which allow for individual as well as departmental variations with respect to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

The Committee urges full implementation of these recommendations while recognizing that any definition of faculty roles and rewards is a dynamic process.

Finally, we want to thank all who helped us in this difficult task. Paul Yu, President of the College, Thomas Bonner, President of the Faculty Senate, Anne Parsons, Past President of the Faculty Senate, Ed Van Duzer, President of the local UUP, Timothy Flanagan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the earlier committee on the Redefinition of Scholarship chaired by Jeremiah Donigian on whose work we built, the 90 or so faculty and staff members who took the time to share their thinking with us in writing, the Departments that responded with written criticisms and suggestions, as well as those who attended one or more of our open meetings and shared their ideas with us.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards

Sri Ram Bakshi Richard Meade Interdisciplinary Arts, x5262 Personnel, 2126 sbakshi@po.brockport.edu rmeade@po.brockport.edu

Virginia Bachelor Sheila Myer Communication, x5289 Nursing, x5309 vbachele@acspr1.acs.brockport.edu smyer@po.brockport.edu

Michael Fox Christopher Norment Academic Affairs, 2504 Biology, x5748 mfox@po.brockport.edu cnorment@acs.brockport.edu

Owen S. Ireland Heidi Rath-Melens History, x5627 Secretary oireland@po.brockport.edu hmelens@frontiernet.net

Sharon Kehoe Educational Administration, x5513 skehoe1@juno.com
SUMMARY OF STANDARDS


Clear Goals

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Adequate Preparation

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

Appropriate Methods

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Significant Results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field? Does the scholar's work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective Presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work? Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences? Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?
Appendix E:
Model Language for Adopting Larger Class Sizes and Rejecting Course Load Increase, History Department

Facing a Financial Crisis While Maintaining Pedagogical and Scholarly Standards

A. Why the college should not move to a 4-4 teaching load:

1) A 4-4 teaching load is based on the assumption that scholarship and teaching are mutually exclusive endeavors—that somehow scholarship can be diminished without eroding teaching. This idea is effectively countered in the 1998 “Faculty Roles & Rewards” report developed through shared governance and unanimously supported by the College Senate: “Sustained scholarship is essential to quality teaching. It adds to the body of knowledge within the discipline, keeps us current in our fields, exemplifies for our students the intellectual skills we want them to learn, and provides them with opportunities to participate in intellectual discovery.” (pg. 3)

2) It would undermine faculty members’ ability to engage in scholarship and creative projects, transforming Brockport from a place where students engage with a vibrant community of practicing scholars and artists into a place where they come into contact with a faculty who only teach about knowledge areas. Only faculty engaged in scholarship and creative production can deliver knowledge in its fullest sense. Knowledge conveyed in the classroom is often inaccurately reduced to information. Knowledge, however, is not simply content but process and what scholar/artist-teachers are uniquely positioned to convey is the process of the production of knowledge/art—the disciplinary-based methods by which knowledge/art is created, evaluated, and conveyed.

3) It would imperil the integrity of Brockport as an institution of higher learning and run directly counter to the College’s efforts to gain a national reputation. A 4-4 teaching load would signal future students and faculty that the institution has adopted diminished scholarly standards and that it does not expect faculty to maintain a research program that revitalizes their teaching.

4) It would make the future recruitment of good faculty more difficult and likely cause the College to lose good, productive faculty members. The difference between a 3-3 and a 4-4 teaching load is that faculty perceive institutions with the former as a professional opportunity and those with the latter as a professional trap that will undermine their ability to advance in their profession. The College’s ability to maintain its reputation of excellence and continue to provide a high-quality educational experience for students is largely dependent upon its ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty.

B. How to retain a 3-3 teaching load, meet student demand, and cut costs:

1) Encourage departmental autonomy in meeting student demand in a manner consistent with disciplines’ professional standards and pedagogical approaches. The College should encourage departments to creatively service their students’ needs through a variety of class sizes, offering large courses where necessary and consistent with pedagogical goals and maintaining small classes in cases where student learning would otherwise be diminished.

2) The college should seek to equitably match current tenure track and tenured lines to student demand across departments. One step in this direction would be an analysis of the gap between the number of seats that the tenure-track faculty can provide and the number of seats we need to fill across the
campus. With that knowledge, we can begin to allocate resources adequately in such a way to best meet student needs.

3) **Continue to pursue initiatives to reform our general education curriculum that would maximize opportunities for the College to reduce the use of associate faculty.** For example, SUNY allows the general education writing requirement to be met with a “writing across the curriculum” model instead of mounting large numbers of comp courses largely taught by adjuncts as we currently do.