Committee Reports and Attachments

Winter Plenary Meeting
Stony Brook University
January 21-23, 2016
Charge: The Committee on Diversity and Cultural Competence [now known as the Committee on Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity] will concern itself with issues pertaining to equity, inclusiveness and access, as they are reflected in the curriculum, student body, and personnel of the State University. Among the activities of this committee will be collecting and disseminating information, organizing periodic meetings and workshops, and providing guidance and recommendations to the Senate so that it may act with the best intentions of all people in mind.

2015-2016 Committee Members:

Chair: Noelle Chaddock, Chair  
Chief Diversity Officer - Director Multicultural Life and Diversity, SUNY Cortland  

Evan Bigam  
Community Development Specialist, SUNY Oswego  

Timothy Gerken, Chair UFS Ad Hoc Committee on LGBTQAI Matters  
Associate Professor, Morrisville State College  

Sunil Labroo - Professor, SUNY Oneonta  

Gloria Lopez  
Affirmative Action Officer, SUNY System Administration  

Chrisel Martinez  
SUNY Student Assembly  

Carlos Medina  
Chief Diversity Officer, Associate Provost, SUNY System Administration  

Sean Simpson  
Westchester Community College  

Soundarapandian Vijayakumar  
Associate Professor, SUNY Cobleskill  

Aimee Woznick  
Director of Academic Support Services & Asst. Professor, Empire State College  

Jie Zhang  
Associate Professor. The College at Brockport  

Ruhan Zhao  
Associate Professor, The College at Brockport  

Committee Goals for 2015-2016:

The goals highlighted in bold below have moved forward. The rest of the goals are in process through the work of subcommittees. We anticipate seeing the bulk of our work accomplished in the Spring 2016 semester.

1. Resolutions related to the Making Diversity Counts White Paper especially around promotion and tenure and considerations of service and publication around diversity inclusion and equity work  
2. Reach out to the Programs and Awards Committee about developing recognitions for campuses and individuals who are doing good work around Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion  
3. We will reach out to the campuses that have not finished the diversity survey with a return date of November 6, 2015 and begin working on analyzing the data with a report for the UFS body during the spring plenary
4. We will engage the senate in a conversation about the gap between illegal acts of discrimination and harm and the behaviors that negatively impact cultural climate in an attempt to identify ways to hold our campuses accountable for cultural climate issues.

5. Work with student life and the ADHoc LGBTQAI Matters in creating a resolution addressing the strong recommendation for implementation of the banner, registrar, and ID creations for preferred name and gender identity applications – will be brought to the senate floor during the Winter 2016 Plenary.

6. Co-drafting/submission of a resolution addressing gender inclusive spaces with the AdHoc LGBTQAI Matters and Student Life Committee – will be brought to the senate floor during the Winter 2016 Plenary.

7. We will be doing a research project on the practices. Processes and impacts around disclosing felony convictions at the point of application.

8. We will be doing a research project on the practices, process, and impacts of how diversity is being measured on campuses and in the system:
   a. Addressing the conflation of international and domestic students faculty and staff in the reported diversity number which is potentially confusing our sense of success in diversity as well as the ability to recruit, retain, and support our community across populations.
   b. Examining the role of the “other” box.
   c. International students – programs and locations of those students in the system – we are concerned with the non-matriculated student experience and the integration experiences of all international students.
   d. International and Domestic Faculty and Staff matters.
   e. Representation of visible and invisible populations outside of the federal mandated categories in our diversity numbers.

**Committee meeting dates: Currently meeting via phone conference.**

**Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Planning Meeting:**

1. Tim Gerken has been appointed to the Diversity Conference Planning Committee. The 2nd Diversity Conference co-hosted by the University Faculty Senate and the Office of Diversity Equity and Inclusion is tentatively scheduled for November 8-11, 2016.

**Requests to UFS Senators from committee:**

1. Please make sure that diversity equity and inclusion are part of your faculty senate and sector conversations. Just asking “what is going on with diversity equity inclusion access impact and bias on your campuses” will elicit a great deal of information.

2. Dig out that white paper! What has your campus done with this document? How can we help?

3. Has your body had a conversation about the Board of Trustees resolution on diversity? If not, why not? This should be a shared governance conversation.

4. Where is your campus regarding the Chief Diversity Officer position? Do you have one? What is the structure of that position? How is that position being received by your campus community?

5. Does your governance body and/or campus leadership need diversity training? Ask us! We have recommendations!!
University Faculty Senate Resolution Recommendation the SUNY Wide Implementation of Preferred Name and Gender Identity Applications on the Registration, Email, ID cards, and other Identification Systems

Whereas the SUNY Board of Trustees passed a resolution on September 10, 2015 “to make SUNY the most inclusive higher education system in the country”; and

Whereas SUNY has “defined diversity broadly to include race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity and expression, age, socioeconomic status, status as a veteran, status as an individual with a disability, students undergoing transition (such as transfer, stop-out, international student acclimation), and first-generation students”; and

Whereas “SUNY’s approach must employ best practices to attract diverse students, faculty, staff and administrative leaders, including efforts to strengthen the pipeline of diverse individuals with advanced credentials; ensure that services are in place to support retention (of faculty and students) and foster student completion at a rate that closes existing achievement gaps; and implement programs and strategies to establish a welcoming environment for all”; and

Whereas members of designated groups require specific action plans to be taken on their behalf to ensure inclusive and equitable learning and work environments; and

Whereas the practice of using “non-legal” names for the purposes of identification is long standing on our campuses; and

Whereas the practice of using a ”preferred name” does not change a person’s “legal identity” but creates equitable access to a persons lived experiences and intimate realities; and

Whereas being forced to use a name that does not represent one’s lived experience and intimate realities is harmful, traumatic, and damaging to a person’s health and wellness; and

Whereas students who are transgender, adopted, native, in domestic partnership, transitioning, victims of domestic violence, those with non-traditional family structures and any other number of possibilities desire the right to have access to preferred name and gender identity representation on our campuses; and

Whereas being able to use one’s “preferred name” is a reasonable accommodation that enhances our cultural climate and acts as a mechanism for inclusion and creates a welcoming environment; therefore,

Be it further resolved, That the University Faculty Senate recommends that SUNY System Administration require a SUNY-wide implementation of preferred name and gender identity policies and processes so that all students can equitably represent themselves on our campuses with their preferred names; and


Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to all Campus Presidents, Chief Information Officers, and SUNY System Administration that they implement the necessary processes and software to allow faculty, staff, and students the ability to use their preferred name and gender identities; and

Be it further resolved, that preferred name and gender identity policies and processes allow for flexible identity based on context and contact so that students can use a preferred name and gender identity on campus while not being “outed” at home or work; and

Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommend that the SUNY Chancellor and the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees make access to the use of preferred name and gender identity a standing policy of the Board of Trustees and SUNY System Administration.

Background

The Chronicle of Higher Education states that “Another concern cited by many study participants was not being able to include their chosen name (which for many differs from their birth name) or their gender identity on campus records. More and more colleges are creating a process for students to have their chosen first name (some institutions refer to this as "preferred" name, but it is not a preference) on course and grade rosters, advisee and campus housing lists, online directories, email addresses, unofficial transcripts, and identification cards and diplomas. But only about 150 colleges currently offer this option. There is no legitimate reason for colleges not to provide a chosen-name option; it is legal to do so in all states, and software systems used by campuses can be modified to accommodate an additional first name.

Only about a third of the colleges that allow students to add a chosen name also enable them to change the gender marker on their campus records, unless they have changed their gender on legal documents, which in many states requires undergoing gender-affirming surgeries. Having the gender marker on campus records match one’s gender identity and expression is important in instances when gender comes into play at colleges — such as for housing, locker-room, and bathroom purposes.”

http://chronicle.com/article/Leaving-No-Trans-College/233754/?key=TgpJxK1ElaUfogHu3cAXSVIc43vcqmHjA1L-LH--Q41CbEpibzU3U2tDQ2l2ckowUWViVTROSFNJRUZQeUJ5MGFmdVN3UGxlaGxB
University Faculty Senate Resolution
Recommending the SUNY Wide Implementation of Gender Inclusive Spaces

Whereas the SUNY Board of Trustees passed a resolution on September 10, 2015 “to make SUNY the most inclusive higher education system in the country”; and

Whereas SUNY has “defined diversity broadly to include race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity and expression, age, socioeconomic status, status as a veteran, status as an individual with a disability, students undergoing transition (such as transfer, stop-out, international student acclimation), and first-generation students”; and

Whereas “SUNY’s approach must employ best practices to attract diverse students, faculty, staff and administrative leaders, including efforts to strengthen the pipeline of diverse individuals with advanced credentials; ensure that services are in place to support retention (of faculty and students) and foster student completion at a rate that closes existing achievement gaps; and implement programs and strategies to establish a welcoming environment for all”; and

Whereas members of designated groups require specific action plans to be taken on their behalf to ensure inclusive and equitable learning and work environments; and

Whereas students, faculty, and staff who have gender expressions and gender identities that do match with male and female designated spaces—bathrooms, locker rooms, dressing rooms, and residential housing—are often unwelcome and unsafe in these spaces; and

Whereas to create a welcoming and safe environment for faculty, staff, students, alumni, and visitors all campuses must have spaces that accommodate a fluidity of gender identities, gender expressions, and biological sexes; therefore,

Be it resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to Campus Presidents, Chief Student Affairs Officers, and Chief Diversity Officers that they create gender inclusive spaces on all campuses where there are currently only male and female designated spaces; and

Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to Campus Presidents, Chief Student Affairs Officers, and Chief Diversity Officers that gender inclusive spaces be marked per their intended use without a gender designation (i.e. Men’s Room becomes Bathroom or Women’s Locker room becomes Locker room) and these spaces be placed on campus maps; and

Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to Campus Presidents, Chief Student Affairs Officers, and Chief Diversity Officers that gender inclusive housing be provided to all students on all campuses and this housing be part of regular student housing; and
Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to SUNY System Administration create gender inclusive spaces at SUNY System where there are currently only male and female designated spaces; and

Be it further resolved, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to the SUNY Chancellor and the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees that gender inclusive spaces become a requirement for campuses via a standing policy of the Board of Trustees and SUNY System Administration.

