

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL  
2006/2007**

**Charge:** It shall review the educational process and recommend policy for improving the quality of undergraduate academic activities. The Council reports to the Senate and advises the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies. Its responsibilities include but are not limited to: (1) recommending the minimal obligations of members of the academic staff in meeting their assigned instructional duties and developing methods for the implementation of its policies; (2) monitoring the undergraduate program through participation in accreditation and five-year reviews of academic programs and liaison with assessment administration; (3) reviewing and coordinating all curricular and other academic matters that are not limited to a single major academic unit.

Chair: Brian Colle for Spring '06

**Humanities and Fine Arts:**

Martin Levine	Art, 2-1049	MartinLevine@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/07
Sarah Fuller	Music, 2-7676	SFuller@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/09

**Social and Behavioral Sciences:**

Andrea Tyree	Sociology, 2-7725	ATyree@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/07
Norman Goodman	Sociology, 2-7750	NGoodman@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08

**Natural Sciences:**

Brian Colle	MSRC, 2-3174	BColle@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/07
Scott Sutherland	Math, 2-7306	ssutherland@notes.sunysb.edu	9/08

**Library:**

Janet Clarke	Library, 2-1217	JClarke@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/07
--------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	------

**College of Engineering:**

Joseph Mitchell	Applied Math, 2-8366	JSBM@ams.sunysb.edu	9/09
Q. Jeffrey Ge	Mech. Eng., 2-1110	QGe@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	0/08

**Health Sciences Center:**

Ora J. Bouey	School of Nursing, 4-3273	Ora.Bouey@sunysb.edu	9/09
David Bell	SHTM, 4-2403	dbell@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/09

**Professionals:**

D. Kane Gillespie	CAS, 2-6991	DKGillespie@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/08
Arelene Feldman	Transfer Office, 2-7028	AFeldman@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	9/09

**Ex Officio Members:**

Donna DiDonato	CAS - ddidonato@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	2-7801
Richard Gatteau	Advising - RGatteau@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	2-7082
Cheryl Hamilton	AIM - CHamilton@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	2-9834
Beverly Rivera	Registrar - BRivera@notes.cc.sunysb.edu	2-6175

**Students:**

**Two Undergraduate Students:** Amy Wisnoski (acwisnos@notes.cc.sunysb.edu), Christopher Dolley (fdsaL72@yahoo.com)

**One Graduate Student:****Administrative Contact:**

Mark Aronoff-Provost's Office, 2-7002  
maronoff@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

**Stony Brook University**  
**Undergraduate Council Minutes**

**October 3, 2006**

In Attendance: Ora Bouey, Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Donna Di Donato, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Kane Gillespie, Norman Goodman, Ridha Kamoua, Beverly Rivera, Scott Sutherland, Andrea Tyree

1. Scott Sutherland volunteered to take the minutes.
2. We are pleased to welcome Ridha Kamoua of Electrical Engineering as a new member of the council. We hope to have another student join us as well; generally such students are selected by the student government.
3. Upcoming External Reviews were discussed, and a member of the council was selected to act as representative.
  - Humanities on October 18 &19: Brian Colle will attend.
  - Computer Science on Oct. 24 & 25: Andrea Tyree will attend.
4. Tutoring: Rick and Cheryl have offered to co-lead a committee to study tutoring services on the campus, focusing on a survey of what currently exists, looking for where gaps are, and formulating suggestions on how we can improve. Rick gave an initial suggested list of people, which consisted of people currently involved in the tutoring process. Norm Goodman suggested that instead, it would be better for the committee to consist primarily of people less involved with the current tutoring offerings, and then use those people as resources. Certainly the committee should contain a number of faculty, as well as administrators (for example, Brent or Mark from the Provost's office), advisors (Rick, maybe Courtney from Athletics), etc. It was decided that members of the council would solicit volunteers, and forward them to Rick. It is anticipated that the committee will begin meeting in late October, and will meet regularly through December.

5. There was some discussion regarding the Combined Bachelor's/Master's degree program regulations, continuing from the last meeting. Some of the language was mildly revised and accepted; the wording of the point regarding when each degree would be awarded was pointed out to be wrong, and revision was left in the hands of Kane Gillespie and Beverly Rivera.

6. The proposed News Literacy requirement was briefly discussed. Howie Schneider will discuss this with us at a later meeting this term.

7. New Business:

a. What about a potential minimum GPA to be a TA as an undergraduate? There is an issue about students who might not qualify to enter corresponding teacher-prep programs acting as TAs in courses.

b. The issue of non-matriculated student (primarily in SPD) taking courses came up. Since there are few requirements for such students to enroll in the university, some such students may not be academically strong enough to succeed in the courses they enroll in, and can be disruptive.

c. The suggestion of a certificate-like program for Pre-med or nursing was raised. This could help with planning for such students.

d. It seems like we will soon be asked to think about revisions to the D.E.C.-- how does it relate to SUNY requirements, learning objectives, and so on. Kane Gillespie suggested that we should wait before we were charged with such a task before charging in on it. The issue was already raised by Mark Aronoff and Bob McGrath. Brian will contact Mark and ask about this.

e. Kane raised the issue of undergraduate internships, specifically EXT 288, which was discussed last spring. There may be some issues with how the bulletin addresses this.

f. Andrea asked about the International Studies Minor. Questions regarding this should go to Patty Liggan.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Sutherland

---

**Stony Brook University  
Undergraduate Council Minutes  
September 12, 2006**

In Attendance: Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Donna Di Donato, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Kane Gillespie, Norman Goodman, Cheryl Hamilton, Chinelo Onochie, Beverly Rivera, Andrea Tyree, Mark Aronoff (guest).

1. Janet Clarke volunteered to take the minutes.
2. The rest of the Fall meeting times (4:00 pm) and dates were confirmed:
  - September 12, 19
  - October 3, 17, 31
  - November 14, 28
  - December 12
3. Brief overview of upcoming matters for UGC (Mark Aronoff, Deputy Provost)
  - a. Stony Brook Southampton
  - b. DEC Reform

c. National search for Aronoff's replacement in the Provost's Office: D. Di Donato, K. Gillespie, and N. Goodman volunteered to be on search committee when it is formed.

#### 4. Academic Integrity Statement.

a. It was accepted after revision:

"Each student must pursue his or her academic goals honestly and be personally accountable for all submitted work. Representing another person's work as your own is always wrong. Any suspected instance of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Academic Judiciary. For more comprehensive information on academic integrity, including categories of academic dishonesty, please refer to the academic judiciary website at <<http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/CAS/ajc.nsf>>."

b. It will be posted on the appropriate Academic Judiciary webpage.

c. It will be included in the Provost's Office memo to all faculty at the beginning of each semester for inclusion in all syllabi.

d. It will be incorporated into the Undergraduate Bulletin.

e. D. Di Donato announced that the new Academic Integrity Officer, Wanda Moore, has been active in revising the Q-Course syllabus, partnering with appropriate departments, and initiating a campus-wide trial of Turnitin, which is a plagiarism detection software.

5. Template for course syllabi: K. Gillespie reported that the CAS Curriculum Committee discussed creating a template for all course syllabi. Does the UGC want to create such also? The Committee decided it was not appropriate.

#### 6. Combined degree vs. undergraduate degree:

a. The current policy—that if a student decides to drop out of the combined degree program, that student is only allowed to use six graduate credits toward the undergraduate degree—is a local policy, not SUNY's.

b. The Graduate School asked the Committee to consider allowing more, up to a possible 15 credits, toward the undergraduate degree. The Committee decided to keep the current policy for the following reasons:

i. Undergraduate students may be unprepared to take so many graduate-level courses, not really knowing what they are getting into.

ii. Graduate courses can be too specific for undergraduate students who should take broader, foundational courses.

iii. Graduate students go through a different screening/admission process than undergraduates; having undergraduate students in graduate courses could change the nature of the graduate-level courses.

iv. In general, undergraduate students should be taking undergraduate courses. Those who want to take an overload of graduate courses should be the exception to the rule, and be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. The Committee approved a slight wording change in the Bulletin on p. 96, 4b, to clarify the meaning.

7. Tutoring task force: At the summer meeting of the Senate Executive Committee, the UGC was pressed to do more than make a recommendation for action. It was asked to organize and give purpose to a task force that will do fact-gathering (what are the existing tutoring services on campus, what is the range of tutoring possibilities) and implementation of oversight to all tutoring services/activity on campus.

a. ask force membership: It was discussed whether the TF should have a combined membership of UGC, Provost's Office, other Senate Committees and offices (such as EOP/AIM), or be a sub-committee of the UGC since it will have the benefit of the history of the issues discussed at the UGC meetings. C. Hamilton expressed interest in serving on such a subcommittee.

b. Proposal for a university-run science teaching/tutoring center from Solomon Weiskop: The Committee briefly looked at this document. Issues that were raised:

i. What about tutoring for non-science subjects?

ii. How about Roundtable members (retired people) as possible tutors?

c. ITP update: C. Onochie reported that ITP has left the campus and is currently offering tutoring on the Internet. It is probably going to expand the online business. B. Rivera will contact Kevin Kelly of FSA to see what happened to ITP's contract with the university.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet H. Clarke

---

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES  
MAY 2, 2006 MEETING

Attended:

Ora Bouey, Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Scott Sutherland, Andrea Tyree; visitor: Provost Robert McGrath

(1) Agenda Items:

Selection of a note taker: Joe Mitchell volunteered

(2) Southhampton Campus:

Provost McGrath visited with the Council for the first 45 minutes of the meeting in order to discuss the status of the acquisition of the Southhampton campus.

Provost McGrath opened with a brief summary of statistics showing continued success at Stony Brook University: SBU had a record number of applications for fall 2006 (more even than Buffalo, a larger university); the SAT scores are "looking good"; there were 40% more out-of-state applicants this fall compared to last fall; and SBU is on track to meet its milestone goal to reach 30% out-of-state students within five years. A supplement in the New York Times shows that SBU ranks 100 among universities in the category of 6-year graduation rates; while this ranking seems low, the positive aspect of this statistic is that the trend is up compared to previous years (it has risen from 54% in 1995 to 59% now). Similarly, the trend is up for the 1-2 year retention rate, which rose from 85% to 87%.

Concerning Southhampton, Provost McGrath acknowledges that there is "much to be figured out," especially concerning logistics. SBU does not yet own the Southhampton campus; an agreement to buy the Southhampton campus was in the newspapers a month or so ago. The process is slow, "like buying a house." Provost McGrath estimates that SBU may take possession in the summer.

For fall 2006, the President expects there to be a "soft open" of the Southhampton campus, with some courses being offered from the SBU menu of classes. The Marine Sciences undergraduate program is already under way at Southhampton, with classes being offered this semester. Students go back and forth by means of a shuttle van.

Provost McGrath notes that there is lots of renovation needed at Southhampton. Some buildings are in great shape, but others are in really bad shape.

One key advantage of the Southhampton acquisition is that there is now a facility for an undergraduate Marine Sciences major. During last year, the President and Provost McGrath were putting together a new curriculum for Southhampton entitled "Sustainability in the 21st Century." It is very interdisciplinary by design; the major is not just about science, public policy, architectural design, and sociology; it is about all of these things. Students will have project learning experiences. It will really be a "big fat major," with students taking tracks having to do with all aspects of sustainability.

There is an issue of legal status of the new programs at Southhampton: they need approval of the NY State Department of Education and also of Middle States. Of most urgency, the President must draft a letter this

summer stating what the concept is. The Commissioner will need to say whether this makes sense; then, the proposal will go to Middle States, requesting that by fall 2007 the new program can be run as a legitimate program.

As Provost McGrath says, "Things are very confused now." There are dorms there; Provost McGrath notes that they are not as nice as ours at SBU. Campus Residency says the dorms are satisfactory but in need of rejuvenation.

Andrea Tyree asked if there would be activities at Southhampton other than Marine Science and the new Sustainability program. Provost McGrath noted that there will also be some graduate programs. There will be a writing program (MFA); Prof. Roger Rosenblatt and Prof. Robert Reeves were hired to be part of this. Also, Health Sciences plans to offer at Southhampton programs in Health Technology, Social Welfare, Nursing, etc. Right now, though, people are on hold; it is not clear when Southhampton will be ready to start these courses.

The Southhampton campus will cost 35 million dollars for the property. There will be additional expenses; these are not yet known.

The President insists that the 2000 additional students that will result from the acquisition of Southhampton will need to be "fully funded." Since SBU currently has a student-to-faculty ratio of about 25-1, being fully funded will translate into about 80 new faculty positions necessary for supporting 2000 new students. Some of these faculty will spend most of their time at Southhampton; some may want affiliations with departments on the Stony Brook campus. Similarly, Provost McGrath expects that some faculty on this campus will also want appointments there on the Southhampton campus.

Provost McGrath estimates that 10 million dollars will be needed for renovations of non-residences at Southhampton; the dormitories will be separate, as they are expected to be self-funded.

It was asked if the 10 million dollars was in addition to the 35 million to purchase the campus; Provost McGrath replied that there is "lots of back and forth right now." The Governor recently vetoed the 10 million dollars (along with other items in a package bill); Provost McGrath understands that "we will have the 10 million."

It was asked why did the Southhampton campus fold? Provost McGrath responded that it was an ancillary operation, run by former provost Tim Bishop. There was no sense of pride; the campus needed a sense of purpose and a theme. Southhampton had high tuition, but it was often heavily discounted. Marine Sciences at Southhampton was the "jewel in the crown." They had some good students, but their SAT's, even in that program, were not higher than the average SAT's at SBU. Thus, even there, they never had the outside draw to sustain themselves. They had very small courses. Faculty tended to teach more courses (they were not a research campus). Multiple classes that averaged only 9-11 students made it labor intensive for instructors. They had three different majors within Marine Sciences; it was hard to tell the differences among them. SBU has dropped down to two majors within Marine Sciences.

The Southhampton campus will be called "Stony Brook Southhampton."

Brian Colle asked about the time line for the transition. Provost McGrath responded that the most urgent matter is to get the President's letter of intention to the Commissioner of Education, and to get his "blessing." But, "that does not mean we will have a curriculum gone through curriculum committees."

The Southhampton campus can accommodate about 2000 students; in its final days, it was down to about 900 students. It will be expected that students in Southhampton programs spend all 4 years of study at Southhampton; they will start with freshman year. One question this raises, and is being considered, is whether we will have a seventh undergraduate college to accommodate the new students.

Provost McGrath responded to a question about library holdings needed for the Southhampton campus: "I don't know."

When LIU came to SBU 2 years ago, asking if we would take over the Marine Sciences majors, we got the curriculum developed at "lightning speed." "I don't have much to do with it now." There are not much in the way of holdings in the library. We would like what holdings there are; however, now LIU say they will take them. This is just one of the things holding up the transfer of ownership of the campus.

Joe Mitchell asked about the status of faculty that were part of Southampton. Provost McGrath responded that some were offered posts at the CW Post or Brooklyn campuses of LIU. For the Marine Sciences program, SBU did a search and ended up hiring 3 of the 8-9 faculty that were at Southampton; we hired them because "We wanted them. They fit right in with what we needed."

Provost McGrath responded to the question: What was the reason for taking this on? Why get involved in Southampton? Provost McGrath responded that one could view this acquisition as a "zero impact" operation; there will be 2000 more students, on another campus, fully funded, with its own faculty. "This is one way to think about it."

Another issue is that there will be many faculty involved in sustainability issues, such as environmental sciences, public policy, etc. Thus, SBU can view the acquisition as a way to create something new. "If it is fully funded, why not do it?" Further, it also gives us an "operational base" in the Hamptons (prime real estate).

LIU could think of selling the campus for mansion development, but there would be no way to get the needed zoning.

Brian Colle raised the concern of isolationism for a campus separated from Stony Brook. One can hope for some interaction, but it is a difficult problem. Students will be out there by themselves. Will there be a level of activity sufficient to sustain it?

Provost McGrath responded that with 2000 students, there should be enough to have a sense of community. The students will have a role in how that campus operates. This will lead us to rethink how we are going to do things. There may be a group of faculty that takes real interest in what is being done. It will be "beyond interdisciplinary" -- it will "have no discipline." The new Dean will have a lot of responsibility. Here, departments are building blocks; there, the new dean will have to think about attracting faculty that like to have a broader portfolio. It was noted that this sounds like "a small college in Vermont."

The issue of transfer students was raised. How will this affect transfers, coming, e.g., from Riverhead, SCC, etc? Our goal is to raise SAT's. Will we be required to take more transfers (based on GPA) who may lower our average SAT's? Provost McGrath responded that SCC transfers with sufficient grades are guaranteed admission to SUNY, not to SBU or the college of their choice. (About 25% of transfers to SBU come from SCC; about 10-11% come from Nassau Community College.) Provost McGrath agreed that transfer students are a big issue for SBU.

SCC students who have not yet completed the Associates degree is the largest population transferring/admitted to SBU.

Provost McGrath noted that many of our students are job oriented; they need to be. "We need to be careful we don't create something that is a little too `fuzzy' -- What do we expect them to go on and do? Parents will ask `Why are we doing it?'"

(3) Minutes: The minutes of April 18 were approved.

(4) Other Items:

(a). Donna Di Donato wrote to the students about the honor society issue; there has been no response yet, so this will be an agenda item for the fall.

(b). On the issue of the internship course EXT288, which has already received curriculum committee approval, Brian Colle was sent the full course proposal. It is not detailed and, in particular, does not address the concerns

raised at the last UGC meeting. The main issue facing us, following up on curriculum committee deliberations about EXT288, is the question of possibly changing the policy in the Bulletin that limits internships to students who have already completed 57 credits. (This limitation is one of the key factors in the curriculum committee not yet clearing EXT288. See <http://www.stonybrook.edu/ugrdbulletin/current/pdfs/SpecialAcademicOpps.pdf>.) Another issue was raised about how the internship course would be factored into grade point requirements (e.g., a "C or better in major"), given that it will be an S/U course. It was pointed out that EXT288 was not meant to count towards major credit.

Do we agree that EXT288 is a good idea? Andrea Tyree suggested that, rather than considering EXT288, we could instead just alter the policy on the prerequisites for EXT488. Scott Sutherland suggested, though, that there may be a real distinction in level between the work done for EXT288 and that for EXT488; he suggested that having EXT288 could allow for this distinction. Discussions regarding internships related to EXT288 and EXT488 ensued. Ora Bouey suggested that students having the same experience during an internship, while coming from different academic levels (lower division versus upper division) may have different learning outcomes, albeit their experiences may be the same.

Brian Colle suggested to return to the issue of credits. Should the current limit of 12 credits for EXT488 be modified to accommodate EXT288, and, if so, how? One option is for EXT288 to be for 0-6 credits, and for there to be an overall limit of 12 credits for EXT288 and EXT488 combined.

Brian Colle will send a memo to the curriculum committee (in time for their meeting on May 10) summarizing our discussions and questions raised so far.

---

### UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MINUTES APRIL 18, 2006 MEETING

#### **Attended:**

B. Colle, B. Rivera, S. Fuller, C. Hamilton, S. Sutherland, J. Mitchell, D. DiDonato, A. Feldman

**Agenda Items:** Selection of a note taker: Beverly Rivera volunteered.

**Minutes approved.** Reviewed and approved minutes for the April 4, 2006 meeting. Minor edits recommended and made.

#### **Academic Integrity**

Donna DiDonato provided a one page statement on "Academic Integrity" which should be submitted to the University Senate and the Provost for consideration. It has been recommended that the statement in a condensed format be required on all faculty syllabi. It should model what is done with the policy DSS Office policy.

Jo Jesty is going to speak with Rich Reeder (DoIT) to see if he could push for university access and licensing for the software used through SPD's Electronic Extension Program. The software is called "Turn-It-In". There was question as to the cost to the university. J. Jesty would like the Undergraduate Councils endorsement on this recommendation.

Recommended changes to the statement are as follows:

S. Fuller: Second sentence, "This requires that you pursue your academic goals in an honest way that does not put you at an unfair advantage over your fellow students". Concept of "unfair advantage" seems unclear. Suggestion made to strike text out of the statement. Suggestion made to have a sentence that reads, "Pursue your goals in an honest way and take personal responsibility for the work you submit."

The statement needs to be kept simple and short for the students otherwise they will not read it. Under the definition for **Fabrication**, it was suggested that we may need to remove the word "invention" as we



do want to encourage students to be inventive in their work.

Since Donna pulled the words and definitions in the statement from the website listed, it may be a good idea for the Chair (Brian) to look at the web before changing any of the definitions.

Under the definition for **Cheating**, edit the definition to read: *Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized assistance, materials, information or study aids in any academic exercise, preventing or attempting to present, another from using authorized assistance, materials, etc.*

Website issue. Propose to Executive Committee of Senate. Recommend that this statement or a condensed version of it be on the web and each syllabus. It should be limited in size and text like that used for the statement used by the Disabled Student Services office.

Possibly there should be an email with All Facts and Sources ....

Condense the ideas

Joe Mitchell brought up the fact that faculty will have something condensed on their syllabus that is tailored to their course. This is very common.

There should be an abbreviated policy statement to include something on syllabi. Refer students to the Academic Integrity Policy statement in the University Bulletin (page 77).

Three points that should be used in the statement to students:

1. Student must cite sources used in their work. Generic statement "In all cases, representing some ones work as your own is wrong."
2. Student must observe the rules of Academic Integrity.
3. Student is personally responsible for all their work submitted.

Refer to the website.

**Honor Society**: On hold, waiting for statement from Donna DiDonato.

### **Internship proposal for sophomores (EXT 288)**

Recommendation for an internship for sophomores was reviewed by the CAS Curriculum Committee. The current policy is that students must be juniors to be able to take an internship. The reason being they want students to have some background and knowledge before going out to the market. The committee cited the "Disney Internship", should students be getting lower and upper division for the same work.

Cheryl Hamilton brought up that AIM/EOP students participated in a program called "In Roads". They specifically want sophomores to work with them over a 2-3 year period. The level of work would change to justify the level of credit earned.

Scott Sutherland stated that if the internship is identical it should be at the same level. It should not be a lower division for some students and upper division for others.

One assumes that there is someone in charge of internships and that if they are approving them, they are assessing the work for upper or lower division level credit? Clearly multi-year internships are lower division and subsequent upper division learning.

Sarah brought up the problem the departments are having with TA's and them being exploited for credit.

400 level students require more independence as they are more grounded and mature.

Question was raised about the number of credits for 488 and whether the course is a variable credit course. Bev checked and EXT 488 = 0 – 6 credits; as are other department 488 offerings.

This was discussion about whether a student should receive payment and credits at the same time for an internship. Some members on the committee felt it was appropriate others were mixed.

Joe Mitchell cited that the university bulletin does not mention EXT under the internships section. Question was raised whether EXT is a university wide course or is it limited to college. There seems to be a lack of parallelism in that EXT crosses colleges, CAS, COB, MSRC but not CEAS.

Sarah recommended that the committee see a more formal proposal. It should set out very specific program criteria.

Issue was raised whether there would be proposal to raise the credits for Internships to 24 (12 lower division; 12 upper division).

From the email received from Marianna Savoca, Director of Career Services, she would like to see the policy requiring students to have 57 credits to participate in an internship changed.

Joe M. pointed out what appears in the Undergraduate Bulletin regarding internships is very confusing.

It appears that the subject code or course designator "EXT" was set up to address non-departmental internships, externally.

The committee favors it is in principal. Policy needs to be straightened out and the bulletin wording needs to be discussed.

### **MSRC High School Program**

Brian spoke about the proposal submitted by Mary Scranton. The proposal is written specifically for Smithtown, in which the Dean of MSRC assigns the professor of record at MSRC. The proposal points to a one time deal. If there was a plan to offer the program in other high schools, there would have to be much more detail and commitment in the proposal.

Training required for instructors. It appears there is not as much controversy in the department since it is confined to Smithtown HS.

Question was raised about active participation and who would be in charge of this program and who would be keeping it running, administering it, etc.

They expect to have the application process go through Admission. There is to be a meeting to organize the administrative office(s) to discuss process. MSRC expects to see this managed through the Young Scholars Program very much like the Geosciences program.

The plan is to run this program once, getting feedback from the high school and administering department (MSRC?). The Office of the Dean (MSRC) would be supervising the course. The committee strongly recommends that the program be reviewed at the end of the year, academically and administratively. The UGC encourages mentoring for this program.

Brian needs to speak with Brent. The question for Brent is does it need to go through the Senate for a vote or can it just go to the Executive Board for approval.

---

## **Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting April 4, 2006**

**Present:** Brian Colle, Janet Clarke, Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Norman Goodman, Cheryl Hamilton, Joe Mitchell, Chinelo Onochie, Beverly Rivera, Scott Sutherland, Andrea Tyree

**Note taker:** Norman Goodman volunteered to take notes.

**Previous minutes:** With the addition of Norman Goodman as present, and a few minor editorial changes, the minutes were accepted as corrected.

**Academic integrity:** There was a discussion generated by Chinelo Onochie's "Proposal to include academic integrity lessons in the classroom curriculum."

The issues discussed included the fact that many of our students simply do not know what plagiarism is and, consequently, that they engage in that practice. As an educational institution, it was suggested that the initial way to deal with the problem is to educate our students about the nature of plagiarism. There will be a manual published shortly that will be used in the SBU 101 courses that has a section on academic integrity. Janet Clarke offered to add some material and relevant exercises to the manual, and will send them to Donna DiDonato.

There was also agreement that there needs to be a statement on academic integrity, especially including plagiarism, in the syllabus for each course on campus similar to the one that is required for disabled students. Donna DiDonato will draft such a statement for discussion by the Undergraduate Council and subsequent submission to the University Senate (through the Executive Committee) for its endorsement and promulgation by the Provost. Not only should faculty include such a statement in their syllabi, but they should discuss it during the first week of the class and subsequently when exams or any written work is to be submitted. Such a statement should also be included on the campus website. In this way, discussion of the issue of academic integrity will not be limited to freshmen, but will continue to be discussed throughout students' academic career at Stony Brook.

There was a brief discussion of soliciting the advice of experts on the issue of plagiarism. Professor Donald McCabe of Rutgers University was suggested, and Chinelo Onochie will consider having him invited by the Undergraduate Student Government.

In addition to the "educational campaign" discussed above, several mechanisms for dealing with what is likely to be some level of academic dishonesty were discussed. With respect to plagiarism, there was a discussion of encouraging faculty to require students to submit any written papers electronically, which can be examined by a number of possible modes of checking for plagiarism, such as "turn-it-in." Donna DiDonato mentioned that SPD subscribes to that service and suggested that we check whether that is on the basis of a "program" license or "site" license. With respect to other aspects of academic integrity, especially encouraging faculty and graduate students to report violations of academic integrity such as plagiarism, cheating on exams, etc., that two avenues be pursued: (1) the issue be discussed with the academic deans and department chairs to sensitize faculty to this issue; and (2) that Brian Colle speak to Lawrence Martin as to whether there currently is a session on academic integrity in the orientation the Graduate School holds for incoming graduate students. Also, whether there is a program to alert TAs to their responsibility to

report breaches of academic integrity of students they “supervise,” and how they should go about doing so.

**Honor societies:** Donna DiDonato raised the issue of how the university should consider requests from honor societies to gain institutional endorsement. She used the current request from Sigma Alpha Lambda for such an endorsement as an instance. There was a discussion of the general value of honor societies that apply for institutional endorsement that would provide them with access to lists of student names from the Registrar; that is, what they offer the students other than an item on their curriculum vitae in return for the fee they pay. Though a number of these societies indicate that they use the fee they collect for student scholarships, there seems little evidence of substantial scholarships being provided to students from these funds. The discussion included the view that to be an honor society, there should be entrance criteria that reflect an honor level of performance: like a 3.5 GPA and evidence of prior activities on the part of the prospective member commensurate with the goals of the society (e.g., evidence of leadership skill for societies that say that they use that criterion). Also, it seems important that the requesting society should already be a member of the Association of College Honor Societies. Donna DiDonato, once again, “agreed” to draft a brief motion on this issue for the Undergraduate Council to consider at a future meeting.

**Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned as 5:10 P.M.

---

### Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting March 21, 2006, 4:00 PM

Janet Clarke, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Sarah Fuller, Kane Gillespie, Norman Goodman, Cheryl Hamilton, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Beverly Rivera, Scott Sutherland, Andrea Tyree

1. C. Hamilton volunteered to record the minutes.
2. The minutes of the March 7, 2006 Undergraduate Council meeting were approved with necessary corrections.
3. Chinele Onochie, the undergraduate student representative to the Undergraduate Council, was scheduled to attend the meeting. In her absence, the committee reviewed and discussed a “*Proposal to Include Academic Integrity Lesson in the Classroom Curriculum*”, which was submitted by Ms. Onochie. The UG Council members agreed that the student should be given the opportunity to present the proposal to the council, perhaps at the next meeting. In response to the proposal, S. Fuller proposed that the UG Council develop an academic integrity statement and ask faculty members to include it on their syllabi. K. Gillespie indicated that all that is currently prescribed is a standard statement regarding plagiarism. J. Mitchell reported that this concern was previously brought to the Undergraduate Council most recently in Fall 2000. Donna Di Donato informed the committee that her office was in the process of conducting a search for an Academic Integrity Officer, and that the individual hired would have responsibility for addressing student groups and freshman seminars regarding academic integrity. It was agreed that developing an “academic integrity statement” should be a priority for this position.
4. Concerning improving TA English proficiency, the UG Council suggests that a jury, comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, should be appointed to observe presentations and assess students’ preparedness. The jury pool should include faculty and students from within various disciplines, and should include social sciences, mathematics, natural sciences, etc. Coordination of this process should be the responsibility of the Graduate School or the Graduate Council. The UG Council also proposed that an additional assessment/observation should

take place within the candidates' first six weeks of teaching classes.

5. A Proposal for a Stony Brook Institute for Global Studies was presented. N. Goodman pointed out that the main foci of the proposal are research and outreach, with globalizing curriculum as a secondary focus. D. Di Donato pointed out that the proposal does not specifically target undergraduate students, but that there is the potential for a new major to be developed through the Stony Brook Institute for Global Studies. She stated, further, that the SBIGS seeks to expand on experiences with the International Studies Living Learning Center/ minor, which is currently full. K. Gillespie raised concerns regarding the fact that faculty would need to be taken from the classroom to run the institute. S. Fuller stated, on behalf of the UG Council, that we would hope that the Stony Brook Institute for Global Studies would enhance the Undergraduate College of Global Studies. Questions were raised regarding the "mandates" described in the proposal (page 19) for "upgrading the International Studies minor....." and "construction of an International House.....". The proposal was endorsed by the Undergraduate Council.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM

---

## **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

Minutes of March 7, 2006 meeting (4 PM)

Present: Brian Colle (chair), Janet Clarke, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Norman Goodman, Cheryl Hamilton, Martin Levine, and Joe Mitchell.

1. R. El-Maghrabi volunteered to record minutes.
2. Minutes of the UG council meeting of February 6, 2006 were approved as recorded.
3. New undergraduate student representative to UG council Chinelo Onochie expected to attend.
4. Future items UGC may be asked to discuss; preliminary proposal on plagiarism.
5. Major item on agenda; assessing English speaking proficiency of foreign students who will be expected to serve as teaching assistants.

Barbara Brownworth (ESL oral coordinator) informed UGC that a member of her department, Ms. Kristi Perry, would be present during today's UGC meeting after 4:30 PM

Council discussed existing practices for assignment of teaching assistantships to foreign students who have not yet met English speaking requirements.

- Many departments assign teaching responsibilities to foreign students immediately upon arrival on campus.
- It was suggested that the Graduate Council establish guidelines defining "speaking proficiency" and, thus, when students can be considered competent to TA.

Ms. Kristi Perry (who administers the English Proficiency test) explained to the UG council how Spoken Proficiency is assessed:

One week before classes all graduate students for whom English is not a first language are "speak" tested, which consists of a 20 min taped interview during which students are:

- a. required to give some verbal information on their respective fields,
- b. answer questions from the examiner

Students are examined only one time, and based on their performances are either considered "proficient" or assigned one of three classes depending on the speak test grade.

ESL 591 which focuses mainly on improving pronunciation;  
 ESL 596 which addresses pronunciation and teaching; and  
 ESL 599 which emphasizes teaching.

Students showing substantial improvement in ESL 591 reflected in a grade of A may skip ESL 596 and take ESL 599 directly.

The ESL 599 final requires a 10 min teaching presentation with audience participation and the ability to satisfactorily answer questions.

N. Goodman asked why there were still complaints regarding speaking proficiency of TA's.

K. Perry replied that passing courses does not imply/guarantee that the students are now fluent, just competent. Also lack of exposure or familiarity of undergraduate students to foreign accents may be a contributing factor to complaints.

In response to a question whether there is any departmental follow up on the students;

Ms. Perry replied that there should be and that ESL had previously invited members of the host departments, but unfortunately few responded.

She also added that it would be advantageous to have departmental supervision throughout the courses; perhaps after 3 weeks, followed by one in the middle and one towards the end.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM

---

#### Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting of February 21, 2006

Present: Janet Clarke, Donna Di Donato, Sarah Fuller, Kane Gillespie, Norman Goodman, Beverly Rivera, Scott Sutherland, Andrea Tyree.

1. Sarah Fuller volunteered to take the minutes of the meeting.
2. The Minutes of the UG Council meeting of February 7, 2006 were approved with the following emendation. The first sentence of item 3a (regarding MSRC/Smithtown High collaboration) should read: Colle reports that there is a less than 50% chance that this will go forward for this academic year.
3. The new undergraduate representative to the council will be Chinelo Onochie. She was just appointed and should be at our next meeting.
4. Regarding plans for the Southampton College campus, the Provost will be out of town so cannot meet with us in the immediate future. Negotiations about the campus are in process; Stony Brook has not yet acquired the property. The Council wishes to discuss potential plans for that campus while they are in flux and when our advice can still be taken into account. We hope later this semester to have an informative session with the Provost on the matter of programs at the Southampton campus.
5. The Journalism Program has revised its proposal to require a minimum 2.0 GPA for good standing rather than the 2.5 GPA originally proposed. The 2.0 GPA conforms with that across the CAS. The Council endorses the Journalism Program proposal, pending approval by the CAS Curriculum Committee. If any major changes are introduced following Curriculum Committee review, the UG Council would like to review the proposal again.
6. English Proficiency of Teaching Assistants

The Council thought the recommendations from Barbara Brownsworth, ESL Oral Coordinator, did not offer an effective solution to the problem, partly because they give insufficient attention to remedying real situations that are an impediment to undergraduate student learning. A number of aspects concerning language competency of TAs were discussed. Clearly this is a very important issue that the Council needs to investigate and for which it needs to propose effective action.

- a) Graduate students should not be assigned teaching duties until they can pass the speak test or have satisfactorily completed the speaking program and achieved a level of competence sufficient to function effectively in the classroom. A policy that international students cannot be assigned teaching duties until they have passed the speak test needs to be established and enforced. The UG Council needs to communicate with the Graduate Council and the Graduate School on this issue and ask them to endorse this policy.
- b) We need to get the syllabus of the ESL speaking courses and to find out what kinds of skills, and at what level are required in order to pass each course and the speak test.

[NOTE 1: *Grad Bulletin* p. 34 states a score of 55 or better on the TSE or SPEAK tests is required for those 'who wish to be considered for a teaching assistantship'. A score of 7 (or better) on the IELTS test is considered equivalent to one of the speak tests.

NOTE 2: *Grad Bulletin* pp. 193-4 lists the following ESL oral skills courses (under the Linguistics Department: ESL 591 Intermediate Oral/Aural Skills Class; ESL 596 High Intermediate Oral/Aural Skills Class; ESL 598 Advanced Oral Aural [Skills Class]. There is no indication of how completion of these courses at some level relates to one or another of the speak tests.]

c) We need to have a mechanism for assessment of current standards of English competency for graduate TAs. Is a speak test score of 55 or better, or completion of the ESL oral/aural skills courses sufficient to guarantee speaking competences needed in the classroom? How can we find out the degree to which defective English expression on the part of their instructors is a significant problem for undergraduate students? To add this as a question on the current op-scan teacher evaluation form seems problematic (not least because of other questions that would be competing for space on the form). We could have comments on selected teacher evaluation forms checked and could tabulate the frequency of comments that concern language, but that is time consuming, and not all departments archive the completed forms. We could canvass undergraduate directors in departments where TA English competency has been a problem to get their impressions on the scope and nature of the problem and possible remedies. The Provost could sponsor a survey of a representative sample of undergraduates to find out the degree to which TA language competency is considered an important issue. The freshman 101 seminars might work into their syllabus a segment on communicating with instructors that would touch upon language competency. Seminar instructors would be asked to report back on their informal findings. Departments could be asked to report on the kinds of assessment practices they have for international students doing teaching of any kind: conducting classes, sections, labs, holding office hours—anything that requires direct student contact. Rick Gatteau might also be asked about the frequency with which members of his advising staff receive complaints about language competency of instructors. We need also a mechanism for finding out views of the undergraduate population directly.

d) We should meet with someone from the ESL Oral/Aural Program (Barbara Brownworth or Mary Ann Catalano) in order to find out about their program and make progress toward answering some of the above questions.

Old and New Business:

An Honors Society may ask the UG Council for an endorsement.

The matter of tutoring, raised last semester, needs attention.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Fuller

---

Undergraduate Council 2005-06

Meeting minutes

February 7, 2006

Present:

Brian Colle (chair), Beverly Rivera, Donna Di Donato, Ora James Bouey, Andrea Tyree, Raafat Elmaghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Cheryl Hamilton, Richard Gatteau, Scott Sutherland, Kane Gillespie, Sarah Fuller, Martine Levine, Norman Goodman, Howard Schneider (guest)

## 1) Selection of Note taker:

i) Kane Gillespie volunteered

## 2) Review of minutes

i) December 13, 2005 – Minutes were approved.

ii) January 24, 2006 – Minutes were approved.

## 3) New Business update:

a) MSRC / Smithtown High School collaboration.

Colle reports that there is less than 50% chance that this will go forward this academic year. Although excellent outreach programs have been established as precedents at other institutions such as SUNY Albany and Syracuse University, MSRC is running into some difficulties. Smithtown HS does not seem eager at present to push it forward, so it will become low priority.

b) English speaking skills of TAs

although a policy was set several years ago requiring foreign graduate students to take a "speak test," the TAs who do not pass this speak test are often allowed to teach while they take remedial ESL courses. This is especially problematic if TAs cannot lecture or respond to student questions. The members agree that this topic needs further research and discussion.

c) Southampton College

i) the council members are uncertain which issues should be discussed presently regarding the acquisition of the Southampton Campus. Possible topics include: administrative structure and the relationship of that campus to the main campus; curriculum: President Kenny has formed a curriculum task force, and one approach to curriculum may be an "upper division college;"

ii) Colle plans to invite an appropriate member of the upper administration to the next council meeting to discuss general issues.

d) Undergraduate representation on the Council

i) The members note that the Council currently lacks undergraduate student representation. The undergraduate student government is supposed to appoint someone, but the process needs research. Colle and Rivera will investigate.

## 4) Journalism

a) The council received materials from Howard Schneider and began a preliminary discussion of those materials in preparation for a visit from Schneider later in the meeting. The members had a few concerns based on a reading of the materials and on the discussion with Schneider:

i) Credit load: some members of the council voice their concern that 127 required credits are too many in comparison to most other majors on campus

ii) GPA graduation requirement - The proposed Journalism program requires a 2.5 GPA (of courses for the major) to graduate:

(1) What is the exit policy for those students who get to the end of the program and do not satisfy the required GPA? Schneider:

(a) Students will receive advising early and often, and at each stage of the program. Such advising will

(b) Appeal process will be in place for students who are close to satisfying the minimum GPA

(c) An early Grammar Immersion program will be in place as an gateway to the major, which is intended to filter out most unprepared students

(d) The GPA standard will be published and made clear to all students before and during their pursuit of the degree

(2) Pandora's box: The members are aware of possibility for other majors on campus to request GPA graduation requirement. Feldman clarified that no other program on campus has a GPA graduation requirement other than 2.0



(3) If no other programs on campus have a GPA graduation requirement other than 2.0, what is the justification for the Journalism major to have one?

(a) Schneider responded that the Journalism program will likely exist as a professional school, separate from CAS. Since there is no licensure process for Journalism, to increase the likelihood of student success in the profession, the Journalism task force feels strongly that a raised GPA will "raise the bar" as a guarantee for students who graduate that they will have a good chance of success in the profession.

(b) Goodman remarked that it is the students' responsibility to meet the requirement, as long as they know early what that requirement is. However, advising would be an issue.

(4) Gatteau observed that the higher GPA in Journalism would create an uneven standard amongst majors in the university and would restrict student choice amongst majors.

iii) The members asked Schneider to explain the projected growth of the major

(1) Based on a survey of surrounding and national schools with journalism programs, Schneider reports that these schools experienced a two- to three-fold growth over a five-year period. Based on the number of current minors (30) and the popularity of the profession, Schneider expects 40-60 majors in Fall 2006 to grow to 80-90 in the second year. Based on the survey, and using the second year (2007-08) as the starting point, Schneider anticipates having 180-240 majors by the fifth year of the program.

iv) DEC and availability of seats to non JRN majors.

(1) Schneider reports that JRN 101-B (News Literacy) will be available to all, as will JRN 110.

v) Grammar Immersion

(1) The members observe that this is a much-needed program at Stony Brook given the consensus amongst faculty that students are deficient in writing abilities.

vi) Class size: some courses (News Writing 1, 2, and 3) require class size of 20 seats or less. How will this be possible, and who will teach?

(1) Schneider reports that this is required for program accreditation, and that a mixture of faculty and adjuncts from the profession will teach.

b) The council members thanked Schneider, and the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Kane Gillespie

---

**Undergraduate Council Meeting**  
Minutes of January 24, 2006  
First Meeting of January 2006 Semester

**Present:** W. Collins, R. Rivera, S. Sutherland, C. Hamilton, A. Feldman, D. DiDonato, R. Elmaghrabi, R. Gatteau, M. Levine, N. Goodman, J. Mitchell, O. Bouey, B. Colle, A. Tyree, K. Gillespie, S. Fuller

**Agenda:**

**1. Note taker:** Beverly Rivera

**2. Review of Minutes** from December 13, 2005 meeting. Notes not available. D. DiDonato will provide and will be reviewed at the next UGC Meeting.

**3. Tutoring Services on Campus** – Memo to Provost.

Bill Collins prepared a draft of a memo to go to the Provost regarding the discussions with the UGC Members. In the Fall 2005 there were several meetings and extensive discussions regarding this topic. A recommendation was made at the last meeting of the Fall semester (12/13/05).

**Recommendation:** Provost should be asked to create a Task Force to look into the issues for Academic Support for "all" tutoring services on campus. The UGC feels that this is a big enough issue and should therefore be passed along to a Task Force for solution and oversight. What type of oversight should be implemented and what is the role of the faculty in this oversight process? This current structure should be evaluated. How one advertises these services should provide better academic support and structure for the students it serves.

The committee expressed the need to have all tutoring programs across the campus evaluated. The reason for calling for a Task Force is that the services in place are in some disarray. There are inconsistencies and the students do not know about them. We should be looking at what exists and

provide support to all enterprises on campus.

The memo should go to Mark Aronoff and Joe Auner. Bill informed the committee that he has already informed the Provost Office that this was coming down the path.

#### 4. Selection of a New UGC Chair

Bill Collins will be stepping down. The new chair should be a faculty member. Bill will provide support as needed to the new chair. Beverly Rivera offered to serve as administrative support for the new chair. She would handle preparing the paperwork needed for each session. It was suggested that members who term ends at with the Spring term should be considered as possible chairs for Spring 2006. S. Fuller, J. Mitchell, O. Bouey, R. Elmaghrabi were identified. S. Fuller was already serving on other committees and had a full load; J. Mitchell has served as chair three times; O. Bouey and R. Elmaghrabi are from East Campus and felt it was more appropriate for West Campus faculty to serve in this capacity. Finally, Brian Colle agreed to serve as chair for Spring 2006 with B. Rivera serving in an administrative role. Donna Didonato's office would serve as a resource for Brian.

It was recommended that a procedure be put in place to determine who would serve in future semesters as UGC Chair. That will be discussed during the Spring semester UGC sessions.

#### 5. Representative for Program Reviews

SPD - Beverly Rivera  
 Applied Math - Andrea Tyree  
 Math - Joe Mitchell  
 Physics - Scott Sutherland

#### 6. Journalism Program

New programs have to be considered by certain key committees and then must be considered by the full Senate. It is recommended that the review be done by April and at the very latest must be done by May before the committee breaks for summer.

This is a high priority for the next couple of UGC meetings. This was presented at the University Senate in the Fall. There already has been discussion about hiring people and space has been identified in the main library. Documents will follow through email. The committee has been asked to read these documents and prepare for discussion at the next meeting.

#### 7. Committees Meeting Time

Today's time of 3:45PM came really close for most of the committee. Janet Clark has not yet responded. It looks like the committee will plan to meet on alternate Tuesdays, 4:00-5:15PM. Bill still has to check with Andrew to make sure this works for him as well.

#### Old Business

- MSRC courses to be taught in high school are still pending. Will revisit this issue once Mary Scranton gets back to the committee.

Bill Collins will complete his final UGC duties as chair by communicating with Brent Lindquist re:

- Sending Mary Scranton a note regarding HS courses offered through MSRC
- Forwarding the Committees memo to Bob McGrath and Joe Auner about the Tutoring Services

Any new business should come through Brian Colle, new UGC Chair and Beverly Rivera, who will provide administrative support to the chair.

Question arose if plans for the Southampton Campus were going to be brought before the UGC. Bill Collins

mentioned that there was a meeting being planned with J. Auner and M. Aronoff. Joe Auner did not want to be the contact person to discuss SH. Possibly Bob McGrath will be speaking to the committee.

It was decided that the next meeting should be divided to allow discussion from:

- Joe Auner (Provost Office); Mark Aronoff (Provost Office)
- Howie Schneider (JRN/EGL department)

Brian will get in touch with these parties to arrange the meeting.

---

Undergraduate Council  
Minutes - 12/13/05

Brian Colle, Bill Collins, Donna Di Donato, Randall M-J Edouard (for Cheryl Hamilton), Raafat Elmaghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Norman Goodman, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Beverly Rivera

Di Donato volunteered to take minutes. The minutes of 12/06/05 were reviewed and accepted as amended.

Council chair, W. Collins asked present members if they had any objection to the meeting schedule for Spring semester changing to alternate Tuesdays 3:30 pm – 4:30 pm. With no objection, Professor Collins said that he would check further with absent members.

Old Business:

The Council continued its discussion of tutoring services on campus. Collins made a proposal for a faculty committee on University advising services. This committee, he suggested, would function similarly to the Graduate Health Professions Committee supporting advising/tutoring services on campus and recommending policy for these areas.

Di Donato suggested as an alternate proposal a task force that would look at tutoring on campus; what tutoring do we have? How effective is it? How is it (or should it be) coordinated? How is it or should it be tied to other student services?

Other members of the Council endorsed the idea of a task force and it was agreed that Collins would draft the proposal and it would be directed to the Deputy Provost, the VPSA, and the Senate President.

One example of a coordinated model for student academic services is the Academic Success Center at Oregon State University.

As for ITP, the UG Council is not comfortable at this point recommending the removal of ITP from campus.

Goodman said that until there is some real indication that ITP is doing harm to students we shouldn't recommend elimination of the service.

Colle commented that he is pleased with the task force idea, but remains concerned about resources – students who don't have enough money to pay for ITP – are out of luck.

Mitchell said that a student success center is potentially a good idea, but must have the support of the administration, particularly through resources.

Goodman responded that the University should make a student success center a part of the capital campaign. Tutoring (and other academic services) will be more & more important to out of state recruitment.

#### New Business

Goodman mentioned that the Senate Executive Committee recently discussed the issue of TA's who don't speak English well enough, particularly a concern for those who teach.

Goodman suggested that the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils might both address this topic and offered it

as a Spring agenda item.

Happy Holiday's!

---

#### Undergraduate Council Minutes, September 6, 2005

In Attendance: Beverly Rivera, Arlene Feldman, , Donna Di Donato, Jeff Ge, Brian Colle, Janet Clarke, Bill Collins, Kane Gillespie, Joe Mitchell, Martin Levine, Ora J. Bouey.

1. Note taker: Janet Clarke volunteered to take notes.
2. Membership list: Reviewed membership list; welcomed new member; noted need for student reps.
3. Committee Chair: Norman Goodman, Sarah Fuller, Rafaat El-Maghrabi, were suggestions for new chair.
4. Academic Reviews: The following departments are being reviewed. Members volunteered.  
Writing and Rhetoric, Sept. 20/21 Di Donato  
Political Science, Oct. 18/19 Colle  
Africana Studies, Nov. 1/2 Gillespie (see minutes of 9/20/05)  
SPD, Nov. 15/16 Rivera

#### **Old Business:**

5. SB courses offered through HS: There has been a request for UGC to draft policy regarding SBU credit courses being given at high schools. There is currently a proposal for a programmatic relationship between Smithtown HS and MSRC Department. Smithtown HS previously had a relationship with Southampton College before its closing, where high school students got college credit for college-level courses taken at the high school and paid tuition to the college. Policy issues/questions that came up:

- Who will oversee the program—each corresponding department, or should there be an administrative oversight also? What would motivate the academic departments to oversee the program? Will program approvals go through Curriculum Committee?
- Other institutions that have similar programs are Syracuse, Adelphi, C.W. Post, St. John's. Who are the leading research peer institutions (like the UCalifornia schools, Maryland, etc.) that have a similar program and what are their policies/guidelines? What about AAU universities? (B. Rivera will send out query to her listservs.)
- SBU would charge a tuition, so there would be some financial benefit to SBU; but what are the costs?
- What are the other benefits to SBU? There may be incentives for these students to apply to the SBU department. So there are outreach and recruitment benefits.
- What are the quality control issues, such as high school teacher training/qualifications, similarity of course content with university courses?
- Who could be hurt?
- Is there a union issue; is this a way not to hire full-time faculty?

Mary Scranton, Director of Undergraduate Studies at MSRC, will be invited to a future meeting to discuss this issue.

6. BA/MA and BA/MAT Combined Programs: Nine out of 10 proposals were approved at SBU and forwarded to Albany. They were approved and are now awaiting State Education Department approval. If proposals are approved, the programs will be implemented this fall, retroactively. Charles Taber from Graduate Council contacted B. Collins to discuss these combined programs, indicating the Graduate Council would deal with the graduate-level courses of these programs and that UGC could look at the undergraduate-level courses. However, at the undergraduate level, the appropriate Curriculum Committees oversee curricular issues, so it may be out of the UGC's purview. K. Gillespie reported that the CAS Curriculum Committee has reviewed each program proposal. Last semester, the UGC drafted a set of guidelines and sent them to the CAS Curriculum Committee.

7. Tutoring Services on Campus: UGC has been asked to consider the issues arising from a commercial tutoring service (mainly for biology and chemistry) run under the auspices of FSA. There are three main concerns:

1. Is there a conflict of interest: are graduate students who TA/grade these courses also hiring themselves as commercial/private tutors?
  2. What is the administrative control or monitoring that FSA/SBU exercises on this activity?
  3. What is the viability of the service offered? Is the service provided largely a "cramming" session (short-term learning) or providing long-term benefit to student learning?
- J. Clarke asked if the Graduate Council is looking into the matter from the TA perspective. We decided to find out more information about this situation and to invite Mark Aronoff (Deputy Provost) and Kevin Kelly (FSA) to discuss this matter further.

Meeting adjourned.

---

## **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

Meeting of May 03, 2005 (2:30 PM)

Present: Brian Colle, Bill Collins (co-chair), Ora J. Bouey, Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Martin Levine, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas (co-chair), and Andrea Tyree.

1. Selection of note taker (R. El-Maghrabi)
2. Minutes of 4.26.05 unavailable for approval.

B. Collins announced that the University Senate approved the recommendation to make FYS 102 mandatory, with a stipulation that the mandatory requirement be reviewed after 3 years. The seemingly contradictory "mandatory but not required" guidelines of FYS 101 and 102, were again discussed by the UGC.

M. Levine asked whether transfer students were required to take FYS 101 or 102.

A. Feldman said they were not; transfer students are not assigned to undergraduate colleges.

Another item discussed at the recent University Senate meeting was the proposed restructuring of the Business major curriculum that was reviewed recently by the UGC. The Senate was concerned about any possible redirection of resources, since the College of Business program relies heavily on adjunct faculty. It was mentioned that no reassignment of resources would take place; instead revenue will be raised from other sources; thus, reducing reliance on adjunct faculty.

Another concern was raised regarding the advising component for the Business majors. The advising format was not defined clearly in the proposal. A. Feldman asked whether faculty at the Senate meeting were in agreement regarding the increase work load to advise Business majors. Apparently, this issue was not addressed. UGC was in agreement that advising for the minor should be provided by departments in which that minor is housed. In addition, the College of Business needed more help in establishing a better advising structure to address this concern.

Item 3: Request for clarification of courses taught in area High Schools (memo from Mary Scanton/MSRC regarding Smithtown/Southampton College proposal).

Council members were informed about the previous arrangement between Southampton College and Smithtown High School, allowing the Smithtown high school teachers to teach college-approved courses. With the closure of Southampton College, Smithtown High School has approached Stony Brook for a similar arrangement.

D. DiDonato requested that the Council address this as general policy not as a specific case, since this would create a precedent for other high schools.

A. Feldman said that high school teachers taught AP courses that are accepted by Stony Brook, but that these were subject to stricter guidelines.

M. Levine was concerned that such a policy would imply that high school teachers could be considered on a par with university faculty.

B. Collins said that Mary Scanton raised the issue to exclude this idea.

A. Feldman cited Geo 101 as an example of a course taught outside Stony Brook but with the approval/supervision of the university.

R. Thomas and several council members questioned why Geo 101/ high school agreement was not mentioned in the proposal Southampton/Smithtown proposal. R. Thomas asked why there has been no mention or information made available to the campus community regarding the GEO/high school program; especially, with respect to how course quality is assessed and monitored by the Geology department.

B. Colle suggested that proposal could be viewed as part of the mission to increase recruitment by MSRC, which includes high school outreach.

D. DiDonato and R. Thomas stated that more information about the Geology/high school program is needed for the Council to make a decision regarding the Smithtown proposal.

B. Collins and other council members were interested in knowing how the university benefited from such agreements.

B. Rivera suggested that Dan Davis would be a good person to contact regarding Geo 101/high school program.

B. Collins stated that he would send a reply to Mary Scranton that a decision by the UGC, at this time, would be premature. This proposal would be discussed at a future UGC meeting. Further discussion should include the Geo 101/high school program and the Southampton/Smithtown high school agreement in detail, in particular the supervision of the existing GEO 101/ high school program and the proposed Southampton/Smithtown agreement. Who is responsible for quality control?

#### Item 4: Proposal for Consolidation of Administration of Academic Judiciary

This would include the administration of all academic dishonesty cases with the exception of those at the Health Sciences Centre.

O. Bouey mentioned that academic dishonesty in undergraduate courses at the HSC was also covered by main campus judiciary.

D. DiDonato mentioned that the issue has come up due to the steady increase in the number of accusations in recent years, although she is of the opinion that the proposed budget, personnel in particular, needs to be amended.

A. Feldman asked whether CEAS had approved the proposal.

D. DiDonato stated yes. The proposal would help reduce the administrative record maintenance for CEAS since the increased work load would probably come from there if a new database is created.

B. Rivera suggested that the database should probably be added to a database that already exists; such as PeopleSoft.

O. Bouey seconded the idea, adding that details of a recent case of discipline in Allied Health could not be located, nor was she informed of the outcome of the discipline case.

The Council agreed that centralizing the academic judiciary process was a good idea, but format may be discussed in future UGC meeting. This would include administrative record keeping and establishing a central database.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM

---

#### Undergraduate Council Minutes

March 15, 2005

Present: R. Thomas, A. Tyree, M. Levine, R. Gatteau, B. Colle, L. Muntz, J. Clarke, S. Fuller, B. Collins, A. Feldman, D. Di Donato

#### Agenda:

1. Note taker: M. Levine
2. UC 3.01.05 minutes needed to be corrected and approved via email
3. College of Business Proposal for Combined BA/MBA and BS/MBA Degrees

The discussion focused of the Business School's proposal for their new undergraduate curriculum. A five page

proposal was handed out to members at the beginning of the meeting. The discussion focused on the feasibility of offering these two new combined undergraduate/graduate programs, under current SUNY restrictions and guidelines.

