

Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee Annual Reports, 2008-2009

The Committee's purview includes the review of past all-funds budget expenditures and the discussion of future budget priorities for the University. The nature of the accounting and budget reconciliation process is such that the review of all-funds expenditures for a given fiscal year (which runs July 1-June 30) can begin only during the following fall or even as late as January of the following calendar year, because final budget reconciliation does not occur until the end of October. This report includes both the summary of 2007-08 budget year expenditures as well as the remainder of the committee's activities during academic year 2008-09.

The Committee met four times during the academic year with a supplemental meeting early in the summer of 2009. In addition, the committee chair reported on the budgetary situation at two meetings of the full Faculty Senate during the Fall semester.

Much of the Committee's attention during the 2008-09 year was focused on the budget cuts that were, first enacted in stages during the year. This information has been widely circulated on campus. The net result of budget reductions and the increases in tuition that resulted in the campus needing to absorb major increases in the graduate tuition scholarship budget was a reduction in the *effective spending ability* or buying power of the campus by some \$10.5 million that will need to be handled to budget base in the 2009-10 fiscal year (note that the actual budget from the State isn't reduced by this much, but BU has the added expenses of faculty-staff raises, increased tuition scholarship costs, and other uncovered increases—thus the use of the term *effective*). This has been handled in a number of ways, with the most obvious (to faculty and staff) being the near-total hiring freeze (at least, hiring from State dollars) instituted for 2008-09. This was coupled with the unusually large freshman class that entered in Fall 2008 to create increased pressure on class sizes and increasing demands on what is becoming a shrinking faculty. By the end of the year it became clear that many academic departments and units were seeing real losses—whether to professional or support staff or teaching faculty—that would clearly impact the curriculum and the institution in future years. Different units (at the School level) handled their challenges in different ways, but reductions in equipment purchases, travel funds, monograph and periodical purchases, hiring of adjuncts, and non-replacement of faculty and staff positions was increasingly widespread.

Throughout the year, the Administration members of the Committee kept the rest of the Committee well informed of the best available budgetary numbers and how, in a general way, reductions were being distributed across campus. However, the faculty members on the Committee became increasingly frustrated with the lack of discussion/consultation on the prioritization of future budgetary reductions and how those will be distributed. While on the one hand it is comforting to hear that the University is in a sound enough fiscal position that the 2009-10 budget challenges can be handled without layoffs, it is not sufficient to hear the *results* of budgetary allocations and decisions if the Committee is to meet its charge of reviewing future campus budgeting. An early summer discussion of these issues with the Provost and Interim VP for Administration did not lead to an immediate resolution.

In contrast to the gloom that accompanied the budget for 2008-09 and onwards, the report of the 2007-08 all-funds expenditures was very positive. Total campus expenditures increased from ~\$238 million in 2006-07 to ~\$253.7 million in 2007-08, led by an 8% increase in total

State funds (mostly State tax dollars and tuition). Spending in Academic Affairs reflected both this and successes in external grants; all-funds expenditures increased by nearly 10%, from \$119.3 million in 2006-07 to \$130.7 million in 2007-08. The last five years have seen similar positive budgetary news, though clearly this is no longer the case in 2008-09 or beyond for one or more years.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter L.K. Knuepfer, Committee Chair

Committee members, 2008-09: faculty members Serdar Atav, Howard Brown, James Carpenter (fall), Shelly Dionne, Robert Emerson, Peter Knuepfer, Donald Loewen, Sean Massey, Ed Shepherd, Gary Truce; student members Matt Landau (undergraduate) and Jun Guo (graduate); ex-officio members Michael McGoff (interim Vice President for Administration and Vice Provost for Strategic and Fiscal Planning) and Mary Ann Swain (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)

Faculty Senate Bylaws Review Committee
2008 – 2009 Annual Report

The Faculty Senate Bylaws Review Committee met once to consider proposed changes to the Faculty Bylaws as charged by the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

Proposed changes are in ***bold italics***

1.

ARTICLE III

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

Title B. Faculty Senate

5. **Executive Committee.** There shall be an Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

b. **Composition.** The Executive Committee shall consist of seventeen (*Approved by faculty in mail ballot in March 2006, May 2007*) members of the State University of New York at Binghamton voting faculty. Administrative officers with concurrent academic rank are not eligible for election to the Executive Committee nor may they serve as an observer on the Executive Committee. These include but are not limited to: the president, the provost, vice presidents, vice provosts, the deputy to the president, the deans and associate deans, and the directors ***and associate directors*** of the library and athletics. (*Approved by faculty in mail ballot in November 2007*). Voting faculty will be distributed as follows:

2.

ARTICLE VII

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

Title D. The All-University Personnel Committee

3. **Composition.**

a. **All-University Personnel Committee (AUPC).** Twenty-~~four~~ ***six*** (*Approved by faculty in May 2007*) faculty members consisting of twelve members elected from Harpur College of Arts and Sciences apportioned equally among the Divisions of Arts and Sciences; two members each from the Library; ***Health, Physical Education and Athletics***; Thomas J. Watson School of Engineering and Applied Science; School of Education; College of Community and Public Affairs; Decker School of Nursing; and the School of Management.

3.

ARTICLE VII

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

Title E. Personnel Procedures

2. Procedures for Cases Other Than Initial Appointments.

d. At the conclusion of its deliberations, the IPC shall conduct a secret ballot on the case under consideration. *Although the chair of a departmentalized academic subdivision is a full participant in discussions, that individual shall not vote.*

Sara Reiter - School of Management (Chair)

William Heller - Political Science

Andrew Scholtz - Classical & Near Eastern Studies

Allan Arkush - Judaic Studies - Fall 2008

Sandra Michael - Biological Sciences

Alesia McManus - Libraries

Matthew Johnson - president's ex officio designee

Nancy Stamp - provost's ex officio designee

MEMORANDUM

TO: KATHY BOWMAN
FROM: A. SERDAR ATAV, CHAIR CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE
SUBJECT: CONVOCATIONS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT
DATE: 10/7/2009

The committee used its charge as the major guide for funding decisions: “bringing programs to campus that enhance and support the intellectual, cultural, and artistic aspects of the academic curriculum, and to focus our efforts toward as diverse a university community as possible”. The committee traditionally has not funded events that did not fit the criteria above or requests for food, receptions, or parties. Publicity, speakers’ fees, or transportation are items that were specifically funded. In addition, events that cater to a variety of groups on campus in general, and undergraduate students in particular, were looked upon favorably by the committee.

The funding came from the Presidents’ Office (\$5,375) and the Student Association (\$5,375) for a total of \$10,750. Our available funds for the year, including the carryover from 2007-2008 (\$3,881) and new allocations, totaled \$14,631. Furthermore, through much effort, the bookkeeping issues with Student Life office (Mr. David Hagerbaumer) were finally resolved and an additional \$16,705 has now been officially identified in the Convocations Committee account for funds distributed but never withdrawn, reflecting many past years. As a result, the committee started the semester with a total of \$31,336. Allocations this year totaled \$11,255 leaving a remaining balance of \$20,081 forward into the 2009-2010 academic year.

The convocations committee is comprised of 3 faculty members, 3 administrative members (President’s office, Campus Life, and Provost’s office designees), 3 Student Association representatives, and a Graduate Student Organization representative. The members in addition to the chair are: Bruce Borton, Randy McGuire, Brian Crawford, Shanise Kent, Jennifer Keegin, Peter Spaet, Boris Tadchiev, Aaron Butler, and Ipek Kuran. Each new funding request is discussed during monthly committee meetings. Final decisions are made through voting by the committee members. In a great majority of cases, decisions are unanimous. Student members’ contributions are invaluable during discussions. As SA representatives, they are closely familiar with most events that request funding and provide unique perspective and insight that contribute to funding decisions.

The Convocations Committee awarded funds to support 22 separate events. Allocations ranged from a minimum of \$55 to maximum of \$2,000. Only two applications were denied by the committee, because the committee unanimously felt that these particular activities did not meet the committee’s criteria for funding. One application that arrived in May will be discussed during the first meeting of the Fall semester.

Due to the abundance of funds, convocations committee advertised its function through various student association committees and meetings, resulting in an inflow of applications. We plan to continue our publicity efforts through the 2009-2010 academic year through the Student Association. If necessary, the committee feels Pipe Dream, BU Inside, Dateline may also be used for advertising. The document distributed during SA activities is attached at the end of this report.

A detailed documentation of funding sources and allocations is presented below.

Convocations Committee Funding and Allocations

Fall 2008 – Spring 2009

	Balance forward into 2008-2009 (including missing funds from David Hagerbaumer office)		\$20,586
	New Funding		
	President's Office		\$5,375
	SA		\$5,375
	TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE F08-S09		\$31,336
Fall 2008			
	Howard Zinn - Binghamton Political Initiative	\$2,000	
	Writing by Degrees - BU creative writing	\$250	
	Dialogues on Diversity - MRC	\$400	
	Algebra conf. - Elizabeth Wilcox	\$300	
	Trombone - Music Dept	\$300	
	Shifting Tides - Grad English Org	\$300	
	BHM- Jeff Johnson	\$1,000	
Spring 2009			
	Binghamton Ballroom Dance Revolution	\$700	
	Korean Festival	\$300	
	Tri City GSA	\$300	
	Grant Imahara	\$800	
	Haitian Student Association	\$300	
	Caribbean Culture Night	\$250	
	Sulpoong Concert	\$500	
	Binghamton Crosby's Spring Jamboree	\$300	
	Vino Veritas	\$1,000	
	Purim	\$500	
	Brain Awareness Neuroscience Club	\$55	
	Threads of the Motherland - ASO	\$200	
	Writing by Degrees	\$500	
	Crossing the Boundaries	\$500	
	Shabbat - Daniel Zenilman	\$500	
	TOTAL ALLOCATIONS	\$11,255	
	BALANCE FORWARD		\$20,081

Dear Student Group Leaders,

I hope that your winter break has been restful and that you're ready to start the spring semester!

