

**University Faculty Senate
Spring Plenary Transcript
Upstate Medical University at Syracuse
April 22-24, 2004**



(Transcriber's note: The first tapes from Friday morning were unsalvageable. This transcript begins with Friday's afternoon session.)

Friday morning session

President Hildreth convened the plenary at 9:10 am.

Welcoming speeches by Host Senator Jeff Freedman, Campus Governance Leader Paula Trief and UMU President Gregory Eastwood were delivered.

Reports were received from the Vice President/Secretary and the President.

Jim McElwaine was re-elected Vice President/Secretary.

Garrick Utley, President of the Levin Institute delivered an informational address, describing the mission and governance processes in place at the Levin Institute.

The meeting was adjourned to sector concerns at 11:15 am.

(Transcriber's note: The first tapes from Friday morning were unsalvageable. This transcript begins with Friday's afternoon session.)

Friday afternoon session

President Joe Hildreth: I would like to propose that we conduct the elections of the Executive Committee and then that the reports from the sectors be written and submitted in order to preserve the time that we need.

I'm going to ask the representatives of the sectors come up and we will have the candidates for the five elected positions that will be nominated by their respective group. We can have additional nominations from the floor and we'll go from there. If there is only one candidate from membership that is put forward and there is no objection from the floor, the Senate may authorize the vice-president secretary to cast the unanimous ballot for that candidate. In order for that to occur, once the sector representative places the nomination of the Executive Committee member on the floor, we'll need to receive a motion for the secretary to cast one ballot. We'll then vote on that and if we get the majority then that person is elected. Everyone understand?

Could we have the University Centers?

???: The University Centers have caucused and our general approach is to rotate through the centers. Professor William Baumann from Buffalo would be our nominee and I would ask that this be a unanimous vote.

Joe Hildreth: Are there any nominations from the floor? Seeing none, all those in favor of having the secretary case one ballot for the nominee please signify by saying, "Aye." "Nay"? Congratulations.

The University Colleges?

???: The University Colleges have one nominee: Achim Koeddermann. We move that the secretary cast one ballot.

Joe Hildreth: Do we have any nominations from the floor? I declare nominations closed. All those in favor of having the secretary cast one ballot for the nominee please signify by saying, "Aye." "Nay"? Congratulations.
Health Science Center?

???: The Health Science Center has chosen Peter Nickerson as our nominee.

Joe Hildreth: Do we have any nominations from the floor? Motion for the secretary to cast one ballot? Moved. Nominations are closed. All those in favor of having the secretary cast one ballot for the nominee please signify by saying, "Aye." "Nay"? Congratulations.
Special statutory colleges?

Kathleen Jacquette: I was chosen as the nominated person.

Joe Hildreth: Are there any nominations from the floor? Motion for the secretary to cast one ballot? Nominations are now closed. All those in favor of having the secretary cast one ballot for the nominee please signify by saying, "Aye." "Nay"? Congratulations.
Colleges of Technology?

???: The Colleges of Technology have nominated Anne Donnelly.

Joe Hildreth: Do we have any nominations from the floor? We need a motion for the secretary to cast one ballot? So moved. Nominations are closed. All those in favor of having the secretary cast one ballot for the nominee please signify by saying, "Aye." "Nay"? Congratulations.
Campus governance leaders?

???: Last year we had a somewhat different process because many of the campus governance leaders were not here and do not make every meeting. So we are taking nominations and there will be an email ballot. We'll have the convener of the campus governance leaders for you within a month.

Joe Hildreth: Are there any objections to that process? Okay. Let's give our newly elected Executive Committee a round of applause.

Let's move to the discussion of the assessment issue. I want to start off by having Patty Francis come up and walk you through the elements of the proposal. I continue to be surprised that groups are not as knowledgeable about the key elements of this proposal as I want them to be and, since the proposal is quite different from what you looked at in the past, it's really quite critical that you understand what those elements are. Patty has been involved with this effort from the beginning. She is currently co-chair of GEAR and is a faculty member from Cortland. Her discipline is psychology and her research interest is assessment. She currently serves as executive assistant to the president at Cortland and she is also an intern fellow for the provost office.

I am pleased to introduce you to Dr. Patty Francis.

Patty Francis: Thanks a lot for having me and giving me the opportunity to talk to you about this proposal. Before I get into specifics, I do want to explain and describe some of my experiences to this point with what we are calling the SUNY Assessment Initiative.

I became involved with this effort back in the fall of 1999 when Provost Salins formed his advisory task force on the assessment of student learning outcomes. It was that group that provided this report which has, in some way, become the blueprint for carrying out and implementing the assessment initiative. Like any good blueprint, however, it's proved to be adaptable to changing conditions and I think that the proposal that you have is a good example of that. After that report was provided a key recommendation was the establishment of the GEAR group which had responsibility for overseeing campus-based general education assessment. I have continued on as co-chair as chair of that group.

For the last couple of years I have been involved in the various discussion groups that have been held regarding what was in this document. This task force report was called "University-Wide Assessment," but we are now referring to it as "Strength in Campus-based Assessment." I'm emphasizing these experiences because I think that they put me in a good position to be able to talk about this issue as it has unfolded over time, especially in regard to changes that have taken place in System Administration's thinking and approach.

The SUNY assessment initiative has had three primary objectives:

1. Assessment as improvement. That is using assessment outcomes directly to improve teaching and learning. I think that the system of gen ed assessment that we have in place at this point is a good example of assessment as improvement.
2. Assessment as accountability and advocacy. It's important not only to System but also to campuses to be able to use assessment information to show that learning outcomes are being achieved and also to use that information to advocate on behalf of SUNY and individual campuses.
3. Assessment as best practice. The GEAR group is entirely committed to ensuring that assessment is going on under its charge and under its responsibility represents the best thinking, if you will, in the literature and the research that's been done nation-wide on assessment and its relationship to student learning. I think that the emphasis on best practice has been reflected in the GEAR group's guidelines for developing assessment plans and also in the reviews that we have provided to individual campuses and their plans.

It's an understatement to say that in some instances there have been conflicts among these different objectives and we have struggled to reconcile all three of these objectives at the same time. I think it's fair to say that the current proposal that you have does this. I make this statement for several reasons.

1. The proposal that you have before you provides the campuses with great flexibility and total autonomy of measures and assessment strategies. The route that you choose is totally up to the campus.
2. This approach with three foundational areas of general education (mathematics, writing, and critical thinking) that are externally referenced make it possible for System Administration and campuses to confidently use this information appropriately in aggregate fashion for accountability and advocacy purposes.
3. This proposal maintains the critical element of peer review. An oversight for general education assessment across SUNY has been provided for the last three years by the GEAR group. Also, this peer review would be extended to the discipline-based panels that are described in the proposal.

I know that everyone has had the chance to go over this specific proposal in some detail, so I didn't intend to do that. I will answer any questions that you may have. The major faculty concerns that have emerged over the past two years are what I would like to focus on now. If you refer to the handout, I am going to talk about each of those concerns in turn.

1. Duplication or redundancy of effort, resulting from what was considered a system layer of assessment. Under older conceptualizations not only would we have the GEAR process in place for campus-based, but there would be another process to guide university-wide. Now, all general education assessment is folded into the GEAR group process. The proposal that you have shows you the incorporation of all of these ideas into the GEAR group guidelines.
2. The cost to campuses. System administration has agreed to pay for the administration of any nationally norm measures for up to twenty percent of the target student population, which we think would represent an appropriate percentage of retesting and sampling purposes.
3. Value-added assessment. Now it is an option for campuses instead of being required.
4. Campuses would be forced to use specific measures that they didn't necessarily want to use or weren't appropriate to their curriculum and curriculum programs. In the proposal before you, campuses have a range of choices from a variety of assessment measures and strategies ranging from the nationally norm measures to locally developed measures that either correlate with these externally referenced test or which are basically approved by the discipline-based panels that will be formed as a subset of the GEAR group.
5. A related concern is was that there would be inappropriate comparisons made among campuses with respect to assessment data. I think that it's fair to say that there will be so many different kinds of approaches used that it will be literally impossible to make comparisons because they're all probably going to be using different measures and different combinations of measures.
6. Inappropriate use of reporting assessment results. In order to affirm our commitments to that not happening, we've emphasized an adherence to the specific principles that would safeguard against these problems and also put into the proposal the violation of this would mean that faculty would no longer feel obliged to take part in the assessment effort.

As someone who has watched this process unfold for four years from a very close vantage point, I strongly believe that this proposal represents a real opportunity to develop the SUNY assessment initiative in a way and through a process that we can all be proud of. I also agreed with Joe when he said that if we could come out with an approach that we could reach consensus on that this would definitely be a victory for shared governance.

Joe Hildreth: I would like to have Kimberly present what the Faculty Council did and why. I believe you have the dot in the resolution that they put forward.

Kimberly Riser: At this session Joe asked me to highlight the Faculty Council position on university-wide assessment. We all know that it has been renamed strengthened campus-based assessment.

It has really been a difficult year for us in higher education. Our enrollments are swelling, our budgets are shrinking, and we have been challenged to our core with the passing of the resolution by the Board of Trustees on June 17th.

We've been talking with each other for almost a year now, trying to find common ground .With the passage of the Faculty Council resolution on April 3rd I believe that we did that. I also believe that we would not be where we are today if we did not unite. The students, the faculty, the presidents, the chief academic officers and take the initial courageous stand that we did in the fall.