A. Tyree asked how students can complete the undergraduate portion of these programs in four years?

B. Collins suggested that students can use the summer sessions to complete course work. If the program wants to attract better students, it will be hard to compete with a lot of other programs unless students come to SB with numerous A.P. credits

A. Feldman said that the University wants to create a Winter session.

A. Tyree asked about what happens to transfers?

S. Fuller was concerned as to how this program would attract students from elsewhere?

M. Levine pointed out the University's desire to attract out of state students, generating more tuition revenues.

A. Tyree asked about the difficulty of taking eight graduate courses in their senior year.

R. Gatteau pointed out that there were DEC courses missing in the sample schedules; DEC H, in Program A, DEC D, in Program B.

L. Mutz asked about what happens with BUS 110? Do students start with WRT 102?

J. Clarke asked if statistics needed to be required and not just MAT 123 in Program A.

S. Fuller brought up the GPA of 3.1, for a student to continue in the program.

L. Mutz asked about what happens to a student who falls below 3.1? Probation?

A. Tyree asked what happens at the grad level with GPA's?

R. Gatteau pointed out that students in the A & B Program will not major in business. D. Di Donato said that MBA students should not major in business either.

B. Colle suggested that the program needs a preferred set of majors to better prepare students for the job market upon graduation.

B. Collins asked who will advise these students.

The committee was concerned about the graduate course requirements and that many of the aspects of the programs were confusing. J. Clarke suggested that we invite Joe McDonald to explain the programs. Lawrence Martin was also suggested.

B. Collins suggested that we wait, because the 30 graduate credits needed to complete the undergraduate portion of these programs, exceeded the current maximum of 6 graduate credits that Stony Brook currently allows to be applied toward an undergraduate degree. SUNY will allow a maximum of 15 graduate credits. The idea of raising this number will be floated to Albany for the Teacher Preparation programs.

If we do invite Joe McDonald, the following questions were suggested,  
How does this program compare to other schools? Was it modeled on another school's?  
Who will advise students?  
How many students will be in the programs?  
Undergraduate/graduate credit requirements?

GPA 3.1 guidelines?  
Math needed for programs?  
Missing DECS and skill requirements?

Other business:

B. Collins said that the resolution for the FYS 102 seminars has not been approved for making these courses mandatory until the Senate meets in early April. Also, there has not been a response from the Provost's Office Senate regarding the exception, requiring the minor for business. Our committee needs a volunteer to be the Master of Ceremonies for the Undergraduate Achievement Awards, during graduation, May 19, 2005.

---

## Undergraduate Council Minutes March 1, 2005

Present: R. Thomas, J. Ge, B. Colle, M. Levine, W. Collins, D. DiDonato, L. Mertz, C. Hamilton, R. El-Maghrabi, S. Fuller, A. Feldman, B. Rivera, Lauren Mutz

### Agenda:

1. Note taker: Beverly Rivera volunteered to take notes.
  2. Minutes were approved after edits were made at the suggestion of the committee.
  3. Undergraduate Council Proposal Update: Bill Collins
- The discussion ensued regarding Freshman Seminar 102 being a mandatory course requirement for freshmen. The UGC is waiting for the CEAS and CAS Curriculum Committees feedback regarding the proposal submitted for review.
- The information was sent to Judith Lochhead and was to have been reviewed at the last CC meeting (Wednesday, February 23rd).

CEAS Curriculum Committee met and reviewed Mark Aronoff's proposal. Jeff stated that the Council tentatively endorsed the proposal. The proposal was presented about two weeks ago and the committee was given some time to review and comment. The CEAS Committee had some reservation regarding course content and grading (A,B,C/U). Some of the faculty was not enthusiastic about making the 102 seminar mandatory. The CEAS Committee felt that they should support the initiative and see how it works.

Bill asked if the UC would have any objections to his presenting to the Faculty Senate the proposal which also indicates that the UGC, CAS and CEAS Curriculum Committees support the proposal for 102. It was agreed that Bill and Randy could move forward. Time Table – March 7th will be presented to Faculty Senate

### College of Business (COB)

COB is seeking to launch a new undergraduate curriculum. The department has proposed that BUS majors must complete a minor in a different discipline. Students would then pick a minor from another discipline as part of the major requirements.

COB feels that their students are graduating and going out into the real world and are not prepared with only a degree in Business Management. James Conover has received feedback that Stony Brook students can be better prepared by adding a minor that relates to the students interest. Specifically, the COB has eliminated those courses not associated with the BUS major, except ECO 108.

Arlene cited that current Stony Brook policy does not require a student to complete a minor in order to graduate. She suggested using a twelve credit concentration or minor option the way Psychology does. She also expressed concern for Transfer students, especially Joint Admissions Students and Ajou students, who may have difficulty completing this major and a minor in the two additional years they spend at Stony Brook.

The question was raised as to whether or not "specializations" could be used to better prepare students for the real world upon graduation. Currently, specializations are being used.



It was pointed out that there would be a problem. The BUS major could not be cleared without clearing the minor.

Sarah Fuller supported the proposal as it gives BUS students a focus and direction. It forces students into thinking ahead of time about an area in which to focus on.

Donna DiDonato expressed her concerns in using the concentration as opposed to using the minor. In a concentration, the student chooses the courses they want to take. With the minor, the courses require a more structured, well defined focus and provide a well rounded curriculum for the student.

Bill Collins related to the committee that in CAS, students do not apply to be accepted into a major. Students simply select a major. The only CAS undergraduate exception is the Pharmacology major (BCP) . It appears that BCP requires a separate application to be admitted to the major.

The Council is concerned that other departments might want to do the same thing; requiring a minor on top of a major for graduation.

BUS has gained credits from the new major requirements. It will therefore be more of a challenge to the students to complete the major requirements within four years. This new model would give a focused approach to the BUS curriculum.

Randy Thomas stated the BUS department should follow the model that the PSY department has in place. He did not feel that a major should require a minor to graduate. In the current bulletin, just revised, students are not required to complete a minor in order to graduate.

Martin Levine suggested that the proposal be approved in-house without changing the existing policy.

Jeff felt that since BUS is a professional degree, that we should consider the request.

Brian stated that by confining a student into a minor program that it could limit a student's options. Both Donna and Jeff stated that the BUS department was doing students a favor. Students who have options do not always chose what is best for their careers. This new requirement would help students.

Randy pointed out that we would be making an exception for BUS. Is this what we want to do? He also pointed out that the Psychology department allows the student to select a minor program or an area of specialization. BUS is a more diffused and applied area of study.

It was mentioned that minor programs range between 18 – 24 credits. However, there might be hidden pre-requisites for some upper –level courses. Bill Collins stated that this would be the case for the COB proposal as well.

Arlene asked if we need to change policy or ask for "an exception" to the rule? Should this go to the University Senate for approval? Also, because this new major with a minor requirement will have an impact on the College of Arts and Sciences, this major should also be sent to the CAS Curriculum Committee. This was told to Business by Joan Kenny and others.

Bill agrees with the proposal to add the minor requirement. This would benefit students upon graduating. Bill's concern is whether BUS department will provide some direction to these students going into the minor.

Sarah does not feel that advising for the minor will be an issue. Joseph McDonnell's email clearly addresses the advising issues for the minor. She feels this is a good way to do something more than abstract business. This is an educational argument. Sarah recommends that we approve the proposal as an exception and that there be a report in two years to the UGC with results of students who have completed the requirement and have graduated.

Martin suggested students be allowed the choice of a minor rather than say they must complete a minor.

It was also suggested that Joseph McDonnell should come to speak to the Council about the new major and answer questions.

The question was raised as to the procedure of approving an exception to stated policy. It was mentioned that the request is presented to the Senate as a recommendation from the Undergraduate Council. The recommendation for the exception goes to the Senate and the Provost's Office.

A consensus was reached by the UGC. The College of Business will need to present the proposal to the CAS Curriculum Committee.

The Council stressed that our concern should be for the students. With proper advising, the College of Business will ensure that:

- That BUS majors can complete the major requirements through re-directing of course credits and,
- That transfer students will be able to complete major and minor requirements within two years.

Jeff made the motion to recommend an exception for Business allowing the department to require a minor. Sarah seconded the motion.

English Department – Course EGL 204

Bente Videbaek, UG Director made the request that there be a one-week add/drop period for EGL 204. Beverly Rivera, Registrar, informed the committee that there is another way of managing enrollment in the second week of classes without changing the policy.

Randy will contact Bente and have her get in touch with the Registrar's Office to arrange for restricted enrollment in week two of classes for this course.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

---

Undergraduate Council

Minutes

March 29, 2005

**Present:** R. Thomas, A. Tyree, M. Levine, R. Gatteau, B. Colle, S. Fuller, W. Collins, A. Feldman, C. Hamilton, A. Hazlett, J. Ge, R. El-Maghrabi,

**Agenda:**

1. Note taker: W. Collins
2. Minutes from March 15, 2004 approved as corrected.
3. New Combined Degree Programs: Use of Graduate Credits to Satisfy Undergraduate Requirements (Double-Counting)

Background:

- a) At present, university policy specifies that a maximum of six (6) graduate credits may be applied to meet undergraduate requirements for graduation.
- b) With the support of the Office of the Provost, a number of programs on campus are developing combined BA (or BS) / MA (or MS or MAT) degree programs. In most of the proposed combined degree programs, more than six graduate credits will be counted toward both the undergraduate and graduate degree requirements.
- c) The SUNY policy is that up to fifteen (15) graduate credits may be used to satisfy undergraduate requirements

for students in combined degree programs.

d) The Undergraduate Council has been asked by the President of the Faculty Senate, Brent Lindquist, to review the existing university policy with respect to the needs of new combined degree programs and to consider increasing the number of graduate credits that may be used to satisfy undergraduate degree requirements.

Discussion:

This issue prompted lively discussion of a largely hypothetical nature since the Undergraduate Council has seen only one combined degree program proposal to date (the BA/MBA program proposal reviewed on 3/15/05). Nevertheless, a number of important questions were raised including:

- a) What are the policies of the other university centers in SUNY?
- b) If the Stony Brook graduate credit policy is changed, what impact will this have on students who leave Stony Brook before completing the undergraduate degrees and then want to transfer graduate credits back to Stony Brook to complete their BA or BS degrees?
- c) What limits should be set for double-counting graduate credits? Six for all undergraduates and up to 15 for students in combined degree programs? Or, should the limit be 15 for all undergraduates?
- d) What will happen if an undergraduate decides (or is asked) to leave a combined degree program early? If the graduate credit policy is different for students in combined degree programs as opposed to students in bachelors programs, how many graduate credits will that student be able to use to satisfy undergraduate requirements? Which policy will apply?
- e) If graduate credits are used to satisfy undergraduate requirements, can they subsequently be used to satisfy graduate requirements if the student continues at Stony Brook in a graduate program? (A. Tyree and others commented that this matter may be better addressed by the graduate program and the graduate program would most likely waive specific course requirements and expect the student to take other elective courses)
- f) How would this impact graduate and undergraduate courses that are cross-listed?
- g) How many combined degree programs are being developed at Stony Brook and how many graduate credits will be double-counted in each program? How many students will be enrolled in these programs? (J. Ge pointed out that a number of combined degree programs in CEAS have been proposed. He will provide details about these programs for the next meeting.)

The Council members agreed to continue the discussion at the next scheduled meeting when additional information will be presented.

#### 4. Old Business

- a) Correction of minutes from March 1st not completed. This will be done via email.
- b) At the Faculty Senate meeting on April 4th, W. Collins plans to present the resolution to make the FYS 102 seminars mandatory for freshmen. We are waiting for the CAS Curriculum Committee to complete the course approval process
- c) R. El-Maghrabi agreed to serve as Master of Ceremonies for the Baccalaureate Ceremony on May 19th.
- d) The Undergraduate Council will meet on 4/12, 4/26 and 5/3. An additional meeting on 5/10 will be held if needed.

---

#### Undergraduate Council Minutes

March 15, 2005

Present: R. Thomas, A. Tyree, M. Levine, R. Gatteau, B. Colle, L. Muntz, J. Clarke, S. Fuller, B. Collins, A. Feldman, D. Di Donato

#### Agenda:

- 1. Note taker: M. Levine
- 2. UC 3.01.05 minutes needed to be corrected and approved via email
- 3. College of Business Proposal for Combined BA/MBA and BS/MBA Degrees

The discussion focused of the Business School's proposal for their new undergraduate curriculum. A five page proposal was handed out to members at the beginning of the meeting. The discussion focused on the feasibility of offering these two new combined undergraduate/graduate programs, under current SUNY restrictions and guidelines.

A. Tyree asked how students can complete the undergraduate portion of these programs in four years?

B. Collins suggested that students can use the summer sessions to complete course work. If the program wants to attract better students, it will be hard to compete with a lot of other programs unless students come to SB with numerous A.P. credits

A. Feldman said that the University wants to create a Winter session.

A. Tyree asked about what happens to transfers?

S. Fuller was concerned as to how this program would attract students from elsewhere?

M. Levine pointed out the University's desire to attract out of state students, generating more tuition revenues.

A. Tyree asked about the difficulty of taking eight graduate courses in their senior year.

R. Gatteau pointed out that there were DEC courses missing in the sample schedules; DEC H, in Program A, DEC D, in Program B.

L. Mutz asked about what happens with BUS 110? Do students start with WRT 102?

J. Clarke asked if statistics needed to be required and not just MAT 123 in Program A.

S. Fuller brought up the GPA of 3.1, for a student to continue in the program.

L. Mutz asked about what happens to a student who falls below 3.1? Probation?

A. Tyree asked what happens at the grad level with GPA's?

R. Gatteau pointed out that students in the A & B Program will not major in business. D. Di Donato said that MBA students should not major in business either.

B. Colle suggested that the program needs a preferred set of majors to better prepare students for the job market upon graduation.

B. Collins asked who will advise these students.

The committee was concerned about the graduate course requirements and that many of the aspects of the programs were confusing. J. Clarke suggested that we invite Joe McDonald to explain the programs. Lawrence Martin was also suggested.

B. Collins suggested that we wait, because the 30 graduate credits needed to complete the undergraduate portion of these programs, exceeded the current maximum of 6 graduate credits that Stony Brook currently allows to be applied toward an undergraduate degree. SUNY will allow a maximum of 15 graduate credits. The idea of raising this number will be floated to Albany for the Teacher Preparation programs.

If we do invite Joe McDonald, the following questions were suggested,  
How does this program compare to other schools? Was it modeled on another school's?  
Who will advise students?  
How many students will be in the programs?

Undergraduate/graduate credit requirements?

GPA 3.1 guidelines?

Math needed for programs?

Missing DECS and skill requirements?

Other business:

B. Collins said that the resolution for the FYS 102 seminars has not been approved for making these courses mandatory until the Senate meets in early April. Also, there has not been a response from the Provost's Office Senate regarding the exception, requiring the minor for business. Our committee needs a volunteer to be the Master of Ceremonies for the Undergraduate Achievement Awards, during graduation, May 19, 2005.

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes

March 1, 2005

Present: R. Thomas, J. Ge, B. Colle, M. Levine, W. Collins, D. DiDonato, L. Mertz, C. Hamilton, R. El-Maghrabi, S. Fuller, A. Feldman, B. Rivera, Lauren Mutz

Agenda:

1. Note taker: Beverly Rivera volunteered to take notes.

2. Minutes were approved after edits were made at the suggestion of the committee.

3. Undergraduate Council Proposal Update: Bill Collins

The discussion ensued regarding Freshman Seminar 102 being a mandatory course requirement for freshmen. The UGC is waiting for the CEAS and CAS Curriculum Committees feedback regarding the proposal submitted for review.

The information was sent to Judith Lochhead and was to have been reviewed at the last CC meeting (Wednesday, February 23rd).

CEAS Curriculum Committee met and reviewed Mark Aronoff's proposal. Jeff stated that the Council tentatively endorsed the proposal. The proposal was presented about two weeks ago and the committee was given some time to review and comment. The CEAS Committee had some reservation regarding course content and grading (A,B,C/U). Some of the faculty was not enthusiastic about making the 102 seminar mandatory. The CEAS Committee felt that they should support the initiative and see how it works.

Bill asked if the UC would have any objections to his presenting to the Faculty Senate the proposal which also indicates that the UGC, CAS and CEAS Curriculum Committees support the proposal for 102. It was agreed that Bill and Randy could move forward. Time Table – March 7th will be presented to Faculty Senate

### College of Business (COB)

COB is seeking to launch a new undergraduate curriculum. The department has proposed that BUS majors must complete a minor in a different discipline. Students would then pick a minor from another discipline as part of the major requirements.

COB feels that their students are graduating and going out into the real world and are not prepared with only a degree in Business Management. James Conover has received feedback that Stony Brook students can be better prepared by adding a minor that relates to the students interest. Specifically, the COB has eliminated those courses not associated with the BUS major, except ECO 108.

Arlene cited that current Stony Brook policy does not require a student to complete a minor in order to graduate. She suggested using a twelve credit concentration or minor option the way Psychology does. She also expressed

concern for Transfer students, especially Joint Admissions Students and Ajou students, who may have difficulty completing this major and a minor in the two additional years they spend at Stony Brook.

The question was raised as to whether or not "specializations" could be used to better prepare students for the real world upon graduation. Currently, specializations are being used.

It was pointed out that there would be a problem. The BUS major could not be cleared without clearing the minor.

Sarah Fuller supported the proposal as it gives BUS students a focus and direction. It forces students into thinking ahead of time about an area in which to focus on.

Donna DiDonato expressed her concerns in using the concentration as opposed to using the minor. In a concentration, the student chooses the courses they want to take. With the minor, the courses require a more structured, well defined focus and provide a well rounded curriculum for the student.

Bill Collins related to the committee that in CAS, students do not apply to be accepted into a major. Students simply select a major. The only CAS undergraduate exception is the Pharmacology major (BCP) . It appears that BCP requires a separate application to be admitted to the major.

The Council is concerned that other departments might want to do the same thing; requiring a minor on top of a major for graduation.

BUS has gained credits from the new major requirements. It will therefore be more of a challenge to the students to complete the major requirements within four years. This new model would give a focused approach to the BUS curriculum.

Randy Thomas stated the BUS department should follow the model that the PSY department has in place. He did not feel that a major should require a minor to graduate. In the current bulletin, just revised, students are not required to complete a minor in order to graduate.

Martin Levine suggested that the proposal be approved in-house without changing the existing policy.

Jeff felt that since BUS is a professional degree, that we should consider the request.

Brian stated that by confining a student into a minor program that it could limit a student's options. Both Donna and Jeff stated that the BUS department was doing students a favor. Students who have options do not always chose what is best for their careers. This new requirement would help students.

Randy pointed out that we would be making an exception for BUS. Is this what we want to do? He also pointed out that the Psychology department allows the student to select a minor program or an area of specialization. BUS is a more diffused and applied area of study.

It was mentioned that minor programs range between 18 – 24 credits. However, there might be hidden pre-requisites for some upper –level courses. Bill Collins stated that this would be the case for the COB proposal as well.

Arlene asked if we need to change policy or ask for "an exception" to the rule? Should this go to the University Senate for approval? Also, because this new major with a minor requirement will have an impact on the College of Arts and Sciences, this major should also be sent to the CAS Curriculum Committee. This was told to Business by Joan Kenny and others.

Bill agrees with the proposal to add the minor requirement. This would benefit students upon graduating. Bill's concern is whether BUS department will provide some direction to these students going into the minor.

Sarah does not feel that advising for the minor will be an issue. Joseph McDonnell's email clearly addresses the advising issues for the minor. She feels this is a good way to do something more than abstract business. This is an educational argument. Sarah recommends that we approve the proposal as an exception and that there be a report in two years to the UGC with results of students who have completed the requirement and have graduated.

Martin suggested students be allowed the choice of a minor rather than say they must complete a minor.

It was also suggested that Joseph McDonnell should come to speak to the Council about the new major and answer questions.

The question was raised as to the procedure of approving an exception to stated policy. It was mentioned that the request is presented to the Senate as a recommendation from the Undergraduate Council. The recommendation for the exception goes to the Senate and the Provost's Office.

A consensus was reached by the UGC. The College of Business will need to present the proposal to the CAS Curriculum Committee.

The Council stressed that our concern should be for the students. With proper advising, the College of Business will ensure that:

- That BUS majors can complete the major requirements through re-directing of course credits and,
- That transfer students will be able to complete major and minor requirements within two years.

Jeff made the motion to recommend an exception for Business allowing the department to require a minor. Sarah seconded the motion.

English Department – Course EGL 204

Bente Videbaek, UG Director made the request that there be a one-week add/drop period for EGL 204. Beverly Rivera, Registrar, informed the committee that there is another way of managing enrollment in the second week of classes without changing the policy.

Randy will contact Bente and have her get in touch with the Registrar's Office to arrange for restricted enrollment in week two of classes for this course.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

---

**Undergraduate Council Meeting  
February 15, 2005  
Minutes**

Present: Ora Bouey, Janet Clarke, Bill Collins, Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Jeff Ge, Cheryl Hamilton, Michael Mooney, Lauren Mutz, Randy Thomas, Andrea Tyree, Kane Gillespie (guest), Ellen Lindquist (guest).

The meeting began at 2:30 PM

1. Cheryl Hamilton volunteered to take the minutes of the meeting.
2. Minutes of the 11/30/04 and 2/1/05 meetings were approved with minor corrections.
3. Discussion on On-line Bulletin Resolution

· All in attendance were given copies of the Resolution Regarding the Undergraduate Bulletin (February 17, 2004) which states that " the official version of the Undergraduate Bulletin shall be maintained on-line, and

archived twice each year, prior to the start of each academic semester”.

- Kane Gillespie and Ellen Lindquist addressed concerns regarding the status of the online bulletin. Kane indicated that current sources of academic information for students include the printed Undergraduate Bulletin, the Undergraduate Bulletin Online (UBO), semester course schedules and SOLAR System course information (catalog). Bill Collins indicated that these sources of information do not always agree with one another, and that of these, the Undergraduate Bulletin Online (UBO) appears to be the least up to date. Kane responded that his office is responsible for the printed Undergraduate Bulletin and the Undergraduate Bulletin Online. The Undergraduate Bulletin is printed every two years, contains information regarding academic policies as well as course information and major/minor requirements, and is generally updated on a reactionary basis, or as needed. He also indicated that the current version of Undergraduate Bulletin Online was up to date as of November 2004, just before undergraduate students began registering for the spring 2005 semester. He explained that any updates made since Fall registration would be applicable only to Spring 2005 or later. Updated Bulletin versions are posted at least once per term. New information in the updated version is printed in red with the appropriate effective date so that it can be distinguished from the old information. Ellen Lindquist indicated that there is no longer a printed supplement to the class schedule since Spring, 2004, but that there is an online supplement that presents the updates for each semester. Kane reported that any changes regarding courses for the coming semester would need to be determined/ posted before the beginning of registration for that semester (April for fall semester, November for spring semester). Michael Mooney indicated that the Registrar also does not make changes after students have begun registering for the upcoming semester. Kane indicated that Dean Staros has asked academic departments to link to the Undergraduate Bulletin Online for all their major/minor requirements.

- Concerning the various sources of academic information for students, Kane indicated that his office has the ultimate accountability for coordination of updating this information. All were in agreement that the University should encourage students to consult the online bulletin as it is the “official bulletin”. Janet Clarke indicated that students frequently request hard copies of the printed Undergraduate Bulletin from the Library. It was reported that SOLAR View Course Catalog appears to have the most up to date information, and pulls data from PeopleSoft at least monthly. Kane indicated that he would continue to work closely with Phil Doesschate, Director of Information Systems, to ensure that SOLAR View Course Catalog information is updated and corresponds with the Undergraduate Bulletin Online. Raafat El-Maghrabi suggested that changes made by academic departments should be communicated to all sources of academic information.

#### 4. First Year Seminar Update

- Bill Collins distributed a copy of the proposal to make Undergraduate College 102 courses mandatory. He asked that representatives from the curriculum committees (CAS and CEAS) discuss this proposal with their committees. The Undergraduate Council will review/discuss comments from the curriculum committee at the next meeting, after which the Undergraduate Council will make a recommendation to the academic senate.

- Jeff Ge indicated that the CEAS Curriculum Committee had already begun discussions regarding the UGC 102 proposal, and indicated that they would discuss the proposal further at their next meeting.

- Bill Collins indicated that he discussed the committee’s concerns regarding course guidelines with Mark Aronoff. He reported that Deputy Provost Aronoff agreed that guidelines should be developed, as discussed, and that the six Undergraduate College Faculty Directors would be responsible for developing the guidelines.

#### 4. Departmental Review Update

- Randy Thomas reported that he met with Associate Provost Joe Auner, who clarified that the Undergraduate Council representatives who participate in departmental reviews do not necessarily have to be faculty, but can also be selected from among professional staff members who serve on the Undergraduate Council.

- Minor changes were made to the UGC members who would participate in upcoming departmental reviews. The new schedule was confirmed as follows:

Music Department March 8 & 9 M. Levine

Ecology and Evolution March 16 & 17 A. Tyree



Chemistry April 4 & 5 B. Collins  
Sociology April 20 & 21 J. Clark

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Cheryl Hamilton

---

**Undergraduate Council Meeting  
February 1, 2005  
Minutes**

Present: Bill Collins, Brian Colle, Donna Di Donato, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Jeff Ge, Cheryl Hamilton, Martin Levine, Bob McGrath, Lauren Mutz, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas.

The meeting began at 2:30 PM.

1. Lauren Mutz volunteered to take the minutes of the meeting.

2. The minutes of Nov. 30 were pending approval.

3. Undergraduate Council Governance/ Provost Richard Robert McGrath

A. B. Collins reported on the proposal of making 101 mandatory for incoming freshman. Collins also reported on the proposal of making 102 mandatory as well. He cited the following issues with the later proposal: 1) Many sections and instructors will be required—there may not be a strong enough faculty commitment. 2) Collins is uncertain of students' reception of 102 as mandatory. 3) Grading. While 101 was S/U, 102 would be A, B, C, U; it may be difficult to grant letter grades in a 1-credit seminar. Provost Robert McGrath proposed using UC San Diego as a practical model: a school which is affordable, has out-of-state students, and engages its students in small/intimate classrooms. McGrath hopes that the 102 course becomes mandatory because freshman won't know the advantage of these intimate courses. McGrath passed out two memos: one from Dean James Staros and one from Dean Yacov Shamash. B. Collins asked if untenured faculty will be teaching these courses. McGrath responded saying only tenure-track faculty will teach the courses. Bill Collins asked for clarification on Health Science Center faculty and whether they would be allowed to instruct the 101/102 courses. McGrath said that this has yet to be clarified.

B. D. Di Donato reported on students' response to the 102 course. Di Donato claims that students responded positively and that they "liked small classes and being able to talk to faculty." S. Fuller asked whether faculty will be prepared to address the topics of their seminars. She also asked whether these seminars will have reading and exams or be more "off-the-cuff discussions." Requirements, she claimed, should be comparable across seminars. Course guidelines for faculty involving student workload should be developed. R. Thomas interjected by saying that the focus has become diffused. According to D. DiDonato, faculty shouldn't just teach their research but, rather, should have the opportunity to explore their other academic interests with students. McGrath agreed. B. Collins asked about credit enrollment and whether students would be deterred from registering because they are over their credit limit. McGrath responded by saying that students usually find a way around the problem by seeing an Advisor and getting permission to enroll.

C. Collins mentioned faculty commitment. Accordingly, it's been a challenge to line up instructors. He asked: "what do we do when we have to twist arms?" McGrath claims he had a discussion with Dean Staros on this matter and that, like in San Diego where every faculty belongs to one of the six colleges, he would like every faculty member here to be associated with a particular college. He continued by saying he hopes to model San Diego's system in this manner. B. Colle said that he does not feel this should be a big issue. Accordingly, if the Dean and Chair are committed, these feelings will trickle down to the faculty and things will eventually get done.

D. McGrath wants to bring in out-of-state students so Stony Brook better resembles other institutions.

4. On the Agenda for the next UGC meeting: Approval of the 11/30 minutes. Also, proposal to discuss the online bulletin.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:35 PM.

---

**Undergraduate Council Meeting**  
**Nov. 30, 2004**  
**Minutes**

Present: Kristen Buczynski, Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Bill Collins, Donna Di Donato, Randall Edouard, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Randy Thomas

The meeting began at 2:30 PM.

1. Janet Clarke volunteered to take the minutes of the meeting.
2. The minutes of the meeting of Nov. 16 were pending approval with corrections. R. Thomas will circulate the corrected minutes via email for approval.
  - A. Regarding item 5.a of Nov. 16 Minutes, A. Feldman reported that the CAS Curriculum Committee agreed to an A,B,C,U grading structure for Spring, 2005.