I would like to inform you of an important and underutilized source of funding that can potentially help you with your events this semester: the Convocations Committee of the university.

The Convocations Committee helps to provide funding for events that enhance and support the intellectual, cultural and artistic aspects of the academic curriculum. In the past, the Convocations Committee has helped fund events such as Caravan for Democracy (which brought former Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres via satellite), lectures by Rami Khouri and Dinesh D'Souza, as well as various conferences.

In order to apply for funding, student groups must fill out the following application found at: [www.binghamton.edu/facultysenate/MAIN/ConvocationsApplicationForm%20\(2\).doc](http://www.binghamton.edu/facultysenate/MAIN/ConvocationsApplicationForm%20(2).doc) and e-mail it to the Convocations Committee chairperson, Professor Serdar Atav, at atav@binghamton.edu.

As always, please feel free to stop by or email me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Boris Tadchiev

August 27, 2009

EPPC (Educational Policy and Priorities Committee) Annual Report 2008-2009

Committee Members

Alvin Vos - English
Benjamin Fordham - Political Science
Herbert Bix - History
Wayne Jones - Chemistry
George Catalano - Bioengineering
Stephen Zahorian - Electrical & Computer Engineering (Chair)
Elizabeth Brown - Libraries
Peter Spaet - undergraduate student
Boris Tadchiev - undergraduate student
Kim Vose - graduate student
Mary Ann Swain - president's ex officio designee
H. Stephen Straight - provost's ex officio designee

Monday, October 13, 2008 meeting

Committee members met with Provost Swain and had a discussion about assessment, Middle States accreditation, and new pedagogies. There were no specific action items and no voting.

January 30, 2009 meeting

The EPPC committee met and:

1. Unanimously endorsed the proposed Chinese Major.
2. Unanimously endorsed the deactivation of the BFA in Studio Art degree.
3. Unanimously passed the motion by Peter Spaet: "Motion that the EPPC recommends that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee pursue the possibility of making the compiled results of SOOT Surveys, as well as similar surveys completed by students, publicly available."

March 25, 2009 meeting

The committee considered the following agenda items:

1. On the graduate proposals in Art History, Anthropology, Forensic Health, and Doctorate Nursing Practice, the committee appreciates the information and concurs with the approvals given by the graduate council.
2. On the request that SOOT data be made available to students, the committee generally agrees with the request. However, we also requested that Peter Spaet, student member of the EPPC, write a much more specific request, addressing the issues rose by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and then run this by EPPC members for formal approval. When and if this request is approved, it will be forwarded to the faculty senate.
3. On the proposal for the Physics PhD, the committee is in favor of this proposal, but makes the following recommendations
 - a. The materials science faculty in chemistry and mechanical engineering should be given copies of the proposal and any comments they give considered by the physics department.

- b. The table of faculty expertise should be amended to include materials science faculty in chemistry and mechanical engineering whose research would be closely related to the proposed program.
- c. The proposal should acknowledge that implementation will proceed as budget permits.

March-May, 2009

Using email exchanges, the EPPC committee considered the document prepared by Peter Spaet regarding using of SOOT data and voted in favor of supporting it and passing it on to FSEC.

May, 2009 activities

Using email exchanges, the EPPC committee considered the following items, and made recommendations.

1) A new graduate certificate in Family Psychiatric Mental Health Nurse Practitioner Certificate,

SUNY does not require a letter-of-intent for graduate certificates when the certificate is based on courses already offered by the graduate program. The proposed certificate is based on courses that are already offered and does not result in any new costs to the University. For the M.S. Psychiatric Nursing, SUNY does require an LOI which was approved last fall (attached).

And 2) M.S. Psychiatric Nursing, which has been submitted by Decker School of Nursing and approved by Graduate Council. The proposed M.S. is based on courses already offered and does not result in new costs.

Both of these items were endorsed by EPPC committee.

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Marilyn Gaddis Rose, chair, EOP Advisory Committee

RE: Report AY 2008-2009

Members: Hina Ahmed
Maryam Belly
Masha Britten
Cheryl Brown
Dennis Chavez
Randall Edouard
Jennifer Jensen
Dina Maramba
Francine Montemurro
Jarvis Rojas
Marilyn Gaddis Rose
Kelvin Santiago
Nancy Um
Leo Wilton
Emily Yu
Zhiman Zebari

Although the Committee was able to meet only twice during the academic year, many of its members were engaged almost weekly in the search for a new director. The new director, Randall Edouard, has met with the group. (In addition Brian Rose hosted an introductory breakfast both for the Search Committee and the Advisory Committee.)

The Committee wishes to go on record commending Vanessa Young for her meritorious handling of the EOP office as interim director.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Gaddis Rose

Report of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee 2008-2009

Binghamton University continues to be committed to being an increasingly recognized NCAA Division I institution. Along with the Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB) which makes recommendations directly to the President, the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) of the Faculty Senate seeks to gain specific understanding of the impact of intercollegiate athletics on academic standards and practices, and provide reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

The activities of the IAC, 2008- 09

Again this year, the committee met twice, once in the fall semester and once in the spring.

At the fall meeting, October 30th we reviewed the charge of the committee and considered which topics we would include on our agenda.

Also the committee was asked by Ed Scott, the new Associate Athletics Director for Student Services for recommendations for improved “outreach” to the faculty, and he led a review and discussion of the procedures for student/athlete academic progress reporting. A new reporting procedure was presented and discussed with recommendations made by faculty members of the committee. Consequently, a revised procedure was presented at the spring meeting, receiving unanimous approval.

Joel Thirer, the Athletics Director, provided a fall update and winter prospectus, listing a wide variety of accomplishments, expectations and concerns for the universities Athletics Programs and the participation of our student athletes. It was a very positive report in all regards other than the general financial issues we are all familiar with.

The concern for the loss of Priority Registration for Student Athletes was discussed. This was considered to be a serious matter; an inequity for our athletic programs as they compete against other institutions while recruiting, as our student/athletes attempt to successfully matriculate while balancing academic and athletic demands, and as the couches attempt to schedule practices where most or all members of their teams are able to attend without missing class meetings. There was a resolution passed that addressed the need to reinstate priority registration for student athletes. Some days later, it became know, that the Provost’s office had not intended for Priority Registration to be discontinued for student athletes or for students in the Binghamton Scholars Program, and that Priority Registration was to be restored for both.

Dave Egan, the Associate Athletics Director with responsibility for compliance with NCAA regulations made a report of some minor changes in NCAA rules and procedures, none of which were thought to present a concern.

One of the faculty members made the point that there seemed to be considerable redundancy between the IAC and the IAB. We discussed the existing circumstance where many of us were members of both, and how often the agenda items overlapped. The Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA indicated that she intended to expand the role of the IAB to include academic issues, and took the position that the IAC should be dissolved. Also the point was made, that the IAB is the product of, and reports to the President and the IAC is a committee

which reports to the Faculty Senate, and that structurally these are important differences. The chair indicated that this issue would be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

At the spring meeting, April 17th, we received a report from Ed Scott on how the Student Services and Academics Office procedures and staff have been restructured, and the positive results that are already evident, with more anticipated. There were significant academic accomplishments by our student athletes reported including: the Men's Soccer team having the highest GPA in Division I Soccer, the Men's Basketball team being one of only seven schools of sixty five in the NCAA tournament with a 100% graduation rate, and that the 3.06 fall semester GPA average for all the student athletes was the highest on record here. We were presented a new Travel Letter which student athletes will present to each of their course faculty when it is necessary for them to miss a class meeting because of a scheduled athletic event.

The chair was pleased to be invited and attend the Athletics College Honor Society inductions ceremony May 4th. To be inducted, a student athlete must have junior standing, have earned a letter in their sport and have a cumulative GPA of 3.4 or higher.

The issue of redundancy between the IAC and the IAB was discussed, with the FAR recommending that the Faculty Senate should suspend the IAC, thereby having the opportunity to activate it if a need arises. The AD stated he didn't have a position other than that he was for transparency, and would participate and provide whatever was asked for. And the chair continued to support the structural advantages and contributions provided by an independent IAC and IAB. The chair also made the point that with so many of the faculty being the same individuals on both the committee and the board, there was a redundancy that should be addressed in order for each to potentially become more effective. It is recommended that aside from the Chair of the IAC and the FAR, the faculty representatives to each be different where ever possible. The chair did not see a consensus, and a vote was not taken.

Again this year, it is clear that the positive culture continues and improves; which requires a balanced "best effort" athletic and academic performance by our student athletes, their coaches and the athletics administrators and staff.

Membership:

Michael Lewis - Computer Science
Karen Bromley - School of Education
Jim Stark - Art (Chair)
Stephen Boehm - Psychology
Melissa Bykofsky - undergraduate student
Shaun Hiller - undergraduate student
Junpeng Zhang - graduate student
Joel Thirer
Suzi Howell
Sandra Michael

Annual Report 2008-09
Faculty Senate Library Committee

A listing of significant events and issues regarding the University Libraries for the 2008-2009 academic year can be found in the Binghamton University “LibraryLinks”, available at <http://library.binghamton.edu/about/librarylinks/>

Highlighted Activities:

Symposium on “New Approaches in Scholarly Communications and Publishing”, funded as part of the Provost’s Symposia series, with additional sponsorship from the University Libraries and the Division of Research, to review and discuss ways in which publishing is changing in response to a host of issues. This project was spearheaded by Elizabeth Brown of the Libraries staff. A full description of the symposium is available at the LibraryLinks page.

Formulation of a resolution to have the Libraries Director implement policies restricting the number of books that faculty can check out, as well as provide for the suspension of borrowing privileges for faculty who fail to respond to calls to return books. A resolution was submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in December of 2008, and subsequently approved by the full Faculty Senate. It was noted in the course of discussing this issue that faculty have in the past left the University without resolving outstanding overdue books checked out from the Libraries; this issue appeared to be beyond the scope of the Libraries, and may need to become part of an “exit interview” process when faculty leave the University.