**Background**

1. BOT Memorandum September 10, 2015: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Policy
Committee On Ethics and Institutional Integrity  
Presented January 23, 2016 UFS Winter Plenary  
At Stony Brook, Stony Brook NY

Charge: The committee will study and make recommendations to the SUNY University Faculty Senate President regarding issues of professional behavior, ethical conduct and institutional integrity as they relate to faculty, students, administrators and other personnel in SUNY and higher education. The committee will gather information and serve as a resource for the Senate and the University.

The Committee will not serve as a disciplinary body nor will it take part in judicial proceedings.

The Committee’s area of activity and interest will be quite broad and will include but not be limited to the following areas as they pertain to the State University of New York:

Curriculum, Academic honesty, Research, scholarship and creative activity, Instructional, institutional and operational policies and practices, Personal integrity, Electronic communication, Confidentiality, Use of university resources, Conflicts of interest and commitment, Financial transactions, Impact on the environment, Hiring and admissions practices

Committee members: Carlie Phipps—Chair, Joshua Altemoos (SA), Amitabha Banyopadhyay (Farmingdale), Reneta Barneva (Fredonia), Sharon Boyce (Morrisville), Sandra Casey (System Admin), Andrew Fitz-Gibbon (Cortland), Joe Marren (Buffalo State), Kathleen Powderly (Downstate), Camilio Rojas (Dutchess CC, FCCC), Subrata Saha (Downstate), Diane Tice (Morrisville)

Committee Goals:
1. Submit SUNY Ethical Values statement for discussion at the fall plenary, confer with FCCC during the late fall, vote at January plenary
2. Develop a white paper on electronic privacy issues
3. Develop guidelines for implementation of the recommendations in the Chancellor’s Task Force on Social Media Responsibility report based on the Ethical Values statement
4. Work with Student Life committee on Bullying and Hazing paper

Committee meeting dates: September – UFS planning meeting, November meeting by phone conference, spring phone meetings to be planned

Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:
Work between Ethics subcommittee and FCCC representatives to revise values document; subcommittee progress on the electronic privacy statement

Requests to UFS Senators from committee:
1. Alert committee members to any electronic privacy issues that have arisen on your campuses
2. Watch for requests for information including your campus privacy policies

Anticipated upcoming actions/accomplishments:
Revision of the ethical values statement is in final stages and should be ready for spring plenary, white paper on electronic privacy is in progress, joint work with undergraduate committee members on bullying/hazing will be initiated.
Governance Committee
Report Date: January 13, 2016
Presented at: Winter 2016 UFS Plenary

Charge: The Committee shall concern itself with University-wide governance and shall provide guidance on matters of campus governance. The Committee shall interact with local governance leaders of the University.

2015-16 Committee Members:
Chair, Peggy A. De Cooke - Purchase College
Phillipe Abraham - University at Albany; Dale Avers – Upstate Medical; Mark Blakeslee – Morrisville; Ross Borden – Cortland; Marc Cohen – Student Assembly; Justin Giordano-Empire State College; Norman Goodman - Stony Brook University; Yenisel Gulatee – University at Albany; Fred Hildebrand - System Administration; Kat Kielar – University at Buffalo; Walt Nadolny - Maritime; Wendy Ravitz – System Administration; Jack Rivituso - Cobleskill; Ron Sarner-SUNY Poly; Shishir Singh – Empire State College; Daniel Smith – SUNY Polytechnic; Ken Vennette – Fulton Montgomery Community College

Committee Goals for 2015-16:
1. To finalize a resolution requesting that campuses discuss academic freedoms and formulate language that clarifies these freedoms for inclusion in campus bylaws, policies and procedures manuals, and handbooks. The resolution will be accompanied by a discussion packet to facilitate the discussions. Completed.
2. To finalize a Senate Bylaw amendment to have the Vice-President/Secretary of the Senate relinquish the campus seat upon election to the VP position. Completed.
3. To make recommendations concerning the timing and time frame of Presidential reviews, productive ways to involve all campus constituencies in the review, and ways to regularize the process. Completed.
4. Develop a white paper addressing the role of contingent faculty in shared governance, and provide guidance to campuses on the constitution of fair service and level of involvement in campus governance.
5. To develop guidance for campuses regarding faculty bylaws focused on academic searches at the level of Dean and above (excluding Presidents).

Committee meeting dates:
9/24-25/2015: Committee Planning Meeting (face to face)
11/2015: Committee Meeting (Electronic) – ongoing discussion to provide guidance to President Knuepfer on the presidential review process
02/2015: Committee Meeting (Electronic) (TBD)
03/2015: Committee Meeting (Electronic) (TBD)
04/2015: Committee Meeting (Electronic) (TBD)

Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:
1. Bylaws Amendment. At the Fall 2015 plenary, the Senate approved an amendment to the Senate Bylaws recommended by the committee. Specifically, the amendment endorsed the resignation of the Vice-President/Secretary of the Senate from the campus seat upon election to the VP position, clarified what happens when the Senator/VP terms do not coincide, and retained the ability of the VP to run for
President of the Senate. This amendment has been forwarded to the SUNY Board of Trustees for discussion and ratification at its January 2016 meeting.

2. **Presidential Reviews**
P. Knuepfer asked the committee to review the process put in place last summer to evaluate campus presidents, with particular emphasis on commitment to shared governance as reflected in the evaluation survey. After reviewing the survey materials, the committee identified several issues with the process concerning the timing and time frame of the review, and discussed productive ways to involve all campus constituencies in the review, as well as ways to regularize the process. The committee finalized its recommendations in November and sent them to P. Knuepfer.

3. **Contingent Faculty**
The committee continues its examination of best practices for involving contingent faculty in shared governance, begun last year. R. Borden has compiled information describing the definition of voting faculty in the state-operated and contract colleges and in the community colleges. The committee has drafted a survey to further explore how campuses actually translate these written practices into reality, focused on voting rights, and expects to distribute the survey to campuses following the Winter Plenary.

4. **Academic Searches at the Level of Dean and Above (Excluding Presidents)**
Last spring, the committee developed and distributed a survey exploring campus search practices. Responses were received from 23 campuses. P. De Cooke presented preliminary analyses that the committee discussed; when campuses have defined search procedures, they are generally followed but only half of the responding campuses had such procedures. A small subcommittee has begun a more in-depth analyses to highlight problems with procedures, and is working on a draft document to provide guidance to campuses regarding the development of faculty bylaws focused on searches.

Requests to UFS Senators from committee:
The committee has developed a brief survey to explore the role of voting rights of contingent faculty on system campuses that will be distributed to Senators/Campus Governance leaders at the Winter 2016 Plenary.

Anticipated upcoming actions/accomplishments:
1. Ongoing discussion concerning the roles that contingent faculty can/should play in voting on issues of importance to their institution, expectations for fair and equitable service to their institutions, and issues of climate, culture and civility. Next steps to be determined, but may involve further surveying of campus regarding important issues prior to developing a position statement.

2. The committee anticipates finalizing the academic search draft for discussion by the Spring Plenary.
Survey on Voting Rights for Contingent Faculty

The Governance Committee of the SUNY University Faculty Senate seeks your help in understanding the role of contingent faculty in shared governance on your campus. Where available, we have reviewed online campus governing documents. To be sure that we understand them and for additional information, we would appreciate your attention to this brief survey. Individual campuses will not be identified in our report on the findings of this survey for the SUNY University Faculty Senate. We only ask for identifying material at this time to track responses. Please return your completed surveys to peggy.decooke@purchase.edu Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

Your name:
The position in faculty/shared governance and the name of the campus governance organization you represent:
Campus and sector:

1. With respect to senate (or the equivalent campus governance body) elections and college-wide referenda, please indicate which faculty have voting rights. Check all that apply.

- Full-time academic faculty with continuing appointment
- Full-time academic faculty who are eligible for continuing appointment
- Full-time professional faculty with permanent appointment
- Full-time professional faculty who are eligible for permanent appointment
- Full-time academic faculty on contingent appointments – that is, who are ineligible for continuing appointment.
- Full-time professional faculty on contingent appointments – that is, who are ineligible for permanent appointments
- Part-time academic faculty on contingent appointments
- Part-time professional faculty on contingent appointments

2. Please indicate which faculty are eligible to serve on the faculty senate (or the equivalent campus governance body). Again, check all that apply.