3. Undergraduate Council Governance/Brent Lindquist's memo:

- A. B. Collins reported that Lindquist thought the current constitution was ambiguous as written. Collins also reported that the email memos regarding Lindquist's memo, "Curriculum Policy for the Undergraduate Colleges," almost unanimously agreed that UG Council should have responsibility for broad curricular issues of the Undergraduate Colleges and work with the CAS and CEAS curricular committees.
- B. Collins asked, "If the UG Council makes a resolution to the Senate regarding the Undergraduate Colleges, and the Senate passes that resolution, what does the vote mean? Is the policy adopted or is it merely a strong recommendation? When, or how, does the "new policy" effectively *become* policy?" J. Clarke asked if there was a similar situation with the passage of the Senate resolution regarding FYS101, which is now mandatory. Collins said that the resolution was contested, with objections about the Senate making curricular decisions. However, according to Lindquist, the status of FYS101 as mandatory is now an accepted policy. D. Di Donato reminded the UG Council that all Senate resolutions are advisory to the president and provost, and should be forwarded as such by the Senate President. However, apparently, this last step was not executed regarding FYS101 and has now reappeared as an unresolved issue for FYS102. Collins said that, while there is some disagreement in the Executive Committee of the Senate, it is generally understood that the role of UG Council is to be advisory to the provost's office. Feldman asked, "If we are advisory to the provost, should we be bringing resolutions to the *Senate?*" Di Donato said that we are advisory to the Senate.

Collins pointed to an emphatic sentence from Lindquist's memo: "THIS AUTHORITY WOULD BE REQUESTED FROM THE TWO WEST CAMPUS COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEES (emphasis in original)." He and J. Mitchell disagreed with the statement, saying that UG Council already has authority on Undergraduate Colleges governance. Di Donato agreed, citing the Honors College program as an example. When that program was discussed for approval, there was a clear division of duties between the curriculum committees and UG Council. Mitchell pointed out that UG Council is at the right level of governance hierarchy regarding FYSs because the UG Council works on issues across the colleges, whereas the curriculum committees look for internal issues within their respective colleges.

- C. Collins asked another rhetorical question: Does the FYS apply to freshmen in HSC programs? Di Donato said it did not.
- D. It was agreed that Collins would respond to Lindquist's memo with these three main points: 1. The UG Council already has authority to make cross-college decisions; it does not need to request the authority from the CAS and CEAS curriculum committees. 2. What is the status of a policy when a resolution gets passed by the Senate?

Does it become a bona fide policy at that point, or does it need some approval/sanction of the provost? 3. If it is true that resolutions are advisory to the provost, there needs to be a communication "pipeline" from the Senate president to the provost to finalize these Senate resolutions.

4. Departmental Reviews: There are four academic departmental reviews in Spring, 2005. R. Thomas asked for volunteers. They are:

Music, March 8 and 9—M. Levine  
 Ecology and Evolution, March 16 and 17—B. Collins (tentative)  
 Chemistry, April 5 and 6—R. Thomas (tentative)  
 Sociology, April 20 and 21—J. Clarke

5. UC Council Meetings, Spring, 2005: The members saw no pressing reason to have another meeting this semester. The Undergraduate College directors will meet with us in the Spring. Spring meetings are scheduled as follows (same time and place): February 1, 15, March 1, 15, 29, April 12, 25, May 3, 10.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

---

**Undergraduate Council  
 November 16, 2004  
 Minutes**

Present: R. Thomas, B. Colle, C. Hamilton, A. Feldman, R. Gatteau, D. Di Donato, J. Mitchell, R. El-Maghrabi, W. Levine, B. Rivera, W. Collins

The meeting began at 2:35 PM.

1. B. Colle agreed to take the minutes.
2. Minutes from Nov. 2, 2004 were approved with only minor corrections.
3. Departmental Review: R. Thomas opened the meeting by summarizing the procedure for departmental reviews, which will start in spring of 2005. Undergraduate Council (UC) members will participate during the first day of the review in the Provost Conference room between 9 and 10 AM. An UC member will evaluate the departmental narrative and the structure of the major. R. Thomas noted that volunteers are needed from the Undergraduate Council by the next meeting.
4. Report from the Coordinating Council meeting of November 15:

Statement of the problem: W. Collins relayed an issue that was brought up at the Coordinating Council meeting. There is current confusion over which body has the authority to suggest policy regarding the new Undergraduate Colleges, and, in particular, whether or not a course, such as FYS 101 or FYS 102, should be made mandatory for entering members of the Undergraduate Colleges. Should the authority to suggest policy to the Senate rest with the two Curriculum Committees (CAS and CEAS) or with the Undergraduate Council? The decision to make FYS 101 mandatory for freshmen entering the Undergraduate Colleges was made by the Senate in the spring of 2004, having been debated in the Undergraduate Council, which recommended the policy to the Senate. Should it instead have been debated in the Curriculum Committees? Which group has authority to recommend such policies? The Coordinating Council expressed confusion over this issue, drawing into question the legitimacy of the Senate decision already made to recommend to the Provost that FYS 101 be mandatory for freshmen in the Undergraduate Colleges.

How the process should work: The roles of the Undergraduate Council and the two Curriculum Committees were discussed. It was stressed that all three groups (UC and the Curriculum Committees) should be advisory to the Provost and Senate. For example, D. DiDonato explained that the Curriculum Committees should make decisions with regards to University DEC requirements and individual department courses, but it should not make undergraduate programmatic decisions. Using advice from the Curriculum Committees, the Undergraduate Council, and the University Senate, the Provost's office should make the final decision and record the decision for inclusion in the Undergraduate Bulletin.

J. Mitchell suggested that the authority to recommend policy regarding mandatory courses for the Undergraduate Colleges already does lie with the Undergraduate Council, from a governance point of view, since policies involving the Undergraduate Colleges span across college (CAS, CEAS) boundaries. He reminded the Undergraduate Council of the charge to the UGC within the Senate Constitution: "This Council shall review and recommend policy to the Provost.... Its responsibilities include.... (3) reviewing and coordinating all curricular and other academic matters that are not limited to a single major academic unit."

How to solve the problem: How to solve the problem: W. Collins suggested two ways to resolve the FYS 101 issue. One possibility is that the Provost can state that a decision was made based on the advice of the Undergraduate Council and the CAS and CEAS Curriculum Committees. A second possibility is that the proposal be sent now to the Curriculum Committees for debate. The Provost's office should work more closely with the Curriculum Committees and the Undergraduate Council on policies impacting the new Undergraduate Colleges.

5. Remaining FYS 102 Issues: W. Collins stated that there are other remaining issues regarding FYS 102 such as grading and faculty commitment.

a) Grading: There was some discussion on whether the FYS 102 grading should be A, B, C, U, A-F, or S/U. A. Feldman noted that the CAS Curriculum Committee decided on the grading for FYS 102. The UG Council felt that students would not take the course seriously if graded S/U. The UG Council decided on A, B, C, and U grading for the spring 2005 semester. Students can still withdraw from the course after consultation with an academic advisor.

b) Registration: J. Mitchell asked what happens if a student does not get his or her choice or does not register? In order to guarantee registration for this course, B. Rivera suggested to make the registration for FYS 102 automatic and assign a 999 section number. A student can choose his/her desired section as the semester approaches.

c) Faculty Commitment: About 120 sections of FYS 102 need to be taught by faculty every spring semester. This means that a faculty member will have to teach a section about once every 5 years. Faculty commitment is important for long-term sustainability of the course. D. Di Donato said that we should hear from the Deans and department chairs on how they plan to guarantee faculty involvement. In particular, we need in writing from all Deans whether they support FYS 102 and how they will plan to get faculty commitment.

In order to motivate and monitor faculty involvement in teaching the seminars, J. Mitchell suggested that an explicit category be added to the annual faculty Addendum, highlighting one's participation (or lack of participation) in teaching the seminars. The faculty Addendum is used in merit increases and promotion decisions, as well as sabbatical requests. J. Mitchell argued that having the FYS 102 participation reflected explicitly in the Addendum, and possibly also in the sabbatical request form, would help to emphasize the importance the Provost and the Deans have placed on faculty participation in the Undergraduate Colleges.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

---

**Undergraduate Council  
November 2, 2004  
Minutes**

Present: R. Thomas, S. Fuller, A. Feldman, R. Gatteau, D. Di Donato, J. Mitchell, R. El-Maghrabi, W. Levine, K. Buczynski, W. Collins

The meeting began at 2:30 PM.

1. W. Collins agreed to take the minutes.
2. Minutes from Oct. 19, 2004 were approved without correction.
3. Discussion of FYS 102:

a) FYS 102 Oversight: Committee members agreed that while oversight of FYS 102 is important, it is not an issue for the Undergraduate Council. Rather, oversight (and assessment) of FYS 102 should be addressed by the appropriate curriculum committees. D. Di Donato pointed out that this issue had been discussed at length with Elaine Kaplan and that the Honors College mini-courses could serve as a good model.

b) Should FYS 102 be Mandatory for Freshmen?: This is a continuation of the discussion initiated by M. Aronoff at the last meeting. The major points of discussion were:

- Trial Period: M. Levine raised the possibility of having a test period for FYS 102. D. Di Donato pointed out that this may not be necessary since substantial information is available from other schools and from the SBU Honors College indicating the faculty-taught seminar model is successful.
- Faculty Commitment: It is intended that FYS 102 be taught by tenure-track faculty. However, it is not clear there is sufficient faculty commitment to sustain this model in future years. It was noted that the Deans in CAS and CEAS have contacted faculty asking for participation in the program. R. El-Maghrabi stated that HSC faculty members have not been contacted.
- Student Interest: What is the level of student interest in the FYS 102 seminars? S. Fuller suggested that the curriculum committees could provide information (e.g., enrollment figures, student comments) about the level of student interest. K. Buczynski observed that it may be difficult to maintain student interest in a 1-credit seminar unless the course is mandatory. W. Collins added that making the course mandatory would help in maintaining commitments for resources.
- Grading of FYS 102: J. Mitchell raised the issue of how FYS 102 is graded. This prompted considerable discussion about whether or not freshman performance in a mandatory course should be evaluated with letter grades including "F." The possibility of using ABC/U grading was discussed.
- Postpone Discussion of FYS 102: W. Collins suggested postponing further discussion of FYS 102 until the CAS and CEAS Curriculum Committees have resolved the issues of FYS 102 oversight and assessment. J. Mitchell responded, and the committee agreed, that it is not necessary to postpone the discussion because whether or not FYS 102 should be mandatory for freshmen is really a separate issue.

5. New Business: R. Thomas distributed copies of the descriptions of the new Five-Year Plan Task Forces.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

---

Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting of October 5, 2004

Present: Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Bill Collins, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Randy Thomas, Andrea Tyree.

The meeting began at 2:30 PM.

1. Sarah Fuller volunteered to take the Minutes of the meeting.
2. The Minutes of the Meeting of 9/21/04 were approved.
3. Rick Gatteau brought up the topic of the time at which undergraduates are allowed to pre-enroll for 19 credits. At present, undergraduate students pre-enroll for up to 17 credits but are allowed to extend this to 19 credits two weeks before the start of classes. This causes a problem when orientation sessions for new entering students take place after that date, because fewer spaces and course choices will be available for late-orientation students. Often the students who increase their loads to 19 credits are 'shopping around' and intend to drop one course once they see how their grades are shaping up. Meanwhile, entering students attending orientation sessions may have insufficient choices for their class schedules.

Donna Di Donato noted that even with the opportunity to extend to 19 credits two weeks before classes start, the volume of late 'Adds' is substantial. The early date has not addressed the late-Add problem.

The general sense of the Council is that making more classes available to new incoming students should be a priority. Two or three days before the start of classes provides enough time for students to adjust their class schedules and extend them from 17 to 19 credits.

The Council resolved the following: The date for allowing undergraduates to extend their class schedules from 17 to 19 credits should be right after the last scheduled orientation before the start of classes or two weeks before classes begin,

whichever is later.

This should be adopted for the coming Spring semester and for the following Fall (Spring and Fall 2005). During this phase, any problems with this timing can be identified. If this trial run proves unproblematic, the resolution can be proposed as official policy. The Associate Provost, Mark Aronoff, will be asked to act upon this recommendation. For Spring 2005 the date for extending schedules to 19 credits would be January 21.

In conjunction with this topic, a question was raised about criteria for granting course loads over 19 credits. Overloads are now contingent on a) having no 'Incompletes' from the prior semester, and b) maintaining a GPA of at least 2.5. At present, most overloads are for 20 credits, with students adding an additional 3-credit class to a 17-credit schedule.

The general sense is that an effort should be made to schedule orientation sessions well in advance of the start of classes. This is not always possible, however, and in any case, some orientations must always be provided for late-admit students once classes have begun.

4. The matter of second-semester First-Year Seminars was raised as 'Old Business'. Last year the Undergraduate Council endorsed a requirement of FYS 101 (First Year Seminar, formerly USB 101) for all entering first-year students. At that time the Administration recommended that a second one-credit seminar, FYS 102, taught by faculty, should also be required. This the Council did not approve. Primary reasons were doubts about sufficient faculty resources to teach these courses on a voluntary basis over the long term, and concern about adding even one credit to the requirements for students in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Mark Aronoff will apparently again this year raise the matter of a required FYS 102 to the UG Council.

In response to questions, rationales for requiring the college-based FYS 101 were explained. These include improved retention, advising pointed toward future academic success, community-building within the colleges, possibilities for a close advising/ mentoring relationship with the FYS instructor.

Under 'New Business'

A. Someone has inquired whether majors should have entrance requirements. Present policy is that individual departments have discretion in this area, with the approval of the Curriculum Committee.

B. Concerns were raised that Computer Science prevents students from electing a P/NC option for their introductory courses. Students can be dismayed when told well into the semester that P/NC is not an option in those courses. It was noted that students are already alerted, well in advance, that courses taken under P/NC will not qualify for the DEC and for most major requirements.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35

---

STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY  
MINUTES OF UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING  
**September 21, 2004**

Attendees: Janet Clarke, Brian Colle, Bill Collins (co-chair), Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sara Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Beverly Rivera, and Randy Thomas (co-chair).

The meeting was called to order at 2:40 p.m.

1. Selection of note taker: R. Gatteau.
2. The September 7 minutes were approved with the following corrections:
  - a. #2b: Remove apostrophe in Bill Collins' name.
  - b. #2b: Change Learning Communities Center to Learning Communities Program.
  - c. #5: Add the word "the" after "a few classes in conjunction with ..."
  - d. #5: Change "Inre" to: "In reference to ..."
  - e. #5: Replace the period with a colon after the word "cheating".
  - f. #5: Remove the apostrophe after the word "SAT's" (should read "SATs")

- g. Martin Levine has a new phone #: 27250.
3. Brian Colle from Marine Sciences was introduced as the newest member of the committee.
4. R. Thomas discussed the status of open faculty and student seats on the Undergraduate Council. He will work with Chris Berndt to identify a CEAS faculty member and Jerry Stein and Jared Wong, SGA President, to identify student members.
5. R. Thomas confirmed that the Undergraduate Council will meet on alternate Tuesdays at 2:30 p.m.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

1. R. Thomas re-introduced discussion on Bob Kerber's e-mail which called for making clearer policies regarding the admission and orientation of new students. The concerns include the current on-line and proctored exams, the class reserve list, the automatic and departmental waitlists, and the structure of orientation.
2. S. Fuller said we need to have enough seats in introductory courses such as chemistry, biology, and writing. She said we have chronic underplanning in course availability given our student enrollment.
3. B. Collins said projections are made by departments, but problems aren't identified until July. Then it is too late to make adjustments.
4. S. Fuller commented about the difficulty of retaining students when they can't find courses. She said we need a strategic plan to have enough seats.
5. D. Di Donato said writing (particularly WRT 101) is a good example of how we should work through seat availability issues, as was done this past summer.
6. B. Collins said we need to get numbers of students early on for registration purposes.
7. J. Clarke inquired about resource projections and needs for each academic department.
8. B. Rivera said that beyond projections, facilities needs are also an issue.
9. B. Collins said that more resources are found when we enter a crisis mode.
10. B. Colle said the lack of facilities/classrooms is a growing issue on the main campus.
11. A. Feldman said that setting student enrollment targets are not an Undergraduate Council issue.
12. S. Fuller said a position paper should be put out indicating the needs – for example, CAS cannot function in serving the size of its student body, and that we need instructional and facilities resources.
13. B. Collins stated that resources should match enrollment projections. He suggested adjusting orientation in order to discover problems earlier in the process; for example, use distance registration particularly given the growing out-of-state population. He also recommended looking at the writing and math placement process.
14. J. Mitchell suggested endorsing two things: do writing and math placement exams earlier and have a committee continue to meet for planning purposes.
15. D. Di Donato noted that these issues are already part of the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) agenda and said that the Undergraduate Council could request reports once work is completed.
16. B. Collins said that changing the placement exam process would create a more flexible orientation and registration process. He suggested pre-registering students for their courses.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

1. B. Collins noted that the faculty senate approved to make the first-year seminar (UC 101 course) mandatory for all incoming freshmen. He said that a proposal would be forthcoming to make the faculty taught spring seminar (UC 102 course) mandatory for all freshmen. He suggested having Mark Aronoff, Deputy Provost, attend an upcoming meeting to discuss this issue as well as orientation.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

---

#### **UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

Meeting of September 07, 2004 (2:30 PM)

Present: Janet Clarke, Bill Collins (co-chair), Raafat El-Maghrabi, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Martin Levine, Joe Mitchell, Beverly Rivera, and Randy Thomas (co-chair).

1. Selection of note taker (R. El-Maghrabi)

2. Introduction of new Council Members (Janet Clarke from Library Services, and Martin Levine from Arts) and the identification of members whose service has ended (Hermann Kurthen, Joanne Daly)

A few corrections to the roster were also made:

a. Janet Clarke's e-address is [JHClarke@notes.cc.sunysb.edu](mailto:JHClarke@notes.cc.sunysb.edu)

b. Bill Collins is the new Director of the Learning Communities Program and his extension is now 2-9178

c. Cheryl Hamilton's extension is 2-7752

d. Beverly Rivera's extension is 2-1662

e. Razaat is now Raafat! and his e-address is [RElmaghrabi@notes.cc.sunysb.edu](mailto:RElmaghrabi@notes.cc.sunysb.edu)

3. Discussion of selecting a new UGC chair. B. Collins, R. Thomas and J. Mitchell (current and previous chairs) outlined duties of position.

With no volunteers, the discussion was postponed to the next UGC meeting Sept. 21.

4. The days and times of future UGC meetings was discussed and R. Thomas will send out a questionnaire asking for the preferred time(s) of each member. Next UGC meeting will be on Tuesday, Sept. 21st at 2:30 PM.

5. Most of the remainder of present meeting involved the discussion of "wait-listing" courses and other "new" registration policies (enrollment deadlines, and on-line Math placement). The discussion revolved around a memo to the UGC from Bob Kerber (copy also sent to B.Lindquist/University Senate) whose response was forwarded to the UGC.

B. Rivera pointed out that this was only applied to a few classes in conjunction with parent department, and that these were on experimental bases.

R. Gatteau added that it was one way to establish an enrollment plan, and save a limited number of seats for freshmen.

B. Collins suggested that the UGC "revisit" a proposal to the UGC presented to during the 2003 year by Fred Walter. He also added that perhaps registration should "assign" courses in a manner similar to dorm room assignment.

In regards to second Kerber's concern (on-line Math placement exam) and the potential for cheating; M. Levine suggested that SAT scores might be better criteria than placement exams; R. Gatteau thought that SAT's may be easy to use for English but harder for Mathematics.

The UGC discussed possible ways to have placement results available before June 14th, such as for example utilizing outside examining facilities to proctor the exam.

The discussion was postponed until the subsequent UGC meeting in the hope of receiving input from Bob Kerber.

Old Business:

J. Mitchell asked about the fate of SBU 101.

B. Collins said that 101 has been approved as "mandatory" while 102 is "optional" but there is a proposal to make it mandatory also in future.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM

## UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting of April 13, 2004 (minutes taken by Joe Mitchell)

Present: Bill Collins (co-chair), Donna DiDonato, Arlene Feldman, Cheryl Hamilton, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Gabriela Polit, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas (co-chair) and Fred Walter.

1. Minutes of 3/30/04 were approved after two minor modifications.

2. Gabriela Polit (Hispanic Languages and Literature) was introduced as a new member of the UGC.

3. Discussion of the SBU 101 proposal from Mark Aronoff.

A. Feldman: With about 2300 students and 20 students per section, we will need about 120 sections staffed. Are there



sufficient resources?

D. DiDonato: Yes, this has been carefully considered. In fact, there is only a need to go from the current number (about 60) to about 100 sections, after factoring in the special programs.

The designator of the course would be by college designator. Each section would have a common component and a theme-based customization by college. Stephanie Foote is working now with college representatives the design of the sections.

F. Walter expressed the opinion that there should be a single designator.

It was pointed out that there are already multiple designators for versions of the 1-credit seminar.

In response to the question of whether each section would need separate approval from the curriculum committee, it was answered that no, the course is considered a single package.

A. Feldman expressed the concern that a student may start the course and not complete it, or may fail it -- what happens then? How will a junior/senior be treated who still needs the course because it is a requirement, yet the course has lost most of its usefulness by the time a student is a senior.

One possibility is that freshmen who fail in the first semester can be required to re-take in the spring; another possibility is that it is left to the faculty advisor how to handle the situation on a case by case basis. It was generally agreed that more thought needs to be given to this issue. What are the options for students who do not pass? How is the requirement enforced? Should it be required not that the student simply TAKE the course, but that the student PASS the course? It is possible to make it a requirement to pass it prior to declaring a major.

B. Collins emphasized the need to address the transfer student issue. It was pointed out that there actually already exists one section of SBU 301 on the books for transfer students (though many enroll in a section of SBU 101 designed for transfer students).

There was a question of whether or not a student will be allowed to drop SBU 101.

It was noted that getting a "U" in SBU 101 (which is S/U graded) has no impact on a student's GPA. There was concern that this will mean that some students may not take the course seriously and may repeatedly fail the course.

J. Mitchell raised the question: Is the proposal to make it mandatory to TAKE the course or to PASS the course?

F. Walter suggested that there needs to be a comprehensive plan, which handles all cases, including transfer students and how they will be handled.

J. Mitchell suggested that the proposal could be rephrased to apply exactly to Undergraduate College students; this leaves open the possibility that the cohort of students to which the rule applies may evolve, as the structure of the colleges evolves (e.g., to include transfer students or juniors and seniors). He reiterated his concern that it must be made clear what the requirement is and what the consequences will be for students who fail to meet the requirement (e.g., by not taking the course seriously, and failing it over and over). Will students be prevented from graduating if they never passed SBU 101?

It was noted that starting in Fall 2004 all entering freshmen will be assigned to a college.

J. Mitchell raised the possibility that the requirement could be that every student take either SBU 101 OR one of the 102 1-credit seminars. This would provide the intimate introductory experience, as desired, but allows a student who is already familiar enough with the "mechanics" of the university to avoid being bored in 101.

F. Walter suggested that the possibility of requiring 101 AND 102 be raised again.

In general, it was agreed that many issues remain to be addressed in the proposal. It was agreed to table the discussion until some of the questions and concerns were answered.

UGC members were encouraged to email to R. Thomas their questions and concerns in order that these be passed along to Mark Aronoff for the meeting about the colleges on April 1.

---

### Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting on March 30, 2004

Present: William Collins, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Cheryl Hamilton, Joseph Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter

· The meeting commenced with a review of the minutes from the March 16 meeting. Minor corrections were requested and made.

· Consideration of a resolution submitted to the Council by Professor Fred Walter.

The proposal recommends that no student with U3 or higher standing be allowed to enroll in any 100-level class until after all first year students have been given an opportunity to register for classes.

The rationale for the proposed resolution was that new students deserve first crack at introductory level courses and the University has an obligation to help ensure a nurturing and positive first year which may not happen if freshmen predictably do not have access to courses they want to/should take.

A discussion ensued by Council members on the merits of this proposal.

J. Mitchell inquired as to the extent of the problem that new students have of being closed out of 100-level courses.

A. Feldman asked if we know how many juniors and seniors are currently enrolled in 100-level courses?

R. Thomas indicated that the 100-level THR course that he teaches typically has juniors and seniors enrolled who he believe are attempting to fulfill a DEC requirement.

F. Walter pointed out that freshmen cannot take upper division courses. We should not be rewarding students who did not think ahead and failed to complete DEC requirements or didn't take 100-level courses when it was more appropriate.

There was general agreement that in order to continue the discussion in a reasonable fashion, we needed institutional data to determine the extent of the problem.

A Feldman believes that we have adequate availability of 100-level courses.

J. Mitchell stated that one (partial) solution would be to cap the number of 100-level course seats available to upper classmen.

S. Fuller pointed out that the underlying problem was that the University needs to provide more 100-level coursework.

W. Collins added that as the summer moves along it typically becomes more and more difficult to help new students put a reasonable schedule together at orientation sessions.

J. Mitchell suggested a default level of reserved seats in these courses for new students.

A. Feldman asked that we find out what the "numbers are". Which particular DEC categories are problematic? Which courses within the categories are problems?

F. Walter stated that the presence of upperclassmen in 100-level courses affects the climate of and response to the class.

After some discussion Professor Walter offered to withdraw the proposal until we collect and review data on the issue.

It was agreed that we would request some information from Institutional Research and return to this agenda item at a later meeting.

The remainder of the meeting was dedicated to the consideration of possible future agenda items. Examples include:

New membership  
SBU 101 proposal  
Advising blocks  
International students and full/part-time status

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 pm

Submitted by,  
Donna Di Donato

---

### Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting on March 16, 2004

**Present:** Bill Collins, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter.

The meeting began at 2:30 p.m.

1. The minutes of the March 2 meeting of the Undergraduate Council were amended as follows:
  - a. Under point #3, last paragraph, beginning of first sentence: Add "According to the proposal ..."
  - b. Point #3 is listed twice in the minutes; remove the second point #3.
2. Randy Thomas announced that Bill Dawes has resigned from the Council due to his responsibilities in the Economics Department.
3. Norman Goodman submitted a written proposal to be considered by the Council. This proposal relates to the Undergraduate Council resolution brought forth to the University Senate. His suggestion is to add a point #5: "The major requirements in effect when the student's declaration of a major is filed with the Registrar shall apply throughout the student's enrollment at Stony Brook unless the student chooses to accept a more recent version of these requirements."
  - a. Bill Collins indicated that most departments use the date of matriculation to determine major requirements.
  - b. Fred Walter commented that the proposed addition is not in the spirit of the UC's resolution and we should not accept it.
  - c. Arlene Feldman stated we can take it up as a separate issue, but it doesn't relate to the original proposal.
  - d. Beverly Rivera stated that People Soft currently operates by matriculation date (or rematriculation date for CEAS students out 1 semester and CAS students out more than 4 semesters). She said Norm's proposal would require changes in the rematriculation policy.
  - e. Bill Collins noted that 3 different categories of rules exist: general education, major, and academic affairs/academic standing issues. He said Norm's issue should be addressed, but as a separate proposal.
  - f. The group unanimously decided to exclude point #5 from the original proposal.
4. Randy Thomas announced that there are 2 immediate faculty openings on the Undergraduate Council, one from the Humanities & Fine Arts and one from the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Bill Collins and Randy Thomas asked for nominations of possible faculty members, and asked that the Council e-mail them with suggestions.
5. Beverly Rivera asked for a Calendar Committee representative from the Undergraduate Council to review the proposed 2006-09 academic calendars. She particularly wants a faculty member familiar with the scheduling of labs to look through the dates to identify any areas of concern. Bill Collins volunteered to serve as this representative.
6. Randy Thomas relayed Maria Doelger's request that faculty complete the on-line Academic Integrity Survey.
7. Three future agenda items were noted:
  - a. Post-Baccalaureate students: Bill Collins discussed an e-mail from James Montren related to the difficulty of post-bacs getting classes since they have low priority in registration. Beverly Rivera noted that these students register after continued students, but before incoming freshmen and transfers.
  - b. Summer sessions: Bill Collins noted a concern about the registration dates for summer sessions. Since the enrollment

dates for summer session are earlier than usual, this allows visiting students (non-Stony Brook students) to register for summer courses by mid-April. A problem occurs when Stony Brook students advance register for fall in early May, get closed out of a course, and then attempt to take it in the summer – only to have the class closed due to visiting student enrollment. Bill suggested looking at the schedule and also sending a SOLAR message to students about summer options. Donna Di Donato noted that summer course offerings/scheduling will now be housed in each College.

c. General registration: Fred Walter proposed that 100-level classes be closed to upperclass students until freshmen register. Donna Di Donato noted that many students need to complete 100-level courses in their last year, such as the writing requirement. The group discussed requiring completion of the writing requirement by the fall of the sophomore year.