Members of Faculty Senate Library Committee, Fall 2008-Spring 2009:

Pamela Stewart Fahs - Decker School of Nursing
Michael Lewis - Computer Science
Peter Gerhardstein - Psychology (Chair)
Pamela Smart - Anthropology
Gerald Kadish – History
Martha Kelehan - Libraries (fall 2008)
 Jill Dixon (spring 2009)
Carrol Coates - Romance Languages
Daniel Rabinowitz - undergraduate student
Hillary Kris - undergraduate student
Eleonora Zagorska - graduate student
George Bobinski - president's ex officio designee
John Meador - provost's ex officio designee

Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate
From: Arie A. Ullmann, Chair, Professional Standards Committee
Subject: Annual Report Academic Year 2008-9
Date: May 4, 2009

During the current academic year no inquiries were submitted to the Committee. Consequently, the Committee was inactive.

Committee Members: Mary X. 'Masha Britten (DSON), Sandra D. Michael (Biology), Marilyn Gaddis Rose (Comparative Literature), John Vestal (Theatre).

Report of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, 2008 – 09

During the 2008 -09 academic year, the UUCC continued its work certifying courses that meet Binghamton University General Education requirements, and deciding on student petitions related to General Education requirements.

Additional committee activities included:

The committee met again with Sean McKittrick in regards to assessment of General Education courses and procedures.

The committee spent an extraordinary amount of time considering the Foreign Language Requirement, and alternatives for which we are still gathering additional information. The UUCC recommended that the current reduced foreign language requirement for transfer students be extended beyond the fall 09 deadline. And policies for proficiency testing in a foreign language were clarified.

The committee supported the initiative to have Liz Abate meet with UG program directors to further explain Gen. Ed. course designation proposal submission procedures.

Also, the committee considered distance education course procedures for courses designated as Oral Gen. Ed. Courses. And a proposal to the UUCC from Continuing Education and Outreach which would have created a new mechanism for offering courses, a capability outside the committee's mandate, was forwarded on to the EPPC.

The Chair and the committee would like to express its gratitude to Liz Abate, our coordinator of General Education and Assistant for Undergraduate Education, for the outstanding assistance and coordination she always provided. And the Chair would like to express his appreciation to the members of the committee who consistently worked through our agenda with collective acumen and good judgment.

Attached, are this year's reports, as required, on University Wide Course Offerings (UNIV), Scholars and Global Studies Programs courses (SCHL and GLST), as well as the Proposal for changes in the rubrics and guidelines for approval of Career Development Center Intern courses (CDCI) and the Continuing Education and Outreach (CEO) program.

2008-09 UUCC Committee Members:

Katharine Bouman - Libraries
Leslie Lander - Computer Science
1 faculty vacancy from School of Education
Sara Reiter - School of Management
Anna Tan- Wilson - Biological Sciences
Rosmarie Morewedge - German and Russian Studies
Mark Reisinger - Geography
Jim Stark - Art (Chair)
Masha Britten - Decker School of Nursing
1 faculty vacancy from College of Community and Public Affairs
Peter Spaet - undergraduate student (Fall 2008)
Boris Tadchiev - undergraduate student (Spring

2009)
Idil Ziyaoglu - graduate student
Matthew Johnson - president's ex officio designee
H. Stephen Straight - provost's ex officio designee
Jennifer Jensen*
Lisa Hrehor* - Health and Physical Education
*special appointment by Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Report on University-Wide (UNIV) Course Offerings - 2008-09 Academic Year

Attached please find a complete listing of all courses offered during the 2008-2009 academic year.

Courses offered under the UNIV rubric

No courses were offered under the UNIV rubric.

Courses offered under the SCHL rubric

The Binghamton Scholars Program offered numerous courses under its own SCHL rubric during the 2008-09 academic year, under the following procedures for the use of the SCHL rubric:

- Any new SCHL courses that are created need to be approved by the UUCC, using the same mechanism and process used for UNIV courses.
- Once courses are approved by the UUCC, the Binghamton Scholars Program needs to submit the following information prior to building courses in CICS/Banner each semester:
 1. For approved regular courses SCHL 127, 227, and 395, each semester the program is required to send the UUCC a list of the courses they plan to offer. No descriptions are necessary.
 2. If the program plans to offer SCHL 280 topics courses, the UUCC will review a course description and approve it for offering.
 3. Finally, once the courses have been approved by the UUCC, the Binghamton Scholars Program handles all course-building.

Courses offered under the GLST rubric

In February, 2003, the Faculty Senate approved an amendment to the guidelines for University-wide policies to allow the use of additional rubrics for University-wide courses. Under this policy, the Global Studies Integrated Curriculum (GSIC) was allowed to use the rubric "GLST" to identify its cross-listed courses that have a home in an existing school or department. The Global Studies Integrated Curriculum was recently redesigned as the Global Studies Minor, administered through the Office of International Programs. Courses offered under the GLST rubric will be offered only as cross-listings of courses in other departments and are subject to similar procedures as those listed above for SCHL courses:

- Any new GLST courses that are created need to be approved by the UUCC, using the same mechanism and process used for UNIV courses.
- Once courses are approved by the UUCC, the Global Studies Minor Program needs to submit the following information prior to building courses in CICS/Banner each semester:
 1. For approved regular courses such as GLST 390, 392, etc., each semester the program is required to send the UUCC a list of the courses they plan to offer. No descriptions are necessary.
 2. Once the courses have been approved by the UUCC, the Global Studies Minor Program handles all course-building.

For the 2008-09 academic year, GLST courses were offered in the Fall and Spring semesters and in Winter Session, with the parent department for all courses being Anthropology.

Proposals for new university-wide rubrics

The UUCC received two proposals for the use of new university-wide rubrics:

- **CEO** – The UUCC received a proposal from Continuing Education and Outreach (CEO) requesting that CEO be allowed to expand the use of the CEO rubric beyond Activity/Wellness courses offered by Binghamton Outdoor Pursuits. CEO proposed creating a CEO inter-school faculty program advisory committee to review new course proposals designed to be of interest and open to students from all Binghamton University schools and colleges. This proposal would designate CEO as the unit responsible for initial faculty review of course proposals and continuing oversight of approved courses. The UUCC did not approve the proposal on the grounds that it lay outside the committee's mandate for overseeing UNIV courses under the

specific Senate-approved UNIV guidelines; the UUCC felt this proposal would have the effect of establishing a new mechanism for offering credit-bearing courses at Binghamton University.

- **CDCI** – The UUCC received a proposal from the Career Development Center (CDC) requesting that CDC be allowed to use the rubric "CDCI" to identify the former OCC internship courses, beginning with courses offered for the Fall 2009 semester. Please see attached for full proposal; the committee approved this proposal on 12/9/08 and forwarded it to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This proposal was approved by the Faculty Senate on 5/5/09.

SCHL and GLST courses for 2008-2009

Academic Period	Subject	Course Number	Section Number	Title Short Desc	Instructor First Name	Instructor Last Name	Max Enrollment	Enrollment
200890	GLST	392	01	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	H	Straight	20.	10
200890	GLST	490	01	Global Studies Capstone Sem	H	Straight	10.	8
200890	GLST	490	02	Global Studies Capstone Sem	H	Straight	10.	8
200890	GLST	490	03	Global Studies Capstone Sem	H	Straight	8.	8
200890	SCHL	127	01	Discovering The Scholar Within	Thomas	Anderson	200.	103
200890	SCHL	227	50	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Bridget	McCanesaunders	18.	4
200890	SCHL	227	51	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Milton	Chester	18.	10
200890	SCHL	227	52	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Jeffrey	Horowitz	18.	8
200890	SCHL	227	53	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Gerard	Johansen	18.	14
200890	SCHL	227	54	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Francine	Montemurro	18.	15
200890	SCHL	227	55	Leadership And Achieving Goals	George	Catalano	10.	2
200890	SCHL	395	01	Sch. III: Worlds Of Experience	George	Catalano	30.	6
200890	SCHL	280A	01	Peace A Historical Reflection	George	Catalano	25.	25
200890	SCHL	280C	01	Energy and...You!	John	Fillo	20.	11
200890	SCHL	280D	01	Great Ideas of Physics	Robert	Pompi	16.	16
200890	SCHL	280E	01	Natural Hazards-World Today	Jeffrey	Barker	25.	25
200890	SCHL	280F	A 0	Plato and Aristotle (LEC)	Anthony	Preus	25.	12
200890	SCHL	280F	A01	Plato and Aristotle (DIS)	Anthony	Preus	25.	12
200890	SCHL	280G	01	True Stories	Liz	Rosenberg	15.	15
200910	GLST	390	01	Study Abroad Pre-Departure Sem	H	Straight	29.	28
200920	GLST	392	01	In-Country Study Abroad Sem	Suronda	Gonzalez	20.	10
200920	GLST	490	01	Global Studies Capstone Sem	Suronda	Gonzalez	15.	8
200920	SCHL	227	50	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Milton	Chester	18.	15
200920	SCHL	227	51	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Thomas	Anderson	18.	16
200920	SCHL	227	52	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Thomas	Anderson	18.	8
200920	SCHL	227	53	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Melissa	Emm	18.	18
200920	SCHL	227	54	Leadership And Achieving Goals	Melissa	Emm	18.	16
200920	SCHL	227	56	Leadership and Project Mgmt	Joseph	Picalila	18.	17
200920	SCHL	395	01	Sch. III: Worlds Of Experience	George	Catalano	30.	3
200920	SCHL	280A	01	Wolves and Myths	George	Catalano	10.	10
200920	SCHL	280B	01	The Other America	George	Catalano	15.	15
200920	SCHL	280C	01	Sci&Politics of ClimateChange	Peter	Knuepfer	12.	12
200920	SCHL	280D	01	Great Idea of Physics	Robert	Pompi	10.	8
200920	SCHL	280E	01	Dante's Inferno	Dana	Stewart	11.	10
200920	SCHL	280F	A 0	History of the Death Penalty	Elena	Dalforno	10.	9
200920	SCHL	280G	01	Micro Essay	Liz	Rosenberg	5.	4
200920	SCHL	280H	01	Europe Int in a Global World	Monica	Straniero	10.	5
200920	SCHL	280I	01	Preparedness for Disasters	Laura	Terriquezkasey	10.	9
200920	SCHL	280J	01	Worldviews	James	Dix	11.	11
200960	SCHL	280B	01	Peaceable Kingdom	Francine	Montemurro	25.	6
200960	SCHL	280E	01	Revolutions of the Heart	George	Catalano	25.	4

Proposed Change in the Guidelines for Approval of University-Wide Courses to Allow Use of Another Rubric

Motion: The UUCC moves that the guidelines for university-wide courses approved by the Faculty Senate during the 2001-2002 academic year be amended to allow the use of an additional rubric for university-wide courses.