- Full-time academic faculty with continuing appointment
- Full-time academic faculty who are eligible for continuing appointment
- Full-time professional faculty with permanent appointment
- Full-time professional faculty who are eligible for permanent appointment
- Full-time academic faculty on contingent appointments – that is, who are ineligible for continuing appointment.
- Full-time professional faculty on contingent appointments – that is, who are ineligible for permanent appointments
- Part-time academic faculty on contingent appointments
- Part-time professional faculty on contingent appointments

3. Where contingent faculty are eligible to serve on the faculty senate (or the equivalent campus governance body),

- a number of seats are reserved for contingent faculty, or
contingent faculty may serve in the same positions as tenure-track faculty.

4. Where contingent faculty have voting rights on the faculty senate (or the equivalent campus governance body), is there an FTE requirement?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Where there is an FTE requirement, please specify:
   - less than .5 FTE
   - .5 FTE or greater
   - greater than .5
   - 1. FTE

6. Where contingent faculty have voting rights on the faculty senate (or the equivalent campus governance body), is there a time-in-service requirement?
   - Yes
   - No

7. Where there is a time-in-service requirement, please specify:
   - one semester
   - one academic year
   - two academic years
   - other

8. Are there individual departments and/or other units at your institution where contingent faculty have voting rights?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

9. If contingent faculty have voting rights within departments and/or other units, please check all that apply.
   - There is an FTE requirement.
   - There is a time-in-service requirement.
   - Contingent faculty may vote in elections for department officers.
   - Contingent faculty may serve as department officers.
   - Contingent faculty may vote in elections for department committees.
   - Contingent faculty may serve on department committees.
   - Not sure.

If these questions have not captured the situation, we would appreciate it if you would provide a brief description of the role of contingent faculty in shared governance on your campus.
Graduate Academic Programs and Research Committee
Report Date:
Presented at: January 23rd 2016 UFS Plenary

Charge:

The Committee serves as a source of professional advice and guidance to the Senate on matters relating to the quality, operation, and encouragement of graduate programs and research. To these ends, the Committee may be concerned with the procedures, criteria, and support of existing and new graduate programs within the University. The Committee may review and recommend policies and procedures relating to moral and ethical concerns of research and graduate studies and other matters involving the furtherance of research and graduate studies within the University.

2015-2016 Committee Members:
Chair: Rosalyn Rufer (SUNY Empire State College)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Years on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sylwia Starnawska</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sylwia.starnawska@ESC.EDU">sylwia.starnawska@ESC.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Paige</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine.paige@ESC.EDU">christine.paige@ESC.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kaczocha</td>
<td>Stony Brook</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin.kaczocha@STONYBROOK.EDU">martin.kaczocha@STONYBROOK.EDU</a></td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalyn Rufer</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rosalyn.rufer@ESC.EDU">Rosalyn.rufer@ESC.EDU</a></td>
<td>2-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Ringler</td>
<td>ESF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nhringle@ESF.EDU">nhringle@ESF.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Durkin</td>
<td>Downstate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helen.durkin@DOWNSTATE.EDU">helen.durkin@DOWNSTATE.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Mozlin</td>
<td>Optometry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmozlin@SUNYOPT.EDU">rmozlin@SUNYOPT.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Butler</td>
<td>Student Assembly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nbutler2@ALBANY.EDU">nbutler2@ALBANY.EDU</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Goodman</td>
<td>Buffalo State</td>
<td><a href="mailto:goodmams@BUFFALOSTATE.EDU">goodmams@BUFFALOSTATE.EDU</a></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Caggiano-Siino</td>
<td>SUNY RF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathleen.caggiano-siino@RFSUNY.ORG">kathleen.caggiano-siino@RFSUNY.ORG</a></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Ortiz</td>
<td>System Admin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phillip.ortiz@suny.edu">phillip.ortiz@suny.edu</a></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Goals for 2015-2016:
- 2017 Graduate Research Symposium (Subcommittee: Phil Ortiz, Kathleen Caggiano-Siino, Sylwia Starnawska; Christine Paige)
  o Investigate alternatives by 11/2015
  o Connect with annual graduate research conference
  o Present recommendations of UFS 12/2015
- Feasibility of System-wide or multi-campus IRB – has been turned over to System Administration – Phil Ortiz will update the committee October 2015
- Grant writing handbook – outline developed; will create an electronic resources with the possibility to turn it into an interactive delivery. (Christine Paige, Rosalyn Rufer, Fred Walter, Martin Kaczocha, Scott Goodman)
- Explore possible funding sources to support undergraduate fellowship for graduate work at SUNY campus (Sylwia Starnawska, Shelly Mozlin)
- Identify ways to encourage faculty research across campuses through survey –draft written, IRB approval underway (Scott Goodman, Neil Ringler, Rosalyn Rufer, Martin Kaczocha, and Kathleen Caggiano-Siino)
• Coordinate with undergraduate committee on LOB – lessons learned (Scott Goodman).
• Conclude pilot study to incentivize grant writing applications for the NIH F31 grants
  Phase I – workshops well concluded October 2nd) Over 100 students participated with prior years
  averaging around 40 students.  Phase 2 – submission of grant applications due mid December 2015.
  Committee will measure the success of submission rate and later follow-up to determine the number of
  grants awarded (Kathleen Caggiano-Siino, Scott Goodman, Rosalyn Rufer, Martin Kaczocha)

Committee meeting dates (include type of meeting):
1. September  24th – Fall planning meeting
2. October 19th 12-1 teleconference
3. November 16th 12-1 teleconference
4. December 21st 12-1 teleconference
5. January 12th 12-1 teleconference
6. February 8th 12-1 teleconference
7. March 14th 12-1 teleconference
8. April 11th 12-1 teleconference
9. May 9th 12-1 teleconference

Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:
Pilot study to incentivize grant writing applications well underway; Plan to have full results and report to
the UFS for the April 2016 Plenary. Preliminary results included 105 students attending the workshop
and 21 submitting grant proposals to NIH F31.  Previous years’ number do not include how many
submitted but the number of active grants as of April 2015.

Draft survey written and IRB approval underway to determine what might increase faculty research
across SUNY. Link to survey sent to campus governance leaders on January 21st.  Please send to your
teaching faculty to complete the survey.  Thanks.

We are working on a resolution for April Plenary on how to implement Chancellor’s fellowship for an
undergraduate student at each bachelor SUNY institution for continuation of graduate work at a SUNY
graduate program.

Proposal went to Executive Committee on ways in which to improve LOB showcase and to continue
graduate research conference.

Next Steps:
• Gather data on faculty research and report out at April Plenary
• Evaluate effectiveness of grant writing incentive and report out at April Plenary
• Bring forward resolution on how to fund undergraduate fellowship at April Plenary
• Finish grant writing handbook for graduate students.
Operations Committee
Report Date: January 21, 2016
Presented at: Winter, 2016 UFS Plenary

Charge:
The Committee shall generate relevant reports and recommendations for the University and its institutions concerning:

- the development and administration of budgets, strategic planning, and operations;
- matters related to libraries, educational technology, and forms of instructional delivery; and,
- personnel policies, as they pertain to budget, operations, diversity, equity, affirmative action and delivery of a high quality SUNY education.

2014-15 Committee Members:
Chair: Thomas Sinclair, Binghamton University
Members: Diana Boyer, SUNY Oswego; Kevin Caskey, SUNY New Paltz; Mete Cetiner, Empire State College; Darren Chase, Stony Brook University; Henry Flax, Downstate Medical Center; Carey Hatch, SUNY System Administration; Pamela Mahon, Upstate Medical University; Heather Maldonado, SUNY Buffalo State; Bill Robins, Empire State College; Li-Ru Zhao, Upstate Medical University

Committee Goals for 2014-15:
1) Distribute report on budgeting best practices and transparency among SUNY campuses.
2) Track open access developments by SUNY and assess how to encourage expansion of open access including the creation of a SUNY repository.
3) Complete a case study on the role of campus governance played in development of performance improvement plans related to SUNY Excels.
4) Complete a study addressing how the mix of tenure and contingency faculty has changed in SUNY institutions and what composition of faculty is needed to meet SUNY’s teaching and research missions.
5) A review of different campus practices regarding family and parental leave.
6) An assessment of what shared governance orientations should SUNY campus presidents receive.

Committee meeting dates:
The Operations committee convened by Skype on Tuesday, November 10.

Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:
The Committee Report “Better Budgeting is Good Governance” accompanies this report.
A survey regarding campus governance involvement in SUNY Excels performance improvement plans has been distributed to campus governance leaders.

Darren Chase, Associate Librarian at Stony Brook, has developed materials regarding open access materials and has made those links available to the Operations Committee and the University Faculty Senate. They are:

- The Scholarly Communication Toolkit: http://guides.library.stonybrook.edu/scholarly-communication-toolkit
- Stony Brook University Open Access pages: http://library.stonybrook.edu/scholarly-communication/open-access/
Requests to UFS Senators from committee:
Please ensure timely responses to the performance improvement plan survey as SUNY expects faculty governance to be involved in applied learning initiatives.

Please distribute “Better Budgeting is Good Governance” to your faculty governance bodies and budget review committees (if you have them).