The meeting adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Gatteau

---

#### Minutes of the Undergraduate Council Meeting of March 2, 2004

Present: Mark Aronoff (guest), Bill Collins, William Dawes, Stephanie Foote (guest), Sarah Fuller, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Pam Matzner, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Esam Al-Shareffi, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter.

The meeting began at 2:30 PM.

1. Sarah Fuller volunteered to take the Minutes of the meeting.
2. The Minutes of the Meeting of 02/17/04 were approved as corrected.
3. The chief topic of discussion was the proposal to make SBU 101 (renamed with specific College designators) mandatory for all first-year students in their first semester at Stony Brook. Stephanie Foote provided handouts about the present SBU 101 that included information on course content and student evaluations.

Under the proposal, all incoming first-year students would be required to take 'SBU 101,' chiefly through the college to which they belong. Affinity groups that already have their own version of 'SBU 101' (e.g. WISE, EOP/AIM, HC) will continue their past practice. Each College would personalize its version of 'SBU 101' in keeping with emphases within that college.

'SBU 101' will be taught by College advisors, Residence Hall Directors, and some volunteers. The University is in a position to staff an adequate number of sections (approximately 18 for each College). Besides spaces in the Colleges, a seminar room in the Commuter Lounge of Melville Library will be available for 'SBU 101' classes.

Advantages of a required 'USB 101' include: creating a sense of community within the small classes, individual contact with and guidance from instructors, personal advising from instructors who know the student, communication of important information about the University that will aid retention, training in Library skills (including how to carry out searches that are 'unGoogleable' [MA]).

According to the proposal, 'SBU 101' will continue to be graded S/U. Students will be unable to drop it. It was noted that as presently constituted students could receive a 'U' in the course and still have fulfilled the requirement of taking the course. It was suggested that students should be *required* to earn a 'S' grade in 'SBU 101' if that course becomes a mandated part of the curriculum.

The proposal as initially launched included a second requirement for a 1-credit freshman seminar to be taken in the second semester of the first year of study. Such seminars are now being offered in the Colleges, and the College Directors favor making them mandatory. Mark Aronoff explained that this proposal has been withdrawn. Even one extra credit could be difficult for some students, especially in the College of Engineering, who already have heavy credit loads in the major and many basic course requirements in the early semesters of study. Also, the University cannot presently ensure sufficient instructors to staff a required freshman seminar. Such seminars will continue to be provided under the auspices of the Colleges, and instructors of 'SBU 101' will actively encourage students to take advantage of them.

It was proposed that the requirement be made more general, changed to 'a first-year seminar,' either 'SBU 101' or one of the

topical 'freshman seminars' offered in the second semester. The main objections to this are a) that 'SBU 101' in fact imparts information important to gain in the very first semester; b) that the first 6 weeks of a semester are crucial in terms of retention and of forging a sense of community among entering students and with an instructor who can be a trusted advisor. A second-semester course would not fulfill the role of the College-based 'SBU 101' seminars.

4. Randy Thomas announced that an on-line Undergraduate poll has been approved by the University Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sarah Fuller

Note: I use quotes around 'SBU 101' in recognition that it will in the future have other designators keyed to the individual colleges.

---

Minutes of the Undergraduate Council  
February 3, 2004

The Undergraduate Council met in the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Conference room at 2:30 PM. The following members were present: Randy Thomas, Arlene Feldman, Joe Mitchell, Sarah Fuller, Rick Gatteau, Jyoti Pandit, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Mark Aronoff, Donna DiDonato, Beverly Rivera, Cheryl Hamilton, Jeff Levinton (guest), Imin Kao (guest)

1. A note-taker was selected.

2. The minutes of the 12/2/03 and 12/16/03 meetings were approved with necessary corrections.

3. Undergraduate Colleges

· Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff informed the committee of the status of the six Undergraduate Colleges. He indicated that three of the Undergraduate Colleges were already in place, while the remaining three were expected to be on line in September.

· M. Aronoff added that each Undergraduate College is to have a faculty director and one full-time advisor. Directors of the other three Undergraduate Colleges would need to be selected by May.

· M. Aronoff proposed that every admitted student would be assigned to an Undergraduate College, and would take both an SBU 101 class (fall) and one-credit seminar (spring) within their assigned college. The seminar would be taught by full-time faculty. Concerns were expressed regarding the availability of full-time faculty volunteers to meet the needs of the entire freshman class if the seminars were required for all freshmen (approximately 72 faculty members needed to teach seminar in spring 2005).

· Other concerns were expressed regarding the need for standardization of the curriculum. It was explained that current seminars require class participation and a term paper (1-2 pages).

· Questions were raised regarding the sustainability of the seminar and its impact on teaching load for full-time faculty. When asked about compensation, M. Aronoff indicated that faculty members would receive \$1,000 in research funds.

· Imin Kao discussed his experience as director of ITS Undergraduate College and teaching ITS 102. He stated that the college created a smaller community within the larger University, encouraged interaction of students with faculty, and made students feel more connected with the University.

· Jeff Levinton agreed that the freshman seminar has helped to foster a sense of community among students. He mentioned that lab visits, and special events that are held through the College of Science and Society have helped the students to gain an appreciation for the types of activities that take place at the University.

· A discussion took place regarding making the SBU 101 and freshman seminars mandatory for all incoming freshmen (excluding Honors College, WISE, EOP/AIM and other special programs) for 2004-05. It was determined that various aspects of this proposal would need to be resolved before a recommendation could be made by the Undergraduate Council.

4. A draft of the On-line Bulletin resolution, prepared by Fed Walter based on 12/2/03 discussion in the Undergraduate Council, was given to all in attendance for review.

Undergraduate Council Meeting adjourned at 3:40 PM.

Submitted by Cheryl Hamilton

---

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting of December 16, 2003 (minutes taken by R. El-Maghrabi)

Present: Bill Collins (chair), Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Joe Mitchell, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas (co-chair) and Fred Walter.

1. B. Collins brought up a previously discussed topic on DSS examination policy.

Nancy Franklin from the DSS requested that UGC discuss ways of increasing the availability of TA/instructor's for disabled students taking examinations. Their absence is considered unfair to students with questions, and also increases the possibility of cheating. Possible remedies:

- a. acquisition of two-way communication devices e.g. "walkie-talkies"
- b. encouraging or mandating TA/instructor visits or presence.

J. Mitchell suggested that TA/ Instructor availability (location, extension or cell phone #) should be provided to DSS at the time the exam is forwarded to DSS.  
Suggestions will be forwarded to Nancy Franklin.

2. Discussion of the 2002-2004 Middle States Review (deadline for presentation December 19, 2003).

F. Walter was concerned that although the outlook presented was "rosy" and optimistic, he thought that the recommendations lacked specificity and forcefulness.

R. Gatteau on the other hand thought that major problems like class size were emphasized, and that the student input into the review was a noticeable improvement.

D. DiDonato mentioned that the use of the retreat to define the groundwork for the review was a good idea, and that student input was very constructive, especially to affect change such as campus lifetime.

Several UGC members agreed that report may want to identify various individuals who will be responsible for information dissemination.

B. Collins thought that the report could be more specific without locking individual departments into a fixed mold, e.g. under academic advising, the need for more resources could be mentioned without citing source.

R. Gatteau added that campus communication could benefit from identifying responsible individual(s).

F. Walter also mentioned that certain statements appeared contradictory, e.g. sections on mentoring.

D. DiDonato was of the opinion that recommendations *should* be general enough to accommodate diversity of the university.

R. Gatteau brought up the issue of disparate student vs faculty expectations regarding courses, and the attempts to reconcile the two.

B. Collins suggested that departments should be more explicit in stating their expectations.

R. Thomas thought that the statement regarding the overall mission of the university was not clear; education?, research?

F. Walter/B. Collins agreed that recommendations should follow a clear format of listing strengths of programs and specific areas of improvement. For example report does not appear to mention what has been learned from previous experience, e.g. student research. Was it beneficial? Should it be encouraged? What insights were gained?

D. DiDonato mentioned that in some cases it would be hard to be specific when certain programs are being severely curtailed. She also added that the UGC should recognize the hard work and effort contributed by various committees and individuals to the report.

3. Next UGC meeting will be on February 3 at 2:30 PM.

UGC meeting of December 16, 2003 adjourned at 3:15 PM.

2 December 2003

The Undergraduate Council met in the Dean's conference room at 2:00 PM.

Members present were: Bill Collins, Donna DiDonato, Rick Gatteau, Joyti Pandit, Randy Thomas, and Fred Walter, Joe Mitchell

A note-taker was selected.

- While waiting for members to appear, it was reported that the Skill 4 requirement was approved by the University Senate on 1 December 2003.

- A quorum was declared.

- The 18 November 2003 minutes were approved.

- The issue of the on-line bulletin, and in particular the question of which of the on-line and printed version of the undergraduate bulletin takes precedence, then ensued. The University Senate had requested a word change in the resolution submitted to them in the spring of 2003.

The sense of the committee was that the university should distance itself from reliance on the printed bulletin, which is expensive, costly to maintain, and often out of date upon delivery. It was thought that the on-line version, properly identified by date, and archived at the start of each semester, should be the official version.

It was noted that university counsel prefers a printed version. The on-line bulletin, archived as a pdf file, can be printed as necessary. If properly identified by date, the on-line bulletin should carry as much legal weight as a printed version.

There have not been enough new students enrolling for the spring semester to make reprinting of the bulletin cost-effective. An on-line bulletin permits semi-annual updates of the bulletin. The rules and regulations of the bulletin of record at the time of the student's matriculation will continue to be those that affect the student. Multiple versions of the on-line bulletin will need to be archived.

A draft resolution concerning the on-line bulletin is appended.

- The UC will meet on 16 December to discuss the Middle States self-study draft document.

- The UC thanks Donna DiDonato and the Dean's office for providing refreshments for the meeting.

Submitted by:

Frederick M Walter  
16 December 2003

---

**Undergraduate Council  
Minutes from 11/18/03**

**Present:** Bev Rivera, Donna DiDonato, Joe Mitchell, Cheryl Hamilton, Bill Collins, Randy Thomas, Joyti Pandit

**Guests:** Elaine Kaplan and Bob Cerrato

1. A Notetaker was not selected

2. 11.04.03 minutes were approved with revisions.

3. Elaine Kaplan and Robert Cerrato from the CAS Curriculum Committee presented a new plan to address the SUNY

General Education Requirement (GER), specifically the American History requirement. They stated that the plan was developed because attempts to adjust the DEC K to meet the SUNY American History requirement have not been successful and the SUNY Advisory Committee on General Education (ACGE) declined to approve most of the DEC K courses. Further, SUNY Provost Salins has made it very clear that courses that have not been approved should not be offered. Thus, at present Stony Brook students have no way to meet the SUNY GER in American History and are in jeopardy of not graduating.

The new plan will solve this problem by explicitly decoupling the Stony Brook DEC K and the SUNY GER American History requirements by introducing a new Skill 4, "Competence in American History." The new Skill 4 specifically addresses the SUNY American History requirement and can be satisfied in a number of ways including taking one of 27 courses that have already been approved by SUNY.

Two aspects of the plan that were discussed in detail were (1) whether a minimum grade of "C" should be required to satisfy the skill and (2) how this would affect current Stony Brook students. The problem with requiring a minimum grade of "C" is that each course used to satisfy Skill 4 also satisfies a DEC category (either F or K), and the DEC requires passing with only a grade of "D." It is not known if PeopleSoft will be able to handle this, and Elaine Kaplan agreed to contact Joel Abend in the Registrar's Office. With respect to currently enrolled students, the proposal states that the new plan will apply to students entering Stony Brook as of January, 2004 and the current students will be grandfathered under the existing program. However, the possibility exists that SUNY will not accept this part of the plan and expect it to apply to all students.

It is not clear to what extent this will affect CEAS students and if they will also be required to satisfy the new Skill 4. The CAS Curriculum Committee is in the process of contacting Joan Kenny in CEAS to discuss this issue.

Finally, the impact of the plan on enrollments was also discussed. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in enrollments in the 100-level courses that can be taken to satisfy Skill 4 coupled with a decrease in enrollments in the 300-level DEC K courses that do not satisfy Skill 4.

#### 4. Online Bulletin: Reconsideration of the proposal to make the Online Bulletin the "Official" Bulletin.

Brent Lindquist inquired as to the status of the UG Council's discussions about the proposal presented in Spring 2003 that the Online Bulletin be the "Official" version of the Bulletin. Initially, committee members felt that this issue had been resolved and that the Online Bulletin should be the "Preferred" version, not the "Official" version, of the Bulletin. Joe Mitchell produced a copy of a resolution dated (by him) 5/7/03, two days after the Senate meeting when the Online Bulletin was discussed. It was unclear if this was the original resolution or a version revised after the Senate meeting. Further, it is very possible that this version of the resolution should have been sent back to the Senate in September. Bill Collins will consult the Senate minutes from 5/5/05 to see if this may be the case. He will also try to contact Kathleen Breidenback.

Prepared by W. Collins and R. Thomas

### **Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes: 11-4-2003**

Present: Ora J Bouey, Bill Collins, Joanne Daly, Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Rick Gatteau, Perry Goldstein, Cheryl Hamilton, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter

[The 10.21.03 minutes were accepted as corrected and seconded by Fred Walter.](#)

Jyoti Pandit agreed to take minutes.

Bill Collins inserted another item on this agenda about the topic of Pre-registration and credit load:

The UG Council discussed previously about the same issue at length. This resolution is complicated. The Administration should develop proper planning. Donna said that the Administration is aware of this issue. Who will be responsible? Will



specific recommendations be provided? Bill Collins will invite Mark Aronoff to discuss this with our Committee.

### 3. Undergraduate Electronic Communication (Bill)

It is hard to communicate with students as they have different e-mail communication systems. There should be one system. The current e-mail addresses of students should be kept up-to-date by Solar or Oracle system. Who is in charge of programming students' current addresses? Can blackboards be connected to IC Accounts?

### 4. Tutoring Policy Statement (Randy):

The University neither sanctions nor maintains a list of tutoring services, however, some departments keep a list. There is no way to monitor commercial tutors subject and names of these tutors. Donna suggested that we should provide the list of these tutors to students who need assistance. The Council discussed revised tutoring policy statement. We encourage departments to maintain a list of department tutors.

### 5. Non-Matriculated Student Issue: (Rick)

There is nobody monitoring these students progress. There are 50-60 non-matriculated students admitted. There should be cumulative GPA of 2.5 requirements for them. There may be 20 out of 60 students want to be matriculated. It is not clear as to who will monitor the progress of their progress.

### 6. Future Agenda:

Bill will invite Mark Aronoff to discuss the mandatory policies:

- A. Credit limit for first semester students (freshman and transfers)
- B. SBU 101 for first semester freshman

The meeting adjourned at 3:20pm

Respectfully Submitted by

Jyoti Pandit

---

## Undergraduate Council Minutes of October 21, 2003

**Present:** Randy Thomas, Joe Mitchell, Rick Gatteau, Beverly Rivera, Arlene Feldman, Bill Collins, Raafat El-Maghrabi

1. Selection of minute taker – Beverly Rivera
2. Approval of October 7, 2003 minutes were approved with minor corrections:
  - a. Graduate Council capitalized
  - b. Tutoring Policy edits to be circulated by Randy Thomas to committee. Once reviewed by committee, will be presented to group at scheduled Undergraduate Council meeting.
  - 3a. Bill reported to the council on the visit of Anne Hout. Associate Provost Graduate Affairs (????). Every three years SUNY does a student survey which compares other SUNY campuses and it was determined that the survey was not useful.
  - 3b. Randy Thomas reported on Middle States review meeting with the Provost from the University of Pittsburg. They are considering streamlining the process for accreditation. The focus of accreditation for Stony Brook will be looking at the Student Experience, both undergraduate and graduate. They will look at students from the time they come in through the time they graduate.

The committee talked about communication  
 How do we communicate with our students?  
 How are they advised?  
 Is it consistent, centralized, etc?

He shared with the audience what they did in Pittsburgh.

They will convene the committee in March 2004. They will be soliciting representatives for the committee prior to March 2004. Someone from the Undergraduate Council will be required to attend. There will be a finalized agenda in February 2004. They will have selected committee members by that time.

Bill added that last year they started the discussion. They still had to satisfy intent of fill process. They went through documents and created a document library. Bill was on the Assessment Committee and prepared a draft document for last Thursday's deadline. The Provost from the University of Pittsburg felt the document was mainly focused on the need for resources. Bill revised the document to be an outcome-orientated document. Currently it is 70 pages long. They expect to have public forums and town meetings. Once this is done, they will be set up a meeting for their return visit.

4. Arlene Feldman presented on the topic of Pre-registration and credit load. The policy changed from a 17-credit load during Advanced Registration up to the Open Enrollment Period (two weeks before classes began) to 19 credits. This change had been presented to the Undergraduate Council and the council approved it because of how the wait list process in PeopleSoft worked. This was put in effect for the fall 2003 semester. This summer, at orientation, we ran out of courses to offer earlier than in previous summers. The thought was that undergraduates must be holding courses.

The Registrar's Office queried fall 2003 on August 27th. They queried for continuing students who had registered for over 17 credits during the Advanced Registration period. They identified 1,974 students.

On September 17th, after add/drop ended, we queried the same students (1,974) and 1,130 of the 1,974 students were registered for more than 17 credits. *Of the 844 students who dropped classes, 155 of them dropped at least two classes.* Therefore, 1,000 seats were held that could have been available for other students.

It was suggested that we return to the policy of restricting students to 17 credits until after orientation.

It was suggested that departments use reserve capacities to manage the enrollment and seats for specific groups of students (i.e. students in major, freshman, etc). With course offerings being restricted in future semesters as a result of budget cuts, this appears to be a viable option.

There was discussion about pre requisite screening and how that helps in the registration process and keeping students out of courses that they are not prepared to take. Arlene discussed how the transfer equivalencies used by several departments is working (BIO, CHE, MAT, PHY, ECO, WRT, BUS 110). This is an entirely manual process that was designed to help with transfer students. It is now up to a list of 40 courses. This process was used at orientation and slowed up orientation considerably with long lines. The number of transfer students and transfer courses the Transfer Office has had to manage manually is staggering.

The Committee Recommends:

1. Returning to the 17 credits maximum. Students should remain at 17 credits until orientations are over.
2. The reserve capacities be used to save seats for freshman orientations. This will require the undergraduate colleges to coordinate the setup with the academic departments. Beverly pointed out that once the initial setup of reserves is done, the setup will rollover from one term to the next. Therefore the majority of the work load will be in the initial setup. From term to term departments will have to review their reserve categories and seats reserved.
3. The PeopleSoft student database system should allow student to sign into the waitlist even if it puts them over the 17 allowable advance registration credits.

There was also discussion about students who petition for overloads. The committee would like to see data on students who petition for overloads. For students seeking overloads in excess of 19 credits, how many students actually stay registered in and complete the credits approved? The Registrar's Office will look into providing this data and it will be reviewed at a later meeting.

5. Proposed revision for the Stony Brook Constitution/Undergraduate Council, Standing Committees:

The language was changed to read: **The Council shall review and recommend policy to the Provost**

**concerning all aspects of the universities' undergraduate programs.**

**#4: monitoring new undergraduate admissions and scholarships.**

The recommendation for the changing of the role of the Undergraduate Council is partly the result of the non-functioning Senate Admissions Committee. There is concern that this revision in language could place a huge burden on the council.

Arlene recommended that there be some discussion with Manny London before the council agrees to the changes recommended. It was pointed out that there is an office that already handles scholarships.

Joe M. added if this in fact becomes a role of the council, should there then not be an ex-officio from admissions to serve on the council.

As per Bill Collins, the changes to #4 was presented at the Senate but not discussed.

Bill added that the committee should resist taking over admissions issues. These recommended changes give the council more authority and more levels of responsibilities.

Two agenda items postponed to next meeting:

Undergraduate Electronic Communication (Bill)

Future agenda items (SBU 101, Tutoring Policy, Non-Matric Issue)

Meeting adjourned: 3:20PM

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

**Minutes of October 7, 2003**

*Present:* Ora James Bouey, Bill Collins, Bill Dawes, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Rick Gatteau, Perry Goldstein, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter.

1. Selection of minute taker – Rick Gatteau.
2. September 23 minutes approved with correction to spelling of Mark Aronoff's name.
3. The group discussed the proposal regarding procedures for submitting an undergraduate course proposal to fulfill general education/DEC requirements. Bill Collins stated that this opens the door for the Advisory Council on General Education (ACGE) to ask for additional information about syllabi. The current proposal reflects a compromise, such that professors need to give their OK to send syllabi for review. Bill commented that this new procedure could result in significant delay in DEC approval. Donna Di Donato commented that this new system could set up a confrontation if a faculty member doesn't submit a requested syllabus to ACGE. The proposal was endorsed unanimously.
4. The group discussed tutoring policies as presented in Bob Kerber's original proposal from last year. Donna Di Donato commented that the proposed policy would serve as a "buyer beware", informing students that tutors are not sanctioned by the University. Raafat El-Maghrabi stated that it is fine for academic departments to have lists of recommended and non-recommended tutors. Fred Walter stated that we should warn students about non-recommended tutors at orientation. Bill Collins suggested this information be added to the Academic Advising website; for example, "Many people offer tutoring for a fee. These are not sanctioned by the University; use at your own risk." Bill Collins says it makes sense to have a registration process for tutors. Joe Mitchell made the following comments on the draft of the proposal: Item #1 – should say "Students are encouraged ..."; Item #3 – should say "Academic departments are encouraged to create and maintain lists of approved tutors ..."; We should note that the tutoring issue relates to "for pay" tutoring services; Item #5 – What is the role of the Director of Undergraduate Studies in the approval process? Joe Mitchell suggested sending the proposal to the Graduate Council for input. Randy Thomas indicated that he and Bill Collins will make edits to the document and bring it back to the committee.
5. The group discussed future agenda items, including:
  - a. Requiring students to have an active e-mail account and recognize e-mail as an official means of communication.
  - b. Advanced registration issues.

## UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Meeting of September 9, 2003

Present: Ora Bouey, Bill Collins, Bill Dawes, Donna DiDonato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Arlene Feldman, Rick Gatteau, Perry Goldstein, Cheryl Hamilton, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Herman Kurthen, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Randy Thomas and Fred Walter.

1. Introduction of members
2. Selection of minute taker (R. El-Maghrabi).
3. Bob Kerber and Elaine Kaplan informed the council that they have completed their term on the council.
4. Arlene Feldman (in attendance) will replace Elaine Kaplan.
5. Undergraduate student representative Amanda Sammut has also completed her term on the council. Council agreed that Polity and GSO should nominate 2 new undergraduate and 1 graduate student representatives, respectively, to council.
6. Bill Collins and Randy Thomas "agreed" to serve as co-chairpersons of the 2003-2004 UG council.
7. Approval of minutes of May 7, 2003 after modification of last section of item 4 to read "Three volunteers were requested to read submissions; they were Randy Thomas, Michael Barnhart, and Bill Collins."

(For future reference, minutes should be sent to council chair who forwards them after council approval to Laurie Theobalt, University Senate Secretary,)

8. Tentative item 6 (discussion of annual report) postponed
9. Discussion of electronic scheduling. Beverly Rivera explained that they were trying to minimize the number of printed schedule publications, relying instead on internet access. She added that 82 % of students already use the web to obtain their schedules.

B. Kerber was concerned that students would not get the same extent of advising.

B. Rivera explained that advising should not be affected with the new system.

B. Dawes also suggested that schedules should have designated subsections in order to decrease sizes of down-loaded files.

A. Feldman asked about schedule supplements and was told by B. Rivera that they would also be included on the web.

Several members of the council, including P. Goldstein, and F. Walter, expressed their continued interest in receiving printed copies of the schedule.

B. Rivera said that printed copies would still be available "upon request".

A contact person for obtaining printed copies "to be named".

A suggestion was also made that a few printed copies be sent to each department.

B. Dawes mentioned that this should be brought up in the next Undergraduate Directors meeting.

B. Rivera suggested that with the implementation of designated scheduling, i.e. subdirectories, in-house (departmental) printing would be more feasible and cost effective.

In response to a question on location of web site, B. Rivera said that the schedule is under the registrar's web site. B.

Kerber noted that its location should be mentioned on the Stony Brook front page, or on SOLAR.

B. Collins also suggested that course descriptions be included with schedule.

With the mention of the SOLAR system, B. Collins suggested that pages to be printed should be limited by subdirectories here as well, and that SOLAR also include a table for scheduling.

B. Rivera mentioned that the new scheduling format will be sent to the University Senate after discussion with Undergraduate Directors. She added that they will also be archiving class schedules as well as providing links, e.g. Health Science Center schedules, and that suggestions for improvement are welcome. One suggestion from the council was a table of contents with links.

B. Kerber mentioned that many students were unable to get on course wait-lists, and wanted to know what message(s) the student was given when denied access.

B. Rivera said that if wait list for course is "full", the message is just that.

F. Walter asked whether it would be possible to "over state" the number of slots available for certain courses, by e.g. 10%, in anticipation of the usual expected 10-15% drop out.

The consensus was that such a proposal would have to fall within the accepted lecture hall capacity permit, etc.

B. Kerber brought up several potential topics for future UGC agenda

a. The memorandum from Nancy Franklin on the format of exams for students with disabilities. Specifically the lack of TA's present which is unfair to students with questions as well as the possibility of cheating. Solution mandate TA presence.

- b. Proposal by Elaine Kaplan that instead of relying on outdated departmental web sites for course descriptions and updates, students should be referred to central command, which is more frequently updated.
  - c. Why post baccalaureate students, taking undergraduate courses are handled by graduate school?
10. Old business: Tutoring policy and the inability of the senate to create a functional admissions committee.

UGC meeting of September 9, 2003 adjourned at 4 pm.

---

**Undergraduate Council**  
**Meeting of May 7, 2003**

**Present:**

Members: Bob Kerber, Michael Barnhart, Bill Collins, Elaine Kaplan, Joe Mitchell, Randy Thomas, Amanda Sammut, Perry Goldstein, Jyoti Pandit, Donna Di Donato, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Joanne Daly. Guests: Diane Bello, Kathleen Breidenbach

**Agenda Items:**

1. SARS. Stony Brook has the largest Asian contingent of all the SUNY schools. It was determined that this is not an agenda item for the Undergraduate Council.
2. Minutes of the April 23 meeting were approved.
3. Report on the Online Bulletin Policy. Kathleen Breidenbach responded to questions from the council about the online bulletin being the "official" bulletin. Since the council's objection seemed to relate to the word "official," Kathleen suggested softening the word "official" and designating the "Undergraduate Bulletin Online" as "the preferred resource for up-to-date information on academic policies, regulations, and requirements." A proposal has been made to do away with the printed class schedule entirely in favor of the online schedule. Kathleen suggested that topics courses be listed online rather than in the supplement if there are no printings of the class schedule. Several council members felt that a limited run of printed schedules for departmental advisors would be useful.
4. Update on the 2003-04 Academy of Teachers/Scholars Competition. Donna DiDonato reported that this year saw the greatest number of submissions for the competition, nine. The President's Office has requested that only three submissions be funded. Three volunteers were requested to read submissions; they were Randy Thomas, Michael Barnhart, and Bill Collins.
5. Tutoring Policy. The indefatigable Bob Kerber has drafted a third proposal dealing with Stony Brook's tutoring policies. As there is no urgency to deal with this matter, Bob suggested that the matter be tabled for discussion in the Fall, which suggestion was approved.
6. Elaine Kaplan's conscientious work on behalf of the Undergraduate Council, (which she is leaving), was applauded and noted with a card of appreciation.
7. Moving Credits. It was proposed that a maximum of twelve undergraduate credits completed while in a graduate, non-matriculated program be moved to a student's undergraduate record. Focus on policy was motivated by the case of a current non-matriculated student who wanted to move 65 credits from a graduate transcript to an undergraduate transcript, as the student is seeking a second undergraduate degree. Donna Di Donato wondered why a student should be limited in the number of credits he or she moves from a graduate non-matriculated program at Stony Brook to an undergraduate degree. In the ensuing conversation, several counsel members agreed that such proscriptions were unnecessary. Diane Bello responded: "that's fine."