Specifically, we request at this time that the Career Development Center (CDC) be allowed to use the rubric "CDCI" to identify the former OCC internship courses, beginning with courses offered for the Fall 2009 semester.

Effective July 1, 2008, the administration of the academic internship program and the JC Mentor program was transferred from one Student Affairs office to another – from Off Campus College, where the programs had resided for many years, to the Career Development Center. These courses will continue to include a seminar component during the academic year; Winter and Summer Session interns will continue to participate in the online academic component. As they were in the past with OCC courses, students will continue to be limited to eight credits of internships that may count toward their degree.

The CDC Internship programs will continue OCC's legacy of an Academic Council, which is chaired by a faculty member with full departmental appointment. The responsibility of the faculty chair will include overseeing the quality of all CDCI academic experiences, vetting new seminar leaders and seminar syllabi, and mentoring non-faculty seminar leaders. There will be broad representation on the council from academic units through consultation with the Provost and the Deans. The CDC Associate Director will serve as an ex-officio/voting member.

At this time, CDC is not planning to propose any new courses and will consolidate the old course numbers into fewer CDCI course numbers. The courses that would be offered under the new CDCI rubric are:

- **CDCI 395, Professional Internship Program**, which would replace the old OCC internship courses OCC 395, 400, 490, 495, 394, and 494;
- **CDCI 385, Professional Internship Program – Oral Communication**, which would replace OCC 385;
- **CDCI 496, Johnson City Mentor Program**, which would replace OCC 496; and
- **CDCI 491, Undergraduate Teaching Assistant**, which would replace OCC 491.

The consolidation of courses reflects a desire to use fewer course numbers rather than a desire to decrease offerings substantively. The change from OCC internships to CDCI internships will not affect internships already offered in schools or departments under school or departmental rubrics.

Although there is no plan to propose new courses at this time, if any new courses were to be proposed by CDC in the future, they would need to be approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC) using the same mechanism and process used for university-wide courses. CDC will need to provide the UUCC with a list of the courses they plan to offer each semester prior to course-building. The UUCC reserves the right to request SOTs and/or other evaluations of teaching or assessment measures for any CDCI course. A list of the members of the Academic Council will be provided to the UUCC each year.

Rationale: The guidelines for university-wide courses have been amended in the past to allow the both Global Studies Program and the Binghamton Scholars program to utilize their own rubrics – GLST and SCHL respectively.

The UUCC believes that this request from CDC represents truly university-wide courses with a long-standing history (under the OCC rubric) which do not belong in any of Binghamton's schools or colleges. The proposal from the Career Development Center provides for a limited scope (as no new courses are proposed) with faculty oversight provided by the Academic Council and by the UUCC.

This proposal was approved by the UUCC at its December 9, 2008, meeting by a vote of 7 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

Academic Computing & Educational Technology Committee Annual Report for AY 2008-9

Committee Members:

- Joshua Berk, Student Association
- Kenneth Chiu, Computer Science
- Sungdai Cho, Asian and Asian American Studies
- Edward Corrado, University Libraries
- Stephen Gilje, Research Division
- Michael Hines, Graduate Student Organization
- Bandula Jayatilaka, School of Management
- Thomas Kowalik, Continuing Education & Outreach
- Michael McGoff, Division of Administration
- Mark Reed, Information Technology Services
- Jennifer Stoever-Ackerman, English, General Literature & Rhetoric
- Mary Ann Swain, Provost & VP of Academic Affairs (Chair)
- Bruce White, Physics, Applied Physics and Astronomy
- Stephen Zahorian, Electrical and Computer Engineering
- Jeffrey Donahue, Ed Comm/Information Technology Services (ex officio)
- James Wolf, Academic Computing/Information Technology Services (ex officio)

AY 2008-9 was a challenging year for the University, with the State facing severe budget deficits and passing on large budget cuts to the University. Although cuts and declining state support impact the University's operations and ability to focus on new initiatives, technology continues to change rapidly, offering both challenges and opportunities to the University in terms of support for its mission. In spite of these issues, the ACET committee oversaw or participated in several initiatives which will strengthen the University's teaching and learning environment.

Challenges:

- SCAP Funds cut: The effort to provide technology to support teaching and learning faced several funding-related challenges this year. In addition to the across-the-board, 10-12% budget cut in state funds the State visited upon the University, the State also eliminated Student Computing Access Program (SCAP) funds, which normally provides \$300,000 per year which is used primarily to upgrade and replace equipment in the University's Information Commons and public labs. ITS provided approximately half of this amount from emergency reserves, and students on the "Tech Fee" committee agreed to support a tech fee increase to cover approximately half of the shortfall in future years.
- Internet2 capacity/costs reduced: A review of Internet2 usage by the campus revealed that the 200 Megabit/second capacity of the connection was rarely fully-utilized, and that researchers could accomplish present levels of work with a 50 Mb/s capacity. The ACET agreed with an ITS proposal to reduce the capacity and costs of the Internet2 accordingly. This was accomplished during the Spring semester, 2009.
- ITS identified that the number of modem lines available for dial in to the University has been reduced to only 25, because the maximum use of lines rarely exceeds 16 with an average daily use of only 6 lines. Only about 60 users used modem service more than 30 times during the Fall semester, indicating a very small group of regular users. Maintaining the service is expensive, and the main modem switch is out-of-service (due

to obsolescence) and so a failure in that equipment could end modem service suddenly and completely. ITS proposed to the ACET to discontinue modem service. The committee advised instead that ITS not eliminate the service at this time, but continue the service and contact users to let them know that the service may not be restorable in the case of failure, so users can make contingency plans.

Initiatives:

- Over the Summer of 2008, several improvements were made to IT support for teaching and learning on campus:
 - The Information Commons was expanded by 40 computers,
 - 10 general purpose classrooms were upgraded,
 - Blackboard was upgraded, and the capacity of its servers was increased,
 - A pilot distance learning project was implemented which recorded each session of several Psychology courses and made them available to students via streaming video on the web,
 - The new Banner Student System was implemented campus-wide,
 - The Watson School mainframe was upgraded,
 - Printing capacities in the pods were increased, and double-sided printing was made available. A new quota scheme was introduced which allowed for quota rollover from week-to-week until the semester end,
 - The Collaboratory (AA G05) was outfitted with videoconferencing equipment to facilitate collaborative distance learning. One high profile example of its use was a course jointly offered by Binghamton University and the University of Freiburg in Fall, 2008.
- In its major initiative of the year, the ACET commissioned a subcommittee to examine the question of whether the University should replace the current “Mirapoint” email system with a hosted solution like those offered by Google (G-Mail) and Microsoft (!Live). After due consideration, the subcommittee recommended to the ACET that the campus move to one of those solutions in the Fall of 2009, with Google’s G-Mail preferred. The ACET unanimously accepted the recommendation, and the campus tentatively plans to implement and switch its main email server to G-Mail on September 28, 2009. The recommendation of the subcommittee is attached.
- The ACET reviewed the “Horizon Report”, an annual, joint publication of Educause Learning Initiative and the New Media Consortium, which identifies short- and medium-term technology developments likely to affect higher education in a 1-to-5 year timeframe. The “Report” identified “mobile devices” and “cloud computing” as technologies likely to have effect this year, with “geo-everything” and the “personal web” having impact over the next 2-3 years and “semantic-aware applications” and “smart objects” having impact in 4-5 years. Student representatives, particularly, are rapidly acquiring and using mobile devices, and the ACET agreed that the move to G-Mail and the virtual desktop pilot (described below) were good initiatives in support of mobile devices and in the use of cloud computing.

- An ACET subcommittee including the Research Division, Graduate School and ITS continues to meet to recommend how IT might be better used to support faculty research. Recommendations from the previous year to support infrastructure improvements have been negatively affected by budget constraints, but ITS and Ken Chiu of Watson have made hardware available to provide more computing cycles for general research use and provided a more convenient gateway to the NYSGrid resource. ITS is also adding network storage capacity that can be used by faculty researchers.
- The ACET reviewed the “Virtual Desktop” pilot sponsored by ITS and the Watson School. The initiative seeks to make some specialized desktop computing tools available on the network. Included in the pilot and in the subsequent larger project (which is now live) are statistical packages like SAS, SPSS and Stata. In the past, departments have bought these packages for installation on each faculty member’s desktop, but budget cuts and major price increases like those affecting SPSS this year will put a burden on the departments. The Virtual Desktop makes these packages available to a licensed number of concurrent users on a virtual machine, with the potential for avoiding individual installation costs on faculty machines and in the pods. This same environment will make it feasible for a new category of courses to be offered as distance education, as distant students will have easy access to specialized engineering and statistical software without having to purchase versions for themselves. Similarly, students taking traditional courses on campus will be able to access this software from home or residence hall rooms. Completing assignments will no longer require trips to a specific location on campus to access the software. Further information can be found in the News feed from the ITS web page (<http://its.binghamton.edu>).

