Chapter 4: Leadership, Governance and Administration

Overview

The system of administration and governance at the University at Albany is tiered, involving the State University of New York and the University at Albany. The Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York articulate the main components of this system.

The Board of Trustees appoints a chancellor, who functions as “the chief executive officer of the University” and who “may assign to the officers, faculty and staff of the University powers, duties and responsibilities vested in them by [Board of Trustees] Policies.” The “University Faculty” “shall be responsible for the conduct of the University’s instruction, research and service programs;” the SUNY-wide University Faculty Senate “shall be the official agency through which the University Faculty engages in the governance of the University,” and the “University representatives shall serve at the pleasure of the chancellor of the University.”

The SUNY Board of Trustees selects a Chief Administrative Officer of each college (in the case of the University at Albany, the president) who “shall be responsible to the chancellor and the Board of Trustees for, and shall administer, the college for which he or she serves, and shall promote its development and effectiveness.” A University Council at each college “shall exercise such powers as are provided for in the Education Law, subject to the general management, supervision, control, and approval of and in accordance with rules established by the State University Trustees. Consistent with the statutory responsibilities of such bodies, they shall develop and foster strong relationships between their institutions and local communities and promote campus and University interests.” The campus faculty “shall have the obligation to participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of the educational program.”

This chapter discusses the procedures and activities of (1) the Board of Trustees and the University Council (the institutional governing bodies), (2) the University Administration, and (3) faculty governance, in response to the charge questions posed to the Subcommittee on Leadership and Governance. The chapter draws on public documents in print or on Websites. The subcommittee interviewed, in person or by telephone, 11 current and former UAlbany presidents, provosts, and vice presidents. Three additional administrators responded to questions from the subcommittee in writing. The subcommittee interviewed, as a group, eight individuals who served as University at Albany Senate chairs from the period 2000 to the present, with one additional former Senate chair submitting a written response to questions. Written responses were received to questions from two leaders in student government. The document also uses the results of the Re-Accreditation Survey of faculty completed by the University in December 2008 as part of the self-study process. Three themes recur across the administrative and governance issues surfacing from the review of the documents, interviews, written responses, and survey results.

1 The re-accreditation survey results are available at https://wiki.albany.edu/display/middlestates/Re-Accreditation+Survey+Results. The survey was designed to address specific requests from various Self-Study subcommittees for additional information to answer their charge questions. Accordingly, the survey results, in and of themselves, should not be interpreted as summative evaluations of particular issues, programs, or offices.
First, the frequent changes in senior administration at the presidential and provost level since 2003 challenged administration and governance in several respects. The unexpected resignation of President Karen Hitchcock in October 2003 and the sudden death of President Kermit Hall in August 2006 were particularly notable events among several developments contributing to this instability. Criteria and systems for evaluating administrators shifted frequently; communication between administration and faculty governance operated in varying ways and perhaps helped undermine the development of stable expectations and working relationships; and it became difficult to establish a clear sense of direction at the University. These conditions certainly did not disable administration and shared governance, but they left them operating less effectively than they otherwise would have operated.

Second, despite the difficult circumstances, the routines of University administration and governance continued to operate reasonably smoothly, and in some areas quite well. For example, individuals interviewed by the subcommittee, including former presidents and provosts, said that they had been impressed by the high levels of individuals’ commitment to the University, and the ways in which core functions had been carried out consistently despite frequent administrative changes. During the period of the self-study, voting faculty were surveyed on their perceptions of the extent to which different units had fulfilled their functions effectively.

The following are the summary evaluative ratings of faculty expressing views of the:

- **SUNY Board of Trustees:** 12% satisfied or very satisfied; 36% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Council:** 19% satisfied or very satisfied; 16% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Administration:** 42% satisfied or very satisfied; 27% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Senate:** 28% satisfied or very satisfied; 18% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied

The faculty survey reported the following average levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, by faculty expressing views, concerning various support services.

- **Academic Support Services:** 53% satisfied or very satisfied; 12% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Advisement Services Center:** 51% satisfied or very satisfied; 20% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Career Services:** 51% satisfied or very satisfied; 15% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Counseling Center:** 61% satisfied or very satisfied; 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Disability Resources Center:** 71% satisfied or very satisfied; 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
University Health Center: 57% satisfied or very satisfied; 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
Office of the Registrar: 70% satisfied or very satisfied; 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
Office of Undergraduate Education: 64% satisfied or very satisfied; 9% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied

Third, the appointment in June 2009 of Nancy Zimpher as SUNY Chancellor and George Philip as permanent president of the University at Albany will help address many of the challenges discussed in this document. The appointment of two well-respected individuals to these key posts will provide a higher level of stability and sense of direction to the University than has existed in recent years.

**Institutional Governing Bodies**

State-operated SUNY campuses have two major governing bodies: the SUNY Board of Trustees (NYS Education Title 1 Article 8) and the University Council, which is a local “oversight board” as mandated by NYS Education Law Article 8 Section 356.

**Functions and Effectiveness of Governing Bodies**

**SUNY Board of Trustees**

The functions of the SUNY Board of Trustees are well-defined. SUNY System Administration is the administrative arm of the Board (www.suny.edu). Consequently, SUNY campuses generally engage with personnel in System Administration rather than directly with the Trustees. Similarly, when a SUNY campus proposes to add, extensively revise, or eliminate an academic program requiring approval or registration with the New York State Department of Education, the proposal is sent by the campus to the Office of the SUNY Provost. If the proposal is approved at that level, System Administration interacts as needed with NYSED’s Office of College and University Evaluation, which assures that programs offered for credit meet or exceed minimum quality standards.

The role and effectiveness of the Board of Trustees are not universally acknowledged. In the "Voting Faculty" survey, response to the question “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the SUNY Board of Trustees in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives,” 35% of the respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree,” and 19% chose “neutral.” Just 35% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 10% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” When asked whether the Board of Trustees “functioned effectively in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives for the last ten years,” 36% of respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree,” and 24% chose “neutral.” Just 12% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 28% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” It seems fair to note that the opinions the faculty have formed of the Board could have been based on perceived problems with that body during the period 2000-2006, as well as early actions of those Trustees that carried over into the self-study period.

---

2 BOT Policies, appendix and www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/index.cfm
In contrast to the voting faculty survey response patterns, both administrators and faculty governance leaders interviewed understood the roles of Trustees. Senior administrators noted little interaction between Trustees and campus leaders, and felt the distance from the Trustees impeded campus efforts.