Anticipated upcoming actions/accomplishments:
• The SUNY Excels performance improvement plan case study will be completed.
• The Composition of Faculty Report will be completed by the Spring, 2015 UFS Plenary Session.
Charge: The Committee promotes the educational and scholarly interests of SUNY faculty through the development and strengthening of University-wide programs, grants, and awards.

2015-2016 Membership

Robert Booth  Fredonia  booth@FREDONIA.EDU
Valentin Brimkov  Buffalo State  brimkove@BUFFALOSTATE.EDU
Jian Cao  Stony Brook Univ  jian.cao@stonybrookmedicine.edu
Bruce Leslie (Chair)  Brockport  bleslie@brockport.edu
Logan Rath  Brockport  lrath@brockport.edu
Jane Stephenson  Morrisville State  stepheje@morrisville.edu
Hope Sun  Empire State College  hope.sun@esc.edu
Miriam Vincent  Downstate Medical Ctr  miriam.vincent@downstate.edu
Ryan Yeung  Brockport  ryeung@BROCKPORT.EDU
Iris Cook  Westchester CC  iris.cook@SUNYWCC.EDU

SUNY Staff Liaisons
Bob Kraushaar  SUNY  Robert.kraushaar@SUNY.EDU
Yvette Roberts  SUNY  yvette.roberts@SUNY.EDU

Committee Goals for 2015 - 2016:

- Review the policies and procedures for Chancellor’s Awards for the 2016-2018 cycle
  A variety of policies and procedures are being reviewed for the 2015-2017 cycle guidelines, which will be distributed in summer, 2016.
- The Committee will propose that nominations are eligible in the CAT for nominees who are on sabbatical, as they currently are for the CAS&CA and CAS.
- The Committee will propose that Clinical Faculty are eligible for the CAS &CA as they are currently for the CAT.
- The Committee is discussing a solution for the current anomaly that full-time non-tenure track faculty are not eligible any Chancellor’s Award. Possible solutions are to change qualifications either for the CAT or the CA for Adjunct Teaching.
- As a new program, lessons need to be learned to fine tune the CA for Adjunct Teaching. There are problems defining ‘adjunct’ as well as the bigger issue of whether to include full-time non-tenure track faculty. The Committee hopes to put it on a two-year cycle like other CAs in its mature version.
- The Committee is discussing the definition of shared governance for the Senate’s CA for Shared Governance. A continual issue is whether to favor a long record or a major event. Like the CA for Adjunct, we hope to put it onto a two-cycle.
- The Committee is discussing definitions for the CAs for Librarianship and ways to increase nominations.
- Programs Sub-Committee will begin reviewing the Conversations in the Disciplines (CiD) program toward possibly recommending major reforms for 2016-2018 award criteria.
- Review the 40+ year record to consider whether its original purpose is still relevant as the program was designed to bring former teachers college faculty up to speed in their
discipline on as many campuses as possible.

- Examine the existing policy of identical $5000 awards and consider a variety of Awards. Fewer awards of larger amounts might provide more ‘bang for the buck’. Electronic communication provides possible ways to increase participation and impact.
- The original ban on pedagogical topics will be reconsidered with the possibility that topics integrating disciplinary knowledge and pedagogy be made eligible.
- Oversee administration of the Conversations in the Disciplines (CiD) awards for 2015-2016
- Raise the CiD profile, especially with a goal of a more timely rollout this year and find ways to communicate directly to faculty rather than through administration.
- The Committee will review the current procedures with an eye to clarifying language to correcting problems observed in last year’s award cycle.
- Review applications for awards funded for 2016-2017

**Distinguished Professorships**

- As the revisions were made last year for the 2015-2017 cycle, no action will be taken on policies. The Committee will discuss ways to increase applications.

**Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:**

- The Committee decided not to give out the Shared Governance this year due to too few applications.
- The Committee offered revisions for the Conversations in the Disciplines guidelines for the proposals for funding for 2016-2017.
- Began transition to new staff liaison at Central Administration.

**Requests to UFS Senators from committee:**

If you have thoughts about how to integrate full-time non-tenure track faculty into Chancellor’s Awards, please contact Bruce Leslie (bleslie@brockport.edu).

**Anticipated upcoming actions:**

1) Make a recommendation on inclusion of Clinical Faculty in the CAS&CA & CAS
2) Make a recommendation on ways to include non-tenure track full-time faculty in teaching awards.
4) Clarify definitions of ‘shared governance’ and review ways to encourage applications
5) Clarify definitions of ‘service’
6) Review & revise the guidelines for Conversations in the Disciplines and make recommendations for the 2016-2017 P&A Committee’s consideration.
Student Life Committee  
January 21-23, 2016  
Stony Brook University

Charge:
The Committee will be concerned with significant educational, developmental, social, cultural and recreational policies, programs, issues and services that affect the quality of student life and the campus environment of the State University of New York.

2015-16 Committee Members:
Chair: Kelley J. Donaghy*, College of Environmental Science and Forestry, kdonaghy@esf.edu
Marcia Cornelius, Morrisville, cornelml@morrisville.edu
Liz Droz, SUNY System Administration, Elizabeth.droz@suny.edu
Elizabeth Erickson, Canton, ericksone@canton.edu
Nazely Kurkjian, Binghamton, kurjian@binghamton.edu
Ann Liao, Buffalo State, liaoha@buffalostate.edu
Anne Larrivee*, Binghamton, larrivee@binghamton.edu
Danielle Leonard, Albany, dleonard@albany.edu
Tom Mastro, Student Assembly, Thomas.mastro@suny.edu
Tom McElroy*, Empire, tom.mcelry@esc.edu
Louis Scala, Farmingdale, Louis.scala@farmingdale.edu
Jan Trybula*, Potsdam, trybulj@potsdam.edu

Members marked with an asterisk are coming to the end of their three year term in 2016, please consider volunteering to serve on this committee.

Committee Goals for 2014-15:
1. Workshop on Fostering Collaborations Between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Professionals
   This 2-day workshop will offer collaborative discussions between faculty, staff, and students to address issues shared by Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. During this workshop, panel discussions will foster dialogue relating to students with disabilities in the digital realm, faculty governance involvement to promote shared environments, and uncovering implicit biases associated with student learning. Participants will create a plan, based on workshop discussions, to take back to their home institutions in order to continue collaboration and implement change.
   When: November 13 and 14
   Where: Syracuse, NY

2. Preferred Name – policies and best practices to be collated and shared.

3. Social Media – investigating what to do about social media in terms of student use and abuse, looking for best practices and reviewing language being generated by a separate group investigating student code of conduct requirements.

4. Hazing and Bullying – white paper being written and finished that includes areas for more than just students, joint project with Ethics.
5. **Food Accessibility** – investigating the availability of special menus for allergies and lifestyle choices

**Committee meeting dates (include type of meeting):**
- Planning Committee Meeting 9/24-9/25
- Fall Semester Conference Calls – 10/2, 10/9, 10/19, 10/26, 10/30, 11/6
- Collaborations Conference – 11/13-14
- Spring Semester Conference Calls – Still to be Determined....

**Committee accomplishments since previous UFS Plenary:**

1. **Workshop on Fostering Collaborations Between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Professionals**
   - On November 13th and 14th the committee hosted a very well received and successful conference on building collaborations between student affairs and academic affairs professionals. Approximately half of the attendees were faculty, the other half were students affairs professionals or administrators in student affairs. The program was kicked off with a wonderful presentation by Robert Bonfiglio on the role that student affairs plays in the academic missions of colleges and universities. Taking pot shots at lazy rivers and climbing walls, Dr. Bonfiglio made it clear that student affairs professionals see themselves as agents for helping students see the importance and impact of their classroom education outside of exams and quizzes not social directors on the cruise ship call college. He believes that in addition to helping students navigate the emotional and social aspects of a college education, that student affairs helps them navigate career paths and should foster connections between a student’s academic interests. One example he talked about was a political science major serving as the president of a student government organization and as the contact for this position, Dr. Bonfiglio tries to connect what the student is learning in the class with his experience as student government leader.

   Our second panel talked about specific service-learning cross-over programs that were award winning student affairs/academic affairs collaboration programs with significant faculty cross-over. The first was a service learning project in Buffalo surrounding the refugee populations in SUNY Buffalo. Laura Rao and Maureen McCarthy spoke at length about the success of their project in connecting students with the community. To learn more about this program and its outcomes please visit: [http://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/university-life/awards/Buffalo-State---Refugee-Awareness-Project-The-World-at-Our-Doorstep.docx](http://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/university-life/awards/Buffalo-State---Refugee-Awareness-Project-The-World-at-Our-Doorstep.docx).

   Our second award winning student affairs/academic affairs collaboration program presentation came from The College at Brockport. Led by Sara Kelly and Craig Mattern, the First Year Community at The College at Brockport connects faculty and student in small living and learning communities. The advantages of such living and learning communities include living with people who share your interests, a community specific tutor, and opportunities to make greater connections to faculty and professional staff. To learn more about this program and its outcomes please visit: [www.brockport.edu/lfc/](http://www.brockport.edu/lfc/).