The ACET held its last meeting of AY2009 on May 6th. Initiatives expected to continue next year are: review of the move to G-Mail, review of the Virtual Desktop, and continuation of the subcommittee on identifying how IT can be better used in support of faculty research.

Attachment: Recommendation on Google G-Mail

-----Original Message-----

From: Frank Saraceno [mailto:saraceno@binghamton.edu]

Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 10:08 AM

To: Reed, Mark

Cc: hostedemail@listserv.binghamton.edu

Subject: Recommendation on Outsourcing Email

Mark,

After reviewing our current email service and evaluating the services offered by Google and Microsoft, our committee has concluded that Binghamton University would be better served by contracting with an external provider to host our email service.

Some of the benefits of contracting with an external service provider include reduced software and hardware costs; reduction in the support required to maintain a locally hosted email service; the addition of other collaboration tools not currently available; and more email storage capacity for each user.

The committee unanimously favors Google Apps for Education to provide email and collaboration services to Binghamton University. Although both vendors offer comparable features and functionality, we felt that Google Apps for Education was better suited for education; the Google applications seemed to be better integrated; and over 4,600 of our users forward to Google already.

[Below]... you will find our detailed recommendation to support our decision. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me for clarification.

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the members of the committee for their participation on this important issue. There was much to do in a short period of time and we all worked together and made a decision that will advance communication and collaboration at Binghamton University.

Frank

--

Frank Saraceno

Associate Director

Information Technology Services

PO Box 6000, Binghamton University

Binghamton, NY 13902-6000

Email: saraceno@binghamton.edu

Voice: 607-777-2015

Fax: 607-777-4009

BINGHAMTON
UNIVERSITY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Should Binghamton University Migrate To a Hosted Email Service?

Prepared for Mark Reed
Associate Vice President
Information Technology Services

April 2009

Table of Contents

Background	26
Goals and Objectives.....	26
Committee Membership.....	26
Issues with the Current Email Service.....	28
Benefits of a Hosted Solution	28
Trends in Higher Education.....	28
Feature Comparison	29
Product Testing	29
Vendor Comparison	31
Committee Recommendation	32
Appendix A.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Background

Currently, students are assigned a Binghamton University email address after they have been admitted to the University and they pay their advanced deposit indicating they would be enrolling at the University. The email address they are given is used for all official emails sent to the student by Binghamton University.

But the email landscape has changed over the last several years. A very high percentage of our new students come to Binghamton with a preferred email address already established with services such as Gmail, Yahoo, and Hotmail. As a result, we allow our students to forward their Binghamton University email to a service of their choice. About 58% of our students use this option.

Recently, another trend is taking shape: increasing numbers of institutions of higher education are outsourcing their student email to third party providers, in particular, Google (Gmail) and Microsoft (Hotmail). This is no surprise, as both providers offer email and other services for free to educational institutions.

In light of these two trends, a committee was formed to investigate whether or not Binghamton University should follow the trend, and outsource our student email services too.

Note: the email service which supports our students, Mirapoint, also supports many faculty and staff. We will also consider whether or not to migrate the faculty and staff to an outsourced solution. Some faculty and staff may have additional email accounts on our Exchange server.

Goals and Objectives

The committee was asked to review the offerings of Google Apps for Education and Microsoft Live @edu. Mr. Mark Reed, Associate Vice President for Information Technology Services, asked the committee to consider and make recommendations concerning the following:

- Would the University be served well by contracting with one (or both) to provide email services to the University? If so, which set of products should be offered?
- If the Committee favors proceeding with vendor-hosted email, should this service be offered only to students, or to faculty, and staff as well?
- If the Committee favors proceeding with vendor-hosted email, what issues are anticipated, and how should they be addressed?

Committee Membership

The committee was composed of a diverse group of students, faculty and staff. Members either volunteered to participate or were recommended to work on the committee. They are:

- Jamie Arnold, Sr. Network Analyst and Exchange Administrator, ITS
- Josh Berk, Undergraduate student and SA ACET representative
- Kenneth Chiu, Faculty, Computer Science Department
- Jim Conroy, Assistant Director, Academic Computing, ITS
- Denise Dedman, Helpdesk Manager, ITS
- Michael Hines, Graduate student and GSO ACET representative
- Bandula Jayatilaka, Ph. D., Faculty, School of Management
- Thomas Kowalik, Director, Continuing Education and Outreach
- Matt Landau, Undergraduate Student, SA President
- Tony Poole, Assistant Director, Systems Programming, ITS
- Frank Saraceno, Chief Technical Architect, ITS and Chair
- Bruce White, Professor, Physics Department
- Stephen Zahorian, Professor and Chair, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Issues with the Current Email Service

Before proceeding with an evaluation of the services provided by Google and Microsoft, the committee took a look at the current student email service. Although this service is reliable, well supported, and judged satisfactory by the majority of our user base, a number of deficiencies were identified by the committee:

- Webmail interface is clunky.
- Amount of storage available per user is insufficient.
- Message size limitation of 15mb is problematic.
- Lacks modern features.
- Webmail is often slow during the weekday hours of 11AM to 1PM.
- Spam filtering does not work well and is inconsistent.
- There can sometimes be delays in the delivery of messages being forwarded to other email providers.
- Occasional outages occur.
- Students cannot keep email accounts after graduation.

Based on these shortcomings, it seemed worth the effort to look for something better.

Benefits of a Hosted Solution

An email solution hosted by either Google or Microsoft would appear offer benefits over our current offering:

- Eliminates the fees associated with supporting an in-house email service.
- Reduces the overhead, on the part of ITS staff, in supporting an email system.
- Offers other productivity and collaboration technologies for free, in addition to email.
- Provides faculty, staff and students with much more email storage.
- Allows for the option of providing students with accounts after graduation, thus maintaining their identity and connection to the university.

Trends in Higher Education

In moving to a hosted solution, we would be following the growing trend among institutions of higher education:

- Gartner, Inc., a leading information technology research and consulting company, has indicated that many higher education institutions have or are re-examining their email strategy.
 - Organizations are attracted to the free offerings from Google and Microsoft.
 - Many students arrive on campus with email addresses.
 - A large percentage of current students forward their institutional email to their preferred email address.
 - Vendors offer other collaborative applications besides email.

- Reduces the cost for IT organizations.
 - Educause, a non-profit organization of higher education institutions, reports that a recent study on email outsourcing reveals:
 - There has been a significant growth in outsourcing student email.
 - About 20% of IT leaders who were surveyed reported that commercial providers host their student email systems.
 - With concern over confidentiality, only 2.3% of faculty/staff emails were hosted commercially.
 - More than half surveyed thought that SMS text messaging and social network sites would reduce the amount of email use by students in the next three years; this same group thought that text messaging and social networking would not reduce email use among faculty and staff.
- [Source: <http://chronicle.com/wire/article/3708/new-study-sees-surge-in-e-mail-outsourcing>]

Feature Comparison

The committee has reviewed and compared the features and functionality provided by each vendor. The committee also spoke to the representatives of each company to validate our understanding of the features and functionality. We strongly felt the features and functionality of both products are comparable. We concluded that one product was not superior to the other.

Both vendors offer additional applications beyond email. Collaboration tools are important components of both offerings. Analyzing the email service, both vendors provide virus and spam filters; block advertising for all faculty, staff and current students; provide larger mailboxes; allow larger attachments for sending and receiving; and provide support for POP and IMAP protocols. Other collaboration tools bundled with email are calendar, document storage and secure file and information sharing. The collaboration tools are accessible from any computer at any time, and from anywhere. Both vendors support mobile computing devices, which is very important to our students.

The hosted environments offer more features and functionality than the current email service provided by the University.

See Appendix A for detailed information.

Product Testing

Google and Microsoft provided test environments for us, so we could evaluate the applications.

We tested:

- Use from all popular browsers and operating systems.
- Application components of each offering.
- Application integration with its components.
- Online help or documentation.
- Ease of use.
- Application look and feel.

We did not encounter any show stoppers. The applications ran on the popular operating systems without any problems. Browser support was not an issue. We had reports of slow performance at both sites, but it was not clear if this was the result of poor response from the service or the network itself. Opinions on look and feel and ease of use differed, but we all agreed that we could adapt to either solution.

Vendor Comparison

We spoke to representatives of each company as part of our assessment. We asked each vendor why we should partner with them in this endeavor. Neither vendor wanted to speak to a “features” comparison with their competitor. They each spoke about their products and future directions.

Google

Google Apps for Education provides a cohesive collaborative environment. Google’s goal is to continue to innovate and improve their services to the customer. Google supports open standards and provides a host of APIs to integrate with other campus services.

Privacy and security are important issues to its customers. Google provides security on a large scale and they are able to secure data better than we can. With regard to privacy, Google states that they will not share our data; they will keep it as long as we like; they will remove the data when we ask; and will assist if we want to take the data with us.

There are exceptions to data sharing, however. They will share the data if the user requests it. They will also share the data for legal purposes, to prevent fraud and protect against threats. You can find more on Google privacy at www.google.com/privacy .

The Google representative indicated that Google listens to their customers. They have an advisory board composed of several different types of institutions. The advisory board meets several times a year and provides advice to Google. They see their relationship with higher education as a partnership.

Google provides the infrastructure, scalability and innovation.

About six to eight months ago, Google saw more new customers migrate faculty, staff and students at the same time. Early adopters were migrating only students. Now those customers are beginning to move faculty and staff into the hosted service.

Microsoft

Microsoft’s goal is to bring enterprise applications to the students. They want to win over the students. Microsoft is determined to be a leader in the hosted application space. Microsoft is innovative, builds powerful apps which integrate very well with Microsoft Office. They offer strong collaboration tools.