Respectfully Submitted,

Perry Goldstein

---

**Undergraduate Council**  
**Meeting of April 22, 2003**

**Present:**

Members: Bob Kerber, Bill Collins, Elaine Kaplan, Joe Mitchell, Randy Thomas, Amanda Sammut, Perry Goldstein, Jyoti Pandit, Ora Bouey, Donna Di Donato, Rick Gatteau. Guest: Kathleen Breidenbach

**Agenda Items:**

1. Beverly Rivera volunteered to take minutes
2. Minutes of April 9, 2003 were approved.
3. Announcement: Women Studies will be undergoing review. Elaine Kaplan and Bill Collins will represent the UC.
4. Proposal to make the Online Bulletin (UBO) the official bulletin:

Suggestions and changes were made to the Senate proposal language as follows.

If cost effective, the University Senate recommends that an annual print run of the UBO be done, but at a reduced volume to accommodate **incoming students** and administrative offices. Continuing students will refer to the updated bulletin online and to the historical online bulletins (or the printed version they received on entry) available from the online bulletin homepage.

There were lengthy discussions regarding this resolution. What bulletin will be considered the official bulletin? How will students know which bulletin applies (the printed one they receive on entry or the continually updated online bulletin)? How will they be alerted to changes requirements. Kathleen Breidenbach was invited to join the discussion.

“Official” is what is in place as of the day of the student’s matriculation. The plan is to have references on the UBO page that points users to revisions to the UBO. A page would then be created which lists all of the revisions with a short blurb and a link to the UBO page where the new text has been added or changed. Kathleen will work with Melissa Bishop on this and report back.

Under UBO, we will continue to operate under the rules which are now in place. Changes to requirements and regulations apply to all students. The exceptions are:

Changes to general education and degree requirements: Students are bound by the general education and graduation requirements, as listed in the Degree Requirements chapter of the Bulletin, in effect at their time of matriculation.

Changes to major requirements: Students with 45 or more credits and a declared major may opt to complete either the new requirements or the old requirements if their declared major changes. Students with fewer than 45 credits must follow the new requirements when their major requirements change.

The finalized version of the proposal to the University Senate will be presented on May 5 and will read:

*Resolved: the Undergraduate Bulletin Online is the official undergraduate bulletin. The online bulletin will be maintained in real time, with changes noted and their effective date. The Senate recommends that the Bulletin Online be fully updated annually to correspond with a new annually produced printed bulletin, with a print run only large enough incoming students and administrative offices. Continuing students will refer to the updated bulletin online and to the historical online bulletins (or the printed version they received on entry) available from the online bulletin homepage.*

5. Timing of Major Declaration:

After discussion, the Council agreed that the 45 credit requirement was a reasonable goal. Rick Gatteau has written to over 950 students with more than 45 credits who have not yet declared a major, to encourage them to come to the Prime Time Event on April 30th. Question was raised as to whether or not this could be enforced by the new student database system. If it were possible to enforce this with the database system, do we want to prevent all students who had 45 credits or more but

no declared major from registering? Rick suggested we wait to see if students come to the Prime Time Event and declare their majors. The numbers will be checked again to see how many in fact did take some action. If it appears that the numbers without majors are now much lower, then we can discuss whether or not we would want to restrict registration with an advising block.

These items will be discussed at the next meeting.

- Tutoring Policy
- Moving Credits Issue

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes  
Meeting of 4/9/03

Present: Ora J. Bouey, Bill Collins, Joanne E. Daly, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Elaine Kaplan, Robert Kerber, Joe Mitchell, Amanda Sammut, Laura Valente (guest, Dean for Residential Education), Douglas Little (guest, Deputy Chief of University Police), Patricia Sarubbi (guest, University Police), Kay Losey (guest, Director of the Program in Writing and Rhetoric).

1. Joe Mitchell agreed to take the minutes.
2. Minutes of March 26, 2003 were approved with minor typographical corrections.
3. Smoke Free Policy: Discussions with visitors Laura Valente (Dean for Residential Education), Douglas Little (Deputy Chief of University Police), and Patricia Sarubbi (University Police), regarding the proposed strengthening of the university smoke free policy.

The recently passed New York legislation regarding smoke free workplaces was distributed. In Valente's opinion, this law applies only to smoking in "work places", not to residences. Thus, the UGC's primary concern regarding smoking in the Residence Halls is not directly impacted by the new laws.

Little explained that a 3-prong approach to enforcement is applied: education (advertise and disseminate the rules), peer pressure, and enforcement (which may involve the Department of Health, Suffolk County).

Current policy, explained by Valente, is that smoking is permitted in a residence room or a suite only if a signed form, signed by all occupants, is submitted. There is a proposed regulation to be implemented Fall 2003 to amend the campus policy to assign one building from each quad to be "smoke free"; this amendment is pending approval from University Counsel, but is expected to go into effect.

Valente also pointed out that SUNY-wide there is a proposal that SUNY become smoke-free campuses, including residence halls. The recent meeting of SUNY Presidents suggested that this be adopted starting Fall 2003, but the VP's of Student Affairs indicated that Fall 2003 was too soon for an implementation, since material had already been printed. It was noted, though, that Buffalo already has a smoke-free campus and Binghamton will be starting Fall 2003.

Current policy is that smoking is not permitted in non-residential buildings on campus and is not permitted within 15 feet of entry doors. (For some buildings, e.g. at the Hospital, the distance is 50 feet.) It was agreed that for enforcement purposes, clear signs need to be placed, and possibly a painted stripe on the pavement is needed to indicate clearly the non-smoking regions near entries. Further, employees need to be clearly informed of policy. A possible action item for the UGC is to write a memo to the appropriate authorities suggesting that signs be placed and lines be painted.

4. Discussion with Kay Losey of the proposed new on-line writing placement essays to be replacing the placement exams that have been given during the morning of the summer orientation day.

For the last 5-10 years, students have spent the morning of the orientation day taking two placement exams (mathematics and writing). This is perceived as being an intense and uninviting first experience at Stony Brook, on a day that is packed already with events. It is proposed (and recently approved by the Provost) that starting summer 2003 a new on-line proprietary system will allow

students to be placed by writing essays prior to arriving at Orientation. The essays will be read and scored by "readers" at SBU, just as the placement exams have been to date, using the same scoring levels.

The advantages are that the essays will not occupy precious time at Orientation and the essays will be typed. Potential problems include technical difficulties if the on-line system should fail (although it was pointed out that the system is already adopted by Caltech, LSU, and other campuses), the possibility of cheating, and the problem of students not completing the placement essays by the date instructed (so that their scores will be known at Orientation, allowing them to register for the appropriate writing courses). Students will log on and have 3 hours within a window of 72 hours to complete the writing. Students will have to sign a statement attesting to the fact that they completed the writing on their own. Students will be offered access to campus SINC sites if needed for internet access.

This system represents a compromise between the current system of placement exams and another proposal to use standardized scores (SAT, Regents) as predictors, without requiring separate writing assignments. There was discussion about the overall expense of the placement system, both of the current placement exams and of the new on-line system, each of which seem to cost about the same (an estimated \$50,000 per year). The system is funded by IFR funds collected as fees from the students (about \$20 per student). The main goal is to achieve the correct placement in the two introductory writing courses, not to predict success in the courses.

There was concern that the writing placement exams at Orientation sends the message that writing is important at SBU, and, by giving up on the "live" placement exams, this message is muted. It was also noted that the upper division writing requirement at SBU is considered by most students to be "a joke"; this also needs to be addressed. Kay Losey also related an experience involving some students whose writing samples in upper division courses showed poor writing skills; upon checking, it was found that these students in this small sample were in fact transfer students.

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes  
Meeting of 03/05/03

Present: Randy Thomas, Rick Gatteau, Bill Collins, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Joe Mitchell, Mike Barnhart, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Donna DiDonato, Amanda Sammut, Diane Bello, Jyoti Pandit, Randall M-J Edouard

Agenda Items 03/05/03 meeting:

1. Randy Thomas was selected to take minutes.
2. Minutes of 02/19/03 were approved.
3. Update on University Senate Meeting: This item was not discussed due to the fact that the resolutions seem to be in effect.

There was a brief discussion regarding Item 4 (from the 02.28.03 minutes), the International Student Fee. No objections were raised regarding the content of Item 4. The memorandum will be sent forward to Lawrence Martin for clarification.

Discussion was initiated regarding New Student Orientation that stemmed from the 2.24.03 Senate. The main topic was meeting balancing the new student population and university resources within the 2003-2004 budget.

Gatteau and DiDonato serve on the Committee for the Undergraduate Experience (CUE). They shared the CUE discussion as to what is currently being discussed regarding the Writing Placement Exam (WPE) at Orientation.

The main focus of CUE is to improve the Orientation process by: a. Removing the WPE from the Orientation day and, b. looking at disproportionate number of students and resources. The WPE is focused on two levels of the writing placement process. It will be suggested that students be placed in the appropriate writing class based on SAT and Regents score.

Kaplan mentioned that there are 5 levels of the WPE. ESL placement is determined at Orientation. For these students the WPE must be done at Orientation.



The CUE is considering reducing the number of course options to first year students - to focus on limiting choices to streamline the Orientation process.

An UC member mentioned that the Math department is considering an online MPE. This will not be in place for the upcoming 2003 Orientation. A question was raised if this change in Orientation was driven by resources or making Orientation a more positive experience.

The CUE committee is reviewing the format in order to make the Orientation process more coherent. What do we call it? What do we want to accomplish? It was mentioned that the placement exams are good only if it shows accurate results. If not, then other avenues can be explored to place students in the appropriate writing course.

Item 4: Kaplan gave a brief update regarding the UC's part in the Academy of Teachers-Scholars Proposals (A.T.S.) Kaplan stated that 4 or 5 proposals were submitted. The Globalization proposal submitted by Professors Kurthen and Barthel-Bouchier (Sociology Department) was excellent.

Prof. Barthel-Bouchier, at the time the proposal was submitted, agreed to add her name to the proposal. Prof. Barthel-Bouchier is a tenured faculty member; Prof. Kurthen is on a review appointment. It is evident that Prof. Kurthen did most- if not all – of the work for the proposal.

Prof. Barthel-Bouchier withdrew from the project. Prof. Kurthen enlisted the support of Prof. Eduardo Mendieta, Philosophy Department, December 2002. Funds were not distributed because project was on hold due to eligibility.

The question was raised, "What to do from here?" Globalization exists in several formats (the FLC and a LLC minor in International Studies). A major in Globalization will not happen soon.

It was mentioned that the ATS and Mini-grants guidelines be reviewed.

Ms. DiDonato read Prof. Barthel-Bouchier's letter that outlined her reasons from withdrawing from the project. The discussion continued concerning: a. Kurthen's eligibility, b. Current status of the proposal, and 3. Prof. Mendieta and the Philosophy department commitment to the project.

Bob Kerber suggested that the proposal be resubmitted and the Philosophy dept include a letter to support the project. Prof. Kurthen can resubmit in 2003 with support letter from the Philosophy Department.

The question was raised whether Prof. Kurthen should be awarded a stipend on a pro-rated basis for his work on the proposal. A general consensus was reached that Prof. Kurthen be awarded a pro-rated stipend.

Items 5, 6, 7, and 8 were not discussed. The meeting adjourned at 3.10 pm.

---

Undergraduate Council  
Minutes of Feb. 5, 2003

In attendance: Barnhart, Collins, Dawes, DiDonato, El-Maghrabi, Gatteau, Goldstein, Hamilton, Kaplan, Kerber, Mitchell, Sammut, Thomas.

1. R. Kerber assented to taking the minutes.
2. The minutes of the 12/4/02 meeting were approved with minor editing.
3. Revised memo to W. Arens. The latest version of the memo dealing with International Exchange Program students was discussed and approved for transmission in the name of the UC.
4. Mid-semester course evaluation surveys. We have been urged by the Council of Distinguished Teaching Professors to propagate this practice as a means of improving teaching. An instrument used in AMS 311 appeared to be particularly efficient in eliciting useful information for mid-course improvement. The UC compared use of such instruments with more

informal methods of staying in touch with students in courses, and with use of web-based questionnaires. After looking at the sample materials provided, the UC generally agreed that mid-course evaluation would be a desirable practice, but was unsure how to encourage its broader use. It was resolved that members of the UC and/or the Council of DTP's should make a presentation to the Undergraduate Directors to further promulgate this practice.

5. Honor Societies. (a) General issues: The approved honor societies list distributed included some which have not reported any new members for more than a decade. It was agreed that we should ask Diane Baldwin-Bello of the Registrar's Office to write to the last known address of any societies which have not reported new members since 1999 and, in the absence of response, to delist them. Functioning honor societies should report new members to the Registrar on an annual basis.

(b) Chi Alpha Epsilon, a national honor society for AIM/EOP students, has petitioned for inclusion in the list of honor societies whose members enjoy transcript designation. Discussion centered on the unavailability of membership to students as a whole, and the UC accordingly did not support the petition of Chi Alpha Epsilon.

6. Held over for next meeting: Smoke-free campus policy, student population and resources resolution, tutoring policies, declaration of majors, final exam scheduling on Solar System.

---

Minutes of the 4 December 2002  
Undergraduate Council Meeting, 2:15 p.m.

Present: Amanda Sammut, Joe Mitchell, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Randall Edouard, Donna Di Donato, Rick Gatteau, Bill Collins, Raafat El-Maghzabi, Jyoti Pandit, and John Kincaid.

1. Notes for the minutes were taken by John Kincaid.
2. Elaine Kaplan noted that some corrections were necessary on page three of the Minutes for the 13 November meeting and that a few words needed modification on page one. The corrected minutes will be presented at the next meeting for approval.
3. For the Spring semester, the Committee will meet on Wednesdays at 2p.
4. The Committee reviewed Joe Mitchell's draft the letter to Bill Arens regarding International Exchange Program students. Based on a lengthy discussion, especially of items one, two, and five, Joe will present a second draft at the next meeting. The main foci of the revision will be to emphasize that the IEP should take the lead role in advising IEP students, soliciting the necessary information from the Student Advising Center and Transfer Office, as well as relevant Departments, and to encourage the IEP to 'pre-register' their students as early as possible – preferably during the SUSB pre-registration periods.
5. The Committee would like the paragraph on page 77 [beginning 'A maximum of 12 ...'] of the 2003-2005 Bulletin (draft) deleted. The Committee felt that the policy described in that paragraph regarding 'transfer' of SPD graduate credits to an undergraduate degree program requires significant revision. The committee looks forward to discussing this matter with Diane and SPD.
6. Following a discussion of how the new policy on 'retaking courses' the Committee felt there was no immediate need for modification.
7. The Committee tabled discussion of the policy that requires undergraduates to declare their major by the end of the first year.
8. Bob Kerber is continuing his efforts to draft a policy on 'tutoring' at SUSB. He expects to bring the draft to the Committee next semester.
9. The next meeting will take place on 5 February. [Possible new agenda items may include mid-semester evaluations and a discussion of student advising in teacher prep training.]

---

**STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY  
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

**November 13, 2002  
Minutes**

*Members in attendance:* Bill Dawes, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Rick Gatteau, Cheryl Hamilton, Robert Kerber, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Amanda Sammut, Randy Thomas.

The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. Minutes were taken by Rick Gatteau.

**Issue:** Allowing college courses taken by Stony Brook students while in high school to count toward DEC requirements.

**Discussion:** Arlene Feldman from the Transfer Office came to discuss credit issues of college courses being taken by students while in high school. Prior to 1986, such courses were counted as part of the general education requirements (then called "distribution requirements." Post 1986, such courses have been counted as elective credit, but not as DEC requirements. Since major departments are accepting these courses for major credits, Arlene proposes accepting these same courses to fulfill DEC requirements.

Arlene shared that SUNY Albany, Binghamton, and Buffalo all allow college courses taken while in high school to count for degree and major requirements. Bob Kerber said the issue is whether there is a conflict between perceived standards and providing a simple, more efficient way to handle credits via the new People Soft System.

**Proposal:** Allow college courses taken by Stony Brook students while in high school to count toward DEC requirements.

**Decision:** The committee unanimously approved this recommendation.

After this decision, there was further discussion about the requirement to complete the DEC A **at Stony Brook** upon matriculation if it was not done prior to matriculation. Questions were raised whether this practice should be continued. The group agreed to consider this item at a future meeting.

The minutes from the October 30 meeting were approved with one correction. The vote on the Chi Alpha Epsilon proposal was indicated as 3 abstentions, but should be reflected as 2 abstentions.

Members were asked to participate in external academic review committees. Randy Thomas volunteered to attend the European Languages meeting on December 10. Elaine Kaplan was volunteered in absentia to attend the Psychology meeting on December 12. If Elaine cannot attend this meeting, Donna Di Donato volunteered to attend in her place.

**Issue:** Moving credits from a student's graduate to undergraduate record.

**Discussion:** The group discussed Diane Bello's proposal to allow a maximum of 12 undergraduate credits completed while in a graduate, non-matriculated program to be moved to a student's undergraduate record (e.g., if the student is then accepted to an undergraduate degree program at Stony Brook.)

Donna Di Donato commented that this policy is written narrowly and does not address a larger problem.

**Decision:** The committee agreed to table this issue until Diane Bello and Elaine Kaplan return.

**Issue:** Enrollment concerns regarding students in the international exchange program.

**Discussion:** The group referred to the e-mail sent by Bill Arens, Interim Director of Study Abroad and International Exchanges.

Bob Kerber shared that the international students are unfamiliar with the system.

Bill Dawes said an issue is holding spaces for international students when demand already exists from current Stony Brook matriculated students.

Donna Di Donato said students should have their schedules handled by Bill Arens' office before arriving on campus.

Joe Mitchell asked how many international students come to campus.

Randy Thomas said he believed the number was around 100 students and suggested having a centralized process by which students would receive assistance before arriving on campus.

Amanda Sammut suggested the students should write down their course interests in advance to help with placing them appropriately.

Robert Kerber suggested using email, having access to SOLAR, and perhaps having Bill Arens' office register these students.

Donna Di Donato mentioned that there were some problems in accessing SOLAR in other countries. The problems stem from technical anomalies that make it difficult to access SOLAR information.

It was mentioned that we seek to improve communication between the two universities. Also, it was mentioned how to facilitate these communications and address the ill wills this issue has generated.

Beverly Rivera suggested that perhaps these IEP students can be identified and have a few seats reserved. Bill Dawes stated that he understands the situation. Why should seats be denied to continuing students who need these courses? Also, most of the IEP students do not have the pre-requisites. It is a difficult situation that has no easy solution.

Joe Mitchell made the following suggestion: Bill Arens' office should facilitate this endeavor by establishing better communication with IEP students in advance and working with academic departments in a timely manner and provide the necessary information. The Undergraduate Council would further send a memo to Bill Arens' office with suggestions. Everyone present agreed.

**Issue:** P/NC option and the recommendation to change the Bulletin from a maximum of two courses per semester to **eight credits** for full-time students and from a maximum of one course per semester to **four credits** for part-time students.

**Discussion:** Beverly Rivera stated this is the first semester the policy has been enforced through People soft. The P/NC is set up by credits. PS set up is: 08 credits –full-time, 04 credits, part-time. It was working well until early last week. During an upgrade of the system, it may have broken (altered the set-up). This is being investigated.

**Proposal:** Change item 5 on page 61 of the Undergraduate Bulletin to read:

Full time students (those registered for 12 or more credits) may not take more than eight credits per semester under the P/NC option. Part-time students (those registered for 11 or fewer credits) may not take more than four credits per semester under the P/NC option.

**Decision:** Approved.

Due to time constraints, the Committee did not continue discussion about honor societies, item #7 on the agenda.

Donna Di Donato mentioned the new Prime Time format. Donna and Rick Gatteau worked together in creating the new format. All academic majors and special programs will be represented during Campus Life time on November 20th. Attractive table tents were distributed and all were encouraged to spread the word regarding the event. Donna mentioned that this was a real push for students to declare their majors. In this manner they can become connected to an academic program.

Beverly Rivera stated that a lot of students were declaring majors. She mentioned that many students realized that this was one method in which to register for courses that required a declared major as a pre-requisite. Also, TAP instituted more stringent guidelines that required U3 students to declare a major.

After some discussion on this issue, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes  
10/16/02

Present: Amanda Sammut, Jyoti Pandit, Randy Thomas, Bill Collins, John Kincaid, Donna Di Donato, Rick Gatteau, Bill Dawes, Cheryl Hamilton, Elaine Kaplan, Joe Mitchell, Diane Bello, Robert Kerber Guest: Mark Aronoff, Deputy Provost

· A brief discussion of institutional registration of honor societies was interrupted by the arrival of the Deputy Provost. It was agreed that we would commence with a discussion of the Undergraduate Colleges and postpone the honor society discussion for later in this or the next meeting.

· Mark Aronoff reported on the Undergraduate College project:

The 1st (pilot) college is named the Undergraduate College of Information and Technology Studies (ITS) and its faculty director is Professor Imin Kao of the department of Mechanical Engineering. Two College Advisors were hired for this College and are responsible for advising students in ITS and teaching sections of USB/EAS 101.

All of the existing Living Learning Centers will be incorporated into the UG Colleges as the upper division component. The recruits from the LLCs will (in part) come from the students in the Undergraduate Colleges.

There was a concern expressed by Council member J. Kincaid about whether growth of the LLCs will impact attendance in other courses that may also have DEC designations (particularly Category H). It was suggested that Jason Hofstein, director of the Science and Engineering LLC communicate with departments and consult regarding development of the minor.

B. Collins asked about the responsibilities of the UG College advisors and the faculty. Aronoff responded that faculty would be asked to teach 1 credit, 1 semester content based seminars and UG Advisors would be responsible for advising students in the Colleges and teaching several sections each of USB 101.

Sammut asked if the UG Colleges were “tied” to the residence halls and wanted to know where the 1 credit seminars would be taught. Aronoff responded that although the UG Colleges would take advantage of the classroom and meeting spaces in the newly renovated residence halls, this was a University wide program for commuting and residential students. He continued to say that the seminars are small and would take place in residence halls and other small departmental/classroom space on campus.

Aronoff pointed out that a critical component of the UG College project is the collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

B. Collins expressed concern about the relationship between the Colleges and academic majors. He indicated that the themes of the Colleges should be orthogonal to majors. In addition, Collins wanted to know how we plan to “feed” students into majors? How will the Colleges work with departments? The themes of the Colleges should be divorced from the majors but direct students more successfully to majors and minors. Aronoff agreed.

How will residential hall assignments be made? Response: On the basis of educational interest not, for example, on a hall/suite preference.

J. Mitchell asked about what impetus will be given to the academic departments to encourage participation in the 1 credit seminars. Aronoff said that there would be individual compensation to participating faculty, and that the seminars should not be seen as part of the normal teaching load or threatening to the delivery of the departments’ curriculum.

E. Kaplan mentioned a question that had been raised at the A & S Chairs meeting earlier in the day. With a 5%

budget cut and potential for an additional 2% rescission why is the UG College proposal and SB Manhattan being held harmless?

In conclusion, Aronoff indicated that the current plan for this initiative was to hire an administrative UG College Director, 12 College advisors and appoint 6 faculty directors.

Discussion of honor societies tabled for next meeting. Meeting adjourned.

---

## Undergraduate Council Minutes 10/2/02

Present: Joseph Mitchell, Elaine Kaplan, Cheryl Hamilton, Rick Gatteau, Donna Di Donato, Bill Collins, John Kincaid, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Bob Kerber, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Amanda Sammut, Bill Dawes

### 1. Minutes from 9/18/02 were approved.

### 2. Additional Agenda Item: Undergraduate Colleges

There was a brief discussion of the new Undergraduate Colleges proposal from the office of the Provost. It was noted that the first UG College, Information and Technology Studies, was started this Fall by the CEAS. J. Kincaid stated that the CEAS chairs were not in the "loop" and that no new course was approved by the CEAS Committee on Teaching Policy and Curriculum for the new UG College. (**Subsequent note:** ITS 101 was later approved by the CEAS CTPC.) Of considerable concern is the question of how to deal with the proposed 1-credit freshman seminars (e.g., work load / teaching load issues). In particular, there was considerable interest in how recruitment of faculty for the freshman seminars would be done. Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff will be meeting in the near future with the DUGs to discuss the UG Colleges.

It was agreed that Mark Aronoff should be invited to a future meeting of the Undergraduate Council.

### 3. Agenda Item #3: Continuation of the discussion on the elimination of the 10 credit PEC rule.

Background information is presented in the minutes from 9/18/02 and in the agenda for 10/2/02. In summary, there are currently two rules limiting the number of credits from PEC designator courses that may be used to satisfy graduation requirements.

Rule 1- No more than four 100-level credits can be used toward an undergraduate degree

Rule 2- No more than 10 credits of physical education (PEC courses) at any level can count toward an undergraduate degree.

These rules are based on the assumption that PEC courses are activity-based, as opposed to content-based and there should be a limit on the total number of PEC credits that may be used toward graduation requirements. However, content-based PEC courses have been developed as part of the new Athletic Training major, and strict adherence to the rules will make it impossible for students who major in Athletic Training to graduate. Further, the 10 credit rule will discourage other students from taking PEC courses as electives.

It was noted in the discussion that in general the 100-level PEC courses are activity-based whereas the higher-level courses are more content-based. Thus, Elaine Kaplan's suggestion that the CAS keep Rule 1 and eliminate Rule 2 serves the dual purpose of preserving the intention of limiting the number of activity-based credits while making it possible for Athletic Training majors to graduate. Bob Kerber suggested the possible alternative approach of creating a different course designator (e.g., PHT ) for content-based courses.

The committee recommends that the CAS Curriculum Committee review this issue at a meeting in the near future.

### 4. Agenda Item #4: Tutoring Policies

Bob Kerber reported that there is no official university tutoring policy at present and a tutoring policy is needed.

It is recognized that individuals (e.g., graduate students) frequently provide tutoring services to undergraduates for a fee, and it is not the intention of the committee to limit this practice. However, there are a number of "for profit" tutoring groups operating on campus who flood the bulletin boards with advertisements, frequently including false claims and guarantees of success. Invariably, these "for profit" tutoring groups or individuals charge students significant sums of money.

This issue prompted a lively discussion with everyone recognizing the need for additional information. For example, what are the existing policies about tutoring services? What are the existing guidelines for the regulation of businesses operating on campus?

There was considerable discussion about ways to limit the opportunistic tutoring services. For example, it should be possible to better advertise university-sanctioned tutoring services/facilities. Also, tutoring services not officially sanctioned could be publicly identified.

Bob Kerber will follow up and report back to the committee at a future meeting.

#### **5. Agenda Item #5: International students who do not have proper prereqs.**

Bill Dawes led a discussion about a problem involving the increasingly large numbers of foreign exchange students (i.e., year aboard) coming to study at Stony Brook each Fall. The problem has a number of components:

- Frequently, the students have not completed the proper prerequisite courses before coming to Stony Brook,
- The students arrive late in the summer after many courses are full,
- The students feel entitled to register for specific courses they need to complete during the exchange period and
- Allowing them to register would mean giving them priority over Stony Brook students, even displacing graduating seniors.

It is clear that planning and departmental coordination is required. Better prerequisite screening earlier in the process would be very helpful. Are there model programs (e.g., in CEAS)?

Elaine Kaplan will contact David Hicks in the Provost's office to try to get more basic information and report back to the committee at a future meeting.

#### **6. Agenda Item #6 was tabled until the next meeting**

#### **7. For Future Meetings:**

- Invite Mark Aronoff to discuss the UG Colleges proposal
- Reports by Bob Kerber (tutoring policy) and Elaine Kaplan (foreign exchange students)
- Administration / implementation of course repeat policy (Donna Di Donato, Bob Kerber)

Minutes submitted by W. Collins

October 15, 2002

Undergraduate Council Minutes

9/18/02

#### **1. Introduction of members:**

Present: Diane Bello, Bill Dawes, Donna DiDonato, Rick Gatteau, Perry Goldstein, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, John Kincaid, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Amanda Sammut, Randy Thomas

Related Council Items Discussed:

Meetings will be held every other Wednesday's at 2:15 until 3:30.

Next Meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 2nd, 2002

Minutes will be taken in alphabetical order.