I have provided two documents. The first is an updated university-wide assessment chronologically that was outside. I presented this to you for the first time in January. Several things have happened since then. The other document is the faculty council resolution. Please be assured that it was adopted after a very lengthy debate. It accepts campus-based assessment with five specified modifications. The focus of our discussions changed considerably over the

three-day course of our meeting. Ultimately, the community college faculty realized that either we accept the proposal, accept the proposal with modifications, or we check the proposal with the knowledge that if we rejected the proposal, we could be dealing with implementation of the Board of Trustees' June 17th resolution or something as equally or more problematic.

In the fall the community college faculty were concerned about many things, but the two most prominent were the potential misuse of assessment data and bizarre campus comparisons and also funding for assessment. Because of the flexibility in the new proposal, our concerns about campus comparisons have lessened. If you take out the faculty council resolution, I would like to briefly highlight our suggested modifications.

We had some concerns about the funding that had recently been expressed. System administration has committed to paying the costs of the purchase and administration of the nationally normed measures and our resolution also asks System to pick up the cost of implementation. That was a major concern of ours as well as any locally developed measures. We also asked that the governance bodies and GEAR be involved in selecting the faculty that serve on the discipline-based peer review and that there are equal numbers of faculty from the community colleges and state operated.

We asked that that output of the GEAR process be sent back to the campuses for comment because it was felt that we otherwise would be giving GEAR a blank check agreeing to standards and rubrics we would have yet to see. Perhaps the proposal could be submitted to appropriate departments on all campuses for their review and suggestions before finalized. If time permits, perhaps GEAR could even work interactively with departments. The value of this modification is that it removes any concerns about the GEAR panel not being truly representative of the faculty and mathematics written communication.

The community college faculty believes that the means of assessing critical thinking is less well defined than it is for assessing math or writing. Given that the current GEAR process has the campuses developing standards and rubrics for critical thinking at this time, we would like to wait until they are compiled so that the GEAR discipline-based peer panels can use them as a resource.

Joe Hildreth: I would now like to have Stephanie Gross give an explanation of the students' action on this.

Stephanie Gross: It was a very hard decision to vote against it but it was the right thing to do. I still feel proud to have done that. As we proceeded through this, not supporting the MOU as well as continuing to try to find what the problems were and how we could come to something that we agreed on. What really happened with this task force was to create a checklist of what concerns the bodies stated and to make sure that we covered that to have this proposal that I think is extremely strong. I do hope that you support it. If you don't, please come up with modifications, if you have any, or something in the constructive, positive, productive way so that we have something to go back to the Chancellor and the Board with. I would never dare speak on behalf of the Board but working with them I can tell you that they are looking forward to having something positive to come out of these discussions... (tape ends)

Dick Collier: ...I hope that whatever we wind up voting on clears up the confusions. Although my campus did vote unanimously in rejecting the proposal, I think the wall of the changes proposed by the FCCC would have made it a bit more palatable.

Some of the remaining concerns that Albany had...one is the issues of the mathematics and the fact that there are so many different standards. We're doing a waiver based on a high school examination that covers stats, probability, and things like that. Whatever the norming is, is a problem.

Functional problem...here I depend on people who could have passed this exam. According to my campus, the complete poison pill in the proposal is that we have to do an achievement thing. If we have a locally developed instrument it has to be demonstrated and

have current validity with nationally normed measures. That, we would consider, not strengthen campus-based but considerably weaken campus-based assessment for writing and critical thinking. Some people say that that doesn't mean we have to norm it against national exams or some standard but the people on my campus who have spent years working with assessment we do, and if that's the way it is, we can't support it.

Joe Hildreth: We're going to distribute this resolution that was developed by the Executive Committee. That's a motion. We're now going to continue this discussion, but it will be a formal discussion on the motion. We also have some concerns that we need to figure out a way to address.

One way might be to do a similar format to the Faculty Council. My concern in terms of running the meeting is that we do this in such a way that we don't get lost in the detail. One suggestion that has been passed along to me is for me to walk you through the summary so that we can try to structure the comments that we are making in a more formal fashion. If you then feel that we need to do something in order to enable this to pass, we can work on that.

Comments on the background?

Pete Knuepfer (Binghamton): Probably, at the outset, the most fundamental question and stumbling block for many faculty, including my campus, is that the only reason that has been set forward and suggested that we need to move beyond what we're doing right now in campus-based assessment is to provide assessment as accountability. The difficulty is that most of us don't find that that is a particularly reasonable or legitimate reason to assess. We are interested in assessment to improve education and I know that a number of folks have made comments through email that gets at this issue. There really hasn't been any explanation or justification of providing accountability other than a vague suggestion that there are stakeholders that are interested in having some measures of accountability.

I'm saying this, in part, because I am coming from a campus where that is a major stumbling block in even wanting to consider this proposal. I will then put on my personal hat in that there is a political reality out there that we unfortunately do have to be aware of. This is that accountability is a popular political movement and that it is one of these things where I can use a lot of analogies...the train has already left the station. The proposals that we have on the table in the background here provide us with a mechanism or opportunity to slow the train down or, at least, steer it in a particular direction. On the pragmatic side, that is perhaps a reason to support the basic final proposal that we've got here. You can see that I am personally have a hard time working through these two sides of the issue but I thought it was important to recognize and to get on the record that there is considerable opposition to the assumption that assessment as accountability is an appropriate mechanism or way to go.

Joe Hildreth: Thank you, Pete. I wanted to make clear that the motion that we have just distributed is not on the floor. This is a formal discussion of that motion.

(Extensive discussion and dispute over wording in the document)

Marvin Goodman (Buffalo): We should agree to some kind of a ground rule that says that to go back through this, word by word, where it is word smithy rather than clarification, there need some emendations for clarification to make sure that we know exactly what it is. To go back through and get the most felicitous phrase that we can possibly find (which we're very good at, except that we would be here until tomorrow night), I think would be very difficult to do.

The second piece is to try to put it to this language, which is going to concretize every single iota of it, we've really arrived at this as kind of a good faith effort. It's taken a long, long time. What we have now is a document so different from a high-stakes single exam that was suggested to us four or five years ago at one of these plenary meetings. The difference is almost infinite from where we started and where we are.

Norman Goodman: I think that Marvin is absolutely correct. What we have now is the nature of the legislative debate, which will frame what we eventually do, without having to put everything in the exact same words. The exact wording here is less important than the spirit of what is going on.

(More discussion on the wording and language is discouraged and the discussion continues)

Runi Mukherji: We all know that while you can the supposedly normed test banks, it is very difficult to construct your own that match those criteria. Coming up with our own garden variety of tests that can be shown to have current validity with or going through those processes and then getting them approved by GEAR is a lengthy, time consuming process for faculty. The only financial reassurance we're looking for is in terms of administering nationally normed tests. We are constantly in the position of fulfilling unfunded mandates and this is yet another layer. There is assurance that System will fund the money for twenty percent of the sample if it is a nationally normed test. If this is their way of encouraging nationally normed tests, this is the way to do it. The other way of trying to come up with a good test that has integrity that you develop yourself requires incredible time and effort on the part of the faculty.

Joe Hildreth: I'm going to let Don address that.

Don: Modification two of the Faculty Council endorsement of this makes that very point if we accept that.

Runi Mukherji: If we accept that does that go along with the GEAR guidelines?

Donald Stevens: It's not really a GEAR issue, it's a System Administration issue. That is the kind of thing that is likely to go in a Board policy. It would likely go in a letter from Chancellor King to Joe Hildreth and Kimberly Riser. I'm telling you that we accept that helpful modification from the Faculty Council. That's a nice addition to this.

Joe Hildreth: We need to move along and get through this document. I would like to get to the point where we can have a vote.

Mike?

Mike Andolina (Empire State College): This addresses the resolution in a non-substantive way. The second line really doesn't capture all of the discussion that we have had. This body has voted to continue this dialogue and we have. We have discussed it for a number of years and I think that we should acknowledge that. I would like to make a friendly amendment.

Joe Hildreth: I'm advised that we can do that after we address the resolved section.

Achim?

Achim Koeddermann (Oneonta): The question here is trust. Regarding the Chancellor, a lot of what we have on the table is not of his making, his doing, or his will. There is a general trust of the faculty for the Chancellor. We should say something positive about this institution.

I am not saying conspiracy theory here. However, you must remember that we have rules of the game. In this case they had something to do with the outcome. The secretary of our body, our duly elected representative, was not part of that committee. He himself didn't know that he was not a part of that committee. Very much to my surprise, I come to a committee which debates this when he is not present. This means that the communication is not in the hands of our secretary, which is his charge. Even better, when I was asked to run for vice-president for this assembly I asked him if he wanted to run again. He said that he couldn't because the rules of the game prevent you from doing that.

The question is trust in rules of the game. It can be addressed with an advancement of knowledge. Let's go to the dissemination of the debate. It had to be focused, it happened in two meetings, and the meeting shifted the responsibility to the GEAR group. A couple of essential questions for me still have not been answered. How do we motivate our students to take those exams if they don't count? How do we get them the amount of reason they need in order to get them to the table? What will assessment be worth? This assessment document has made us aware that we have certain things that we really care about. Trust is one of them and it would be bad to sacrifice that. I would like something that would make my and every other class better. I'm still not convinced that this does.