In much of the period covered by this self-study, there was turnover of SUNY System leadership. When state leadership changed in 2007, one result was significant changes in membership and leadership of the Board. Similarly, SUNY saw a succession of chancellors and interim chancellors between 2004 and 2009, when Chancellor Zimpher was appointed. The response of both faculty leaders and campus administrators seems strongly positive concerning these SUNY System changes.

University Council

The responsibilities of UAlbany’s University Council are clearly defined. Among faculty governance leaders and campus presidents who dealt with the Council during the self-study period, there was consensus that the body performed effectively. The full list of University Council functions is available at [www.albany.edu/council/powersduties.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/council/powersduties.shtml), but its two principal functions are oversight of matters related to student welfare and behavior and, when the occasion arises, recommending candidates for President of the University to the Board of Trustees. It also has several other responsibilities, including naming buildings and grounds and the care and custody of the property. The minutes of the University Council reflect the body’s continuing scrupulous attention to student health and safety issues throughout the period. The Council also maintains, and every three years reviews and approves, an updated version of the Community Rights and Responsibilities booklet (available at: [http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/CRR%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/CRR%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf)).

The process by which members are selected is similar to that of the SUNY Trustees (nine of the ten members are appointed by the Governor, who also appoints one of them as Chair of the University Council. The tenth member is elected by the student body). As a local practice, the Vice Chair of the Senate, an alumni representative, and a graduate student representative selected by the Graduate Student Organization are invited to the meetings in the roles, as recounted by the past Senate Chairs-elect, of “observers.” Currently, six members are UAlbany alumni.

Former Chair George Philip stepped down upon becoming Interim UAlbany President in November 2007. Since then, Daniel Tomson, an attorney, has provided leadership to the group as “vice chair.” None of the three governors in the interim has designated a new chair.

The faculty governance leaders and senior administrative leaders rated the University Council as “effective” and its members as “dedicated to the University.” The University-wide survey of Voting Faculty (defined as both teaching faculty and professional employees), conducted for this self-study, gave the body a mean score 3.05 out of 5.0 on “effectiveness.”

The Council posts its functions and membership on the University's Web pages and holds a minimum of four open meetings annually. While governance leaders and campus administrators generally understand its responsibilities, most faculty do not share this perception. This lack of understanding may derive from the SUNY system’s layered structure of governance. In response to the survey question “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the University Council in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives,” 33% of the respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree” and 21% chose “neutral.” Just 33% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,”
and 14% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” Voting Faculty survey respondents were also asked to assess if the governing boards have “functioned effectively in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives for the last ten years.” For the Council, 16% of respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree” and 33% chose “neutral,” while 20% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 33% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.”

There is currently no mechanism to assess the Council on a regular, formal basis. Perhaps feedback from this survey should be provided to Council, and the survey repeated on a regular basis (at least triennially), to provide one form of assessment of the Council (as well as other governance and administrative entities that were the subject of the survey).

**Interaction and Communications between Governing Bodies and Faculty, Administration, and Students**

The Board of Trustees and its several committees meet regularly and post agenda of meetings and hold public hearings that are announced well in advance.

University governance has representatives on the SUNY University Faculty Senate, which interacts regularly with Trustees and SUNY System Administration. The president of the (SUNY-wide) Faculty Senate is now a member of the Board but does not have voting rights. However, communication about the Trustees beyond the University Senate is limited.

University Council agenda and minutes clearly show an active awareness of and response to issues relating to students, and reflect fulfillment of its obligation to review the *Community Rights and Responsibilities* document every two years. It was noted that because that document is maintained by the Division of Student Success and contains more external rules and regulations mandated for inclusion than used to be the case, the Council’s review has required less time than in the past. The other major function of the University Council is presidential searches; for much of the past decade, this responsibility dominated the concerns of the Council. The searches, being personnel matters, necessarily were conducted in closed session.

While the majority of faculty and students have little awareness of the Council beyond what is contained in informational updates and news accounts relating to presidential searches, faculty and students can communicate with the Council through their representatives’ participation at Council meetings. The one concern raised by chairs of the Senate (who as vice chairs attend Council meetings *ex officio*) is that they were rarely asked to comment and, not being full-fledged voting members of the body, generally felt they should leave when the Council went into closed session. One Senate Chair noted, however, that he remained at the table at such times and was not asked to leave. There was sentiment expressed by faculty leaders in favor of legislation that would grant voting privileges to the faculty representative to the Council.

In the interviews conducted of senior level administrators, some felt they had access to the Council as needed and were invited to report on their functions. One administrator reported having had no opportunity over the years to address the Council.

Gaps in the public availability of information and communications among these important stakeholders over numerous areas probably could be addressed relatively easily. Since information on Board of Trustees meetings on the group’s Website is limited, agendas, summaries of meetings, and other relevant information should be posted along with the existing postings of the Trustees’ Policies and Bylaws. Putting a summary of this information, with appropriate links, on the University Senate’s Website would provide a better context to those
members of the campus who are not familiar with the Board of Trustees and its relationship to
SUNY System Administration and the SUNY campuses. The University Senate’s Web pages
should also have links to the Web pages of the University Council, SUNY System
Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty (SUNY-wide) Senate.
College and school bylaws should be posted on their Websites, as currently practiced by the
College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering.

Where not already done and where appropriate, meeting times, with location and agenda, of the
University Senate should be posted in advance on the Web, in keeping with the requirements of
the Faculty Bylaws to distribute an agenda one week prior to a Senate meeting. Full text and
rationale of bills, resolutions and proposed amendments to the Senate Charter should be posted
with the Senate’s agenda for a forthcoming meeting.

The general point regarding communications and the sharing of information among these
important stakeholder groups is that each group should be mindful of the completeness of the
information on its Website, given that this likely is the main source of information used by the
campus community. Satisfying these recommendations might entail resource commitments, as
the subcommittee on Administration and Governance’s view is that information gaps, where they
occur, are due mainly to the logistics of making the information available, given competing
demands on time and resources.

One important example of uneven information is that understanding of the University Council
does not match the Council’s significance. A strong theme across the information reviewed for
purposes of creating the self-study was the importance and potential value of the University
Council. Although there was ample evidence that those who “need” to know of the existence and
functions of the University Council do so, there is a general lack of familiarity in the UAlbany
community regarding the Council. Therefore, the Council’s yearly series of open meetings
should be better publicized, and other campus Websites, notably the University Senate’s pages,
provide more information to explain the role of the Council.