**2. Selection of chair for the 2002- 2003 academic year :** Last year the chair duties were split between Joe Mitchell and Bob Kerber. It was indicated that this worked well. Bob and Joe agreed to a repeat performance--. Joe will be chair for the Fall 2002 semester and Bob will be chair for the Spring 2003 semester. Amanda Sammut agreed to serve as co-chair with Joe in the fall and with Bob in the spring. Elaine Kaplan agreed to provide staff support. The chair attends Senate Coordinating Council meetings once a month, along with other University Senate committee chairs and officers of the Senate.

**3. Approval of the minutes of April 16, 2002**

April 16, 2002 minutes approved with no corrections.

**4. Selection of members to represent the council on CUE:** Bill Dawes and Bob Kerber will continue to represent the Council on the Committee on Undergraduate Education. (CUE). Items of discussion in CUE are the formation of the undergraduate colleges, orientation and automating transfer credit evaluations.

**5. Last year the Council approved the addition of a sentence to the "Minimal Instructional Responsibilities" for faculty entry in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 67: *Any change in grading policy must be announced and made available to all students enrolled in the course.***

There was some discussion about creating a faculty handbook for new faculty regarding policy and procedure. Currently, Harriman has a handbook available for their new faculty. It was suggested that there be a central location. Maybe a web site for each department with this type of information and a list of FAQ's should be created. This may be something the new dean may want to work on. It was also suggested that CELT or the provost area disseminate this type of information.

The wording in the Undergraduate Bulletin will read:

**"Assessment of Student Performance:"** *Instructors are required to assign grades on the basis of the body of work for which all students are responsible, as described in the syllabus. Any change to the course grading policy during the semester must be announced and made available to all students enrolled in the course. Assigning additional work to individual students who wish to improve their grade, during or after the semester, is prohibited.*

**6. Elimination of the 10 credit limit on Physical Education credits**

This item will remain open. Elaine has provided additional information and the committee will discuss again at the next meeting. (See Below). There was both discussion that took place for and against the change. Based on the additional information, the committee will discuss further.

Based on the new major, there is a need for the second part of the physical education credit restriction to be changed.

“No more than 10 credits of physical education at any level can count toward an undergraduate degree.”

Three items that were discussed were:

- 1) Do away with the 10 credit rule,
- 2) Change the designator for the new major,
- 3) Students who are in the new major will be exempt from the 10 credits rule.

See below for additional information on course content.

**Background:** Currently there are two rules that limit the number of physical education credits that can be applied toward an undergraduate degree.

1. No more than four 100 level credits can be used toward an undergraduate degree.
2. No more than 10 credits of physical education at any level can count toward an undergraduate degree.

**Proposal:** Retain the first rule. Eliminate the second rule.



**Rationale:** The second rule preceded the creation of the new major in athletic training, which requires far more than 10 credits in PEC courses and the approval of a new minor in Adapted Aquatics. If it remains in effect, Athletic Training majors will not be able to graduate, since their credits in excess of 10 will be deleted toward the 120 required to graduate.

The A and S Curriculum committee approved the upgrading of the 200 level and 300 level PEC courses, which meet rigorous American Red Cross and other professional standards. Lecture materials in these courses is designed in consultation with the undergraduate health sciences programs. The amount of textbook reading and writing in these courses has increased significantly.

In spring 2002, 43 students' academic records included more than 10 credits of physical education. A review of their records was conducted. It was determined that approximately 1/2 of the students were participating in intercollegiate athletics (which falls under the first rule). About 1/4 of the students were taking courses in adapted aquatics, perhaps in preparation for physical therapy programs. The remaining 1/4 seemed to be taking courses for interest and were strong students, including some CEAS majors and some double majors who would be expected to graduate with excess credits in any case.

### **7. Discussion of the first semester's registration under PS. How did things go, particularly during the freer 2-week add/drop period?**

Time did not allow for a complete discussion regarding this issue. The committee will discuss at a later date and invite Kathleen Breidenbach to that meeting.

---

### **Undergraduate Council Meeting of April 16, 2002**

Present: Mark Aronoff (guest), Ora I. Bouey, Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Joe Mitchell (chair), Jyoti Pandit, Amanda Sammut, Fred Walter

Jyoti Pandit recorded the minutes.

Minutes of March 12th meeting will be edited by Donna and sent to Elaine for the files and the website.

**Congratulations to Amanda Sammut**, our undergraduate student representative, for winning the prestigious Goldwater Award and earning a 4.0 GPA for the past three semesters.

**Academy of Teacher-Scholars:** Donna reported on this annual competition for innovative course and curricular proposals that was established by the University Senate in 1995. The winners of this competition will receive \$5,000 stipend in addition to \$5,000 flexible funds that goes to their departments the following year. The selection process, responsibilities of academicians and the eligibility requirements are available. Bob, Elaine and Barbara have agreed to review the proposals in May.

**External Academic reviews:** The Undergraduate Council was represented at all four external academic reviews this spring; Technology and Society, Biochemistry and Cell Biology, Art, and Neurobiology and Behavior.

**Electronic Devices & Course Repeat Policy** changes were passed by the Senate.

**Declaration of majors:** There has been e-mail correspondence between Bob, Joe, Donna and Elaine on this issue. In 1997, the Undergraduate Council unanimously voted to require students to declare their majors before registering for the first semester of their sophomore year, but this policy is not enforced. To qualify for financial aid, students must declare majors in the beginning of their junior year. PeopleSoft isn't yet programmed for declaration of majors, so we have reverted back to filling out the forms on paper and having students "schlep" them to the registrar's office. What can we do to encourage students to select their majors early so they can take advantage of departmental advising and graduate in a timely fashion? This discussion will be continued at the next Council meeting.

**Undergraduate Enrollment:** The Strategic Planning Committee is discussing this topic. Should we grow in size or stay the same size? If we go from 20,000 to 25,000 students will we have more resources to support teaching, advising and classrooms? The formula that generates resource allocation for additional students does not guarantee that the money will go

to the areas that are responsible for serving these students.

**Mark Aronoff** further described the pilot project for undergraduate colleges beginning this fall for around 300 residential and commuter students interested in science and engineering, especially pre- computer science and information technology majors. Mendelsohn Quad will be designated for the resident freshmen. \$200,000 has been set aside by the provost to fund the project. Gradually this option will be available for other areas, with complete phase-in in 2004. An important part of the program is small one-credit seminars taught by faculty members. The Undergraduate Council members discussed the following issues: Who will pay for these 300 students? Who is going to teach them? Who will teach these one-credit courses? Will these courses be in addition to the faculty member's teaching load? What is the role of professional staff and academic advising staff? How could commuter students become involved?

The meeting adjourned at 4.05.

Respectfully submitted,

Jyoti Pandit

---

**Undergraduate Council  
Annual Report to the University Senate  
2001-2002 Academic Year**

The Undergraduate Council met every other week throughout the academic year. The fall semester chair was Bob Kerber, Chemistry. The spring semester chair was Joe Mitchell, Applied Mathematics and Statistics.

Fall semester members were: Leo Bachmair (CEAS), Ora James Bouey (HSC), William Dawes (S/BS); Donna Di Donato ( Undergraduate Academic Affairs, ex officio), Raafat El-Maghrabi (HSC), Dan Finer (S/BS), Barbara Fletcher (professional staff), Cheryl Hamilton (AIM, ex officio), Ellen Hopkins (Academic Advising, ex officio), Elaine Kaplan (professional staff), Bob Kerber (NS/M), Mario Mignone (H/FA), Joe Mitchell (CEAS), Jyoti Pandit (Library), Beverly Rivera (Registrar, ex officio), Lilia Ruiz-Debbe (H/FA), Amanda Sammut (undergraduate student representative) and Fred Walter (NS/M)

Spring semester members were: Michael Barnhart (S/BS), Ora James Bouey (HSC), William Dawes (S/BS), Donna Di Donato (Undergraduate Academic Affairs, ex officio), Raafat El-Maghrabi (HSC), Andrea Fedi (H/FA), Barbara Fletcher (professional staff), Cheryl Hamilton (AIM, ex officio), Elaine Kaplan (professional staff), Bob Kerber (NS/M), John Kincaid (CEAS), Joe Mitchell ((CEAS), Jyoti Pandit (Library), Beverly Rivera (Registrar, ex officio), Amanda Sammut (undergraduate student representative), Randy Thomas (Academic Advising, ex officio) and Fred Walter (NS/M).

The Council approved several policies and proposals that were presented to and approved by the University Senate:

- Students may repeat a course only once; i.e. it may be taken at most twice. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college and for endorsement by the department offering the course. A course is considered as "taken" if the student remains enrolled in the course past the add/drop deadline, even if the student subsequently withdraws from the course.
- Rewording of the current statement on the use of electronic devices in the Minimal Student Responsibilities section on "Responsibilities in the Classroom" in the Undergraduate Bulletin. The revised statement will read: Students are expected to secure and turn off electronic communication devices, including cellular phones, beepers, speakers and headphones during class time unless otherwise directed by the course instructor. The presence of a cell phone and other electronic devices (when these are not expressly permitted) during an examination may lead to an accusation of academic dishonesty."
- Replacing the Undergraduate Bulletin entry on double degrees to more clearly affirm the distinction between a

double degree and a double major program. The awarding of a double degree requires that one major leads to an externally certified degree in a clinical or professional field.

The Council endorsed several proposals that did not require further University Senate approval:

- Increase in the number of credits from 8 to 11 for which students will be permitted to waitlist under the new PeopleSoft registration system.
- Pursuant to the 9/11 tragedy, the Council approved a temporary policy to allow relevant offices to interpret university policies on incomplete grade reporting and incompletes in a generous and flexible fashion.
- Addition of a sentence to the Minimal Instructional Responsibilities entry in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 67: *Any change in grading policy must be announced and made available to all students enrolled in the course.*

The Council reviewed information on CAS and CEAS grade changes during four recent semesters. Only 1-2 percent of the total number of grades submitted were changed. The Council concluded that there was no evidence of a systemic problem that needed to be addressed.

The Council recommended a two-stage program for enhancement of student computer literacy (entry-level skills requirement and major requirement) that was forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for further discussion.

Several university administrators attended Council meetings:

- Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff visited on December 11, 2001 to discuss the SUNY General Education Assessment Review and preparation for Middle States re-accreditation in 2004 and again on March 12th, 2002 to report on the provostial initiative to create communities of interest in the residence halls beginning in the fall 2002 semester.
- Peter Baigent, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, met with the Council on January 29, 2002 to discuss whether there should be any limits set on the number of hours that students should be permitted to work on campus to guard against their jeopardizing their academic progress. The Council studied the statistics presented and affirmed that there was no reason to develop prohibitions against this.
- Dr. Rachel Bergeson, Director of the Infirmary, visited on February 26, 2002 to clarify the policy on giving excuse notes to students who visit the infirmary. Members and Dr. Bergeson agreed that the current policies and procedures were working pretty well and that there was no need for a policy change.

Members of the Undergraduate Council participated in four external academic reviews in the spring: Neurobiology and Behavior, Art, Biochemistry and Cell Biology, and Technology and Society. The Council representatives suggested to the administration that, since they were answering questions from the reviewers, it would be helpful to have a member from Institutional Research at the governance briefing sessions.

Items that will need to be discussed by the Undergraduate Council in the fall 2002 semester include: more effective inducements for students to declare majors earlier in their academic careers; the "cross-town" ROTC program proposal; the Undergraduate College proposal; the report on the PeopleSoft implementation including whether there should be an override of the time conflict program; the use of mid-semester evaluation forms (an issue of recent discussion among the Distinguished Teaching Professors); and undergraduate education issues that are arising in the Provost's Strategic Plan Advisory and Coordinating Committee (SPACC).

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes  
April 25, 2001

Present: Leo Bachmair, Diane Bello, Bill Dawes, Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher, Ellen Hopkins, Marjorie Kandel, Izabela Kalinowska, Elaine Kaplan (co-chair), Joe Mitchell, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Ben Walcott (co-chair).

Minutes recorded by Elaine Kaplan.

Members enjoyed snacks courtesy of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs.

The minutes of the meeting of April 11 were approved.

**Challenge Exams:** Once again, this topic proved to be too great a challenge for the Council. There is still confusion about proficiency versus credit. Donna D. suggested that this topic would be better addressed in a smaller sub-group and she will work with Kathleen Breidenbach and Lilia on it this summer.

**Visit with Joanna Harris and Donna Molloy:** Joanna, director of the Office of Disabled Support Services, and Donna, learning disabilities specialist were invited guests.

Facts and figures presented showed the importance of the office to the campus. The number of learning disabled students has remained consistent at about 150 per year, but the number of students with psychological disabilities has drastically risen from 25-30 a year to 150. In any given year, 20% of our students have some form of mental illness. Last year graduate students in the office proctored 386 exams for students who required special modifications such as a distraction-free environment, extra time, or voice recognition technology. Students must make a reservation in advance, and the exams are administered during the time frame of the exam to prevent cheating.

The process of identifying and accommodating students with disabilities is somewhat cumbersome. It is not enough to have an identifiable disability; the paperwork must show how the disability affects the student's ability to do the coursework or take the exams. The Office of Disability Support Services is the official office that deals with such matters, but in some cases instructors may receive letters from the Counseling Center, prescriptions or notes from the Student Health Services, or letters from private physicians. Instructors are not legally obliged to accommodate students in these cases.

The visitors showed copies of the letters that are sent to professors to inform them of the special needs of their students. Bill asked if the information could be sent in a more timely fashion and could include specific information about how to contact the student. He suggested that e-mail would be more efficient so that the information could be forwarded easily to his head TA. He would also like the letter to be from a person rather than an office so that contact with the sender can be made more easily. Joanna replied that there were confidentiality problems with e-mail. Council members thought the same problems existed with paper mail.

Ben and Marjorie wondered about "test anxiety." There was also concern that some students present their documentation just before a major exam or a final exam. Joanna and Donna replied that test anxiety could range from common, mild nervous response to a stressful situation to a full-blown major anxiety attack that renders the student completely helpless. Legally students can present their documentation any time during the semester.

Communication with instructors and departments is an ongoing issue. The primary method of communication about the services of the office is through instructors' inclusion of the ADA statement on their syllabi. Not all instructors do this. Ben said that the deans through communication with department chairs should make sure that this information is included in all syllabi

The office is in the process of identifying people in the academic departments that will serve as liaisons. Elaine suggested that Joanna use the e-mail distribution list of undergraduate program directors as another way of communication.

**Proposal to limit the number of times that a course can be repeated:** Council members agreed with the proposed policy. It was edited to read:

"Students may repeat a course only once. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college. Course withdrawals do not count as a repeated course."

The meeting was adjourned with thanks by the co-chairs to the members for a productive year and thanks by the members to the co-chairs for their efforts during the past two years.

---

**Undergraduate Council Minutes**  
**February 26, 2002**

Present: Rachel Bergeson (guest), Donna Di Donato, Raafat El- Maghrabi, Andrea Fedi, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, John Kincaid, Joe Mitchell (chair), Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Amanda Sammut, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter

Minutes recorded by Elaine Kaplan

**Visit with Dr. Rachel Bergeson, Director of Infirmary:** Some faculty wanted clarification of the infirmary's policy for giving excuse notes. As is standard across the country, the policy of the Student Health Services office is not to give notes, except under extenuating circumstances such as fever or symptoms that might be contagious.

Having stated this policy, Bergeson stated that, sometimes, if a student does beg and plead, he may end up getting a note even for less than severe symptoms. This sometimes happens with new doctors at the Health Service. Students in the computer science major tend to get excuse notes more often, because the department's policy on missed exams is severe.

Instructors who call to verify whether a student has been seen at the infirmary cannot obtain this information, unless the student has signed a waiver of information form at the infirmary.

The role of instructors in determining whether or not a student with a note should be given the opportunity to take a make-up examination was discussed.

Members and Dr. Bergeson agreed that the current policies and procedures were working pretty well, and there was no need for a policy change.

**Upcoming MTV event:** Joe reported that he had been asked by Dr. Fred Preston's office to poll the Undergraduate Council about a proposed MTV event on Thursday, April 25th. Since this is not during Campus Life Time, the noise of this event may possibly disrupt classes that are being held at the same time. Members agreed that it would be o.k. to have this event; one member expressed concern that the decibel level should be kept to a tolerable level. The Council agreed with the idea of scheduling such an event in general, but did not have enough information about time, place, or noise level to approve or disapprove of this particular proposal. More information will be forthcoming.

**Minutes of the meeting of February 12, 2002:** Minutes were edited and then approved.

**Course repeat proposal:** The course repeat proposal was slightly edited and then approved by the Council. Beverly, representing the Registrar's office, was concerned that PS may not be able to include course withdrawals within the number of times that a course was taken. Members still thought that the policy made great sense. Policies should be based on what is best for the student, not whether or not the current computer system can administer it.

*Students may repeat a course only once; i.e. it may be taken at most twice. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college and for endorsement by the department offering the course. A course is considered to be "taken" if the student remains enrolled in the course past the add/drop deadline, even if the student subsequently withdraws from the course.*

Joe will send the statement to the Senate Executive Committee for action.

**External reviews:** Elaine will attend the Art review and the Neurobiology and Behavior review. Randy will also attend the Art review.

**Overloads:** Donna distributed information from Institutional Research on how students who take overloads (greater than 19 credits) perform academically. The Council concluded that the academic standing committees of the colleges seem to be doing a good job approving requests for overloads. Most students are not adversely affected by taking overloads. There may be an issue with students who register for overloads and then drop a few of their courses. This practice takes up space in courses and also allows for more "shopping" during the semester. The number of students who are taking advantage of this appears, however, to be quite small.

---

Minutes of Undergraduate Council meeting of 2.12.02

1. Selection of minute-taker.
2. Approval of minutes for 1.29.02 meeting
3. Minutes of 2.12.02 meeting taken by Raafat El-Maghrabi

Present; Joe Mitchell (chair), Bob Kerber, Donna DiDonato, Fred Walter, Jyoti Pandit, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Amanda Sammut, Barbara Fletcher, Randy Thomas, Cheryl Hamilton, Ora Jean Bouey

4. Agenda items from previous meeting:

Discussion on revising statement on electronic devices (see minutes of 1.29.02 meeting for current and proposed statements), novel

proposal to include specific rules on use of cellular phones and other communication devices during classes, as well as exams. At issue was choice of word "presence" instead of simply "use". Argument was made for the former since it would include the vibration-mode as a means of signaling or communication.

A consensus was reached to rephrase the last sentence of the proposal to: "Any use of a cell phone or other unauthorized electronic device during an examination may lead to an accusation of academic dishonesty".

It was also decided that a copy of the amended proposal be forwarded to the Student Polity Association and to Dr. Fred Preston, Vice President of Student Affairs.

5. New Agenda items:

- a. Recommendation on GPA for course overloads
- b. Computer literacy requirements
- c. Deadline policies with regard to full- and part-time students
- d. Infirmary excuse policy
- e. The utility of the 'C-minus' grade

f. Preliminary report by Joe Mitchell on the purpose of a new committee entitled "Strategic Plan Advisory and Coordination Committee", chaired by the provost, and consisting of the deans of CAS, CEAS, MSRC, Senate presidents, and representative faculty. The goal of the committee is to devise an academic plan for the future of the University at Stony Brook. The plan is intended to be a "living document" with a 5-10 year vision, defining the institution's goals. The committee, of which Joe Mitchell is a member, is hoping to draft a preliminary document by May, 2002. Joe Mitchell said he would keep the UGC advised on issues of relevance to the undergraduate program.

a. Inre Agenda item a: Donna DiDonato said that the recommendations on GPA for overloads will be discussed at the next meeting.

b. Inre Agenda item b: Donna DiDonato informed the UGC that many other institutions including sister SUNY systems, Binghamton and Albany, as well as other universities, do not have a computer literacy requirement. Bob Kerber asked if it was mandatory at Stony Brook; DiDonato replied that there was no quantitative requirement.

c. Inre Agenda item c: Full vs Part-time status and PeopleSoft. The status of PeopleSoft (PS) and the programming of full- vs part-time status was discussed. In particular, current understanding is that PS lacks the ability to monitor the number of times a student has withdrawn from a particular course. DiDonato mentioned that M. Aronoff suggested that we should consider possibly abandoning the 1st 2 week policy deadline for withdrawal, pushing it to the 9th week instead. There was concern that this might have implications on financial aid. Kerber commented that changes should not be implemented based solely on ease of change, but rather on necessity for improvement. Inre PS and withdrawals, the question was raised that if P/NC's can be monitored by PS, why not withdrawals.

d. Bob Kerber said he would look into the Infirmary excuse policy and slate it for future agenda.

e. The utility of the 'C-minus' grade was discussed. Most agreed that it should be retained as a 'psychological' preferable alternative to a 'D-plus', even though it was considered a "failing" grade for most (if not all) majors.

Old business:

#### Course repeat policy

The UGC discussed the wording of the new proposal, in particular the last two sentences that state "A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college. Course withdrawals do not count as a repeated course". It was agreed that an endorsement by the course-offering department should be included in the statement and that course withdrawals should count as repeats.

A question was raised if it would be possible to inform the student either electronically or by mail of the number of times he/her has left to take a particular course. The consensus was that it would be too late in the semester to do anything about it, and that it would involve too much paperwork. Whether it could be an electronic 'flag' during registration was also suggested.

It was decided that a re-write of the policy proposal be done. A version drafted by Joe Mitchell [and subsequently approved at the 2.26.02 meeting] reads:

"Students may repeat a course only once; i.e., it may be taken at most twice. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college and for endorsement by the department offering the course. A course is considered to be "taken" if the student remains enrolled in the course past the add-drop deadline, even if the student subsequently withdraws from the course."

The creation of a useful Glossary of terms for students/faculty was proposed, to explain unclear statements such as the first "10 class days" vs "10 days of semester", etc.

The outcome would be a revision of the Student Bulletin. Agenda items a, b and c will be discussed in future UGC meetings.

#### Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes January 29, 2002

Taken by Joe Mitchell

Present: Peter Baigent (visitor, Associate Vice President for StudentAffairs), Ora Bouey, Donna Di Donato, Raafat El-Maghrabi, Barbara Fletcher, Cheryl Hamilton, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Joe Mitchell (chair), Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Amanda Sammut, Randy Thomas, Fred Walter

1. MINUTES of November 27, 2001 and of December 11, 2001 were approved.
2. MEETING TIMES will be Tuesdays at 3:00pm (rather than the 1:00pm time we have used until now). This was chosen in order to try to accommodate as many members' constraints as possible.
3. NEXT MEETING will be February 12, 2002. Future meetings of the semester are planned for 2/26/02, 3/12/02, 4/2/02, 4/16/02, 4/30/02. These should take place in the usual meeting room, the Arts and Sciences dean's conference room, Melville Library E 3320. (Postscript: That conference room is not available at those times. Elaine is exploring other possible venues, but, in the meantime, the default location is the Undergraduate Academic Affairs conference room, where the meeting was today.)
4. STUDENT EMPLOYMENT: LIMITS?  
Peter Baigent distributed a document summarizing statistics and research on the issue of student employment and its effect on academic scholarship, both at Stony Brook and at other institutions. His goal was to solicit the UGC's opinion on what policy should be put in place (e.g., as part of the forthcoming Peoplesoft system) potentially limiting State-sponsored

(on-campus) employment for undergraduates.

It is estimated that between 36 and 63 percent of college students are employed, nationwide. According to a recent survey of freshmen at SUNYSB, about 20% of students are not worried about finances, 60% are concerned but will manage, and 20% are "very worried" about being able to survive financially while being a student here.

We noted that according to the statistics on family income for SUNYSB students, Stony Brook has a disproportionately large number of students whose family income is less than \$20,000 per year (20.8% versus 5.7% at other public institutions with high selectivity).

It was observed that if we have a policy limiting on-campus hours it will have the effect of pushing students off-campus to find employment. Any policy that we adopt will have no effect on off-campus employment and will, in fact, apply only to that portion of on-campus employment that is State funded (not, e.g., FSA, Polity, RF). Thus, there was concern that attempting to limit State-funded on-campus employment will only have the effect of driving students to other options, either on campus or off campus (where there is often a more competitive wage). It was pointed out that trying to regulate the number of hours employed by students is similar to trying to regulate the number of hours of sleep they get each night: While it is advisable to get a certain minimum number of hours of sleep, and it is advisable to limit one's hours of employment while carrying a full-time course load, students should be treated as adults, without futile attempts to micro-manage their lives.

The question was then raised: Why should there be any limits set at all? The data that Peter presented showed that with respect to on-campus employment, very few (only 32 in Fall 2001) students choose to work over 20 hours per week already. Do we really need rules to try to prevent some students from working, say, 40 hours per week (against our better judgment)? It was reiterated that placing limits on State-funded on-campus employment will only have the effect (in the cases that it affects at all) of encouraging students to look elsewhere for employment, which may also lead to a more fragmented work schedule. Students are driven by economic needs (real or perceived) and are not likely to be prevented from taking employment to meet their financial needs.

Students who are on academic probation, it was agreed, should be discouraged from excessive hours of employment, in order to focus on improving their academic standing. This, however, can be done within the current advising system, with each student coming to an agreement with the advisor on what makes sense for the individual situation. Again, it was agreed that no rigid rules need to be instantiated.

5. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS: Beverly Rivera responded to a question from Joe Mitchell concerning the need for training of instructors in the use of Peoplesoft during the upcoming months: her office has been coordinating with departments to make sure that there will be assistance available where needed. There was a general discussion about the transition being one with relatively high "set-up" costs, but these will hopefully be one-time expenditures of effort that will result in a smoother, more efficient, system later.

6. The UGC concluded with a brief discussion on the issue of the proposed policy (drafted by the UGC on April 25, 2001) on limiting the number of times a course can be repeated. The policy draft (below) was tabled by the Senate before the summer recess and not yet reconsidered. Ben Walcott indicated that it will be taken up again by the Senate Executive Committee. In today's discussion, the UGC expressed renewed concern that allowing course withdrawals not to count will permit students to use up seats in critical courses (e.g., CSE113), with repeated withdrawals. Beverly Rivera is going to check to confirm whether or not Peoplesoft will permit one to put limits on the number of times a course is repeated if there have been prior withdrawals from the course.

*Proposal to limit the number of times a course can be repeated (April 25, 2001): Students may repeat a course only once. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college. Course withdrawals do not count as a repeated course.*

Future agenda items will include course overloads, computer literacy, policy on cell phones and pagers, and the deadline policy for selecting full-time versus part-time status (Donna Di Donato to provide background information and lead discussion).

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm.



3. Revision of the statement on electronic devices. For reference see the website on Minimal Student Responsibilities in the UG Bulletin:

<http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/CAS/ubinfo2.nsf/pages/policies2#47>

Students are expected to:

**CURRENT STATEMENT:**

secure in a closed container (and not, for example, wear on a belt or around the neck) and turn off (and not for example, simply set to vibration mode) electronic communication devices, including cellular phones, beepers, speakers, and headphones during an examination.

**PROPOSED:**

secure and turn off electronic communication devices, including cellular phones, beepers, speakers, and headphones during class time unless otherwise directed by the course instructor. The presence of a cell phone and other electronic devices (when these are not expressly permitted) during an examination may lead to an accusation of academic dishonesty.

---

**Undergraduate Council Minutes, 12/11/01**

**Present:** Leo Bachmair, Ora James Bouey, Donno Di Donato, Dan Finer, Ellen Hopkins, Robert Kerber (interim chair), Mario Mignone, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Beverly Rivera, Amanda Sammut, Fred Walter, and Mark Aronoff (guest)

**DEC & Designators:** The proposal that students must complete their E, F, and G DEC requirements with different designators has been “indefinitely tabled” by the curriculum committee.

**SUNY Assessment:** Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff updated the committee on the SUNY General Education Assessment Review (GEAR, website: <http://www.cortland.edu/oir/gear>). SUNY has identified twelve ‘learning areas’ that are to be evaluated on a three-year cycle (four per year). The evaluations are intended to assess the institution, not the students. The mechanism for assessment has yet to be determined, whether done via an external instrument or embedded within the curriculum. The latter approach provides an incentive to students to do well, and so seemed preferable. It was further suggested that the campus could adapt for GEAR purposes various sorts of evaluations we are already using. The Math placement exams, for example, could be readministered following the courses to provide a gauge of how well instruction is being delivered (note: subsequent to our meeting, such a proposal was posted on the GEAR site: <http://www.cortland.edu/gear/math@stonybrook.ppt>). There was discussion concerning how a model like this could be extended to other areas of instruction.