Patty: There's no reason that these measures won't yield very useful information for the individual campuses. You have to keep in mind that the three measures that have been delineated or specified in this proposal and areas that campuses have already built into their G.E. assessment plans anyway. Certainly this is information that will be valuable to individual campuses.

I agree with you about student motivation if campuses are going to utilize standalone testing that doesn't take place in the context of a course. For those of you that have been involved with campus-based G.E. assessment probably at least 95% of all the measures that are being administered through that are course embedded. They are taking place in the context of the course.

With regard to what will happen if campuses decide to use a different kind of approach, I do agree with you that some guidelines will have to be developed and I think that the GEAR group will be very instrumental in the development of them with recommendations. I was very reassured by Stephanie's statement and I think that it was at our second meeting that the student assembly will play a very active role in informing students about this assessment effort and in telling the students how important it is that they do take part in the assessments and do the best they can. I don't know if Stephanie wants to add anything to that...

(Stephanie speaks away from the microphone.)

Patty: I want to go back to a point that I probably didn't emphasize enough. There are methodologies out there that other colleges have used to encourage participation and maximal effort by students and the GEAR group would use those as resources.

Joe Hildreth: Just one more point and then we are going to have to move along. On the composition of the committee... Our people were selected by the sectors, the two people that were appointed that had been on this in the past were selected by the Executive Committee, and the committee changed from a Faculty Senate committee into a system-wide committee with equal representation.

Ken?

Ken O'Brien (Brockport): I support this motion with some genuine reluctance and some real questions. Those of you who were at the meeting last spring when I suddenly became convener of the CGLs know that my default position on assessment was not a welcoming one, particularly anything that smacked of numbers across the system that would yield comparative results. It didn't seem to me that that was going to be useful or possible.

We've come a long way since then. I have been at each and every one of the meetings that have dealt with this issue, one way or another, for the last year. I didn't want to, I'm not particularly happy about it, but I have learned a good deal.

One of the things that I have learned is that it is possible for the system to work in terms of shared governance. It is possible for people to come together from disparate parts of the university, from different kinds of colleges, from different levels of the system and meet...

(end of tape)

...there is something that is very practical that you need to understand. There is a system policy on system-wide assessment. There is, in fact, a Board of Trustees policy on system-wide assessment. We are not talking about what if, in some kind of magical way, if we turn this down it will just go away. It will not. The June 17th policy is there and it will be implemented if we do not find some way with modification and reassurances to come to terms at this meeting with this proposal. That is the threat.

Is there anything in it on the upside for us? Those of us for whom the A-word is not necessarily welcome. I think there is. What this allows us to do on our campuses is to have the campus conversations about how we would best assess the building blocks of G.E. across many different sections, many different levels of student preparation, and many different outcomes. In other words, it would focus our own discussions on how we can begin to evaluate the degree to which we have succeeded in fostering student learning. It will not be on our pyrotechnics in a classroom but on the extent to which we have been able to define with clarity and to lead students to achieve common skill levels and understanding behind them in three key areas. That's all the proposal really does. For that reason, I support it.

Joe Hildreth: Thank you, Ken. Pete?

Pete Knuepfer: Two comments. One of the concerns that many people have about the proposal is that we are handing this over to GEAR and then we will be seeing proposal later during this meeting to clarify GEAR membership and longevity on GEAR. It's lurking in the background and those of us on the Executive Committee know it and other people don't.

To the resolution itself... I would like to propose the following amendment. I'll hand it over to the President as soon as I finish reading it.

(Reads part of resolved clause and then the amendment)

The purpose for that amendment would be to explicitly agree to the modifications and incorporate them, without putting in all the wording, into this resolution. I think that those modifications strengthen the position and the process as well as providing a uniform position from the two faculty governance bodies.

Joe Hildreth: (Reads the amendment) I think we're ready for a vote on the amendment. Do you understand it as read? It's to add the five modifications on the FCCC resolution that's in your packets. All in favor, signify by saying "aye". Those opposed, "nay". It's amended.

Now back to the discussion on the now amended resolution.

Bob Rogers: This all boils down to how much control the campuses have over this. IT gets to the point where I'm not quite sure what the answer is to that. To illustrate it, I would like to ask a question of anyone on the GEAR group because it sounds like that's going to be the group that oversees this. Since there are only three points that are being tested, one of which is math, this accounts for 33% of this entire endeavor.

In mathematics the campuses can choose to go beyond the SUNY minimum which is to get a "B" on the high school Course III regents. Suppose that the campus, no matter what they do on their own campus, say that since the SUNY is that that all of those questions that are in those high school level course are addressed in the SAT. Could we use their entrance score on the SAT in math as the assessment and not do anything beyond that?

Tom: No, you can't, because the assessment is of the courses that you have approved for your G.E. plan that you do have students take. The students that don't take it because they are

exempted due to a Regents test, for example, are not students that would fall into the pool that you would assess.

The math issue is complex. We all know that we were dealt a strange set of outcomes in math when arithmetic was put in there. We need to go back and look at the math outcomes. That is a different issue from the assessment proposal here itself which is a plan for the structural process on assessment. The specifics for math for which many mathematicians across the system have concern is not an unrelated issue but it will be affected by this but it's not really an issue that can be dealt with successfully in a description of a process. The assessment for math that is in any plan does not include the students that were exempted. But the proposal that we are looking at today is for a process that is dealing with assessment, not with the math problem.

Joe Hildreth: Let's go to the last speakers.

???: This may complicate matters but I move to do it because I think it's essential. In the three-page version of the bases for assessment...on page two in the middle of the page there are two paragraphs with roman numerals. If you are looking at another version of it this is under the heading of "Proposed Revisions to the GEAR Guidelines"... I am in the last sentence of those.

I move that the sentence reading, "Campuses choosing to use their own standards and rubrics must demonstrate to GEAR that their standards and rubrics are essentially equivalent to those developed by the discipline-based panel" be changed to, "Campuses choosing to use their own standards and rubrics must provide evidence to GEAR establishing that their standards and rubrics are at least equivalent to those developed by the discipline-based panels." If there is a second, I would be pleased to explain that and speak to it.

Joe Hildreth: There is a second.

???: Demonstrate, for those of us who spend a little time teaching logic, is an extraordinarily strong term. One of my problems in much of the defense of this that I have heard previously is that as long as that word is in there, the only way that I can see that this is done or can be done is by testing of the students involved using both the national and local tests, etc.

That is why I believe that if what has been said is accurate, we would be much better off to phrase it in terms of evidence establishing the change of the alternative rubrics, etc., provided to GEAR. They need to be equivalent or better; not just "essentially equivalent."

(Joe Hildreth reads the current and proposed amendment)

Norman Goodman: I oppose the amendment because using the phrase "provide evidence" is more restricting than demonstrate a variety of different ways. Providing evidence will require the testing that Bill wants to avoid. The wording change makes it what he doesn't want rather than what he does. "Demonstrate" gives us flexibility.

Ron Sarner (Institute of Technology): If I were to agree with the concerns of the speaker, the way that I would chose to handle it is in the resolution to incorporate whatever other concerns the body has about the document...not to attempt to wordsmith and rework the document itself. Other groups have already done that. I think it is appropriate to (fuzzy) the amendment and list any other concerns that the body has at the end as support of the document subject to the concerns and numerated below.

Dick Collier (Albany): I speak in favor of the amendment. That certainly removes the most important of my campus to the existing document. I assume that this will be a change in the document itself.

???: I want to respond to the earlier comment and point out that this is why I raised the question when this discussion began. What we are adopting is not that apparently very short resolution provided by the Executive Committee. We are adopting this document, front to back, all of the wording. If you don't think the "demonstrate" is the right word, and I don't, you don't want it in the document that we adopt.

Joe Hildreth: Shall we vote on the proposed amendment. I'll try to read it to you again. (reads the amended section)

All those in favor of the proposed amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay." Let's have a show of hands. It's defeated. I'm told that I don't have to call for abstentions on this; I'm sorry.

Okay, we're back to discussing this.

Luther Peterson (Oswego): I have one question to Dr. Francis. When we talk about course-embedded, does that mean we talk about twenty percent? This must be a simple question, but what I assume is that you go through your examinations and then you randomly pick out on out of every five?

Patty Francis: Well this is something that the GEAR group is going to have to struggle with to try to figure out an adequate methodology. But the campuses choosing to go with the twenty percent...some details are going to have to be worked out and I think that the GEAR group will probably put a lot of time into it...but, for example, we might be able to propose an alternative where twenty percent of the students taking the course at that particular time might be included in the sample. It's just an idea.

Obviously, if we were to stick to that twenty percent overall as it's stated, course-embedded probably wouldn't work. It would have to be a stand-alone.

Maureen: I just want to follow up on the previous comments about the mathematics assessment. I don't want to repeat what was said earlier.

The campus general education committee at the Old Westbury campus does have serious concerns I share about the proposal. Even with all the flexibility, it could be somewhat constraining on innovation and leadership which SUNY faculty might be providing, especially through sponsored research. Something that came to mind was a five-year program that Old Westbury participated in and which was led by Stony Brook. The intent was no less than systemic reform of undergraduate instruction. This was to provide leadership at the national level, in particular interdisciplinary applications of mathematics and the infusion of math across the disciplines. As such, Old Westbury developed a general education course which was proved by SUNY in quantitative reasoning and decision making.