Unlike Google, advertising is not Microsoft’s primary revenue generator. Microsoft wants to bring enterprise technology to the campus so students can learn to use 21st century technology for communication and collaboration. Microsoft provides a reliable infrastructure with reliable spam-blocking, high availability and support.

Here are comments from Microsoft’s web site on privacy and security.

“Data is stored on our servers where we follow all the common Microsoft practices for security. We do thorough security testing; we have third parties do penetration testing; we use best

practices to maximize security of the servers and prevention of unauthorized network access; and we only allow select personnel with approved clearance to have access to the live site.”

” No, we don't share or sell any contact information unless the user opts in. This is covered in Microsoft's comprehensive privacy and disclosure policies which are available not only to Microsoft Live @edu participants but to all users of Microsoft's online services.” See www.microsoft.com/privacy.

Committee Recommendation

1. Would the University be served well by contracting with one (or both) to provide email services to the University? If so, which set of products should be offered?

The committee agreed unanimously that Binghamton University would be better served by contracting with an external service. We strongly felt that we should not contract with two services. Two services would increase our support efforts and make collaboration more difficult. We recommend that we select one vendor to host our email service.

2. If the Committee favors proceeding with vendor-hosted email, should this service be offered only to students, or to faculty, and staff as well?

The committee favors moving all of our current Mirapoint users to the hosted environment. Doing so would allow us to save money by completely doing away with the Mirapoint service; migrate the entire binghamton.edu mail domain, thus avoiding problems in splitting the domain between internal services and a vendor hosted service; reduce complexity of our email environment by not supporting a third email service; and provide faculty and staff access to the same environment hosting the collaboration tools available to our students.

We recommend keeping the current Microsoft Exchange environment as it is at this time.

3. If the Committee favors proceeding with vendor-hosted email, what issues are anticipated, and how should they be addressed?

The committee has unanimously selected Google Apps for Education to provide email and collaboration services for Binghamton University. The membership favored Google over Microsoft but agreed that Microsoft would work for the University.

Some of the reasons given for choosing Google were:

- Google is better suited for education.
- Google Apps integrate well.
- Microsoft is proprietary.
- Google Apps is easier to use.
- Over 4,600 of our email users already forward their mail to Google as compared to 700 users who forward to Microsoft's Hotmail.

The key issues that we have identified are security and privacy, Microsoft Exchange users, and ease of integration and migration. Each of these issues has been addressed by

reviewing the information available from the vendor's website, discussions with the vendors and interviews with references supplied by each vendor.

Security and Privacy

Terms and conditions of the Google Apps for Education should be reviewed by the Campus Attorney and any issues should be resolved with Google.

Microsoft Exchange Users

All faculty and staff users will be migrated from the Mirapoint server to Google. We need to address those who are on Microsoft Exchange and decide if and when those users are migrated. Initially, we will include the email forwarding address for the Exchange users on the hosted service. They will see no change in their mail service. They will, however, be able to use the collaborative tools provided by the hosted service while still using Microsoft Exchange for reading email.

Integration and Migration

We must review the migration procedures offered by the vendor. We must decide how we will authenticate our users. Will we use Active Directory authentication or a different model? Also, how much of their mail we can move automatically and how the end user will move the balance of their email? The implementation team should be involved in resolving these issues.

Note: the committee has indicated that if the migration to Google Apps presents substantial challenges and a Microsoft implementation is significantly less demanding, selecting Microsoft Live @edu would be acceptable. An implementation team would need to spend more time reviewing the migration process to make that determination.

Appendix A

Features and Functionality Comparison

	Importance	Google Apps Education Edition	Microsoft Live @edu
General			
Do you provide virus filters?	High	Yes	Yes
Do you provide spam filters?	High	Yes	Yes
Is advertising blocked for all faculty, staff and current students?	High	Yes, for students and faculty	All
What is the cost?	High	Free	Free
Are the apps browser/OS independent?	High	Yes. http://www.google.com/support/calendar/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=37057	Full: IE7; Basic Firefox 3.0, Safari 3.0
Do you support mobile devices?	High	Yes	Yes
Ease of use?	Med	Very user friendly	End user opinion
Contract required? Length of Contract?	High	Yes: http://www.google.com/apps/intl/en/terms/education_terms.html	No contract; agreement between institution and MS; renewable every 2 yrs.; allows institution to have its own acceptable use policy with users;
Security/Privacy			
Who owns the user information?	High	The customer owns the data; see Google Website; see privacy policy	Privacy is a top priority for MS; gives school access and control via the admin; MS will not share information
Who can access user information?	High	Google employees will access your account data only when an administrator from your domain grants Google employees explicit permission to do so for troubleshooting purposes	Administrator has access except when a subpoena is issued or written consent from user is received.
Directory integration?	High	Yes, we have APIs that allow you to do this. Provisioning API - This allows you to programatically add, delete, create users. Directory Sync - This is a tool that we created for integrating with your directory.	AD integration;
Can you implement sso?	Med	Single Sign-On API - This API will let you integrate authentication with your current system	Yes, via API
Do you allow secure connections?	HIGH	Yes	Yes
Are you in compliance with Export Control regulations?	High	Unclear	Unclear
Administrative			

What administrative tools are available for managing users; black lists; white lists, etc.?		We have APIs for user management, as well as the ability to setup whitelists: http://www.google.com/support/a/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=60751	Coming soon
Can you comment on the administrative overhead necessary to manage the environment?		Minimal. I would recommend speaking to other schools who have implemented Google Apps about what kind of overhead they see	Reduces the time and money need for a hosted environment; virus filtering; they take care of offering 99.9% up time.
Do you provide any migration/conversion tools?	High	Yes - Migration Tools - We have options for you to do the migration for your users or to allow your users to migrate their own mail.	Yes
Are there usage reports available to the sys admin?	Med	We have reporting in the control panel for administrators, as well as, APIs for more advanced reporting.	Yes
Bulk account creation?	High	Yes, via API or CSV file	Yes, via API, CSV, ILM, Powershell
Support			
End user support 24/7?	High	Support via user help center: http://google.com/support/a/users/?hl=en	Yes
Technical support 24/7?	High	Yes, both email and phone support	Yes
Phone support?	High	Yes	Yes, 24x7 for Admins only
Email support?	High	Yes	Yes
Online Help available?	Med	Yes	Yes
Who may contact support?	High	IT Staff – anyone you deem as an administrator	IT Staff via email, Web
Do you SLA's for system availability? Performance?	Med	Uptime SLA 99.9%; Performance is a key focus area at Google	Uptime SLA 99.9% target uptime; none that I can see for performance
Email Features/Functionality			
Mailbox size?	High	7.3GB	10GB
POP support?	High	Yes	Yes
IMAP support?	High	Yes	Yes
Email attachment size? Send? Receive?	High	20MB (total for message and attachment)for send and receive	20MB
How are mailboxes organized?	Med	Most recent messages are at the top of the inbox. Conversations threaded by subject. Search allows you to view in any way you would like. Labels and Filters.	Flexible; user defined folders/filters
Do you allow aliases?	Med	Yes, as well as, nicknames. Nicknames: http://www.google.co	Yes

		m/support/a/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=33327	
		Aliases: http://www.google.com/support/a/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=53295	
Do you allow mail forwarding?	Med	Yes	Yes(optional)
Can a user retrieve email from another mailbox from another domain?	Med	Yes, can set up to receive to their Google Apps mailbox.	Yes; popular with students; feed them into Live inbox
Do you support distribution lists? If so, is there a limit on number on the list?	Med	Yes, we do. They are called Groups: http://www.google.com/support/a/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=33329 There are sending limits for users: http://mail.google.com/support/a/bin/answer.py?answer=59797	Yes
What type of encryption do you support?	Med	https	Email encryption is supported; https for login and msg transport
Can a user send a message "on behalf of" ?	Med	No	Yes; client Outlook 2007
Can you share a mailbox among several users?	Med	No	Yes
Can you restore deleted mail?	Med	30 days	30 days
What happens to mail in the "Trash"?	Med	Stays for 30 days until permanently deleted.	Deleted messages move to trash; gone after 15 days
Apps			
Shared Calendar?	High	Yes	Yes
Collaborative storage space? If yes, how large?	High	Yes Sites – Each Google Apps account receives at least 10GB of storage in Google Sites. Google Apps Education editions get an additional 500MB for each user account.	25 GB Windows Live SkyDrive
Instant messaging? Chat?	Med	Yes, includes voice and video	Yes
Web space? Web development tools?	Med	Yes; Google Sites	Additional app - Dreamsparc for students only; offers several dev tools; not part of Live @edu offering
What document types can be shared?	Med	Docs, spreadsheets, PDFs, Presentations (PPT), Forms(for surveys, etc)	Soon will offer Office Live Workspace

	Key: High – Must have; show stopper. Med – Nice to have, but not a show stopper. Lo – Not necessary , not a show stopper		
--	--	--	--

Sources for information:

1. Gartner Research, Publication Date: 16 May 2008, ID Number: G00157236
2. Google Website FAQ, <https://www.google.com/support/hosted/bin/answer.py?answer=139019>
3. Microsoft Website, <http://get.liveatedu.com/Education/Connect/FAQ/Default.aspx?ShowAll=True#Supporting>

COMMITTEE FOR THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT
ANNUAL REPORT 2008-2009

The Committee held 5 meetings this academic year. Active members included faculty members Josephine Allen, Don Brister, Anne Clark (Chair), Shelley Dionne, Joseph Graney, Ralph Miller, Julian Shepherd, and Howard Wang; Karren Bee-Donohoe (Physical Facilities), Juliet Berling (Environmental Ombudsperson), Rene Coderre (Residential Life), Holly Horn (PEC representative), Dylan Horvath (Steward, Natural Areas), Michael McGoff (Acting Vice President for Administration and acting Vice Chair) and Hillary Kris and Mary Leonardo (undergraduate students). Invited guests included Katie Ellis (Univ. Communications) and Sandy DeJohn (Utilities Manager).