   The afternoon session was spent thinking about how to make classes more accessible from converting a scanned PDF into a PDF that can be read by an optical screen reader to thinking about how to create powerpoint presentations that are likewise accessible to students using screen readers. Many of the faculty present were surprised at how inaccessible some of their course materials are and found the resources that were made available as well as the demonstration of the technology available impressive. As we move forward into more online classes and increasing degree completions, having adaptive technology specialists and instructional design specialists is essential. The power of SUNY needs to be leveraged so that campuses without these specialists have access to their expertise.
Accessibility takes on an entirely new meaning when applied to the digital realm. We hope to be able to make the materials shared with us available through the student life committee resources page shortly.

After dinner a conversation/panel was hosted about the role that faculty governance can play in promoting student affairs and academic affairs collaborations. The panel covered items from promoting living learning spaces to encouraging faculty to participate in student athletics. Two particular examples seem to resonate with the crowd, the first was Jan Trybula who brought advising to the pool. Instead of asking his swimmers to search him out in his office, he visits them during practice to talk about academic performance and their athletic performance. Another was Canton’s faculty team program, described by Liz Erikson, where senior students dedicate the season to a faculty member. She explained that by doing so, faculty members were more likely to come to games and create a stronger relationship not just with the senior who dedicated the season to them, but also to the younger members of the team. In both examples, advising at the pool and dedicating a season to a faculty member, the goal and outcome is the same, increased faculty/student interaction and the outcome is student feeling more supported on campus in and out of the classroom.

Our final session on Saturday morning was led by our keynote speaker, Dr. Diane Goodman. Dr. Goodman started the session by asking us to think about what descriptors we use when thinking about specific roles such as Scientist, America, etc., then she continued by talking about the literature, providing concrete examples of discrimination based on gender, race, or simply perceived gender and race based on name. Her examples include the same statement being attributed to a male candidate that was characterized as strong, confident, inspiring and when it was attributed to a female candidate it was characterized as energetic, fluffy, and fun-loving. Other examples such as changing an ethnic first or last name to increase the odds of being hired and the most notable example of name/gender discrimination in an online course (“What’s in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching”, Innovative Higher Education, 2015, 40, pg. 291-303.) We also talked about microaggressions and their impact on both our students and our colleagues. There was ample opportunity to share examples of person experiences with microaggressions and then to practice what to do when faced with a microagression or if you’ve committed one yourself! One of the most important take home messages is that standing silent when you are faced with a microagression will not change culture. Silent collusion is one of the most prevalent forms of reinforcing prejudicial behaviors.

Overall, the evaluations of the program indicated a very high level of satisfaction, >85% were highly satisfied. Of those who filled out the form, the felt that the format of the workshop was engaging and worth attending and many provided suggestions for future workshops. The committee believes that a biannual workshop on similar topics relevant and timely would be beneficial.

Finally, the committee thanks Carol Donato for making this possible despite the vagaries of the Syracuse University football schedule! Without her assistance this program would not have been possible. Thank you also to UFS for financial support.

2. Preferred Name – Assisted the Equity, Inclusion and Diversity Committee on their resolution recommending the SUNY-wide implementation of preferred name and gender identity applications on the registration, email, id cards and other identification systems.
Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee (UAPPC)
Report Date: January 23, 2016

Charge:
The Committee shall provide advice and guidance to the Faculty Senate on matters relating to undergraduate programs and policies throughout the University. To these ends, the Committee may review such areas as existing and proposed curricula, standards for academic degrees, undergraduate academic assessment, teaching techniques and evaluation, special undergraduate programs, articulation among units of State University of New York and the various aspects of international education and development.

2015-2016 Committee members
Chair: Daniel D. White, SUNY Polytechnic Institute

Members alphabetically by Name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Brabetz</td>
<td>Cobleskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Beckem</td>
<td>ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Wolfskill</td>
<td>Stony Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Allen</td>
<td>Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Lundahl</td>
<td>FCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Nepkie</td>
<td>Oneonta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Ortiz</td>
<td>SUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kathan</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Smith</td>
<td>Brockport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Baker</td>
<td>FCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Krause</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Freamat</td>
<td>Morrisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amitra Wall</td>
<td>Buffalo State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Wright</td>
<td>RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Alexander</td>
<td>Morrisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Moeckel</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Goals for 2015-2016
1. Undergraduate poster session
2. Applied learning implementation
3. Undergraduate Research: analysis of what we do and how we do it
4. Finalization of the Internship – Co-op guide
5. Service-learning subcommittee

Committee meeting dates
February 24, 2016 (tentative)
Committee accomplishments in 2015-2016:
Completion of the internship guide, resolution and service-learning report, applied learning initiative timeline and guidelines feedback, brainstorming for a new and improved undergraduate poster session.

Undergraduate poster session (committee of the whole)
Undergraduate poster session will be held again this academic year at the legislative office building (February 24, 2016). We still need faculty liaisons from the following campuses Farmingdale, Potsdam, Geneseo, Alfred Ceramics, Maritime, Canton, Old Westbury. We ask that senators touch bases with me or Carol as soon as possible so that your students may participate.

Applied Learning implementation subcommittee
Subcommittee chair: Amitra Wall

No updates since last meeting. The next round of information from campuses is due on February 15, 2016 and includes a list of all courses that meet the applied learning criteria.

Undergraduate Research and Creative Endeavor:
Subcommittee Chair: Daniel D. White

Save the date: SUNY Undergraduate Research Conference April 15, 2016 in Cobleskill. Barbara Brabetz is chairing SURC this year so we will be kept in the loop so that we can provide support where needed.

The committee is working on the questionnaire and IRB approval to interview campus undergraduate research champions.

Old Business
Finalization of the Internship guide:
Subcommittee Chair: Janet Nepkie
The internship guide is expected to be complete by the January plenary.
Introduction

In 2008, The SUNY University Faculty Senate prepared a document titled, “Service-Learning: A Toolkit” which was disseminated throughout the SUNY system and is currently available on the University Faculty Senate website (http://system.suny.edu/facultysenate/resources/). This document was developed by the Student Life Committee of the University Faculty Senate. The toolkit defines service-learning, provides recommendations for students who are considering participation in service-learning, and details possible reflection activities for students involved in service-learning. The toolkit also includes some example forms which may be used by students such as service-learning time logs, applications, and agreements. Additionally, many examples of service-learning activities, organized by academic discipline, are included in an appendix.

The 2014-2015 SUNY University Faculty Senate Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee discussed a plan during its Fall 2014 meeting to assess how service-learning is currently being implemented throughout the SUNY system. Goals included assessing as many campuses as possible and preparing a report by the end of the 2014-2015 academic year. Given the strong emphasis in SUNY currently on strengthening applied learning opportunities for students, the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee endeavored to obtain and summarize information within the academic year, in order to be able to disseminate information to campuses as quickly as possible.

A subcommittee was formed in October, 2014, and data were collected from SUNY campuses from November, 2014 – March, 2015. This report summarizes the data collection approach, details the data obtained, and includes recommendations for campuses. It also includes example forms which may be used as models for other campuses.

Definition of Service-Learning

The National Commission on Service-Learning’s (Fiske, 2001) definition of service-learning was used when assessing whether the campuses currently have service-learning. The Commission defines service-learning as “a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service with academic study to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities.” Notably, this definition was included in the SUNY Service Learning Toolkit document; thus, conceptualizing service-learning in this
way was likely familiar to many of the campus representatives who participated in the 2014-2015 assessment.

Service-learning typically includes, at minimum, three components: 1) service to others, 2) ties to academic content, and 3) student reflection on the service-learning experience. Frequently service-learning is done off-campus, but it may be done on-campus as well (e.g., hosting training sessions for non-profit organizations, providing services at an on-campus clinic). As an example of service-learning, students in a business marketing class could partner with non-profit organizations in the community to develop and execute marketing plans. After participating in the service-learning experience, students could write a paper in which they apply information learned in the field to specific content about marketing strategies learned in the course.

Methods
The sample was first determined to be 60 possible SUNY campuses, from the set of 64 designated SUNY campuses. One campus was excluded from assessment because it has no undergraduate programs. One school, Cornell University, is listed on SUNY materials as four campuses, but as one of these campuses has no undergraduate programs and three of the campuses are treated identically with regard to service-learning on the campus, Cornell University was counted as one campus for this assessment. From the 60 campuses possible for inclusion in the sample, data were obtained from 54 of them; therefore, the response rate for the assessment of service-learning throughout the SUNY system was 90%. In the other 10% of cases, solicited campus representatives declined to participate.

In order to obtain information from as many campuses as possible, the subcommittee decided that data would be obtained through phone interviews, rather than through electronic or paper questionnaires. For each campus, an individual was identified who was considered likely to be able to provide information regarding service-learning on the campus. Solicitations for interview participation were sent initially by e-mail, facilitated by SUNY’s Coordinator of Community Relations. In some cases, information on a likely contact was obtained from the campus website, or phone calls were made to career services offices and academic dean’s offices. Eventual interviewees included service-learning coordinators, faculty members, academic deans, volunteer coordinators, and career services directors. For consistency in data collection, only one person per campus was interviewed. Prior to the interview, campus representatives were told that no campuses would be specifically identified in the data. Some campuses provided examples of forms which could serve as a model for other campuses; campus representative consent to include such forms in this report was then obtained.