As part of this program, the course itself was team-taught. It was mathematics, but it also involved the philosophy and social science professor. Part of the exercise in terms of the charge from NSF was to develop assessment measures. There were and are no nationally normed assessment measures for such an innovative and important aspect of general education mathematics, which is to focus not only on basic skills, but to motivate students to see how math is part of their everyday decision-making and how it's infused into their majors across the disciplines. How might a panel composed of experts in SUNY from other areas of mathematics weigh in on how a campus could develop assessment measures for something that has not been done before?

Don: It sounds like a terrific program and the emphasis on quantitative reasoning is probably more along the lines of where we'd love to go in terms of math outcomes rather than grounded as we are. I'm interested in learning more about what you are doing.

The proposal here is a structure for developing assessment. It is, in a sense, removed from the problem that you're telling us about, which is very real. The best guarantee of that is to

make sure that some of our most informed and progressive minds in mathematics as the discipline panel that would advise GEAR on that. I think you'd be very helpful to be a part of the process of giving us some understanding about whom might be on that panel and why.

The point that the Faculty Council raised, which is a perfect illustration of it, is to make sure that that discipline panel doesn't operate in a vacuum. If they don't and they are in a dialogue with the campuses, I think you could be very confident that the outcome would be both enlightened and meet all of the expectations that we would have.

My gut instinct is that the problems that we face in math and this process here may help us get to a better place in math general education and try to develop a set of outcomes more appropriate to college education.

Joe Hildreth: We're on the clock and I promised that we would go back to that proposed amendment to the whereas that Mike had. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, nay?

And now to the final whereas...are we ready to go? Ed, read this, please? (Ed reads the revised statement.) All those in favor of supporting the proposed amendment, signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, nay? It passes.

Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of the amended resolution on strengthened campus-based assessment, please signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, nay? It passes. Thank you very much for the discussion.

We're going to take a quick break and then we'll have the panel on plagiarism.

...has perhaps as many as four hundred majors. She has been an acting member in terms of our committees and is currently an acting member of the undergraduate committee. She's organized this and it's a pleasure to introduce Janet to you.

Janet Nepkie: This is a hot topic for all of us in higher education. The background to this panel is that about a year ago I was very concerned for students at Oneonta who were being obliged to turn their work in electronically to software called TurnItIn.com, which many of you may be used to. What happens is that the student submits his or her paper and two days later TurnItIn.com turns it in to the teacher with a plagiarism report. I was concerned because it seemed to be blatant copyright infringement which did not rise to the level of the fair use exception. I also thought that it was a breach of privacy for our students. I have since heard other points of view which also make sense to me. I brought it to the Exec Board and that group went bananas because plagiarism is such a hot topic. I was immediately instructed to put together a panel so I did.

This problem has grown exponentially as the facility of technology has enabled copying to happen. The problem cuts across all populations in higher education. It has to do with faculty, staff, and students. But today we are focusing on the question students, ethics, and plagiarism. If you would like to see us explore the broader issues, including staff and faculty, I strenuously urge you to fill out the evaluation form which is in your packet and let us know what you would like us to discuss if you would like to have a future symposium on a broader level.

Is plagiarism caused by the simplicity of doing so through new technology? Is it caused by faculty who don't know how to give good clear directions about what constitutes plagiarism? Is it caused by the fact that we can cut and paste much more easily now with the Internet? Or are our students simply not honest anymore?

We have experts here with us today and I want you to hear them. I have with us today Dr. Don McCabe, professor of management and global business from Rutgers University and a national expert on plagiarism, not only in this country, but throughout the world; Thomas Mackey, an assistant professor at the School of Information Science University in Albany; Stephanie Gross, President of the SUNY Student Assembly and a member of the Board of Trustees, well-known and respected by all of you; and Chip Morris, Office of Student Conduct and

Community Standards from SUNY Potsdam, who is the head of a new organization of Campus Judicial Officers. I'm proud and pleased to introduce our speakers to you.

Dr. McCabe: I've had the opportunity over that last twelve of thirteen years to survey almost 100,000 students now on almost one hundred different campuses primarily in the U.S. and Canada as well as in a few other countries. I should tell you up front that my bias is promoting academic integrity rather than punishing academic dishonesty. Certainly, we could reduce cheating by being more vigilant and stronger punishments more frequently applied and I have no problem with strong punishment when it's deserved, but I think that a part of what we are trying to do here is to engage in some form of character education and teach students some lessons in responsibility and integrity that they can take away with them when they leave campus.

I'm going to try to give you a more global picture than my colleagues will probably give you. I think they'll focus more on the SUNY picture. In my reduced agenda I'll try to give you a brief overview of my most recent research by focusing on just the last year or two. I will try to identify what I, as well as the students and faculty I've surveyed, perceive to be some of the major issues.

The survey I did last year in the U.S. and Canada focused on thirty-four different schools and about 35,000 students. In the Canadian environment we did undergrad and grad students, faculty, teaching assistants and first-year students. We asked the last group about their experience in high school and how they thought college might differ. It's clear that this problem is starting sooner than college. The question is what are some of the attitudes that students might be arriving with at our campuses and what some good strategies might be to address that. In the U.S. we did only the students, faculty, and TAs. There were only about seven hundred TAs in Canada and the U.S., so I'm not going to speak to those.

We're basically asking students to be honest about their dishonesty which raises some questions. I will tell you that the results are very consistent, they make sense, and when you compare when student admit they've done themselves to what they say goes on at their campus in general their results hold together. I would not stand here and tell you that the percentages of the students that admit they've cheated are truly representative, but the relevant comparisons between different types of campuses, majors, and students are very valid.

I've switched over the last couple years of surveying to web-based surveys. That's raised some new issues particularly with regard to self-report data...

...it might not be necessarily completely representative, but I can assure you they represent the thoughts of many students and that is why I selected them.

Some of the reasons they cheat:

1. They don't have enough time to do the work.
2. The course load is too heavy and you've got to get some assistance.
3. The pressure to do well (parents almost encourage them to cheat sometimes.)
4. The course is required by the university and the student doesn't want to take and it doesn't know why they have to take it.
5. Motivation related to faculty...some don't proctor their exams very well...a lot of them give you meaningless assignments that have no learning value...professors with inadequate teaching skills... However, student do say that when the professor is putting forth 150% effort and the professor is holding up their end of the bargain, students are less likely to cheat due to respect for their professor.

Over 80% of the students cheated, especially in first-year required science courses.

6. Many students say that they feel almost left behind if they don't cheat. They say they don't want to be cheating and if you can just get the other people to stop they will fall into line...but as long as the institution and the faculty are letting these students cheat, they feel as though they have no choice and must cheat to keep up.

7. Competition increases for the jobs and for the spots in the top graduate schools...cheating is perpetuated by this.

From my faculty surveys I want to highlight one my pet peeves here. One of the safeguards that faculty use to reduce the level of cheating or encourage higher levels of academic integrity is highlighting and putting this information in your syllabus. These are such simple things to do. Students need to know that you care about this issue, otherwise they're not. They may not even if you do, but I think there's a minimum level of care that may change the equation for them.

I want to cover the issue that I already touched on that even faculty acknowledge that they incur cheating on occasion. Students make that accusation, but faculty admit that themselves. A primary reason is a lack of adequate proof but also lack of support from schools.

These are faculty comments, not students' comments. The role that the faculty should play on the proactive side is leading by example. If you behave ethically toward your students, the students are likely to reciprocate. We should discuss this topic openly with the students to understand and acknowledge the dilemmas that they have. We have to talk about what it means to cheat. A lot of students don't understand that information on the Internet is not public information and that you do have to cite it. Someone needs to help them understand that that is not the case.

On the defensive side, faculty who want to monitor their exams, set and enforce more rules, and need to vary assignments and exams don't have problems with any of these. I think that's why the schools that have honor codes are so effective. Clearly, there are some schools that have something called a single sanction penalty, where if you are found responsible for cheating you are dismissed from the institution. Obviously, there is some negative reinforcement there that reduces the likelihood of cheating, but at most other honor school codes it does appear that the more positive approach is having an impact.

I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have later on.

Thomas Mackey (University of Albany): I'd like to shift the focus now to looking at this from the classroom perspective. The name of my presentation was originally, "Preventing plagiarism through information literacy". Someone pointed out, though, that we aren't preventing... I guess she was right. Internet cheating has become very common; people just copy and paste from the Web. I haven't seen a student using a library book to plagiarize in about three years, so I think that this is about easy access to the Web and how we conceptualize this resource.

What I want to talk about is one of my courses. It's a large lecture class and it's about eighty to one hundred twenty students per semester. This is a conceptual model for the class and it's something that I draw the first day on the blackboard and try to make all of these different connections. It shows the four main components of the class, but also how I try to make central linkages between the student areas.

First of all, there is a research and writing component. I don't think that we can make any assumptions about the skills that a student has coming into our class whether it is an information literacy course or not. This is an upper level discipline-specific literacy course so I have a certain obligation to teach research methods. However, I don't think that the information should be limited to literacy courses. It should be across the board.