---

Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2001

Present: Leo Bachmair, Diane Bello, Donna Di Donato, Bill Dawes, Bob Kerber (interim chair), Jyoti Pandit, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Amanda Sammut

1. **MINUTES** of November 6, 2001 were approved.
2. **NEXT MEETING** will be December 11, 2001. Mark Aronoff will attend to update the Council on the SUNY General Education Assessment Review. Please read the two documents that were distributed at the November 6, 2001 meeting.
3. **COURSE OVERLOADS:** Donna Di Donato is still waiting for additional data from Institutional Research. Once received, she will study the data and report back to the Council.
4. **COMPUTER LITERACY:** The discussion continued about creating a two-tier Skills 4 computer literacy skills requirement/major requirement. Although many of our students are technologically proficient, not all students have had the opportunity to be exposed to rapidly changing technologies, especially in their major field of study. The importance of these

skills in the workplace was pointed out. A proposal for computer literacy was distributed to the Council, including a brief outline of key goals for computer literacy. A copy of the proposal is attached.

Many questions were raised about how this proposed skill requirement would be implemented. It was suggested that the Instructional Computing Office be assigned to assess students fulfillment of Skill 4, in conjunction with a faculty board. Each major department would be responsible for the creation of graduation requirements for their students and would track their students' satisfaction of the requirement. CEAS agrees to the outline and implementation of the two-phase design that has been suggested. Implementation should begin no later than Summer 2003. This should allow ample time to design the new skill requirement and to determine how to implement it. Further discussion needs to take place to move this issue forward. It was suggested that research be conducted to see what other schools are doing. Donna Di Donato has agreed to follow up on this.

5. **ADD/DROP:** Proposal: Eliminate "permission required" to add any course after the fifth class day. This would be a return to the previous add/drop policy, which allowed students to register throughout the 10-day period for open courses. The Council approved this proposal. Bob Kerber will bring before the Senate on December 3rd, for implementation in the Fall 2002 semester.

6. **UNDERGRADUATE EXECUTIVE GROUP:** Two volunteers are needed to serve on this committee. Bill Dawes and Donna Di Donato have agreed to serve.

7. **CURRICULUM:** Is the curriculum too diverse? What are the issues? Tabled until issues arise.

8. **COLLEGES:** Fall 2002 there may be a new residential college created. The College will be created based on the general interest of the student. This new model has been discussed before. Each college would have a variety of student services (advising, counseling, etc.) available in the building that students are assigned to based on a specific, or not too specific, interest. After the first two years, students are more on their own. Proposal would be needed for new colleges outlining with detail a plan and implementation schedule. Nothing has been finalized regarding this.

9. **CELL PHONE USAGE:** The Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs is planning to create posters stating university policy on cell phone usage. The posters will be hung in every classroom. Donna will draft and clarify what the current policy is. Once the committee approves the written policy, it will be presented to the Senate for approval. Does Polity need to approve the changes as well?? It was suggested a copy of the current policy be sent to all faculty members.

10. **DEC E, F, & G:** It has been suggested that student must complete the two-course DEC E, F and G requirements using courses with different designators. Is this something that should be researched? The Undergraduate Council will write to the College of Arts and Sciences' curriculum committee asking that they consider this issue.

## PROGRAM FOR ENHANCEMENT OF STUDENT COMPUTER LITERACY

Recommended by the Undergraduate Council, December 2001

1. Following the proposals of the Skills Development Group of the Fall, 1999, Undergraduate Directors Retreat, we recommend establishment of a two-phase computer literacy requirement to be met by all students obtaining Bachelor's degrees after January, 2007.
2. The first phase of this program will be Basic Computer Literacy, to be designated as Entry Skill 4 within the current Diversified Education Curriculum (D.E.C.) structure. Satisfaction of this Skill should be entered on student transcripts in the same manner as current Skills 1-3, and Skill 4 should be usable as a prerequisite for courses, at the discretion of the department or program offering the course.
3. Skill 4 should include basic word processing, use of e-mail, and competence at Web searching (including critical judgement of search results). [Spreadsheets? Databases? Other components?]
4. Assessment of Skill 4, remediation for those in need, and certification of its fulfillment should be assigned to the Instructional Computing Office, operating under a faculty-staff supervisory committee. They should employ workshops and

minicourses (predominantly electronic- or distance-learning based) to assist students in completing the requirement as early as possible after admission. Entry to sophomore status should be denied to students who have not fulfilled the Skill 4 requirement. This phase should begin no later than summer, 2003.

5. For phase 2 of this program, all major programs should define an appropriate array of computer skills necessary for successful practice of their respective disciplines in the 21st century. They should define means to bring students to the designated level and incorporate them into their major requirements by September, 2005. These means should be described explicitly among the major requirements starting with the 2005-6 Undergraduate Bulletin. At a minimum, they should constitute all or part of a required course in the major, but the great diversity of majors and computer needs likely to be identified precludes our prescribing more specific means or methodologies, requiring instead that this be left to the departments and college curriculum committees to define.

---

#### Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes November 6, 2001

Present: Fred Walter, Dan Finer, Jyoti Pandit, Amanda Sammut, Leo Bachmair, Bob Kerber (interim chair), Bev Rivera, Elaine Kaplan, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Joe Mitchell, Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher

1. **Minutes** of October 23, 2001 were approved. Request noted that minutes not be in attached format, but be part of e-mail posting

2. **Future meetings** Fall semester: 11/20 meeting cancelled due to Thanksgiving break; meetings to be held on 11/27 and December 11

3. The Undergraduate Council has been asked to have a faculty representative (preferably) on the **committee on Orientation** review and planning. Ellen Hopkins has volunteered.

4. **Mark Aronoff** will be invited to December 11 meeting to discuss the upcoming SUNY General Education Assessment Review (GEAR Group) [2 handouts distributed]; also preparation for upcoming Middle States reaccreditation review. GEAR is program assessment, not student assessment. There will be a meeting at Farmingdale at which Elaine will represent the Undergraduate Council.

5. **Course overloads:** Donna is doing an analysis of requests for course overload approvals (N=267 Fall 2000 and Spring 2001 for CAS and CEAS) and relation to grade point average. She is massaging the data for more information (e.g., what was gpa before and after overloads; how many courses in overload semester were P/NC or W, etc.); needs some data before this information can be looked at. Overload approvals went to students with gpa 2.5 to 4.0. Some students were registered in departments without going through formal overload approval process. People Soft will not allow departments to register students without overload approval.

6. **Computer Literacy:** (handout: "Report of Skills Development Group, Undergraduate Directors Retreat 9/17/99") The report makes recommendations about computer literacy but no action was taken as a result. Discussion of the concept of computer literacy ensued with particular attention to the variety of levels that might be demanded by a particular department or discipline (e.g., computer science vs. art history). Points also raised include: what assumptions can be made about the level of computer skills for our entering classes (freshmen and transfers); should computer literacy be a pre-requisite for courses, or for graduation and if so, how would this skill level (however operationalized) be tested/evaluated; who would test/evaluate; what staff, budget and programmatic resources would be required, etc. Should this appear on a student's official record as Skill 4 for example? College curriculum committees will need to be involved. Bob Kerber volunteered to draft a statement of computer literacy recommendations for discussion at a future Undergraduate Council meeting in preparation for presentation to the University Senate.

7. **ADD/DROP:** Tabled but not to be forgotten! Revisiting the issue of dates of drop and add and permission required will take place after implementation of People Soft.

8. **Academic contracts** for readmits and waived students: There has been no formal implementation of academic contracts

for readmits or students at risk. However, several processes have been put in place that serve a similar purpose. That is, students at risk are required to meet with an academic advisor; there is a notes advising system such that the advisor can put recommendations/suggestions/outcomes of the meeting and they are available for all to see (e.g., Cliff Huffman, Joan Kenny, Donna Di Donato). Student gets a copy. If a question arises, the notes are a trail of professional advice given the student who may or may not have followed same. A formal contract has not been fully implemented partially because there is no permanent director of academic advising yet. Further discussion of this topic is tabled, but not to be forgotten!

Minutes submitted by Barbara Fletcher (out of alphabetical order!)

---

## Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2001

Present: Fred Walter, Dan Finer, Jyoti Pandit, Amanda Sammut, Leo Bachmair, Bob Kerber (interim chair), Bev Rivera, Elaine Kaplan, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Joe Mitchell, Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher

1. **Minutes** of October 23, 2001 were approved. Request noted that minutes not be in attached format, but be part of e-mail posting
2. **Future meetings** Fall semester: 11/20 meeting cancelled due to Thanksgiving break; meetings to be held on 11/27 and December 11
3. The Undergraduate Council has been asked to have a faculty representative (preferably) on the **committee on Orientation** review and planning. Ellen Hopkins has volunteered.
4. **Mark Aronoff** will be invited to December 11 meeting to discuss the upcoming SUNY General Education Assessment Review (GEAR Group) [2 handouts distributed]; also preparation for upcoming Middle States reaccreditation review. GEAR is program assessment, not student assessment. There will be a meeting at Farmingdale at which Elaine will represent the Undergraduate Council.
5. **Course overloads**: Donna is doing an analysis of requests for course overload approvals (N=267 Fall 2000 and Spring 2001 for CAS and CEAS) and relation to grade point average. She is massaging the data for more information (e.g., what was gpa before and after overloads; how many courses in overload semester were P/NC or W, etc.); needs some data before this information can be looked at. Overload approvals went to students with gpa 2.5 to 4.0. Some students were registered in departments without going through formal overload approval process. People Soft will not allow departments to register students without overload approval.
6. **Computer Literacy**: (handout: "Report of Skills Development Group, Undergraduate Directors Retreat 9/17/99") The report makes recommendations about computer literacy but no action was taken as a result. Discussion of the concept of computer literacy ensued with particular attention to the variety of levels that might be demanded by a particular department or discipline (e.g., computer science vs. art history). Points also raised include: what assumptions can be made about the level of computer skills for our entering classes (freshmen and transfers); should computer literacy be a pre-requisite for courses, or for graduation and if so, how would this skill level (however operationalized) be tested/evaluated; who would test/evaluate; what staff, budget and programmatic resources would be required, etc. Should this appear on a student's official record as Skill 4 for example? College curriculum committees will need to be involved. Bob Kerber volunteered to draft a statement of computer literacy recommendations for discussion at a future Undergraduate Council meeting in preparation for presentation to the University Senate.
7. **ADD/DROP**: Tabled but not to be forgotten! Revisiting the issue of dates of drop and add and permission required will take place after implementation of People Soft.
8. **Academic contracts** for readmits and waived students: There has been no formal implementation of academic contracts for readmits or students at risk. However, several processes have been put in place that serve a similar purpose. That is, students at risk are required to meet with an academic advisor; there is a notes advising system such that the advisor can put recommendations/suggestions/outcomes of the meeting and they are available for all to see (e.g., Cliff Huffman, Joan Kenny, Donna Di Donato). Student gets a copy. If a question arises, the notes are a trail of professional advice given the student who

may or may not have followed same. A formal contract has not been fully implemented partially because there is no permanent director of academic advising yet. Further discussion of this topic is tabled, but not to be forgotten!

Minutes submitted by Barbara Fletcher (out of alphabetical order!)

---

Undergraduate Council Meeting

October 9, 2001

Present: Leo Bachmair, Diane Bello, Ora Bouey, Donna Di Donato, Dan Finer, Ellen Hopkins, Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber (interim chair), Joe Mitchell, Mario Mignone, Jyoti Pandit, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Amanda Sammut, Fred Walter

Minutes of the meeting of September 25, 2001 were approved.

Elaine Kaplan volunteered to record the minutes.

**Announcements by the chair:** Bob reported that the Coordinating Council wants the Undergraduate Council to look at three matters during the academic year:

1. New student orientation—It was suggested that 3 or 4 UC members should join the ad hoc group to review orientation. This group is being convened by Stephanie Foote, associate director of orientation.
2. Freshman curriculum-- Is it too diverse? Should we create freshman colleges? Should the curriculum be more integrated? Should freshmen have fewer registration options?
3. Articulation agreements—These agreements form the basis of how students transfer credits between area two- year SUNY colleges (especially Suffolk, Nassau and Farmingdale) and USB. Are these reasonably up-to-date? Should the Council be involved with these? The Council will invite Arlene Feldman, director of the transfer office, to meet with us when we discuss this issue.

**Grade changes:** The Council reviewed information on CAS and CEAS grade changes during four recent semesters. Only 1-2 percent of the total number of grades submitted are changed. Questions arose about whether there was a discernible trend. Are the figures out of line with reasonable margins of error? Are younger faculty being coerced to change grades? Do our students expect grades to be negotiable?

After some discussion, the Council concluded that there is no evidence of a systemic problem that needs to be addressed.

**Overloads:** Overload (19-24 credits per semester) petitions are routinely approved by the CAS CASA and by the CEAS CAS for students in good academic standing. A student may, however, be registered for more than 24 credits if the department has processed the student's registration. Should a 2.75 or 3.0 grade point average be used as a cutoff for approval of overloads? Opinions were evenly divided. Donna Di Donato will contact the committees of the two colleges to see if they can come up with a joint proposal for a minimum grade point average for students seeking overloads. Note-- A cut-off of 3.0 is currently in effect for summer session overloads.

**Distance Learning:** Should there be a maximum number of distance learning credits allowed toward a degree? Student transcripts do not differentiate between standard courses and distance learning courses. Does it matter whether the distance learning courses are sponsored by Stony Brook or by another institution?

This discussion will be continued at the next meeting, Tuesday, October 25th at 1:00 p.m.

---

Minutes of Undergraduate Council

September 25, 2001

Present: Elaine Kaplan, Bob Kerber, Donna Di Donato, Ora J. Bouey, Fred Walter, Barbara Fletcher, Dan Finer, Amanda Sammut, Jyoti Pandit, Ben Walcott, Beverly Rivera, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe

- Minutes of September 5 were approved after adding Fred Walter's name to those present for that meeting.

- Discussion of students affected by the events of 9/11:

The Provost, R. McGrath, requested that the UG Council consider a recommendation by Professor Don Lindsley to

"adopt a course grade that falls somewhere between an "R" (continuation grade) and an "I"? Here's what I'm thinking: University policy wisely prohibits students with "I" grades from taking the course the next semester and using the grade earned there to replace the "I". But perhaps in this extraordinary semester we need to relax this policy for students who can demonstrate that the Sept. 11 events seriously affected their abilities to perform. Doing so would allow these students to maintain full-time status (essential for some financial aid or insurance purposes) without being forced to do essentially 2 semesters worth of work during Spring, 2002."

After some discussion the UG Council decided that although we should not publically announce a [temporary] policy shift as recommended by Prof. Lindsley, a case-by-case review of students affected by the tragedy in NYC may warrant a generous and flexible interpretation of University policy on Incomplete grade reporting including permitting students to sit in on subsequent sessions of particular classes to resolve an Incomplete from this semester.

- Ben Walcott conveyed a request from the Intercollegiate Athletic Board to have two members of the UG Council serve on the Board. Beverly Rivera volunteered for membership and Ben offered to identify a faculty member as well.
- Discussion of new chair resulted in Bob Kerber being named Chair of the UG Council for the fall 2001 semester.
- Double degrees vs. Double Majors

Elaine Kaplan asked the Undergraduate Council to consider a revision to the Double degree description in the Undergraduate Bulletin. The new language would more clearly affirm the distinction between a double degree and a double major program. Among the criteria, the awarding of a double degree requires that one major leads to an externally certified degree in a clinical or professional field. The new language was approved and will be presented to the Senate Executive Committee:



double degrees.doc

- Proposal for the addition of a sentence to Minimal Instructional Responsibilities entry in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 67.

In an effort to make University grading policy more explicit the following sentence was approved to be included in the Undergraduate Bulletin: "Any changes in grading policy must be announced and made available to all students enrolled in the course".

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes

September 5, 2001

**Present:** Members-- Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher, Cheryl Hamilton, Ellen Hopkins, Elaine Kaplan, Mario Mignone, Joe Mitchell, Jyoti Pandit, Fred Walter. Guest—Kathleen Breidenbach

**Committee Business:**

The minutes were recorded by Elaine Kaplan

New members were introduced.

The meeting time for the fall 01 semester will be 1 p.m. Tuesdays . Dates are September 25, October 9, October 23, November 6, and November 27.

The election of the chair or co-chairs for the academic year was postponed until the September 25th meeting, since the Council is short several faculty representatives.

The minutes of April 25, 2001 were approved.

Mario Mignone and Elaine Kaplan will represent the Council at the external review of the art department. Barbara Fletcher and Ellen Hopkins will represent the Council at the external review of neurobiology and behavior department.

**Waitlist Credits:** The implementation of PeopleSoft in fall 2002 will allow students to be on waiting lists for courses that are filled. They will be notified by e-mail if a place becomes available for them in the class. Kathleen Breidenbach, who is working on the details of this new system, requested that the number of waitlist credits allowed be increased from 8 credits to 11. This would allow students more flexibility, especially if a course or a section is highly overcrowded.

Kathleen described how the system **should** work under PS, but explained that there are still a number of details to be worked out. Council members are concerned with several aspects of the enrollment management, registration and waitlist processing functions. All especially agreed that PS should be able to handle a “swap” transaction (if I get into course A, drop me from course B), but currently if there is a time conflict between A and B, or the total number of credits for A and B exceeds the number allowed for a student, the system bypasses that student does not notify him that he could have a place in the section or course if he dropped another section or course.

The Council approved the increase in allowable waitlist credits from 8 to 11. The Council wants to receive a report (verbal or written) on PS implementation early in the fall 2002 semester. It was agreed it was sufficient to inform the Senate Executive Committee of the change and a full Senate vote was not required.

#### **Upcoming Council Issues:**

- Double degrees and double majors (information included in the September 5th packet)
- The seemingly increasing number of grade changes (over 3000 in the 1999-2000 academic year). Donna will get more information from the registrar’s office. There is concern among Council members and others that students are putting instructors (especially teaching assistants and young faculty) on the spot.
- The need for a published policy to remind instructors that if one student is given the opportunity to raise his or her grade by doing extra credit work during the semester, the same opportunity must be afforded to all students.
- A minimum required grade point average for students who request overloads. This should be uniform in CAS and in CEAS. Donna will contact Joan Kenny and see if the academic standing committees of the two colleges can agree on a standard.
- Should there be a limit on credits earned through distance learning programs? If so, what should the number be?
- Should the university adopt a computer literacy requirement? Elaine suggested that Fred Walter discuss this with Associate Provost Mark Aronoff, since it is connected to response to the SUNY mandate on general education.
- General problems and confusion with the add/drop process. Should the deadline dates for adding and dropping courses be the same? Should we put any decisions off until we see how PS works?

---

Undergraduate Council Minutes

April 25, 2001

Present: Leo Bachmair, Diane Bello, Bill Dawes, Donna Di Donato, Barbara Fletcher, Ellen Hopkins, Marjorie Kandel, Izabela Kalinowska, Elaine Kaplan (co-chair), Joe Mitchell, Lilia Ruiz-Debbe, Ben Walcott (co-chair).

Minutes recorded by Elaine Kaplan.

Members enjoyed snacks courtesy of the Office of Undergraduate Academic Affairs.

The minutes of the meeting of April 11 were approved.

**Challenge Exams:** Once again, this topic proved to be too great a challenge for the Council. There is still confusion about proficiency versus credit. Donna D. suggested that this topic would be better addressed in a smaller sub-group and she will work with Kathleen Breidenbach and Lilia on it this summer.

**Visit with Joanna Harris and Donna Molloy:** Joanna, director of the Office of Disabled Support Services, and Donna, learning disabilities specialist were invited guests.

Facts and figures presented showed the importance of the office to the campus. The number of learning disabled students has remained consistent at about 150 per year, but the number of students with psychological disabilities has drastically risen from 25-30 a year to 150. In any given year, 20% of our students have some form of mental illness. Last year graduate students in the office proctored 386 exams for students who required special modifications such as a distraction-free environment, extra time, or voice recognition technology. Students must make a reservation in advance, and the exams are administered during the time frame of the exam to prevent cheating.

The process of identifying and accommodating students with disabilities is somewhat cumbersome. It is not enough to have an identifiable disability; the paperwork must show how the disability affects the student's ability to do the coursework or take the exams. The Office of Disability Support Services is the official office that deals with such matters, but in some cases instructors may receive letters from the Counseling Center, prescriptions or notes from the Student Health Services, or letters from private physicians. Instructors are not legally obliged to accommodate students in these cases.

The visitors showed copies of the letters that are sent to professors to inform them of the special needs of their students. Bill asked if the information could be sent in a more timely fashion and could include specific information about how to contact the student. He suggested that e-mail would be more efficient so that the information could be forwarded easily to his head TA. He would also like the letter to be from a person rather than an office so that contact with the sender can be made more easily. Joanna replied that there were confidentiality problems with e-mail. Council members thought the same problems existed with paper mail.

Ben and Marjorie wondered about "test anxiety." There was also concern that some students present their documentation just before a major exam or a final exam. Joanna and Donna replied that test anxiety could range from common, mild nervous response to a stressful situation to a full-blown major anxiety attack that renders the student completely helpless. Legally students can present their documentation any time during the semester.

Communication with instructors and departments is an ongoing issue. The primary method of communication about the services of the office is through instructors' inclusion of the ADA statement on their syllabi. Not all instructors do this. Ben said that the deans through communication with department chairs should make sure that this information is included in all syllabi

The office is in the process of identifying people in the academic departments that will serve as liaisons. Elaine suggested that Joanna use the e-mail distribution list of undergraduate program directors as another way of communication.

**Proposal to limit the number of times that a course can be repeated:** Council members agreed with the proposed policy. It was edited to read:

"Students may repeat a course only once. Credits for the course will count once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student who wishes to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college. Course withdrawals do not count as a repeated course."

The meeting was adjourned with thanks by the co-chairs to the members for a productive year and thanks by the members to the co-chairs for their efforts during the past two years.



---

**Undergraduate Council Report**  
**2000-2001 Academic Year**  
**May 8, 2001**

The Undergraduate Council was co-chaired by Ben Walcott, professor of neurobiology, and Elaine Kaplan, assistant dean in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Council met every other week throughout the academic year.

Elected faculty representatives were Leo Bachmair (CEAS), Michael Barnhart (S/BS), Ora Bouey (HSC), Sasha Barcus (NS/M), William Dawes (S/BS), Izabela Kalinowska- Blackwood (H/FA) Marjorie Kandel (NS/M), Mario Mignone (H/FA, fall semester), Joseph Mitchell (CEAS ), Lilia Ruiz-Debbe (H/FA, spring semester), Benjamin Walcott (HSC). Elected professional staff representatives were Barbara Fletcher and Elaine Kaplan. Undergraduate student representatives were Michael Weaver and Arif Rafiq. Library representative was Michael Huang. Ex-officio members represented the following offices : Donna Di Donato ( Undergraduate Academic Affairs, CAS), Dennis Geyer (Registrar, fall semester), Cheryl Hamilton (EOP/AIM), Ellen Hopkins (Academic Advising Center), and Beverly Rivera (Registrar, spring semester). Diane Baldwin-Bello (Registrar) and Ana Maria Torres (Enrollment Management) attended occasional meetings.

Minutes for 2000-2001 Undergraduate Council meetings have been posted on the website:  
<http://naples.cc.sunysb.edu/Admin/usenate.nsf/pages/ucouncil>.

The following is a summary of the Council's activities during the 2000-2001 academic year:

### **I Policies and Statements:**

· Proposals for Inter-Unit Cooperation were approved by the University Senate. The proposals are intended to enhance communication between academic units.

*Proposals for Significant Revisions to Existing Courses:* A department in one academic unit proposing to significantly change (including prerequisites) an existing course that is required by or which has significant numbers of students enrolled in it from a program in another unit must simultaneously transmit the request to both its own curriculum committee and the curriculum committee of the other academic unit.

*Proposals for New Courses:* If a new course is proposed in one academic unit that significantly overlaps that given in another unit, the proposing department must notify both curriculum committees of the potential overlap.

*Proposals for Deletion of Courses:* A department proposing to delete a course that is required by another unit's program/major/minor must inform the curriculum committee of that department's academic unit before the course is dropped.

*Proposals for New Programs, Majors, and Minors:* An academic unit proposing a new program, major or minor that requires courses from another academic unit must simultaneously inform both its own curriculum committee and the committee of the academic unit that offers the course.

· Proposal to allow students to advance register for 19 credits. The purpose is to allow students to take advantage of registering for up to 8 credits of wait-listed courses. This was approved by the University Senate, with the proviso that it be implemented at the same time that PeopleSoft is implemented (fall 02).

· The Council approved changes in the leave of absence policy, eliminating the need for unnecessary petitions to the CAS and CEAS academic standing committees. Changes were approved by the Provost's office and were incorporated into the 2001-2003 Undergraduate Bulletin

· Request by the Bachelor of Science degree program in Health Sciences for its students to earn double degrees with west campus majors. The Council expressed the opinion that students who completed a West campus undergraduate degree

program and the BSHS program should qualify for a double major, not a double degree. The Council believes that double degrees should be awarded only when one of the degrees is a clinical or professional degree. The language in the Undergraduate Bulletin should be rewritten to clarify this policy. Further discussions on this are taking place with University Counsel and the Provost's office.

- Request by the WISE program to have its senior participants receive a notation on their academic transcripts as is done for other honor societies. The unanimous decision of the Council was that WISE students should be recognized for their performance by being named to the dean's list, Sigma Beta, national honor societies, departmental honors programs and degrees with distinction.
- Proposal for limiting the number of course repeats: "Students may take a course twice. Credits for the course will count only once toward cumulative credits, but will count each time toward semester load. Both grades will be averaged into the cumulative grade point average. A student wishing to take a course more than twice must submit a petition for approval by the academic standing committee of the student's college."
- Proposal on academic standing and participation in co-curricular activities was approved by the University Senate: "Students who are validly registered at Stony Brook and whose current standing remark is "academic probation" are considered to be in good standing for purposes of enrollment certification and participation in athletic and other co-curricular activities." This statement will go at the end of the section on "Probation" in the Undergraduate Bulletin, page 63, 1st column.
- Proposal for Q grades and university honors was approved by the University Senate: Graduating students who have a "Q" grade and/or remark 31 (or notation of academic dishonesty under PeopleSoft) currently on their transcript will be ineligible to receive University honors. Students who have previously received a "Q" grade or remark 31 (or notation of academic dishonesty) that has been removed from the transcript will be reviewed by the appropriate college committee in the semester before graduation to determine their eligibility for University honors."
- At request of the Registrar's office, approved use of double asterisk to denote blank grades.
- Challenge exams: The Council agreed that the current guidelines were confusing to students and in need of revision. Students should be able to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language regardless of their previous success or failure at studying the language. The issue of earning degree credit for these languages was a separate matter. Donna Di Donato will be working on clarifying the current guidelines over the summer.

## · **II Meetings with University administrators**

- Mark Aronoff, our administrative liaison in the fall semester and in the spring semester-- The fall discussion was about the SUNY general education mandate and the SUNY assessment mandate. The spring discussion was about the task force report on undergraduate administration.
- Robert McGrath, provost-- Discussion about the task force report on undergraduate administration.
- Susan Cappello, director of the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences program—Discussion about whether students in the BSHS should qualify for a double degree.
- Nancy Franklin, Executive Secretary of the CAS Academic Judiciary Committee; John Shea, Chair of the CAS Academic Judiciary Committee; and T. Owen Carroll, Chair CEAS AJC.
- Joanna Harris and Donna Molloy, Office of Disabled Support Services

## **III Other Activities**

- The Council participated in the external review of the linguistics program
- The Council participated in the AACU site visit to consider Stony Brook as an institution qualified to compete for PEW funds.

- Council co-chairs participated in the University Senate Coordinating Council
- Council co-chairs met with representatives from HSC and CEAS to discuss inter-unit cooperation proposal

#### **IV Upcoming Issues and Items for Discussion in 2001-2002**

- Recent data from the Office of Records shows that during the 1999-2000 academic year, over 3000 grades were changed after submission. 42% of the grades that were changed were from one letter grade to another (as opposed to grades changed from incompletes to letter grades)
- The need for a published policy to remind instructors that if one student is given the opportunity to raise his or her grade by doing extra credit work during the semester, the same opportunity must be afforded to all students.
- Should there be a minimum grade point average required for students in order to register for an overload?
- Should there be a limit on credits earned through distance learning programs?



Created by [Melissa Bishop/DoIT](#)  
November 10, 1998  
Modified by L. Theobalt, June 2006