In addition, the University should work with the new chancellor to urge that the Governor
appoint a chair of the University Council. Additionally, a procedure should be put in place, such
as the establishment of a vice chair, for an official who would ascend to the chair’s position on
an interim basis if circumstances warrant; in this way, the chair’s position will not remain
unfilled for an extended period in the future, as has occurred in the past.

The most substantial recommendation to emerge regarding the University Council is that the
campus consider whether to seek legislation to make the Council more of a local board of
trustees, extending its functions, notably in fiduciary matters, and perhaps modifying the
procedures through which its members are selected. This would require the support of the
chancellor and SUNY Board of Trustees. Because University Council members include alumni,
faculty, students, and community representatives, the Council is well positioned to have a deep
understanding of both the senior administration and the campus as a whole. A Council with a
broader mandate could be a very important vehicle for effective presidential evaluation and
advocacy for the University with the broader community, including regular communication with
the chancellor and Board of Trustees.
Responsibility for and Effectiveness in Securing Resources for UAlbany

There have been five chancellors (or officers in charge) in the last five years and, as noted above, a change in membership of the Board of Trustees. This instability, in the context of the New York State’s continuing financial crisis, may have hampered the effectiveness of System Administration and the Board in securing resources for the System. Interviews suggest that the appointment of Chancellor Zimpher is viewed as promising for the System and for the University at Albany.

The University Council’s official charge does not include securing resources. However, the University Foundation has stepped into this effort for the University, and Council members are very active and supportive in this effort. As recommended above, the role of the University Council should be redefined by the New York State Legislature to include advocacy and fiduciary responsibilities.

Presidential Appointments and Assessments

The University Council discharged its responsibilities with respect to recommending a president twice during the period since the last accreditation. The first search, 2004-05, resulted in the appointment of President Hall, whose sudden death in August 2006 required a second search, which continued into 2009. This latter search produced five finalists whose names, at some of the candidates’ insistence, were not disclosed to the campus or external communities at the time of the campus interviews. There was widespread feeling among UAlbany faculty that this was a procedural violation of SUNY policies, though a fairly large number of governance and other faculty leaders, student government representatives, and administrative leaders participated in the closed, off-campus interviews. As it turned out, the five names were leaked to the local press and, for reasons not made public, all five withdrew their names from consideration. It is critical that in the future all such searches should follow applicable rules.

Subsequently, the University Council consulted members of the Search Committee and recommended to incoming Chancellor Zimpher that President Philip be selected. On June 4, the chancellor announced in a well-attended gathering of faculty, staff, students, and community leaders her recommendation to the Trustees that then Interim President Philip be made permanent in the post. (Last year’s president of the Student Association, on behalf of that organization, had already made this recommendation to the University Senate in his final report.)

With the exception noted above regarding finalists’ names not being made public, the individuals who served as chairs-elect of the University Senate affirmed in interviews with this self-study subcommittee that the Council’s efforts in these searches to recruit a new leader were conducted according to the policies and procedures governing searches. They also testified that faculty input and participation in these searches were appropriately welcomed and regarded.

Presidential assessments are the responsibility of the chancellor and have been affected by considerable transition both in SUNY and at the University. During the period there has been only one presidential review. The presidents interviewed noted the nature and interval of presidential review varied with the chancellor, and there was some consensus among the presidents that it would be beneficial for all concerned if the reviews occurred yearly or biennially so any problems that might be identified could be addressed as soon as possible. It is therefore recommended that frequent, regular reviews by the chancellor of the UAlbany president—as opposed to formal evaluations separated by several years—be instituted, as they
would benefit UAlbany and the president. Regular feedback on the direction of UAlbany from the chancellor to the president would allow any necessary course corrections to occur more easily.

Assessments of activities on campus occur unevenly in the academic and administrative spheres. It seems that, in addition to turnover in leadership, the pressures of routine activities reduce the attention to ongoing and consistent assessment of the performance of units. While continuity and progress in the realm of academic assessment have been achieved, procedures and criteria for reviewing administrative offices and senior administrators have varied with changes in leadership. Some critical new areas, like information technology, received substantial attention by some senior administrators but less attention than warranted from important units like the University Council. The Going Forward Plan is a good example of systematically reviewing issues, and such planning might be built into routine systems of review and assessment. As noted in the chapter on Institutional Effectiveness, the campus should revisit the Institutional Assessment Plan, with particular emphasis on refocusing administrative unit assessments.

It is strongly recommended that the campus survey of faculty completed for the Middle States self-study be done annually as a way to monitor faculty views and conditions at the University.

**University Administration**

The University Administration is organized under the president, the senior staff, and the oversight and advisory body of the University Council. Appointed by the Board of Trustees, the president serves as the chief executive officer of the University and reports to the chancellor of the State University of New York System (the specific responsibilities of the president are listed on the University’s Website, http://www.albany.edu/presidentialsearch/position.php). Over the past decade the University has been under the leadership of six presidents or interims, and was without a permanent president between the death of President Hall in 2006 and the appointment of Interim President Philip as president in June 2009.

**Clarity of the Requirements and Qualifications for President and Senior Administrative Officers**

Among members of the senior administration interviewed for this study, there is a general consensus that the roles of the University president and senior administrative offices generally were clearly defined and understood during this period of change, although there were some differing views on the appropriate balance of the external and internal roles of the president.

**Effectiveness of Interactions with Governing Bodies and University Governance**

According to the interviews, the frequent transitions of administration produced some ambiguity in the communication of expectations. As a result of senior staff working diligently and persistently to overcome the problem of leadership turnover, team-building between faculty and senior staff has suffered. These transitions have also affected the relationship between the senior administration and governance bodies, including the Senate, student governance, college and school governance and deans, and SUNY System Administration. Frequent disruption of working relationships likely impeded the development of familiarity and trust among individuals and units on campus, including the relationships between administration and faculty governance bodies, resulting in suspicions about lack of “transparency” in decision-making and a lowering of the quality of communications. By no means have these difficulties disabled interactions, but
they seem to have led to their functioning less effectively and efficiently than they would otherwise.