Web design...I think it's very important to have students become Web developers to, in part, demystify this process of what the Web is and how easy it is to make documents for the Web and what it is to be original in that particular space. Collaboration is key along with ethical collaboration. The fact students are working in a Web-based environment and hypertext theory and Web theory is really all about collaboration. That's one of the reasons that we talked about that. It's very real world for students to gain skills in working with other people and to be able to work ethically and responsibly in teams.

This is an upper level information science course and I have all of these great topics ideas to work with, talking about copyright, intellectual property, access and Internet security... I use a book that discusses our rights in a digital environment and working with and

communicating ideas. The center of this conceptual map is ideas. I tell my students on the first day of class that this is about their development of ideas. I also want them to think about how ideas originate and how to ethically refer to another idea through citations, etc. What is the public domain and how do we work with ideas in them?

I really try to focus on research literacy and Web literacy. That is essential and we look at the information literacy literature...there is a lot of debate over whether we are teaching technology skills or information/research skills. I don't think you can avoid the Internet or technology in this era, especially when our students are so easily going to the Web.

In this model I see two pillars. The first pillar is research literacy. I encourage you to think visually because the Internet is such a visual environment. I explain to my students what the editorial process is all about and actually have your students be peer reviewers for other students in the class. The other pillar is the web literacy component so that students are learning HTML, cascading style sheets, etc., and developing digital images. I think that they gain a better understanding about what virtual space is and what virtuality is by actually constructing these images through something like Photoshop. Also through working with Web teams and thinking about how ideas change in dialogue with someone else, negotiating, exchanging ideas and seeing visually how that has an impact on what it is that they create.

What I am trying to think about with research literacy is for them to create a formal research paper and they are really authors of that paper. I don't have them just make silly pages about their hobbies; they are making research-oriented websites. I want them to think about the Web as an idiom for communication and as a meaningful space where they are not just being sold a product. Everything about the Web is always selling you something, but remembering the Web and the hypertext as a place for meaningful content is what I want them to be thinking about.

Those research skills have a direct impact on the Web literacy and thinking this way has a direct effect as well on the papers and ideas that they are developing, and even how they are documenting Web sources. I am trying to help them demystify this process of what the Web is. It's not this absolute authority that has all of the answers. Our students are original thinkers and I think that we sometimes have to remind them of that.

Research literacy is about more complex searches by going beyond Yahoo! and Google. Getting them to think about the difference between the kinds of sources that they run into...popular sources versus scholarly versus trade and getting them to analyze and create these site and scholarly journal articles. I'm getting them to question the validity and reliability of these sources and having them participate in some sort of editorial review process. This, by the way, is a great opportunity to collaborate with librarians in a meaningful way.

Thinking in terms of a higher level model of information literacy...for me, one challenge is trying to get them to think about what a scholarly journal article is for us. Also, changing your assignments every semester is very important. Making a lot of Web-based resources available for them is important. This gets them to use the Web in a productive way and not just copying it. This conversation about plagiarism isn't just scolding them on the first day and telling them not to do it. It's fully integrated in everything that they are doing.

The number one thing I see in terms of plagiarism is copying it from the Web. Sometimes they will copy from other students on their team or they will have inappropriate collaboration where they are working together and they present the same exact code. What we are seeing is the content being appropriated in an appropriate way.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions through email or after.

Stephanie Gross: I often wonder where we are as a people, culture, and nation in regard to our integrity and values. Being able to share with you is a reaffirmation of how fortunate we are. We have been able to develop a way of life that puts so much emphasis on education and learning. Our emphasis seems to focus more on the acquisition of information rather than the perpetuation of the ideas and values that are the source of our greatness.

Our entire culture is, in my mind, on the brink of having to make some important decisions as to where we are going. Are we so caught up in handing down information, facts and ideas that we are willing to forego the values that have helped make us the greatest nation and culture in the world? Is increasing the speed of my new Dell laptop where the greatest minds should be focusing their efforts? Is the creation of Smart Moms, cruise missiles and Black Hawk helicopters where our engineers should spend their hours? I wonder where we are as a culture when our President lies under oath to Congress about extramarital affairs, where a governor of a predominant state accepts bribes and gifts contrary to his oath and goes on to his fellow politicians, the press and his constituents, and where a CEO of a multimillion dollar corporation lies, cheats, and steals and thousands of his employees are out in the cold without retirement money.

I'm sure that each and every one of you has asked the same questions. My thoughts and concerns are not original but I want to show you that our SUNY students all around the state share our concerns about the topic today. Not all of us steal from the information sources without giving credit to the source. Not all of us cheat on tests and lie. And dare I say that only a small percentage of my fellow students engage in such activities. Those that do, however, in my mind engage in immoral and illegal actions. Yes, in some way they are stealing. I do not intend to truly discuss what you will eventually continue to discuss which is the punishment that ensues if a student in your class violates these basic rules of society. I am here, however, to offer some suggestions on how to correct this problem.

My father once told me a story about his life when he was only ten years old. Living in the Bronx, he would go to a small corner candy store after school and each day buy some sunflower or pumpkin seeds. These came in a small rectangular box and cost only two cents. One day, he finished school and walked down the hill to the store. The little old man who owned the store was in the back making milkshakes for people sitting on the stools in the corner at the counter. My father waited, waited, and waited. When the little old man didn't turn around to take his usual two cents my father turned, took the box and left.

What does that have to do with today's topic? My father is now fifty-six years old and what he did that day still plagues him with guilt and remorse. My father has developed a conscience. Perhaps that is what is missing in today's culture. Where do such values emanate from? The family is and continues to be the source of any and all such values...values such as concern for others, courage, and the strength to stand tall in the face of adversity, the integrity to tell the truth all of the time and not when it is just convenient, the curiosity to reach out, intentionally discover all the world has to offer and, of equal importance, the leadership to help others become all they need to become.

I am indeed fortunate to have a family that has been involved with character education. My father is the director of an alternative high school that focuses entirely on character development. He is constantly answering the questions that I have mentioned. He works every single day with families who are trying to figure out what they and their children aren't able to make connections with the values I have mentioned. My mother also reminds me of the definition of ethical behavior and doing the right thing. Parents know what is right. However, to do what is right often takes strength, courage and conviction often lacking in many parents today.

What goes on in college students' minds when he or she copies from another's work or does not give credit when credit is due? Is what goes on in their mind not really the problem but rather that there is little thought given to honesty or integrity? Families today are more concerned about grades and SAT scores in order to get their students into prestigious colleges and are, unfortunately, less concerned with how those grades are attained. It comes to be more and more acceptable to lie, cheat or steal in order to get the grades and get accepted into those colleges. Often, these are the students who continue to do what their parents have taught them to do. The pressure their parents feel is transmitted to their children and to your students in your classrooms throughout the state. They have come to believe that hard work is often not enough and they think they must plagiarize in order to get the grades.

I offer you a three-pronged approach that our society must adapt in order to return to the basic value system that made us the great nation that we are. Integrity must, once again, become the cornerstone of the home. Parents must set the example and live lives of truth and honesty. The media must encourage and promote the idea that doing the right thing is the right thing to do. Michael Milken made his billions by lying and stealing, not using his god-given intelligence to creativity. His way to success is not to be applauded. Finally, there is no modeling other than role modeling. The people we choose to emulate and model should always be of the highest moral standing. The key to all of this and our future is education. We must teach students the value of original thought and we must teach them what plagiarism is and how to access information written by others and then use such information with honesty and integrity.

Plagiarism is nothing more than stealing. This is not acceptable in any society, or is it? This is a question that you cannot fully answer today, but a direction we can certainly take.

Thank you.

Dr. Chip Morris (Potsdam): I am a very strong believer in the idea that if we are to hold students accountable, we need to explain and articulate very clearly what those expectations are. I'm not sure that, as institutions, we always do that as well as we should. As institutions we can do these through a variety of measures. We can articulate those expectations and those core values. At Potsdam we happen to have what is referred to as the "Potsdam Pledge." It's in your packet. I think it's a simply stated set of core values for our institution. Students who go through orientation receive it in a credit card sized copy and they keep it with them. I am often surprised by the student who comes up to me and says that they still have it. Sometimes it's the student that I'm facing across the desk when they haven't made a particularly appropriate choice in their behavior. But I think it's a very important beginning for the student to see what the core values of the institution are.

There is also a copy of our academic honor code in your packet, not because I think that it is the very best, but I'm not sure that all SUNY schools have one and I believe you should. There are some important components here for us. The front side is a bit more philosophical and it does end with, "On my honor..." I have students sign that and the pledge to follow this. There is research out there that indicates very clearly that when you require a student to review and make a commitment, they are more likely to follow the ideas related to that commitment. The backside goes into specific detail about what academic honesty is so that you don't violate our policy.

I believe that not only should colleges articulate these expectations, but each and every faculty member should as well. The syllabi are a perfect opportunity for this. I'm a believer that we need to repeat over and over again that academic integrity is an integral part of what the academy stands for. Faculty can do that in their first class meeting and over and over against they request assignments that will receive academic credit.

A growing number of courses encourage and allow group work. I think there is often significant confusion on the part of students about what that means. Does that mean that I work in a group so that everyone in the group can understand the idea behind the theory and then go and do independent work? Does that mean that we can work as a group to understand the theory and then do some common work? Can we turn in the exact same work? I think that means students are genuinely confused by that and as faculty we need to clearly articulate what our expectations are for that class. It's very real that my expectations may be very different than another faculty member's. We really need to clarify that.