Interviews were scheduled at each interviewee’s convenience and lasted 10-30 minutes, depending on the breadth of information provided. Each campus representative was first asked to establish whether the campus had service-learning opportunities for students. In some cases, this was evident from the campus website (e.g., listed name of service-learning coordinator, included manual for service-learning, policies presented on website), and the campus representative was asked first to confirm that the campus did indeed have service-learning. If the campus representative indicated that there was service-learning on the campus, he/she was asked a set of 14 questions. These questions are included in Table 1. In some cases, additional information was volunteered by the interviewee.

Table 1: Interview Questions for Campus Representatives Who Indicated There Are Service-Learning Opportunities on Their Campus
1. Is service-learning required or optional?
2. Are there certain programs of study that require service-learning?
3. Is there a minimum number of hours that needs to be completed if a student is enrolled in service-learning?
4. Are service-learning courses assessed?
5. How are service-learning courses assessed?
6. How well known to the campus is service-learning (i.e., very well, somewhat well, not very well)?
7. How are students and faculty informed about service-learning?
8. Do students receive credit for service-learning?
9. If so, is the credit granted separately from credit given for a typical course?
10. Are there non-teaching professionals (e.g., individuals in Student Affairs) involved in providing credits, or are all the instructors faculty members?
11. What established policies do you have for service-learning on your campus?
12. Are faculty members or professionals compensated for participating in service-learning?
13. Are there any financial resources available for service-learning through the campus?
14. What do you see as barriers to more service-learning occurring on the campus?

If the campus representative indicated that the campus did not have service-learning, the representative was asked to discuss perceived barriers to offering service-learning opportunities for students on the campus.

Each campus’s website was also investigated in order to obtain information regarding written policies related to service-learning, examples of forms used on the campus, and examples of service-learning activities.

Results
Information obtained from the interviews was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Data were summarized across all 54 campuses which provided information, and also were in some cases analyzed separately, based on type of campus (i.e., university centers, university colleges, colleges of technology, community colleges, and specialized doctoral degree granting institutions). Sector membership was determined by reference to the SUNY Admissions Information Summary – 2014 (http://www.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/summary-sheets/Admissions_qf_stateop.pdf).

It is important to note that in a few cases, information was not provided by an interviewee, because he/she was unsure of an answer. Thus, for the results of the quantitative analyses, the number of respondents is provided for each question analyzed.

Prevalence of Service Learning in SUNY
Of the 54 campuses which participated in this investigation, 74% of them do provide service-learning opportunities. Twenty-two percent of the campus representatives indicated that they do not have service-learning on their campus, and in 4% of the cases, the campus representative said that he/she was unsure whether the campus offered service-learning opportunities. In the two cases where the interviewee was unsure if service-learning opportunities were offered, one campus representative categorized service-learning as generally part of experiential learning and the other campus representative knew of a few faculty members who were offering service-learning in their classes, but he/she did not view service-learning as campus-wide. One of the campus representatives that indicated that he/she was unsure if the campus offered service-learning answered the set of questions posed as if
the campus did have service-learning; the other campus representative only answered the one additional question, regarding perceived barriers to service-learning on the campus.

Analyzing the data by sectors \((N = 54)\), it was found that 100% of the university centers have service-learning, as well as 92% of the university colleges, 80% of the specialized institutions, 67% of the colleges of technology, and 63% of the community colleges.

Of those campuses which have service-learning \((n = 41)\), service-learning is required on only three of the campuses (7%); it is optional on the remaining campuses. It is required at one of the university colleges, one of the community colleges, and one of the specialized institutions. On two of these campuses, the requirement is incorporated in a first-year student experience program.

For 51% of the campuses which have service-learning \((n = 41)\), there is at least one program of study which requires service-learning. Twenty-five percent of the university centers have majors which require service-learning, and of the other campuses which offer service-learning opportunities, 61% of the community colleges, 55% of the university colleges, 50% of the colleges of technology, and 25% of the specialized institutions have at least one program of study requiring service-learning. Across the campuses, examples of majors requiring service-learning are architecture, social work, public health, hospitality administration, nursing, physical education, recreational studies, honors, communications, environmental studies, and human services.

Of those campuses which offer service-learning opportunities \((n = 41)\), no minimum number of required student hours has been established on 66% of the campuses. On one campus, a minimum number of hours is “sometimes” required for students who participate in service-learning. Across the set of campuses which do not have a minimum number of required hours, several interviewees discussed that if the service-learning component of a class requires the completion of a specific project, the faculty member may be reluctant to assign a specific number of hours of service-learning (i.e., it may not be possible to establish ahead of time how long the project will take; some students will take longer to finish the project than others). Since only 13 of the campuses require a set number of service-learning hours to be completed by students, these data were not analyzed as a function of type of campus. Across all the campuses, the number of required service-learning hours in individual courses which have a service-learning component varies widely \((range = 10 - 156; average = 52.5)\). Approximately one-half of the campuses which have a designated number of hours for students who participate in service-learning require no more than 20 hours. The association between number of hours of service-learning required and number of course credit hours was not assessed.

Given the wide range of disciplines of study in the SUNY system, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive list of examples of service-learning activities or community partners. However, some examples of service-learning activities in SUNY are as follows: planning and executing engineering and design projects for community organizations, instructing homeschooled students in content associated with an academic discipline, mentoring youth in after-school programs, mentoring young adults with developmental disabilities who are enrolled in an adapted college program, developing and delivering content for public radio stations, implementing adaptive physical fitness programs for youth and adults with disabilities, conducting interviews with community members to obtain information for non-profit service organizations, meeting with state New York State Senators to advocate for increased funding for youth programs, planning and implementing a day of respite for parents of children with special needs, and conducting research for local historical society archives. Some examples of community partners are the United Way (which helps the campus identify service-learning opportunities for students), YWCA, K-
12 public schools, parochial schools, local Chambers of Commerce, public health clinics, the Boys and Girls Club, shelters for homeless individuals, museums, historical societies, the American Red Cross, Boy Scouts of America, Planned Parenthood, the Urban League, and nursing homes. Some campuses have international service-learning opportunities for students (e.g., for architecture and design projects and nursing).

Assessment of Service-Learning
Campuses which have service-learning ($n = 41$) tend to assess service-learning in at least some way. Eighty percent of the campuses which have service-learning reported that they assess it. An additional 15% reported “sometimes” assessing service-learning. The three campuses which require service-learning for all students each assess it. Across the various types of campuses which offer service-learning opportunities, 100% of the university centers assess service-learning at least sometimes, as well as 100% of the colleges of technology, 100% of the specialized institutions, 94% of the community colleges, and 91% of the university colleges.

Across the campuses, service-learning courses are assessed through a variety of methods but instructor-based/supervisor-based assessment is the most common. Many interviewees noted that assessment is dependent on and varies by the instructor. Some programs use surveys and questionnaires to test specific rubrics but other service-learning opportunities are assessed like a regular course (e.g., examining written or oral work completed by students). Examples of assessment tools, which may be adapted for use at other campuses, are included in the appendix to this report.

The interviewees associated with the university centers all indicated that an instructor or site supervisor normally assesses service-learning experiences. These assessments may include student self-reflection in the form of journals, peer feedback, and community partner feedback. The relationship between the student and the community partner also factors into student and experience assessment in many cases. At two of the university centers, specialized organizations such a Center for Teaching within the institution have some assessment responsibility and provide support for instructors with regard to assessment.

Interviewees associated with the university colleges tended to note that service-learning assessment is dependent on and varies by instructor. In general, there is no specific service-learning assessment tool required. One of the university colleges has a service-learning minor that requires feedback from the service partner and culminating projects by students. Community partners are invited to attend the final project presentations.

Regarding the colleges of technology, it was reported that service-learning assessment occurs mainly through the instructor. Students are assessed through their writing and based on skills that they acquire through the service-learning experience.

The community colleges mainly use instructor-based assessment methods. Instructors use rubrics, grade student projects, and review journals to assess students. If service-learning coordinators are on staff, these coordinators provide survey instruments and an additional level of program assessment. In two cases, interviewees noted that community partners provide feedback for assessment purposes. Some interviewees noted that service-learning assessment falls into the regular course assessment cycle at the institution.
The specialized institutions have diverse approaches to assessment of service-learning. One campus representative reported typical instructor-based assessment, another noted a departmental-level assessment, and yet another discussed assessment completed through Student Affairs. Student projects and journals are used to measure learning outcomes. One interviewee noted that the community partners are sometimes asked to evaluate the campus’s full service-learning program.

**Getting Students and Faculty Involved in Service-Learning**

Interviewees were asked to indicate how well-known service-learning is on the campus. Across the set of campuses which have service-learning opportunities for students ($n = 39$), 38% of the campus representatives said that service-learning is “very well-known”, 51% reported that it was “somewhat well-known” and approximately 11% said it was “not very well-known.” Among the university centers, 50% of the campus representatives said that service-learning was “very well-known” and the other 50% said it was “somewhat well-known.” The most common response for the university colleges (55%), colleges of technology (75%), and community colleges (44%) was “somewhat well-known.” For the specialized institutions, the most common response was “very well-known.”