Despite working through contentious issues from time to time, both administrators and those with experience in university governance spoke of an emerging tension involving the administration and governance bodies over the past several years. This tension has often arisen around differences of opinion regarding when consultation with governance bodies is appropriate and a lack of clear consensus on the boundaries of administrative purview. Voting faculty’s overall ratings and open-ended comments regarding the administration and/or the University Senate in the survey also suggest that this is an important concern. It is therefore recommended that the administration and faculty governance examine the tension between the current Board of Trustees’ policies and sections of the faculty bylaws and Senate charter as an important element of their review of strengthening working relationships.

Clarity of Definition of President’s Role in Relation to SUNY Board of Trustees, University Council, and the University Senate

Ultimately the president has an active internal and external role in maintaining the academic excellence and fiscal integrity of the University. To achieve these ends, the president works with the SUNY System Administration, the University Council, the University Senate, and with the eight vice presidential divisions of the senior leadership team.

Past presidents and interim presidents interviewed for this study agree that in general the president’s role is clearly defined. This opinion is supported by the survey results which show that the majority (75%) of the voting teaching and non-teaching faculty respondents agree or strongly agree that they “understand the functions and responsibilities of the University Administration” (including the president), while only 10% disagree or strongly disagree (the other 15% are neutral or have no answer). Similarly, past and present senior administrators interviewed for this study agree that the president’s role is clearly defined. Past presidents and interim presidents also agree that the president’s role and responsibilities are clear and distinct from those of the SUNY Board of Trustees, the University Council, and the University Senate. The written policies of these governing bodies are widely available on the Web.3

Definition and Organizational Description of Senior Administrative Officers and Offices

The president’s senior leadership team includes eight vice presidential areas: Academic Affairs, Research, Student Success, Finance and Business, the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE), Athletics and Recreation, University Development, and Communications and Marketing. The offices of the University Counsel, Diversity and Affirmative Action, Strategic Initiatives, Audit and Management Services, and the CIO also report to the president in the University organizational plan (Appendix 4.5). The vice presidential divisions changed significantly over the course of this self-study period. In the past decade the University has been under the leadership of four different provosts, has added Athletic Administration and Communications and Marketing to the senior administration, and with the addition of CNSE, there is now a senior vice president and chief executive officer of that college who also serves as the vice president and special advisor to the president for University-Wide Economic Innovation & Outreach.

The senior leadership team covers a comprehensive array of administrative responsibilities. The provost supervises eight of the schools and colleges at the University and the offices of Undergraduate Education, International Education, Graduate Studies, Institutional Research, Enrollment Management, and the Libraries. The vice president for Research supports all research endeavors at UAlbany and oversees regulatory research compliance, sponsored programs, technology development, and the University’s research centers, institutes, and laboratories.

The Division of Student Success provides opportunities and support for students to learn the intellectual and personal skills necessary to succeed in an academic community and in a global society. The Department of Athletics and Recreation facilitates the NCAA Division I athletic program and acts as a liaison between the University, athletic administration, and student-athletes, providing academic support services for student-athletes through academic tutoring, counseling, and monitoring.

The Division of Finance and Business oversees the Office of Human Resources and the areas responsible for general accounting, accounts payable and receivable, procurement contracts and purchasing, student financial services, sponsored funds, and other related fiscal functions of the University. The Office of Communications and Marketing is responsible for the integration and implementation of strategic public relations programs designed to build credibility and advance positive visibility of the University among its constituents. The Office of University Development oversees campaign/development, and corporate, foundation and advancement services to raise funds for the University.

CNSE offers the emerging disciplines of nanoscale science and engineering as well as emerging nanoscale-enabled disciplines of the 21st century, including nanoelectronics, nanoeconomics, bioinformatics, renewable green energy, infotonics, environmental technologies, biotechnology, and telecommunications. The leader of CNSE has a unique set of responsibilities, which are reflected in his titles, listed above, as the college’s chief administrator and special advisor to the president on economic innovation and outreach, and also as professor of nanoscience. The CNSE physical plant falls under the purview of that college.

One of the most significant developments in administration and governance since 2000 has been the growth and development of CNSE and the evolution of a system whereby it remains within the University while being granted separate, autonomous governance structures in key areas (SUNY Board of Trustees resolutions 2004-41 and 2008-165 and University Senate Resolution 0405-01R, at Website http://www.albany.edu/senate/0405-1R_Resolution_Endorsing_MOU_with_CSNE.htm).

**Methodology and Effectiveness of President and Senior Administrative Officer Assessment**

Senior administrative areas reported that internal performance reviews by the Office of the President are completed, but that the methodology used has been inconsistent from year to year given the frequent turnover of senior leadership. Each unit also has its own style of conducting its reviews. The presidents and provosts have had performance reviews but they have not been consistent, either in regularity or methodology. Performance reviews have ranged in frequency and scope from annual evaluations to 360-degree evaluations. Those interviewed acknowledge that some offices and departments cannot be evaluated using the same methods and standards as others. The performance of The Office of University Development, for example, can clearly be evaluated by seeing how fundraising levels compare with fundraising goals; a review of the more
dynamic mission and goals of the Office of Academic Affairs, on the other hand, requires a much different method of evaluation. Collective bargaining agreements and SUNY Board of Trustees policies dictate annual review of all professional staff, but this has not been done consistently across the University under different administrations.

**Appropriate Staffing in Relation to Overall Institutional Mission and Goals and the Pursuit of Professional Development**

Within each unit, there are procedures to develop a mission and to set goals and monitor their attainment. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, planning has been episodic in some units and uncoordinated with planning conducted by other units within the institution. Again, the methodology for planning differs from unit to unit. An overwhelming majority of the divisions reported that they are understaffed. A significant majority reported that the lack of staff is affecting the division’s ability to fulfill its mission. All divisions have been forced to do more with less. The only divisions that claim staffing is adequate are those that raise their own funding from external sources.

Staffing issues also extend to professional development. All units report that, due to a lack of funding, there is a problem with offering professional development. Budgets have been cut sharply and travel is one of the first items to go. There are some opportunities for on-campus training, but this does not fill all needs. The attending of external conferences offers the best opportunities for casual networking with colleagues and learning how others are handling similar problems. Creating external contacts is also extremely important. Rectifying these deficiencies may have to wait for substantial improvement in the budget situation.