In my class I have students sign something that says, "On my honor..." whenever they submit work for academic credit. It is another way to remind them that this is an important value for me and that it should become an important value for them. When they are constantly reminded, they are more likely to live up to that expectation.

Now, what I recommend you do when you come across an act of academic dishonesty. First and foremost, I think it's important for every faculty member to know the rules or your college and then to utilize them. At SUNY Potsdam I think that we have made it relatively easy

for faculty to avail the judicial system for acts of academic honesty. I think it's important that they do that for several reasons:

1. When it goes through one office as opposed to a dozen different faculty members, we have a much more consistent response to these incidents.
2. It allows for a common site for record keeping. I've had faculty tell me that they do it themselves and if they had it again, something else would happen. What they don't always know is that because it's the first act of academic dishonesty between a student and them, it doesn't mean that it's that student's first act of academic dishonesty. Unless we have a central location to keep those files there's really no way to know that.
3. By utilizing your campus's judicial officer and system it shifts almost any legal liability from you to the judicial officer. I would think that would be wonderful.

There are three or four fairly current cases that have come through the courts and that have indicated that the courts do not want to get involved in assigning a grade based on whether you think it's a good paper or a bad paper. That's your job as the faculty member. It is clearly stated that when you assign a grade because you believe that there has been an act of academic dishonesty, it is now a punitive judicial act and there are certain specific due process obligations that you need to afford the student.

It's my sense that they are genuinely unaware of what due process means and what is required by law. It's what we in judicial affairs live by. We have to know it, be familiar with it, and follow it or what we do will be thrown out. So we're fairly well versed in it. Because you are familiar with it, I feel that it is less likely that we will make a mistake that will cause a court to overturn a decision relative to a sanction or punishment concerning an act of academic dishonesty.

I will close by saying that I have great faith in our students to do the right thing and to do it the right way, especially when we help them to understand what we believe our core values to be.

Mike Andolina: This is for Chip. There has been some research about ethics codes that were developed from the bottom up instead of from the CEO on the top down. The CEO tended to be distanced from the actual implementation of the codes when they did some research and experiments where the employees from all ranks were involved in designing codes to internalize codes for. Has this been tried with students? Having students involved in writing codes every year would make them more likely to understand the codes and would be able to share them with their fellow students. If either of you could respond to that...

???: In 1995 I looked at a variation of schools that had honor codes and the point is that those honor codes with the highest levels of student involvement were the most effective. The students say themselves that you've got to get the body into it before anything will work. There is a lot of evidence from Rutgers and other places as well at both the corporate level and the university level based on the honor code.

Chip Morris: Mike, I would agree. At Potsdam we are involved in the rewriting of our academic honor code. I think that any time a group is going to have the rules apply to them, by participating in those rules... I mean, we saw today in the discussion about assessment that they are going to buy into it more than if it's just imposed on them.

Norman Goodman: Stony Brook was studied and I've seen some of the results. In light of this conversation about getting students involved, they are prepared to do so. One comment from a student in our study was, "Make it stop. Those of us who work hard are pissed."

Janet Nepkie: Thank you for that pithy comment.

Donald Stevens: I wonder if our colleague from Potsdam has looked at any of these issues from a legal standpoint has any sense as to whether sanctions which may vary from one end of the punishment spectrum (don't do this again) to the other (you're out of this school) are sustainable legally in a system which is a university as whole...whether the various outcomes on various campuses are sustainable in the courts.

Chip Morris: I am unaware of a specific challenge on that basis. I can tell you that every successful challenge has been on the basis of process, not sanction and that the courts have been... (end of tape)

...I wonder if I might, as a friendly suggestion to the senate, to perhaps explore best practices and processes on the various campuses and to perhaps offer guidance to campuses to make sure that their processes are as effective and legally defensible as possible.

Dick Collier (Albany): Albany's experience was that it is not appropriate to assume that ignorance to the law is no excuse. Too many of our students come in completely ignorant of plagiarism as an issue honestly not seeming to have heard in high school any distinction of discussion of citation versus quotation and so forth. As a result, our library has come up with very nice tutorial information that we are going to be putting in our bulletin and encouraging the instructors of freshman level courses to refer students to this online work so that they can tell what the rules are on plagiarism.

My second point is that after hearing all of these lead-by-role-modeling examples, I sincerely hope that the governance committee comes forth with a strong, solid document for us to consider at our fall meeting concerning plagiarism and other acts on the part of our faculty.

Paul Brodsky: This is for Don...out of curiosity; would you know what the rate of cheating or plagiarism at a place like UVA where it's a one-strike-and-you're-out type system as compared with an honor system with less draconian results?

Don: That's a very tough question because UVA is unique in its size. If I look at schools other than UVA I am convinced that the draconian penalties are not what makes these systems work. What makes them work is the level of student peer involvement and the fact that they are addressing the issue. All else being equal will make the system feared by students and therefore be more effective. There are many other ways to go about it. At one all-female school the penalties aren't that draconian, but they've convinced students that every student has a role to play and that if you see cheating your obligation is not to report it but rather to confront it, speak to that student, and talk about how they are violating the peer principles at that school and making it worse for everyone else. Regarding plagiarism as a result of competition...they also have an unwritten rule there that most of the young women adhere to that you don't discuss your GPA or your grades with anybody.

Janet: The other thing for all of you to think about is that a great deal of copying both face-to-face and online is legal now. It is therefore necessary for us to know the copyright law or to know the expert on campus who can educate us about it.

???: I assume that judicial affairs is located under student affairs? One of the things that I have noticed is a frequent disconnect between the academic side and the student affairs side. Your presentation was a good example of why we need closer association between the two.

Peter Knuepfer: When we enacted some significant changes to our honesty code a couple years ago, we went through some extensive discussion in the faculty and then between the faculty and student affairs about adjudication of issues should be housed. Both groups felt, for perhaps

different reasons, that the adjudication of academic integrity issues should be housed with faculty in the academic side of the campus. In fact, the dean of students from student affairs told me that he didn't want to be involved in that and I would be curious as to your comments about what kind of a model you think works more appropriately and which one works better.

Chip Morris: I don't think that there is one approach that is better or that works better or more efficiently. I can clearly understand why the majority of people would say that this kind of issue belongs in the academic side. I don't see anything wrong with that. What I think is required if that happens is that you need someone who is well versed in what due process means and what the courts have said about what must be done. It's just that, generally speaking, it's not an area of expertise for most faculties, nor do they often express a real interest in learning it.

Janet: It's time for that last observation or admonition from each panel member. Stephanie?

Stephanie Gross: I think that this discussion was really terrific and I would encourage that it continue at length. I don't think that you would even have a true solution but rather a good idea of best practices from each campus. As we agree, assessment can't be the same at each campus. You students are different at each campus and maybe you need to look at best practices and have a different setup at each of your campuses regarding what's best for your students.

Tom Mackey: When Stephanie said that most of her peers are not doing this, I think that that is very true. When we look at these statistics they can be very dramatic and make a teacher cynical about what is happening in the classroom. I think that we need to resist that and accept the fact that most students are not doing this kind of activity.

Don McCabe: I highly recommend an organization I am a part of called "The Center for Academically Integrity Based Student University" as a source of information if you are going to move forward and do something. It's a valuable resource with a website (www.academicintegrity.org) and you can see what it's all about.

Chip Morris: It's important to remember that the larger topic of academic honesty goes to the heart of what the academy stands for. We all need to ensure that grades, credits and diplomas mean and stand for something and that it's the actual attainment of the knowledge. That's why students are there whether they know it or not. It is learning and we need to help them understand that.

I believe that the majority of students want to do the right things for the right reasons but at time we need to help them. They also require that we do our job, as difficult as it is sometimes, because these confrontations are not fun. We need to help create a level playing field so that the student who does not want to cheat can't rationalize it by saying that everyone else did and that they got a poor grade on that test when those who didn't study as much and did cheat got a better grade.

Janet Nepkie: I'd like to thank our four speakers. Thank you very much.

Joe Hildreth: I'd like to give our panel a final round of applause. It's time for our traditional Senate reception and you may leave your things here because we are meeting here tomorrow.

Saturday morning session

President Hildreth convened the meeting at 9:00 am

(Roll call on Saturday morning)

Joe Hildreth: The Executive Committee has a resolution that we would like to put forward. Our awards committee created a University Faculty Senate Outstanding Service Award and that was voted on at our last plenary. They will be presenting criteria that were established for the award today. This is a resolution to change the name of the award to include the name of the man who decided that he wanted to give the Senate an endowment which would be enough to generate a \$500 cash award to go with this award.

(Reads resolution) It's very simple.

It looks like we are ready to vote. All those in favor, please signify by saying, "Aye." Those opposed, "Nay"? It passes without dissent.

The next item would be the resolution on bill A07141.

???: There is a bill sponsored by Ron Canistrari who is the chair of the assembly higher education committee. This bill would provide for membership of the President of the Faculty Senate to be ex-officio and non-voting on the Board. This would give faculty a voice on the Board. This is something that CUNY has had since 1976 and that voice would be very important.