Across SUNY, opportunities to participate in service-learning experiences are communicated to students and faculty in a wide range of ways. Faculty members are typically informed of service-learning teaching opportunities through faculty meetings, workshops, and professional development exercises. On campuses with service-learning coordinators, coordinators reach out to faculty who incorporate service-learning into their classes, and the faculty members then provide information to students. Campuses with service-learning opportunities also advertise through the institution websites, through campus governance bodies, through email/newsletters, and through social media.

Among the university centers, two interviewees mentioned “word of mouth” as a way that students learn about service-learning opportunities. Community service and service-learning offices, as well as student success offices, contact faculty to inform them of the opportunity to incorporate service into their courses and then the faculty members relay that information to their students. In addition to faculty members, there are fairs and newsletters that get the message out to students.

Several of the university colleges have dedicated engaged-learning offices, institutes, and centers to share information about service-learning opportunities. Students also learn about service-learning at new student orientations, at volunteer or career fairs, from the career services center, and from campus websites. On one campus, administrators talk about service-learning with faculty at workshops and then students learn about the opportunities through faculty. Social media such as Facebook and more traditional listserv e-mails are also used to disseminate information.

The colleges of technology follow the general trend that service-learning options are brought to faculty to incorporate into courses and then students learn about service-learning through their instructors. One college of technology is hoping to incorporate service-learning into the campus’s strategic plan. At this campus, faculty members are learning about service-learning opportunities through regular professional development activities each year. On campuses that have them, some service-learning coordinators team up with faculty to provide guidance and information on best practices at faculty workshops. One institutional representative mentioned that Banner has an indicator to designate service-learning courses. Other traditional e-mail and paper postings are also part of the outreach efforts of the colleges of technology.
At the community colleges, service-learning coordinators often work with faculty members during professional development opportunities to teach them more about service-learning. On some community college campuses, deans and academic vice presidents are involved and on others, service-learning is coordinated mostly through Student Affairs. Faculty and student governance groups are also occasionally engaged, depending on the campus. Some service-learning coordinators at the community colleges will go to classrooms to talk about service-learning with students.

The specialized institutions have a variety of strategies to inform faculty and students about service-learning. Some share information about service-learning experiences through Banner during course registration. At one institution, the athletics department has a big campaign for service. The residence hall staff was also mentioned by a specialized institution as a means to share information about service-learning with students. At one of the specialized institutions, it was noted that service-learning is incorporated into most first-year classes. Thus, first-year students learn about service-learning as soon as they begin coursework on the campus.

Granting Academic Credit for Service-Learning
In response to the question of whether students receive academic credit for service-learning, of those campuses which have service-learning opportunities (n = 41), 88% of the campus representatives indicated “yes”, 7% indicated “no”, and 5% indicated “sometimes.” As only three campuses indicated that they do not give academic credit for service-learning, the data on the granting of academic credit were not analyzed with regard to type of campus. In one case in which academic credit is not given, the service-learning is an extracurricular experience related to the academic program, and project outcomes are assessed. In another case, the service-learning opportunities are coordinated by faculty members but credit is not given for the service-learning hours. In the third instance in which no credit is given for service-learning work, service-learning work is considered part of the general category of experiential learning and students volunteer their time with community organizations.

On most of the campuses (i.e., 83%) that offer service-learning (n = 41), students do not receive separate academic credit for participating in service-learning. That is, the service-learning experiences are fully integrated into a typical academic course. Interviewees indicated that sometimes service-learning is required of every student in a particular class, and other times, students may elect to complete service-learning hours or instead do another type of class assignment. For 10% of the campuses, campus representatives indicated that students receive separate academic credits for service-learning; for 7% of the campuses, students sometimes receive separate academic credits for service-learning.

The interviews elucidated more information regarding possible formats for how academic credit may be granted for service-learning, outside of a typical class. These approaches include the following: service-learning as a separate 1-credit class, projects which include service-learning components may receive independent study credit, students may elect to take a 1-credit service-learning class as an add-on to a typical academic course, and students can earn 1 credit of service-learning by writing a paper after participating in an Alternative Spring Break service project. As mentioned earlier, one campus had developed a service-learning minor.

At 54% of the campuses which have service-learning (n = 39), only teaching faculty assign grades in credit-bearing classes for service-learning work completed by students. On the remaining campuses, professional staff members (e.g., staff members in the Student Affairs division) at least sometimes are the instructor of record for courses which include service-learning experiences. There is considerable
variation across the types of campuses. At 100% of the university centers, professional staff members at times are the instructor of record for courses which include service-learning. The proportions of campuses which have professional staff members serve sometimes as the instructor of record for such courses are as follows: 64% of the university colleges, 25% of the colleges of technology, 33% of the community colleges, and none of the specialized institutions. Regarding the specialized institutions, it is important to note that only three of the specialized institutions provided information regarding this variable; thus, it may be that this practice does occur at the other specialized institutions. With regard to the differences found across the types of campuses, it may be that campuses with more professional staff members related to experiential learning (e.g., including in some cases a part-time or full-time designated coordinator of service-learning) are more likely to give these professional staff members roles which include teaching students in service-learning experiences. For example, a course in leadership may include a service-learning component and be taught by an individual from the Student Affairs division.

Policies Related to Service-Learning
When asked about campus policies related to service-learning, the campus representatives provided information about established policies, recommendations for best practices on the campus, and examples of forms which are used on the campus. Thus, it is difficult to compile the information quantitatively (i.e., some interviewees mentioned “policies” which were only campus recommendations). Across the campuses which have service-learning (n = 41), the most common policy relates to criteria which courses must meet to be designated as service-learning opportunities. Other polices relate to use of a specific service-learning contract, signing of liability waivers, student use of forms to track service-learning hours completed, designated learning outcomes for service-learning, and required assessment forms. One campus has a specific policy related to reducing safety risks when in the community. One of the colleges of technology illustrates well the extent to which supportive documents can be provided for faculty and staff. At this campus, there is a brochure for prospective community partners, liability form, service-learning agreement form, assessment instruments for students and community partners, application for service-learning course designation, and a student service hour tracking form. Some SUNY campuses have developed full service-learning manuals which include information for faculty, students, and community partners.

Some campus representatives indicated that there are no set policies or forms used on the campus because policies and materials are developed individually by faculty members, departments, or schools on the campus. Thus, the establishment of campus-wide policies for service-learning is not universal at SUNY institutions in part due to issues related to academic freedom and faculty purview over the curriculum. With consideration that some campuses may wish to develop a stronger infrastructure for service-learning, the appendix to this report includes several examples of forms used on SUNY campuses which can be modified for use on other campuses.

Compensation and Financial Resources for Service-Learning
Among the SUNY campuses which have service-learning (n = 41), faculty and professionals receive extra compensation for including service-learning experiences in their courses on 12% of the campuses. Seven percent of the campus representatives replied in the affirmative to this question about additional compensation for teaching which includes service-learning and 5% indicated that there is sometimes compensation given. Of the five campuses in which this additional compensation is given at least on some occasions, three are community colleges, one campus is a university center, and one is a university college.
Many of the campus representatives indicated that courses which include service-learning experiences were part of the faculty member’s regular teaching load. On other campuses, faculty members choose to include service-learning in a class or not, but there is no additional compensation to the faculty member for including it. One interviewee, from a campus in which faculty and professionals are not compensated for including service-learning in their courses, indicated that the faculty have been working with campus administrators to have service-learning added to the annual report, so that their time in service-learning is acknowledged if not compensated. On another campus, faculty and professionals may receive recognition for their service-learning work through awards from the campus President. Some campus representatives indicated that faculty may receive some compensation to add service-learning to an existing course or to develop a new course including service-learning, but once the course has been offered once, there is no further compensation.

At 56% of the campuses which have service-learning experiences for students (n = 41), there are some campus financial resources for service-learning. Examining the prevalence rates separately for each type of campus, it was found that at 72% of the community colleges, 50% of the university centers, 50% of the colleges of technology, 45% of the university colleges, and 25% of the specialized institutions, there are at least some financial resources for implementing service-learning on the campus.

Across the campuses, resources include financial compensation to faculty for developing courses with a service-learning component, money for travel to conferences, funds to support professional development seminars related to service-learning for the faculty and staff, and small grants to support supplies for specific projects, student transportation, and food. Sources of funding across the campuses include the President’s Office, the Office of the Academic Vice President, Student Senate, budgets associated with academic deans, and external donors. Some campus representatives described having an annual budget for service-learning projects. On some campuses, there are general civic engagement grants available for faculty, which may include support for service-learning initiatives. Although the community colleges were more likely than the other types of campuses to have some financial support for service-learning, the types of resources did not differ across the types of campuses. It should be noted that only one of the campus representatives mentioned financial support for a service-learning coordinator, even though such coordinators of service-learning were among the campus representatives interviewed.

**Reported Barriers for Implementing Service-Learning on Campuses**

A final question posed to all the campus representatives related to perceived barriers for implementing service-learning on their campus. This question was asked of all the interviewees (n = 53). Even on campuses with extensive service-learning opportunities, there are many courses which do not have a service-learning component. Thus, interviewees were asked, “What do you see as barriers to more service-learning occurring on the campus?” if they reported having service-learning on the campus, or were asked, “What do you see as barriers to offering service-learning opportunities for students on your campus?” if they said that there was not service-learning on the campus. It is important to recall that for 22% of the campuses, the campus representative indicated that there is not service-learning on the campus.