**Adequacy of Information Technology Infrastructure for the Academic Mission and Individual Office Support of the Academic Mission**

Units that support the attainment of the University’s academic mission include ITS and the University Libraries. The range of satisfaction with IT services is diverse. The academic support structure reports more satisfaction than the administrative divisions. There is an inherent challenge in reconciling what the administrative units feel it takes to do the job and what ITS is able to accomplish with current resources. The opinion supported by the survey is that the University Libraries’ infrastructure supports the academic and research missions of the University effectively; 60% of the respondents felt the Libraries performed “somewhat well” or “very well.” In contrast, only 37% of faculty and staff surveyed thought existing information and decision-support systems adequately inform administrative decisions “somewhat well” or “very well.” From the student perspective, it is noteworthy that computing support has been an area of steady student satisfaction, as exhibited in the 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009 findings of SUNY’s Student Opinion Survey (SOS). In the most recent SOS (2009), 62% of students reported being satisfied or very satisfied with computer support services, and 69% were satisfied or very satisfied with the University’s computer network.

**Clarity of Lines of Organizational Authority and Responsibility in Administrative Offices**

Most administrative areas have an extremely tight organizational structure and definitive lines of reporting and accountability are clear. As reported by one division where two areas of responsibility overlapped, the staffs from each area felt they were ultimately accountable but did not have the authority to effectively carry out that responsibility.
Influence and Operations of Union Agreements and Research Foundation Agreements

Union agreements are understood at the University and clearly recognized by administration. There is some concern that union agreements provide unwelcome limitations with respect to personnel issues. For example, administrators across the divisions agree that unions lessen the ability to meet recent budget cuts. However, most acknowledge that unions are an intrinsic part of the University administrative environment and that their policies must be incorporated in decisions.

Union leadership believes that there has been an overarching improvement in working relationships with campus administration over the past five years. Accessibility, inclusiveness, and open door policies set forth by presidents over this period have facilitated positive working relationships between union leadership and administrators at multiple levels which are highly respected as being proactive. Union leadership believes that this has led to consultative practices between labor and management that result in fewer contract violations as well as diminished multi-level grievance proceedings.

The Research Foundation (RF) is another organization that deals with personnel at the University. The RF was created in 1951 to support research, education and public service at SUNY. Through a 1977 agreement with SUNY, the RF was designated as the organization responsible for managing sponsored programs. The RF helps SUNY acquire, administer and manage external funds to advance research and education, and transfer technology from campuses to the marketplace. The RF provides SUNY campuses with services, such as affiliated corporation establishment and support, sponsored programs administration, and technology transfer. Related services that the RF performs include human resources/payroll administration and purchasing and payables administration for campus-related organization and affiliated corporations.

The RF is a private, nonprofit educational corporation. It does not receive services provided to New York State agencies or state appropriations to support corporate functions. The RF is an employer separate and distinct from SUNY and the State of New York, thereby offering separate and distinct compensation and benefits. The RF is governed by a board of directors, composed of representatives of business and industry, researchers and campus and system administrators. The chancellor of the University serves as chair of the board *ex officio*. A Sponsored Programs Advisory Council, composed of faculty researchers and campus administrators, provides operating advice to RF management.

The RF consists of a central office working in conjunction with operating units at 30 campus locations across New York State. The campus RF offices are responsible for the day-to-day administration of sponsored programs, including financial, human resources, procurement and reporting activities. The offices provide this support in accordance with federal, sponsor, RF, SUNY, and campus guidelines. Sponsored program functions delegated to the campuses are conducted under the supervision of RF operations managers, who are appointed by the RF’s board on the recommendation of the respective campus presidents. The RF maintains an internal audit office that has a direct reporting line to the board of directors in addition to external auditors.
Faculty Governance

The Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees state that, on SUNY campuses, the faculty “shall have the obligation to participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of the educational program.” The faculty “shall prepare and adopt bylaws which shall contain: (1) Provisions for committees and their responsibilities; (2) Procedures for the calling and conduct of faculty meetings and elections; and (3) Provisions for such other matters of organization and procedure as may be necessary for the performance of their responsibilities….Bylaws shall be consistent with and subject to the Policies of the Board of Trustees of State University of New York, the laws of the State of New York, and the provisions of agreements between the State of New York, and the certified employee organization established pursuant to Article 14 of the Civil Service Law. Provisions of bylaws concerning consultation with the faculty shall be subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer of the college. All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college.”

The two main documents at the University at Albany relating to faculty governance are the Faculty Bylaws and the Charter of the University Senate. The preamble to the Faculty Bylaws states: “The responsibility of the Faculty for the conduct of the University's instructional, research, and service programs, and its right to create bylaws to establish mechanisms to discharge those responsibilities, are derived from the ‘State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees.’” The Bylaws establish “the inclusion of professional as well as teaching staff into the faculty, and the inclusion of participation from administration and students into a University Senate.” Thus, the University Senate is not a “faculty senate;” it is a University Senate. Some faculty are “teaching-only” faculty, while many professional staff members are members of the Senate and referred to as “Non-teaching Faculty,” although some do in fact teach classes. The Senate also includes ex officio members of the administration and student representatives.

Beginning in 2001 the University Senate Executive Committee began comprehensively revising the Faculty Bylaws and the Charter of the University Senate. The revisions originally were initiated because current practices in areas such as Senate communication with the faculty did not align with the decades-old text of the Bylaws and Charter which, for example, predated internet communication. Regardless of the original impetus for the revisions, the changes were made in a context in which some faculty members and some members of the University administration disagreed sharply on specific issues. A faculty committee drafted the revisions in consultation with faculty and the administration; they were approved unanimously on December 8, 2003, and signed by President Hitchcock. Partly reflecting this context, the revised Bylaws and Charter set out in much greater detail the mechanisms through which the administration consults with the faculty, and explicitly identified the University Senate as the body representing the collective will of the faculty.

The revision of the University’s Faculty Bylaws and adoption of the Senate Charter also increased the number of teaching and professional faculty members of the Senate and most of its councils and committees. In addition, a new standing committee, two new councils, and several new council subcommittees were created. Because the revised Bylaws established attendance requirements, attendance is monitored, but so far no senator has had to face expulsion for absenteeism.
The University Senate membership contains ex-officio voting members, appointed members, and elected members spanning the range of constituencies on campus (See Article II, Section 2 of the Bylaws). The Executive Committee of the Senate (Article II, Section 4) contains the elected leadership of the Senate, including Council chairs and elected leaders of certain student governance organizations.