This resolution intends to show the support of the Senate for the bill and also to establish that the interpretation of the bill should be that the voting rights of the student. The trustee member should continue and to ask Chancellor King, Chair Egan and the members of the Board to support the passage of the bill. (reads bill)

(discussion near and away from the microphone regarding the language of the bill)

Okay, are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the resolution say, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay?" It passes without descent.

Our next item is going to be a resolution on ACTG. In the past the union has not supported this bill but it is now. The background on this is that we wanted to talk about the process of nomination of members on the general education assessment review group and the advisory council on general education. We wanted to recommend a specific term of service since that does not exist now. (reads the resolution)

Ken: In the CGL meeting yesterday, the issue of the relationship between the University Faculty Senate and the GEAR group and particularly the nomination process for membership came up first as a question. It's one I can't answer. As I understand it, there are eighteen members of the GEAR group. That group, according to the business we enacted yesterday, has seemed to take on some greater meaning in terms of the lives of general education across the system. Could we have a brief explanation about how many people are specifically pointed to the GEAR group? When we say the nomination of members, what percentage of the members will in fact be nominated by the University Faculty Senate?

Joe Hildreth: The basic composition was established before I came into office. I have put a couple of people on as people have retired. If asked, I basically look for someone like a historian to fit, for example, the comprehensive colleges and then I ask for recommendations. That is what I've basically done in the few cases where I've made an appointment. I would certainly be willing to reach out to the CGLs and to people when we're looking for someone to be a member of that group. It's basically just been me making calls and trying to determine who would be appropriate for that and if I knew them fine and if I didn't I'd call people to check up on them.

David Carson (Buffalo State): I have a concern as one of the co-chairs of ACGE that it would have been nice to have been consulted on this. We always talk about consultation and so I have some ideas I'd like to share with you. My specific question is when this would go into effect.

Dick Collier (Albany): I believe that the Faculty Council is to be equally represented and there was a mechanism to ensure that as well as you are planning.

Norman Goodman: This motion states what the Senate preference is. We would urge the Faculty Council to have a similar discussion and similar action but it's their decision how their representatives are sent to the committee.

Joe Hildreth: We couldn't presume to make a motion on their behalf. In specific terms of service, we could insert "beginning the fall of 2006" and that would make this a better resolution.

Bob Brumm (Alfred State College): It appears that we have covered a number of aspects here and it sounds logical to me that we should get things lined up correctly. I'm going to move that we table this motion.

Joe Hildreth: That would need a second and it won't be debatable. There's a second. Oh, we need a vote to table it.

???: If you table it you can take it up today at this meeting. Or, you can take it up at the fall plenary. Other than that, you can't do anything with it.

Joe Hildreth: We need to vote on this. All those in favor of tabling the motion say, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay?" Okay, it's not tabled.

Bill (Buffalo): I move to refer this motion to the Executive Committee for revision and resubmission at the next plenary meeting. (There's a second.)

(heated discussion and debate about why it is or is not beneficial to table the motion until the fall plenary and whether or not to refer the motion to the Executive Committee)

Joe Hildreth: Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of referring the resolution back to the Executive Committee please signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay?" Okay.
Peer, would you like to give some background on this next issue?

Peer Bode: The issue involves the resolution that was passed in the New York State College of Ceramics. I'd like to say that this college is a statutory college and the statutes exist at Alfred University and there are some at Cornell University. Statutes are public institutions that live within closed institutions.

The specifics of the resolution were supported unanimously by the faculty of the college in addition to former deans who participated in the discussion as well. The resolution was to move the unit head position which is presently in the provost's office and has been for the past three years and to move the head of the college back into the college where it has been for the last one hundred years. The sense of this is that the statutory piece, the college, is in fact being absorbed into the private university. There is a lot of information about this and I can give you two pieces to give you a flavor of it.

I'm glad to be here among my colleagues and be able to refer to the New York State College of Ceramics. Within Alfred University I can't say that name within our publicity. We have to take it off our literature, etc. Our college is disappearing within the university. Within a year our paychecks will no longer be state paychecks; they will be Alfred University paychecks paid by the state. There are a number of examples of the disappearing of the college into the university where the motto is, "One university with distinctive features."

Basically, what this resolution that the faculty unanimously supported is asking for is to rebalance the statutory/non-statutory partnership which is, at this point, out of balance. It's a governance issue; it has severe consequences that go way further than the examples I

explained, which are obviously important. There are world-class programs at the college which are at risk. That is some of the immediate concern. The statutory is a unique kind of construct and the large extensive programs are being absorbed into a small liberal arts university. I wanted to share with you what it is that's going on to clarify a little bit what the resolution is.

Don Stevens: At the Executive Committee I suggested a sense of the Senate, a statement, that I think would pick up on the Chancellor's statement last night that he feels that he needs to reengage the leadership of Alfred University and the issue that will need to be resolved between the Chancellor, the university, and the president of Alfred University. (He reads the statement.)

My sense is that this body can't really tell a particular campus what's an appropriate administrative structure, but this sense of the Senate would ask the Chancellor to engage in that discussion, which I think he's inclined and wants to do. I think it would be supportive of the process and supportive of the faculty of the Alfred University.

Peer Bode: It's clear that the Chancellor needs to reengage and there's also a value in the faculty here showing support to the faculty of the college. At this moment we are very much without support and advocacy and the symbolic weight is a real weight in terms of the support of fellow faculty. I'm very glad that the Chancellor is interested in reengaging.

(wordsmithing debate)

Joe Hildreth: Hearing this discussion...my interpretation would be that the Senate cares about this and we share the concerns that Peer has. We want this flexibility, we think this is appropriate and we want the seated Chancellor to engage in that. There is quite concern here and we are going to be monitoring the situation.

Are we ready to vote? All those in favor of the sense of the Senate, please signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay?" It passes without descent.

We have a resolution by our student assembly that we wish to endorse, but I don't have anything in writing to support that so we are not going to take that up right at this moment in the meeting. We'll wait until we get that paper and deal with this a little bit later today.

I'd like to go to our committee reports. Let's go to the awards committee and Marvin LaHood.

Marvin LaHood: Justin and I just have a brief report. Two things about the University Faculty Senate Outstanding Service Award that have come up today... Nominations by any member of the University Faculty Senate and the recipient to be chosen from nominees by the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee...I have commend at the last plenary that this would be done in this body and, surprisingly, this body turned it back to the Executive Committee.

The only criterion is, "The sustained service above and beyond what is ordinarily expected of a senator committee member or officer." We thought that we'd leave that simply enough. That is the most important thing we've been involved in.

The most important thing we're doing at the moment is meeting in Buffalo on May 7th. We're currently evaluating twenty-nine applications for conversations from the disciplines. Justin has been very much involved with this over the three years so he is going to make a presentation.

Justin: There's not much of a presentation other than that we've now been restored to thirty thousand dollars which we're very grateful for so have more money to distribute. Essentially, we've had twenty-nine portfolios this year that we're evaluating. They come from basically every sector and pretty well have good representation of SUNY as a whole. We're very pleased.

Joe Hildreth: Let's move on to the governance committee.

???: One of our projects for this year was completed. You all passed two resolutions concerning resources for campus governance at the last plenary. Three other projects, unfortunately, are somewhat behind schedule. We anticipate completing those sometime during the summer, I hope. During the course of the year, we were given two additional projects by the Executive Committee and Ron will speak to those.

Ron: In January, I was welcomed back to the committee with what I thought were a few wonderful hot potatoes. One of them was that there were issues raised from our colleagues at Albany regarding the circumstances revolving the establishment of the School of Nanotechnology. There were questions having to do with the financing, with resources that were (indecipherable) to it, faculty were taken from the department of physics to establish it... This school has wonderful new facilities across the street from the Albany campus. What were financing arrangements...what will the impact be on the institution over the long haul... it becomes an intertwining web.

Ray Guydosh and I worked on putting a couple of visits together and I think that our first task was to try and figure out what we could fight off and what we were unlikely to get to the bottom of. With that in mind, we visited the Albany campus meeting with a number of faculty in mid-February and we were struck by a couple of things. First, not one of the faculty members we spoke to opposed the establishment of the school. The complaints that we got had largely to do with procedural issues and was the requisite consultative process followed. The allegation there was that it was not. Some peripheral issues were raised but person after person came forward with the same story: process, process, process.

We attempted to meet with President Hitchcock but she had left by that point. The provost had accepted a position elsewhere and we were unable to meet with him. We did meet with the dean of the School of Nanotechnology and three of his faculty just a couple of weeks ago.

On both sides there is a perception that the other side has one or more demons among them. There are strong personalities. Part of what we were trying to sort out was who said what when. That is a very difficult thing for two of us to come to a campus and try to figure out in six to eight hours. A couple of themes did emerge and do have wider applicability. By and large, all of the people we met with have pretty much the same set of facts with some minor difference in interpretation from point to point.

Was there adequate consultation? Was it sidestepped or skirted? I don't think we can get what the intent was, but clearly the two parties had different perceptions of what they saw the consultative requirements were and whether they were met. With that said, there was not a well understood set of processes that all had bought into prior to the discussions to establish the School of Nanotechnology. That ultimately led us to a series of recommendations which we brought in resolution form but we are not going to introduce the resolution today. It's not quite ready for prime time yet so we'll take it back and fix it.