The data regarding perceived barriers were analyzed somewhat differently than the data from the other questions. Because each respondent often indicated several barriers for implementing service-learning on the campus (e.g., as many as 13 listed barriers, for one campus), the data were analyzed using a systematic qualitative analysis process. Separate idea units were identified, and then categorized into
themes. Two of the subcommittee members analyzed the data independently and then consensus regarding the themes was obtained across the two subcommittee members.

Across the data, the most commonly mentioned barrier (indicated by 43% of the campus representatives) was lack of administrative support or campus infrastructure for service-learning. This includes the lack of designated staff for coordination of service-learning and lack of policies. Other frequently mentioned barriers were campus members not valuing or prioritizing service-learning (30%), lack of student and/or faculty time for service-learning (30%), lack of financial resources for service-learning on the campus (28%), challenges related to geography (e.g., campus is located in a rural area) or community partners (28%), workload concerns of faculty (26%), lack of campus understanding of service-learning and how to execute it (23%), lack of perceived reward to faculty, including considerations of tenure and promotion (21%), and transportation concerns (21%).

In some cases, 100% of the campus representatives in a particular sector mentioned one of the barriers listed above. For that reason, these sensitive data are not separated by type of campus. However, there are some general trends that can be noted, related to type of campus. None of the university center interviewees mentioned challenges with regard to transportation, geography/community partners, or financial resources. None of the representatives from the specialty institutions reported campus members not valuing or prioritizing service learning, or there being a lack of campus understanding of service-learning and how to execute it. Last, none of the campus representatives from the colleges of technology mentioned lack of perceived reward to faculty for engaging in service-learning.

Overall, these data are sobering and illuminate the time, initiative, and commitment of individual faculty and professional staff members who are offering service-learning opportunities for students. As mentioned above, there are three campuses which require service-learning of all students. These campuses have clearly found ways to implement service-learning, even though there are challenges. Some of these barriers are more easily surmounted than others. Informally, some of the campus representatives mentioned recommendations to overcome some of these barriers; these recommendations are summarized below.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Ninety percent of the SUNY campuses participated in this investigation. Of these campuses, approximately three-quarters of them have service-learning opportunities for students on the campus. The university centers and university colleges were more likely than the colleges of technology and community colleges to provide service-learning opportunities. On most campuses, service-learning is optional, rather than required. Approximately one-half of the campuses which offer service-learning have at least one program of study which requires service-learning. On most of the campuses which offer service-learning, there is no minimum number of hours established for students to complete. Most of the campuses which offer service-learning opportunities complete at least some assessment of service-learning, but the types and comprehensiveness of assessment strategies vary across campuses. Campuses have generated many ways to inform students and faculty about service-learning opportunities. On most campuses which have service-learning, students receive credit for participating, and the credit is integrated into a typical course. With regard to service-learning policies, the most common campus-wide policies apply to criteria under which courses may be designated as including service-learning. Many campuses have recommended forms for faculty, students, and community partners including contracts, applications, student time logs, and assessment measures. Most faculty and professionals on the SUNY campuses do not receive additional compensation for including service-learning components in their courses. In general, financial resources for service-learning are limited.
When resources do exist, they are typically used to support the development of courses which include service-learning, student transportation to service-learning sites, and training opportunities for faculty and professionals. Reported barriers to service-learning occurring on the campuses included lack of administrative support and campus infrastructure for service-learning, lack of financial resources, and lack of time for faculty and students to participate in service-learning.

It is hoped that this document will provide ideas for campuses which are interested in increasing the number of faculty and students involved in service-learning. The following recommendations are made:

1) Some of the campus representatives indicated that there is not good understanding of what service-learning is and how to execute it on their campus. This investigation revealed that there is not one single way to conceptualize or implement service-learning on a campus. However, individual campuses can define service-learning, and set criteria under which courses can be designated as including service-learning. Courses can receive service-learning designation in the course catalog, which also has the benefit of increasing the visibility of such courses to faculty, professional staff, and students.

2) This investigation yielded considerable information about ways to disseminate information related to service-learning on a campus. Faculty and students can be informed about service-learning at orientations, and faculty can gain training through campus workshops. Faculty members who are engaged in service-learning can discuss their experiences at such workshops, and provide assistance to other faculty members who are interested in adding service-learning components to their courses. Students can be reminded about service-learning opportunities through electronic media including campus websites and social media avenues.

3) It is important to assess the outcomes of service-learning. On the campuses, service-learning is currently being assessed mostly through evaluation of student work (e.g., papers, journals, oral presentations), and through assessment forms completed by community partners and students. Assessment of specified learning outcomes appears to be rare, as is evaluation of overall service-learning programs.

4) Service-learning may need to be more incentivized, to increase the number of participating faculty and students. Many of the campus representatives reported that faculty members are not currently compensated specifically for service-learning work, though it is perceived as more time-consuming than more traditional teaching approaches. Several campus representatives expressed that faculty members have concerns about spending such time in service-learning when it is not valued by the university in considerations of tenure and promotion. The interviews elucidated some possible ways to increase faculty members’ perceived reward for facilitating students’ service-learning work including recognizing this work on annual reports and giving university awards for this faculty work. Recognition of faculty initiatives may also be highlighted through campus websites, blogs, electronic newsletters, and e-mails. It is not likely that financial compensation for including service-learning in courses is possible on most campuses. However, having small campus grants for service-learning projects (e.g., for project materials and transportation) may make service-learning work more attractive and feasible for faculty and students. Regarding students, many campus representatives reported that students often do not have time to participate in service-learning experiences, particularly if the student is working and has family responsibilities while attending college. Helping students to see that service-learning helps to build their career-relevant field experience, and developing service-learning projects which are time-flexible may encourage more students to participate.
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Resolution to adopt the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee report entitled
“Service-Learning in SUNY: Current Status and Strategies for Implementation”

Whereas, the service-learning subcommittee of the 2014-2015 Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee has researched, collected data, and produced a report entitled “Service-Learning in SUNY: Current Status and Strategies for Implementation”; and

Whereas, the report is the culmination of interviews with campus service-learning champions from 54 institutions in the SUNY system; and,

Whereas, the report provides a baseline knowledge from which service-learning, as a form of applied learning, may be understood, explored, and improved at a system-wide level; and,

Whereas, the report makes the following recommendations:

1) Individual campuses should take time to define service-learning for their campus and set criteria under which courses can be designated to include service-learning, consistent with guidance from the Applied Learning Steering Committee
2) Disseminate information effectively on campus. The report yields a number of ways that faculty and students learn about this opportunity.
3) Assess the outcomes of service-learning.
4) Provide incentives for service-learning to increase the number of participating faculty and students (e.g., through tenure and promotion criteria, small grants, and recognition awards),

Therefore

Be It Resolved that the University Faculty Senate of the State University of New York adopts the “Service-Learning in SUNY: Current Status and Strategies for Implementation” report and encourages campuses to follow the four recommendations developed as a result of the report’s findings.
Background

The subcommittee on service-learning of the 2014-2015 Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee investigated how service-learning is executed throughout the SUNY system. Individuals on this subcommittee include Andrea Zevenbergen (Fredonia), Dan White (SUNY Polytechnic), Amitra Wall (Buffalo State), Ramona Santa Maria (Buffalo State), Michael Jabot (Fredonia), and Sarah Titus (Fredonia). Interviews with individuals involved in service-learning on the various SUNY campuses were conducted between November and March. One knowledgeable representative from each campus (e.g., coordinator of service-learning) was interviewed. In total, interview data were obtained from 52 of the SUNY campuses.

The following is excerpted from the conclusions that will be presented in the service learning report. Andrea Zevenbergen from Fredonia is the first author and principal contributor to the analysis. “Ninety percent of the SUNY campuses participated in this investigation. Of these campuses, approximately three-quarters of them have service-learning opportunities for students on the campus. The university centers and university colleges are more likely than the colleges of technology and community colleges to have service-learning opportunities. On most campuses, service-learning is optional, rather than required. Approximately one-half of the campuses which offer service-learning have at least one program of study which requires service-learning. On most of the campuses which offer service-learning, there is no minimum number of hours established for students to complete. Most of the campuses that offer service-learning opportunities complete at least some assessment of service-learning, but the types and comprehensiveness of assessment strategies vary across campuses.

Campuses have generated many ways to inform students and faculty about service-learning opportunities. On most campuses that have service-learning, students receive credit for participation and the credit is integrated into a typical course. With regard to service-learning policies, the most common campus-wide policies apply to criteria under which courses may be designated as including service-learning. Many campuses have recommended forms for faculty, students, and community partners including contracts, applications, student time logs, and assessment measures. Most faculty and professionals on the SUNY campuses do not receive additional compensation for including service-learning components in their courses. In general, financial resources for service-learning are limited. When resources do exist, they are typically used to support the development of courses that include service-learning, student transportation to service-learning sites, and training opportunities for faculty and professionals. Reported barriers to service-learning occurring on the campuses included lack of administrative support and campus infrastructure for service-learning, lack of financial resources, and lack of time for faculty and students to participate in service-learning.”

The subcommittee has included recommendations and an appendix with the report that includes best practices, typical forms, and ways of integrating service learning into the curriculum.