In addition to the Executive Committee of the Senate, the Senate contains other committees and councils, all of which are discussed in detail in the Bylaws and Charter. These councils and committees, which are listed on the current University Senate Web page http://www.albany.edu/senate/councils_committees.htm, span the range of programs and issues found at the University at Albany, providing a structure in which the University Senate can engage the University comprehensively. University Senate elections have been conducted in a timely fashion, and more than enough faculty members have volunteered to fill Senate committees and councils. To support the goal of broad participation in university governance, term limits were instituted. Under Bylaws Section II.2.8, the term limit for someone elected to the Senate is six consecutive years (three consecutive two-year terms). The elected senators are 10 teaching faculty, professional faculty and part-time faculty elected University-wide by the voting faculty, plus 44 voting faculty elected proportionately by their colleges and schools plus the 12 undergraduate and graduate students elected by their constituencies. The term limit for faculty membership on a Senate council or standing committee is also six consecutive years. There is no term limit for an ex officio member of a council, standing committee, subcommittee of a council, or the Senate Executive Committee. In recent years the Senate has improved its administrative and information systems in an attempt to stimulate faculty engagement in governance, such as a system of on-line voting in Senate elections. The documents establishing faculty governance are readily available to the campus community through the Senate Website, and address governance issues comprehensively. Furthermore, the Website contains extensive information on the Senate’s operations, including membership, schedules, reports, meeting minutes, texts of legislation and resolution, and other materials. Survey respondents generally understand the functions of the Senate. The survey of faculty completed for this self-study presented the statement “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the UAlbany University Senate in advancing UAlbany's mission and objectives.” Using a 1-5 scale, with 5 indicating “Strongly Agree,” the average of responses was 3.50 overall, and 3.57 and 3.41 for teaching-only [TO] and non-teaching [NT] faculty, respectively.

One other level of faculty governance is at the college and school level. The Faculty Bylaws state that colleges and schools should establish bylaws, although such bylaws are not required. Eight of the University at Albany's nine schools and colleges, as well as the University Libraries, have written bylaws in place. The College of Computing and Information does not yet have written bylaws. While bylaws vary somewhat among the schools and colleges, the documents typically outline the role of the faculty, the role and responsibilities of any standing committees, governance structures, as well as policies pertaining to these structures, and the duties and responsibilities of the administration of the college or school. Most of the schools and colleges have faculty governance structures that address personnel policies, school/college budget issues, and organizational issues. These governance structures at the school and college level also generate many of the proposals that go to the University Senate.

---

4 http://www.albany.edu/senate/index.htm
The College of Arts and Sciences and CNSE have posted their bylaws and information regarding faculty governance in an easily accessible manner on their colleges’ Websites. The bylaws of the other seven schools and colleges are not posted on Websites and thus not as widely available.

**The Extent to Which Faculty Governance Reflects its Written Procedures**

The University Senate has dealt with a substantial number of proposals and campus issues over the period of the self-study. From the 2002-2003 through the 2008-2009 academic years (for which data are readily available), the Senate forwarded to the president 160 completed items of legislation, ranging from 13 items in 2002-2003 to 34 in 2007-2008.

Faculty responses to the survey regarding the Senate’s core work of program review and approval are generally neutral. The responses to the statement “The processes of the University Senate are constructive and effective for curricular changes, new programs, or other initiatives requiring Senate review” were 3.15 for all faculty, 3.05 for teaching-only (TO) faculty, and 3.26 for non-teaching (NT) faculty. Twenty-three percent of faculty members (19% TO faculty and 28% NT faculty) indicated “don’t know/not applicable” in response to this statement.

In the period covered by the self-study the University Senate has engaged several complex issues affecting a wide range of organizations and processes on campus. These include, among many other matters, the revisions of the Faculty Bylaws and the Senate Charter, the creation of the CNSE the College of Computing and Information, related governance matters, and the establishment of a new procedure for review of alleged academic misconduct. The evidence suggests that the campus governance system has demonstrated an ability to deal with potentially contentious issues in ways that, while not necessarily leading to unanimous agreement, avoided long-term, persistent conflicts.

**Effectiveness of Faculty Governance Interaction with Governing Bodies and Administration**

Faculty governance participates actively in University decision-making, as indicated by its formal responsibilities and authority outlined in the Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charter and the numerous actions spanning campus life undertaken since 2000. Interviews with University administrators done for the self-study indicate vividly that faculty governance is a salient presence in the way these administrators conduct their operations and make decisions.

There is a long-standing tension between the wording of the Policies of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Bylaws that may put a strain on effective working relationships on campus. The policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees emphasize the importance of faculty involvement in decisions on campuses; faculty must become involved in an effective, responsible way, and administrators must consult extensively with faculty. At the same time, at the campus level, the president retains the ultimate authority for decisions subject to federal and state law, collective bargaining agreements, or other higher authorities, and the Board of Trustees policies state: “All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college.”

However, Article II, Section 2.4 of the Faculty Bylaws says that “the Faculty executes its responsibilities directly, as authorized by Section 2.2.1” (curriculum, academic standards, and other areas). The Board of Trustees policies stipulate that “All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college,” and Section 2.2.1. of the Faculty Bylaws says “The Faculty may initiate and shall disapprove or approve and
recommend for implementation...” [changes in curriculum and so forth; italics added]. So, it is not clear what it means to say that the Senate “directly” exercises control over any area.

Also, the statement in Article II, Section 1 of the Faculty Bylaws that “The Senate shall be the principal policy-forming body of the University” does not square with the Board of Trustees Policies’ emphasis on the authority and accountability of the chief administrative officer to the Board of Trustees regarding decisions on campus. In practice, a president who pushed his or her authority so far as to disregard major and often decisive faculty input on curricular decisions and the like would be ineffective because such action would antagonize the faculty. On the other hand, if the University Senate saw itself as “the principal policy-forming body of the University” to the degree that it asserted control over decisions which the Board of Trustees’ policies place with the president’s administration — for which the president is accountable — it would make it difficult for the administrative system to operate effectively.