The lessons here are, first, that each campus needs or should within its bylaws have a very carefully articulated process for reviewing proposals for academic reorganization, academic reorganization from program discontinuance...the latter being a flashpoint with some members of the body ripe with all sorts of labor management issues as well. But the academic reorganization I had in mind was the establishment of a new academic unit, the combining of existing academic units into a different academic structure, not necessarily with not intent to diminish the number of programs. The establishment of new academic programs... These should all be bedded through the appropriate governance procedure... A clearly articulated process prior to the submission to SUNY. Explicit process for approval and changes to the curriculum...i.e. the addition of courses. That latter process may and often is different when a new program is approved in one time and place while the actual course is perhaps approved by a different body at a different time and place.

We believe that there is a real problem throughout the body with institutional memory. Administrative positions turn over with some rapidity. What that speaks to is the need for the

institutional history to go on. Another recommendation that we will come up is that the chair of the local governance leader should meet with each new academic administrator as they are appointed or come on board. Also, as periodic review of governance occurs, that's very good time to reacquaint the institutional faculty with what the established procedures are and look at what's working and what is not.

Increasingly, I think that we are going to see interlocking arrangements with corporations, other government entities, non-governmental bodies...some of these arrangements can be quite convoluted in terms of the Nanotech center...who owns the land and what the arrangements are. To the extent that these things are done behind closed doors or in a way that they simply do not see the light of day, I think that two things happen. First, conspiracy theory. Whether one exists or not, when a senior administrator of an institution decides to put things behind a curtain or closed doors, it invites criticism. That strikes me as a dumb management style. Beyond that, as bedding these things as they come up it invites the corporate wisdom of the institution to look at the proposed arrangement and improvements will be made and will prevent the institution from getting itself into an embarrassing position.

That's what we've learned as a result of our visits to Albany. The circumstances there are still a work in progress. I believe that the Board passed a resolution this last week to change the School of Nanotechnology into a College of Nanotechnology. For all I know we may be visiting this issue again.

Thank you very much.

Joe Hildreth: Graduate and research committee?

Gary Kitmann: There are no action items or resolutions from this committee. Our main emphasis this year was the program that was run on the scholarly workshop on getting grants carried on at Albany Nanotech. There is a complete listing of the program that was done for those two days.

The business plan that was used... we had \$14,000 to throw away, ha-ha, so we spent it on food. The business plan was essentially that we loaded it from the top down so that it had minimum on advertising...went through and used the internet to advertise the program and then to get the presenters we went out and searched through the research foundation with the help of Pat Winters and picked out, as a committee, the person who would be presenting. These became the senior mentors.

We then had the president send out, through the Chancellor's office, invitations to the Presidents to select the people who would come to the conference. As a result of that we got a very good presentation from all of the units within SUNY and we ended up with ninety-four participants for a total of about one hundred twenty.

The program went off. We had very few situations in which there were last minute corrections like when somebody gets sick. We also did an evaluation of the conference and we received a 4.4 on a scale from 1 to 5 for the conference.

One of the nice outcomes is that we have established an email list for senior monitor researchers and junior researchers involved and there is a general feeling among the SUNY people that there is one research faculty.

Joe Hildreth: Operations committee?

Paul Brodsky: The budget handbook is finished. We expect copies to be sent out to everyone and have a few hanging around. The handbook is online so that everyone has access to it. The presentation by our information technology people was very well received. The white paper by Maureen is in the works and the item on the back page is to be done by the fall.

Joe Hildreth: We don't have a report from the public information committee so let's go to student life.

Peter Nickerson: Our last meeting Alban was jointly held with the undergraduate committee and was a very useful collaboration. We're still working jointly on putting a template on student retention. We had the symposium and would like to consider best practices.

The committee continues to work on Greek life on campus. We've not seen the legislation on anti-hazing. This is something that we are concerned about and what of the major issues on hazing is the definition. Basically, if you feel you've been hazed you have been. This is something that I'm a little concerned about in the legislation. It's certainly a step in the right direction because the public is very concerned about this issue.

That's our report.

Joe Hildreth: Undergraduate committee? Norm?.. (tape ends)

Norman Goodman: ...which has taken on more meaning in the last few weeks with newspaper reports. We'll work on that.

The second point on demographic data is something that we have been working on for a long time. There was a 1998 report by this committee which has to do with trying to get SUNY to look ahead. They do look ahead now to project student populations but we want to use those demographic data as a committee and a senate here to examine the degree to which those factors will tell us something about the kinds of programs on the academic and student services side that we will need to look forward to and plan in advance. That's a large task and we're trying to work with the office to use those demographic data and then the committee's structure to consider the programmatic change that might be necessary.

The third item has to do with the SUNY learning network and there has been a report before on some of the processes involved here but we are also concerned with how the courses get accepted for that and how they define success in a course. We've had some dispute about what success means and we're trying to work that through so that we understand when SLN tells us it's accessible what they really mean by that.

On plagiarism and ethics... We had a very interesting and successful presentation yesterday and, based on your comments, we may try to get a one or two day conference workshop on some of the range of issues that are involved, beyond student ethics and plagiarism.

We're working on transferability issues. There is a model in western New York and we're trying to see if it's adaptable elsewhere. The whole issue of internships is something that we haven't touched before but, to some extent, the issue is brought to us by our favorite trustee about a year ago who said that that's worthless stuff. We don't believe that but we need to have some work done to demonstrate precisely what is going on in these areas of academic integrity.

Finally, a liaison from the Faculty Council of Community Colleges raised the issue of courses which are taught in the high school but required to get academic credit at the college level. Students take that at the community colleges and then get approval for that and are accepted there as well as at a four-year institution. There is some concern about what kind of academic controls there are in that. It's an area of interest and an area that needs to be continually explored. We will be working on that.

That's my report.

Joe Hildreth: Public Life committee?

Achim Koeddermann: There is a webpage. However, the protesting members of the committee have constantly asked that something be put on that webpage. That hasn't happened yet. Suggested was that showcased campuses would rotate and share information with the Executive Committee and then put a showcase page of each campus in the webpage. It was also suggested that a presentation like the one we had on plagiarism be it on students or, in the future, on faculty on the webpage so that the newest things would be there.

Joe Hildreth: Campus governance leaders?

Ken: One of the things that has happened is that the campus governance leaders are more fully informed than we ever have been about the University Faculty Senate's business and better informed about the potential relationship between local governance units and the actions taken by this body.

One discussion at our meeting yesterday revolved around the issue of swing courses and their relationship within graduate programs. That is an issue that seems to be well on its way to resolution within the system. We had a discussion of the composition of local senates. A member wanted to know if all of them included both teaching faculty and professional staff and we shared our own experiences based on our own campus.

We also discussed some of the issues that emerged from the governance committee's fine report on Albany and this was just a point of discussion because, looking at such local governance issues and the procedures at a given campus for the way that governance takes place, they are at the heart at some of the issues for the local governance units.

We also had a discussion about the relationship between the CGLs and the councils at colleges and universities across the state. That was brought to us by UB because although they are invited as ex-officio members, it sounded as if the UB council treats the local governance leaders as if they're part of an extended peanut gallery. That was not the case at all institutions and certainly not the case at my own.

The last discussion was given too little time but I think that it's on its way to resolution now was the important of GEAR and the importance of the mechanisms by which membership in GEAR is rotated and the relationship between this body and the Executive Committee and President and the nomination process of GEAR membership. I think that in a couple of cases the discussion focused, to a great extent, on strengthened campus-based assessment and focused on GEAR and the new importance that GEAR was going to play in academic programs. They wanted to make sure that we all understood how people were appointed and for what terms and by which mechanisms.

Thank you very much.

Joe Hildreth: We now have a resolution which is in support of the hazing legislation. This morning Stephanie Gross presented a resolution passed by the New York Student Assembly Executive Committee and I'd like to read that to you. (reads the resolution) She asked if we could support that and here is our resolution presented by the Executive Committee. (reads the supporting resolution)

I think we're ready to vote. All those in favor of please signify by saying, "Aye." Opposed, "Nay"? It passes without descent.

She has another issue that was too complicated to deal with in the time that we had so that has been referred back to the operations committee and we'll bring that back once they have had a chance to review and report on it to the Executive Committee.

I believe that brings us to old or unfinished business. New business?

Judith Adams-Volpe: I have two small things I'd like to leave with you as my final last words of my eight years in this Senate. First, I think you might be facing a crisis soon in terms of the virtual resources that are available to SUNY. There is a very difficult issue that has come up about all of the major scientific journals and you may need to address that because that will affect all of you. I think they are going to have to ask for money from SUNY and I don't know if that's available in order to continue that contract. There is a lot of expertise with you and a lot of expertise can be found if you need any help with that.

I would also like to say that I think the timing might be right for a presentation about student athletes in SUNY. The Chancellor just recently created a new award for scholar athletes. I was concerned about the negative impression of athletics and I think that maybe it's time for

people to see the incredible striving for excellence and what SUNY has done with athletics and how well we are handling it.

Joe Hildreth: Thank you, Judith.

I think we're to that part where we have the tradition of the Senate and Dick Collier is at the ready with our poem.

(Dick Collier reads his poem *The Black Squirrels of Syracuse*)

Joe Hildreth: Our fall plenary will be at SUNY Maritime and there are black squirrels there. Thank you everyone and I look forward to seeing you again next fall. Have a nice summer.



Presented by Vice President/Secretary Jim McElwaine

Transcribed by Holly Tatnall