Our primary business this year included:

1. Continuing Review of Construction Projects.

The Committee reviewed the plans for East Campus Housing, Rt. 434 Main Entrance Modifications, the DOT Rt 434 bridge project and campus West Entrance modifications.

2. Campus Tree Cutting and Planting Plans for Construction Areas

CUE reviewed plans for tree removal for above and other projects. Shepherd and Clark also provided input into unforeseen changes in impacted areas during construction.

3. Tree Policy development

CUE members approved the establishment of a Tree Sub-Committee (Julian Shepherd, Dick Andrus and Dylan Horvath). The subcommittee met with Clark and drafted a Tree Policy complete with recommended species and species specific uses. This Policy was sent to K. Bee-Donohoe to help guide decisions on plantings. It remains to take the policy forward through channels to make it an official guiding document.

4. Campus Sustainability groups and activities

Paul Davis presented an initiative for a permanent campus sustainability group of faculty and staff. CUE members discussed contacts and project sharing between this group, student groups and Broome Regional Sustainability Initiative.

5. Student Groundwater Monitoring Wells –Fuller Hollow Creek

CUE discussed the siting, benefits and development of an educational project—a Groundwater Monitoring well with weather station—funded by a CCLI grant to J. Graney. CUE received updates on this project throughout the year, discussing possible impacts as well benefits as demonstration project.

6. Biking and bike racks on campus

The need for more bike racks on campus was discussed with respect to establishing better bike routes into campus (with 434 projects). Student Environmental Awareness Club (SEAC) members presented the results of a survey and petition for more racks. CUE learned that covered bike racks are planned for campus and new housing.

7. Car-pooling and Parking reduction plan

Dan Chambers, University Police, presented the inception of “green parking solutions” including assigned spaces for car pools in the parking garage starting Jan 2009, paperless ticketing and solar powered meters.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne B. Clark, Chairperson

DATE: May 8, 2009
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Angelique Jenks-Brown, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees

Committee Members: Beth Burch (Fall 2008), School of Education
Manas Chatterji, School of Management
Meredith Coles (Spring 2009), Harpur/Psychology
J. David Hacker, Harpur/Social Science/History
Scott Henkel, Harpur/Humanities/English
Gary James, Decker School of Nursing
Celia Klin (Fall 2008), Harpur/Psychology
Leslie Lander, Watson/Computer Science

RE: Faculty Senate Committee on Committees 2008-09 Annual Report

The committee members met once each semester: Fall (September 25, 2008) and Spring (February 13, 2009). A chair was selected at the first meeting; Angelique Jenks-Brown agreed to serve as chair. An interim chair was selected at the second meeting; Gary James agreed to serve as interim chair during the summer of 2009. At the meetings, committee members volunteered to fill vacant committee positions based on faculty feedback from a Survey Monkey survey, *Faculty Interest in Serving on Committees in 2009-2010*, which was created and sent to faculty by Kathy Bowman. All other committee work was done via email.

Vacancies which remain for 2009-10 and will be filled in Fall 2009 are:

- Intercollegiate Athletics – 1 vacancy
- UUCC – 1 vacancy in SOE and 1 in Harpur/Humanities

Date: September 12, 2009
To: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
From: James M. Pitarresi, Chair, Faculty Senate Evaluation Coordinating Committee
Subject: 2008-2009 Annual Report

The Faculty Senate Evaluation Coordinating Committee (FSECC) met five times during the academic year (with numerous additional meetings conducted electronically via e-mail). The initial meeting was held on November 4, 2008. At this meeting, the FSECC elected James Pitarresi chair of the committee. As discussed in previous FSECC meetings (2007-2008), the committee followed the working rule that administrators should be reviewed within three years of being appointed to an administrative post, and thereafter, reviews should be conducted on a three-to-five year interval.

Applying the above approach, the FSECC identified one administrator to be reviewed during the 2008-2009 academic year (Mark Reed, Vice-President for Information Technology Services).

The FSECC elected to use the on-line survey web site SurveyMonkey to conduct all surveys. Documents summarizing their accomplishments of Mark Reed were collected. From these documents and through review and discussion, the FSECC constructed a survey that was administered electronically by Kathy Bowman, Secretary to the Faculty Senate. The survey was conducted in the Spring 2009 semester. The data were collected and summarized in a written report that was sent to Mark Reed, his supervisor, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Faculty Senate Evaluation Coordinating Committee Members (2008-2009):

A. SERDAR ATAV
ANNE BAILEY
CASSANDRA BRANSFORD
WAYNE JONES
MARCY STRONG
SARA REITER
ELIZABETH TUCKER
JAMES PITARRESI (CHAIR)

**Binghamton University
Intercollegiate Athletics Board
2008/2009 Annual Report**

The annual report this year is a combination of an overview of the activities of the IAB for 2008/2009, and of information deemed to be of general interest to the Faculty Senate and the BU community.

Reporting: The IAB has a dual reporting structure, to both the University President and to the Faculty Senate.

Intercollegiate Athletics Board Annual Report

Membership:

6 Faculty:

Sandra D. Michael, Distinguished Service Professor, Dept. Biological Sciences (IAB chair)
Stephen Boehm II, Assistant Professor, Dept. Psychology
Karen M. Bromley, Distinguished Teaching Professor, School of Education
Michael Lewis, Associate Professor, The Watson School of Engineering & Applied Science
Norman E. Spear, Distinguished Professor, Dept. Psychology
James A. Stark, Associate Professor, Dept. Art

4 Students:

Kyle Kucharski, junior, men's soccer
Travis Nembhard, junior, men's track
Casey Pederson, sophomore, women's soccer
Kara Slowik, senior, women's lacrosse

1 Designee of the VP for Student Affairs:

Suzanne E. Howell, Director of Residential Life and University Housing

1 BU Alumni Association Member:

Rico Dicamillo, '80 SOM, Andrew Mancini & Associates

Ex Officio With Vote:

Student Association President, Matthew B. Landau
Student Association VP for Financial Affairs, designee: Bradley Small

Ex Officio Without Vote:

Director of HPEA, Joel Thirer

Functions: The Board conducts broad-based reviews and gathers information as necessary on matters related to:

- Standards and policies for student participation in intercollegiate athletics to ensure conformance to the University's mission, goals, and practices

- Standards and policies of conferences and NCAA Division I athletics
- Academic data for student-athletes
- Programs and policies to ensure overall welfare and academic success of student-athletes
- Title IX/Gender Equity and minority participation
- Funding for intercollegiate athletics

Meetings: The IAB met 4 times during the academic year, twice each semester. In addition to reports from the IAB Chair/FAR (see below), the athletics director, associate athletics directors, and senior associate athletics directors were regularly invited to each meeting. They shared a range of items related to teams, coaches, athletics department personnel, student-athletes, and operations. Major items for presentation, discussion, consideration or action:

- General compliance issues, academic summaries, academic progress rate, athletic performance program, graduation success rate, transfer policies, minor violation self reports, and eligibility waivers. IAB members received explanation and documents: NCAA guidelines handbook, Pocket Guide to NCAA Regulations, NCAA Principles of Institutional Control, BU Academic Fast Facts for student-athletes eligibility, among others.
- Team and coach updates, reports on department disciplinary policies and Code of Conduct.
- Department of athletics organizational charts, NCAA Manual, Student-Athlete Handbook, NCAA journals the FAR receives, and the range of pamphlets available to student-athletes, including information on eating disorders, nutrition, substance abuse, etc.
- Reports from the student-athlete IAB members on a variety of academic and athletics issues.
- America East Commissioner's Cup, a competition that rewards across-the-board success in the league's 21 sports. BU has been in the top tier for the sixth straight year, with a standing of third for the 2009/10 academic year, behind first place Boston University and second place University at Albany.
- The Academic Cup, established by the America East Board of Directors in 1995, is presented to the institution whose student-athletes post the highest grade-point averages during that academic year. For the 2008/09 season, BU finished a close second to Vermont. The student-athletes at Binghamton compiled a cumulative 3.12 GPA, just behind Vermont student-athletes who ended the year with a 3.14 GPA.
- Candid report about public relations issues of the 2008/09 season. The IAB Chair/FAR gave the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a related report.
- The NCAA mandates that each school appoint a Senior Woman Administrator. She provided the IAB with an overview of her role in the management of BU's intercollegiate athletics program and her role in support of women's interests.
- Overview of the BU intercollegiate athletics budget. Athletics received the same across-the-board cut as other divisions at BU (except for the Division of Academic Affairs that received a lesser cut). The budget includes funds for salaries, benefits, scholarships, operating funds, etc. Only approximately a third of the budget is derived from state monies. Most of the budget is derived from a combination of ticket sales, fundraising, marketing, and student fees. IAB received an overview of the full range of revenue and expense categories. Several measures are now being undertaken to reduce expenses: eliminate glossy team media guides, induce restrictions on travel including range of locations, reduce size of travel teams, restrictions on over-night stays, scale back

recognition events, use local referees as much as possible, among others cost containment strategies.