The Middle States Site Visit team in 2000 led off its discussion of university governance by saying: “The University at Albany may be one of those unusual, increasingly rare campuses where governance appears to work effectively and relatively efficiently—as perceived by both administrators and the faculty—at the University, School, and College levels. In an era in which effective campus governance is all too rare, there is a consensus at the institution that the values of shared governance are alive and well.” As noted above, the revised Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charter, approved in 2003-2004, elaborated and formalized procedures of administrative consultation with the Senate. As these changes have been interpreted and implemented, different perspectives within Senate leadership and the University administration on the appropriate balance of administration and faculty authority in dealing with campus issues have increased the level of tension between the administration and Senate since 2004. These tensions have not disabled shared governance, but the theme of increased tension did surface in interviews, and in open-ended responses to the survey, and the working relationships have not been as successful as they otherwise might have been.

Interviews with individuals functioning in the presidential or provost roles in recent years referred to the relationship with the University Senate as, on the high end, one of mutual respect. On the low end, the interviews referred to, among other traits, “constant negativity and general suspicion” to a degree not seen at any other institution with which the individual had experience. In between were comments by administrators referring to an adversarial atmosphere with the University Senate. Referring to senior administrators belonging to the Senate as ex officio members, one individual spoke of a perceived sentiment within the Senate Executive Committee that ex officio members are not “real” members. This individual also referred to the “oppositional quality” of interactions with the University Senate. Subcommittee notes from the group interview with Senate chairs, and a written response to questions, produced comments (Appendix 4.2) from multiple participants on the interactions of the University Senate with the administration. Results show diverse perspectives on the effectiveness of those interactions. For example, Senate leadership continues to express concerns about what it believes to be a lack of consultation by the administration with faculty governance over the past several years. These concerns are outlined in a report by the Governance Council to the Senate in 2009 (http://www.albany.edu/senate/03-09-09_Senate_Minutes.doc, and http://www.albany.edu/senate/04-06-09_Senate_Minutes-jwd.doc).
One of the concerns discussed in the subcommittee, and expressed in open-ended responses to the faculty survey, is that over the past five years there has been a group of members appearing repeatedly on the Senate Executive Committee, reinforcing an ongoing tension with the administration. The subcommittee examined a spreadsheet of the frequency with which individuals participated on the Senate Executive Committee since 2000 (Appendix 4.3). The subcommittee did not unanimously agree on the implications of repeated appearance of individuals on the Senate Executive Committee in the recent period.

One point of view on this issue is that the composition of Senate leadership, and the membership of its councils and committees and the Senate as a whole, reflect an open, transparent, and legally established process of elections and appointments. No group of faculty members could exercise disproportionate influence over the University Senate, given the openness and transparency of this process; outcomes reflect the collective will of the faculty. Furthermore, since 2004 the increase in the volume of formal legislation generated by the Senate demonstrates an increase in the vitality and effectiveness of faculty governance on campus, and a restoration of an appropriate and constructive level of faculty influence that had weakened in the preceding two decades (Appendix 4.4.). Over this period the University Senate has affirmed the essential role of the faculty, emphasized in the Board of Trustees’ policies, in overseeing decisions at the University.

The other point of view is that in recent years the political environment and implementation of this legally established process have become dysfunctional. A small group of voting faculty that is intensely interested in governance and suspicious of the administration has shaped the operating style of the Senate since 2004, and other faculty members are less likely to participate in the Senate or have withdrawn from it. The recent proliferation of Senate legislation reflects an overreaching of attempts to control activities at the University, eroding what were well-functioning working relationships between faculty governance and the administration. The spike in formal legislation exemplifies a problem rather than a healthy situation. As noted above, individuals differ in the extent to which they hold either of these points of view.

Effectiveness with which the Senate Represents Constituencies and Informs Administrative Operations

As noted earlier, the Faculty Bylaws establish “the inclusion of professional as well as teaching staff into the faculty, and the inclusion of participation from administration and students into a University Senate.” Thus, the University Senate is not a faculty senate; it is a University Senate, combining faculty, administrators, and students.

The UAlbany Faculty/Staff Re-Accreditation Survey (December 2008) surveyed faculty, including teaching-only faculty (TO) and non-teaching faculty (NT) (non-teaching faculty generally are in administrative roles). About 77% of the faculty respondents answered “none” or “not much” when asked of their level of participation in the University Senate; the corresponding figures for TO and NT Faculty were 72% and 83%, respectively. An ambiguity in these results is whether respondents were referring to their current direct participation in the Senate as Senate members or members of a Senate council or committee—which by definition would produce a low rate of participation—or responding on their overall level of participation or engagement.
with the Senate over the last several years. However, other information, discussed below, 
indicates a low level of interest and participation in the University Senate on the part of faculty.

On average, faculty members respond neutrally to the statement “The University Senate has 
functioned effectively in advancing the University's mission and objectives for the last ten years.” The overall faculty rating of the Senate was 3.11, with 2.97 for teaching-only faculty and 3.29 for non-teaching faculty. The group interview with faculty members who had served as Senate chairs indicated hope for wider faculty participation in the Senate. The comments referred to faculty tendencies to focus on their disciplines as opposed to more collective University issues 
raised by the Senate, resulting in limited faculty participation in the Senate.

The Faculty Bylaws and Charter of the University Senate call for substantial student 
participation in the Senate as a whole and on its councils and committees. For example, Article 
II, Section 2.6 of the Bylaws specifies that the Senate should include 15 student senators, with 
dergraduate and graduate students represented in proportion to their enrollment at the 
University; the majority of the councils and committees also require appointment of student 
members. Students, including students appointed to the Senate and its councils and committees, 
actually are involved in Senate activities much less than the Bylaws and Charter specify. Student 
attendance at meetings is, at best, uneven, with a small number of students participating on a 
consistent basis but most student members not participating. Students and faculty comment that 
student appointees likely underestimate the time commitments of the Senate and the University 
Senate interacts with student organizations infrequently, leading to students not seeing it as 
central to student governance.

Student leaders also comment, however, that when students are interested in specific issues 
before the Senate they are able to become involved through the power granted to them by the 
Bylaws and Charter, and have done so on several occasions over the period covered by the self-
study. So, while student participation in the University Senate is low, this is more a function of 
student choice than an absence of formal access and power. However, student leaders also noted 
that periodic visits by University Senate leaders to meetings of student governance organizations — in a show of reciprocity — might lead students to increase their Senate involvement.