- A major activity of the IAB was to work with the associate director of athletics for student services to review past practices related to faculty awareness and notification of student-athlete participation in BU sponsored athletic events, and the process for academic progress reporting. IAB members critiqued current practices and suggested ways to improve athletics department and student-athletes interaction with faculty. Accordingly, revised travel letters and other materials have been developed for the 2009/10 academic year.
- The IAB chair was invited to attend the head coaches meetings to learn about perspectives and issues related to intercollegiate athletics and BU's student-athletes. At the first meeting, the IAB chair learned about the full range of issues due to the loss of priority registration for BU's student athletes, the only school in the America East conference without it. The IAB heard from the student-athletes themselves, and from coaches, advisors and other staff. It was clear that our student-athletes were compromised, both academically and athletically. After thorough discussion and review of materials, the IAB chair was directed to work with members of the Provost's office to have priority registration restored in parallel with those students in the Binghamton Scholars Program. Apparently, glitches related to Banner and other matters were the cause of the loss. The associate director of athletics for student services and his staff will work with the registrar's office to coordinate student-athlete registration priority.
- The IAB Chair/FAR provided an overview of the history of the Faculty Senate Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) in relation to the NCAA-mandated Intercollegiate Athletics Board. Both entities have faculty and student representation and report to the Faculty Senate. BU is the only school in the America East Conference with a dual structure, and BU was the only school so identified out of 173 schools represented at the 2008 annual meeting of the Faculty Athletics Representative Association. Most members of the IAB believed that the IAC was redundant in that the IAB chair/FAR has the knowledge base and awareness to identify agenda items and individuals to provide reports so that faculty are fully engaged in the review and oversight of athletics at BU. Further, both the IAC and IAB acquire faculty members through established processes of the Faculty Senate, and both provide annual reports to the Faculty Senate. Also, the IAB chair/FAR, an experienced faculty governance leader for many years, knows of no other instance on campus where two bodies with faculty exist for the same purpose.
- During the 2008/09 academic year, the IAB met as one body. Plans for subsequent years include the establishment of a subcommittee composed of the IAB faculty members for the purpose of more detailed review of sensitive individual and team academic data.

IAB Chair/FAR: The IAB chair also functions as BU's NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), a position required for every NCAA participant school. Thus, during the IAB meetings the IAB chair/FAR reported on a range of activities related to a combination of both roles. These include:

- Meeting with each of the 21 teams and their coaches to explain the role of the FAR. This was accomplished by attending one of each team's 5 mandated orientations related to NCAA rules and expectations, academic services and advisors, sports medicine, eligibility, and overall orientation.
- Explanation of role in certifying student-athlete compliance eligibility, financial aid squad lists, and waiver requests to the NCAA.

- Role in voting for America East scholar-athlete awards. These include the All Academic Team for each sport, individual scholar-athlete for each sport, and individual male and female scholar-athlete of the year.
- Items of interest arising from meetings with the athletics director; the associate directors of athletics for compliance, communications/sports information, student services, fiscal and information systems/senior women's administrator, internal operations; and the senior associate athletics directors for administration and external operations.
- Participation in athletics honors events, including the National College Athlete Honor Society induction ceremony, BU Hall of Fame induction, and end of year student-athlete recognition ceremony. The IAB Chair/Far requested that faculty members of the IAB also be invited to attend these events. This was initiated and several were able to attend.
- Met with the Binghamton University Athletic Club (BUAC), a group of alumni and friends that supports and raises money for the Bearcat Athletic Fund to support the most pressing needs of our student-athletes and teams. The FAR also participated in two of the BUAC special fundraising events: Lourdes Hospital Women's Athletics 4th Annual Luncheon & Auction, and the 20th Annual BUAC Golf Tournament.
- Shared items of interest gleaned from the 2008 Annual Faculty Athletics Representatives Association meeting, including possible enhancements to IAB activities in the future. Also, provided various athletics department staff with new resource materials obtained at the meeting.
- June attendance at the annual meeting of the America East Conference with planned report to the 2009/2010 IAB.
- Concluded first year on the NCAA Eligibility Committee for International Students, a committee that has a weekly teleconference to discuss requests for waivers from Division I schools.

BU Intercollegiate Athletics Program

Status: BU participates at the NCAA Division I level, the highest level of collegiate competition.

History: In the fall of 2001, Binghamton completed a 5 year transition from Division III, through Division II, and finally into Division I of the NCAA. Simultaneous to its admission into Division I, Binghamton secured membership in the America East Conference (AEC). BU now fields teams in 21 sports, 19 of which participate in the AEC: men's and women's basketball, cross country, lacrosse, soccer, swimming and diving, tennis, indoor track and field, outdoor track and field; baseball; softball; women's volleyball. BU is a member of 2 other athletics conferences: America Sky Conference for men's golf, and Colonial Athletic Association for wrestling. BU student-athletes are nicknamed 'Bearcats' and wear dark green, black and white colors. The school mascot is named 'Baxter.'

BU Student-Athletes: Approximately 450 BU students participate in intercollegiate athletics, of which about 60% receive some level of athletics-related scholarship.

Mission Statement and Philosophy for Intercollegiate Athletics:

Binghamton University is a major comprehensive research and teaching university that serves as a center for learning, scholarship, and creative endeavor. Among its values, the University is committed to excellence. It fosters a multicultural environment in which the dignity and rights of the individual are respected.

The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is a legitimate part of the academic program of the University. It exists to provide all student-athletes an opportunity to achieve excellence in their academic, athletic, and personal pursuits. In this pursuit for excellence, the Department supports equitable opportunity for all student-athletes and staff and embraces the NCAA principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct, amateurism, compliance, and institutional control. While we pride ourselves in the athletic prowess and academic achievements of our teams, competing safely, honestly, and with dignity are greater sources of pride.

Athletics Achievements: There were many 2008/09 athletics achievements including:

- All-American selection for a wrestler
- America East Coach of the Year designation - volleyball, men's basketball, women's tennis, and baseball
- America East Conference Champions - men's basketball, men's tennis, baseball
- Individual America East Conference Champion - 3 in men's swimming, 2 in men's indoor track
- Numerous MVP selections - America East Conference (3), America East Championship (3), In-Season Tournament (golf 4, volleyball 4, softball 1)
- Individual NCAA Qualifier (1), and NCAA Individual Regional Qualifiers (5)
- Individual Statistical Rankings in national top 50 (8)
- Team Statistical Rank in national top 50 or top 20% (10)
- America East Championship All-Tournament Team (16)
- America East All-Conference Honors (69)
- America East Athletes of the Week (35)
- America East All-Academic Team (15)
- America East Rookie of the Year (4)

Academic Integrity: Academic majors of student-athletes reflect those of the overall student body. Student-athletes have posted a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher for the 13th time out of the 16 semesters since moving to Division I. This year BU placed 2nd for the America East Academic Cup with a cumulative GPA of 3.12, just behind Vermont with a 3.14 GPA. BU won the Academic Cup for 2001-02 and for 2002-03. Three teams earned the highest GPA in the conference for their sport: men's lacrosse attained a 3.38, men's soccer finished with a 3.27, while men's swimming & diving ended the year with a 3.16. Most notably men's soccer had the highest average GPA of any Division I program in the nation. Other student-athlete academic highlights include:

- Men's cross country placed 11 members on the AEC Academic Honor Roll
- Senior swimmer Brenno Varanda was awarded Academic All-American honors
- Men's swimming ranked 26th out of 139 D-I teams with 3.10 GPA
- Women's swimming ranked 69th out of 190 D-I teams with a 3.15 GPA
- BU won Academic Squad Honors from the Intercollegiate Women's Lacrosse Coaches' Association (IWLCA)
- 10 volleyball players named to AEC Honor Roll
- 251 out of 440 fall student-athletes earned AEC Academic Honor Roll status
- 273 winter/sprint student-athletes earned AEC Academic Honor Roll status
- BU had more Academic Honor Roll student-athletes than any other school in the AEC
- BU had the most AEC Commissioner's Honor Roll recipients with 158 student-athletes achieving a 3.5 GPA or higher

- 100% basketball graduation rate - one of only seven schools out of the 65-team NCAA Tournament field
- 4 members of outdoor track were named to the 2009 AEC All-Academic Team
- 27 student-athletes inducted into the 2009 National College Athlete Honor Society (GPA of 3.4 or above required).
- 120 student-athletes added to the National College Athlete Honor Society since 2006
- 15 of 19 teams with a 3.0 GPA or higher for spring 2009 semester
- 11 student-athletes with a 4.0 GPA for the spring semester
- Average 3.12 GPA - Highest Academic Year GPA in Division I history
- 4 student-athletes received the SUNY Chancellor's Scholar-Athlete Award
- 2 student-athletes received honorable mention in the President's Award of Undergraduate Student Excellence
- 1 student-athlete received America East Scholar-Athlete of the Year

Academic Support: BU offers student-athletes academic support services through the Student-Athlete Success Center. The support services are organized to provide all student-athletes an opportunity to achieve excellence in their academic, athletic and personal pursuits. The academic success of the student-athletes is the Center's top priority. The office of student services operates in conjunction with student support personnel across campus, including the Writing Center, Discovery Center, and Career Development Center. Student-athletes participate in an NCAA Life Skills Program that includes a mandatory course for all first year student-athletes, emphasizing academic excellence, personal and career development, and community service.

Student Governance: The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) provides a forum for communication between BU's student-athlete population and the athletics administration. The organization serves as a vehicle for the education and dissemination of information in an attempt to develop and maintain positive student-athlete, staff, and faculty relations. It also seeks to promote expectations in the areas of athletic excellence, academic integrity, sportsmanship, and citizenship in the campus and larger communities. Further, SAAC fosters mutual support for athletes on campus, and arranges a variety of events for all student-athletes. The athletics department also offers The Scholar-Athlete Leadership Institute (SALI), the goal of which is to provide education outside of the normal classroom setting that is aimed at developing a young person's skill and confidence as a leader. SALI provides opportunities for expressing that leadership in both campus and community settings.

Community Service/Outreach: The athletics department coaches, student-athletes, administrators and staff have maintained a long tradition of reaching out to the Broome County community. Activities range widely, including volunteering for the Special Olympics, Empire State Games, and Habitat for Humanity, to participating in reading programs, blood drives, collections for CHOW and underprivileged youth, sports clinics, and fund-raising for breast cancer research, among others. Binghamton's student-athletes also raised in excess of \$100,000 for the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital during the past three years.

Benefits of Intercollegiate Athletics Program: BU's intercollegiate athletics program encourages excellence in athletics, academic success, health and personal development among its participants. Competitive success is a source of recognition and pride for the student body, faculty, staff, alumni, and the region. This, in turn, contributes to the University's initiatives in student recruitment, fundraising, branding of BU, and community and state relationships.