While faculty governance and administration interactions have been largely effective and 
successful, it is nonetheless important to encourage wider involvement in governance by faculty 
members and students. It is recommended that the president, provost, vice presidents, college 
and school deans, department chairs, and directors of offices and centers encourage their faculty, 
both teaching and professional, to run for seats on the University Senate and their college/school 
governance bodies, and to volunteer for Senate councils. Student Association and Graduate 
Student Organization should attempt to elect their Senators and place student representatives on 
Senate councils early enough for the students to participate fully in the governance process. The 
University Senate should consider amending the process by which part-time faculty Senators are 
elected (currently by vote of full-time faculty) and examine whether comparable representation 
on the Senate should be extended to representatives of the emeritus faculty and of those 
employed in the Research Foundation.

**Ongoing Assessment of Faculty Governance**

While a formal structure of periodic review of faculty governance is not in place, faculty 
governance at the University at Albany is quite active, and it has responded to a variety of new 
issues. Since 2000, this is indicated, for example, by the number of its formal actions sent to the
president, revision of the Faculty Bylaws and Charter, review of the establishment of CNSE and the College of Computing and Information, and the establishment of new procedures for investigating alleged academic misconduct. The subcommittee noted the value of the survey of faculty in assessing faculty perceptions of governance, as in other areas. Repeating the survey on an ongoing basis—triennially or biennially—would be a valuable exercise.
APPENDICES

Appendix 4.1 Summary of Recommendations

- The administration and faculty governance should examine the tension between the current Board of Trustees policies and sections of the faculty bylaws and Senate charter as an important element of their review of strengthening working relationships.

- In order to encourage wider involvement in governance by faculty members and students:
  - The president, provost, vice presidents, college and school deans, department chairs, and directors of offices and centers should encourage their faculty, both teaching and professional, to run for seats on the University Senate and their college/school governance bodies, and also to volunteers for Senate councils.
  - The Student Association and Graduate Student Organization should attempt to elect their Senators and place student representatives on Senate councils early enough for the students to participate fully in the governance process.
  - The University Senate should consider amending the process by which part-time faculty Senators are elected (currently by vote of full-time faculty).
  - The University Senate should consider extending comparable representation on the Senate to representatives of the Emeritus Faculty and those employed in the Research Foundation.

- In order to close the gaps in the public availability of information and communications among faculty governance, the Board of Trustees, and the University Council:
  - Agendas, summaries of meetings, meeting Webcast announcements and links, and other relevant information should be posted along with the existing postings of the Trustees’ Policies and Bylaws.
  - The University Senate’s Web pages should add links to the Web pages of the University Council, SUNY System Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty (SUNY-wide) Senate.
  - The University Council’s Website should include information about its role and a schedule of its open meetings.
  - Feedback from the University-wide survey of voting faculty should be provided to the Council, (and the survey repeated on a regular basis — at least triennially — to provide one form of assessment of the Council as well as other governance and administrative entities).
  - College and school bylaws should be posted on their Websites, as currently practiced by the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering.
  - Where not already done and where appropriate, meeting times, place and agenda of the University Senate should be posted in advance on the Web, in keeping with the requirements of the Faculty Bylaws to distribute an agenda one week prior to a Senate meeting. Full text and rationale of bills, resolutions and proposed
amendments to the Senate Charter should be posted with the Senate's agenda for a forthcoming meeting

- The University should work with the new chancellor to urge the Governor to appoint a chair of the University Council, and that a procedure be put in place, such as the establishment of a vice-chair who would ascend to the chair’s position on an interim basis if circumstances warrant, so that the chair’s position will not remain unfilled for an extended period in the future, as has occurred in the past.

- The campus should seek legislation to make the Council more of a local board of trustees, extending its functions, notably in fiduciary matters, and perhaps modifying the procedures through which its members are selected.

- Frequent regularized UAlbany presidential reviews should be conducted by the chancellor, as opposed to the current formal evaluations separated by several years.

- As noted in the chapter on Institutional Effectiveness, the campus should revisit the Institutional Assessment Plan, with particular emphasis on refocusing administrative unit assessments, as administrative unit assessments are largely uneven in coverage and application.

- The campus survey of faculty, completed for the Middle States self-study, should definitely be done annually as a way to monitor faculty views and conditions at the University.
Appendix 4.2 Summary of Comments from the Group Interview with Senate Chairs

- Currently it is pretty effective.
- I don’t know how you measure or assess.
- The recent history is pretty good, but not perfect.
- It’s difficult to answer the question. The nature of the relationship depends heavily on personality.
- Ideally, you want governance to have consultative role with administration. Often, in the past, there was notification, but there have been other cases where there has been genuine advice.
- In earlier days there was a number of *ex officio* members on committees, and concern about administrative presence on those committees. There was a concern that many curricular issues were being done in administrative rather than Senate committees.
- There is a piece in the current bylaws/charter regarding assessment of administration that we are not doing.
- One needs to distinguish between notification and consultation.
- We are an important resource.
- *Ex officio* members on Senate committees remain an issue; the members are valuable, but there is question of balance.
- Budget transparency remains an issue.
- Sense of mutual trust and respect is critical. We need to distinguish between vigilance and cynicism; cynicism is not what you should be walking into a meeting with.
- We need judicious, thoughtful strategies, rather than automatically going nuclear.
- Beware of your reputation; it is your most valuable asset.
- Given the lack of stability of administration, we don’t have a good chance to develop stable relationships and trust over time.

The final bulleted point comes from a written response submitted by a former Senate chair who did not participate in the group interview.

- For the last couple of years, and even more during the current year, faculty governance as represented by University Senate and in particular its Senate Executive Committee has NOT interacted effectively with administration...How is the lack of effectiveness of the Senate measured? — by the decreasing attendance at Senate meetings, by the increasing unwillingness of faculty members to serve on Senate committees and councils, and by the lack of term limits for members of the Senate Executive Committee, who appear to have used their positions to create niches of power for themselves.
### Appendix 4.3: Membership on University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SEC Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Collier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MacDonald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Savitt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lanford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Wulfert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dudek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dewar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pipkin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hoyt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lyons</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. McCaffrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lifshin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Delano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Kranich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Pryse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Messner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Shub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Spitze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Monfasani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Raffalovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Schell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Dalton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chaiken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Doellefeld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Idone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Anderson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Andrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Baran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Castracane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Charlambous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Reinhold-Larrson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Mullin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Roberts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Videka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.-A. McNutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Abolafia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Raider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Duchessi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bosco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Toseland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Zitomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fessler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Goel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sherman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Liang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.5 Current Organization of UAlbany