

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 26, 2000 - (approved)
E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on April 26, 2000. in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
3. Update on the general education issue - Professor Gold
4. [Report on the Division of Athletics budget - Professor Cerny, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation](#)
5. Executive Session
6. [Old/new business](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair:

The Chair reported that:

1. a job description for the position of Vice Provost for Educational Technology is being circulated around campus; faculty members should feel free to nominate themselves or someone else
2. Provost Trigg will not be able to attend the meeting today or the Senate meeting on Tuesday; he would like to begin his executive session with the FSEC on May 10 at 1:00 PM rather than 2:00 PM; the Chair would also like to schedule a brief public session of the FSEC if the Promotions and Tenure Committee is ready to report on the teaching portfolio requirement
 - o may have additional language to offer to make the document meaningful for librarians (Professor Adams-Volpe)

- modest dissent against including an action item for a day scheduled as an executive meeting (Professor Swartz)
 - if we don't act before the end of the academic year, the document will be adopted without our input (Professor Nickerson)
3. Mara McGinnis is leaving UB for a new job at Columbia; he thanked her for her wonderful reporting
 4. he attended the meeting of the Provost with the Departmental Chairs; the President presented information on the budget; he talked about a considerable reduction in Faculty members in the Medical School and the shifting of resources to other parts of the campus
 5. the President will meet with the chairs of the College of Arts & Sciences; the Chair has been invited to attend
 6. the calendar for the Faculty Senate was distributed last week; with the approval of the FSEC, the calendar will be distributed at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate
 7. the Provost met with the Deans; there was discussion of starting the University Calendar later in 2001; the Provost discussed our recommendation on Women's Studies, but the matter was postponed until Dean Grant and Professor Marcus could make presentations; the restatement on promotions was discussed and the revision in the promotions checklist was approved; the Deans would like to work with the Faculty Senate Committee on Tenure and Privileges
 8. UB will host a CNN session this evening, a "town meeting with Hillary Rodham Clinton
 9. President Greiner wants to talk with us at some length, so Dr. Gold's presentation has been rescheduled for next week; by then we will know whether UB's response to the General Education Submissions has been accepted by SUNY Central Administration
 10. the SUNY Senate is meeting this weekend
 11. the Budget Priorities Committee met and discussed the faculty role in capital planning; we will request that faculty representatives be included on the University Planning Group; the Budget Priorities Committee also gave Professor Cerny, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation, suggestion for additions to the report on the budget for intercollegiate athletics that is being finalized between the two committees; the Information and Library Committee is meeting on April 28.

Item 2: Presentation of the President

The President previewed the presentation he will make to the Dean and Chairs of the College of Arts & Sciences. His presentation provides a big picture overview, reviews key financial issues of the last decade, reasserts the priorities driving financial decisions, and discusses the next 3-5 years.

In 1988/1989 SUNY's revenues were derived from three sources: tax support of \$1,614,500B (53%), tuition of \$269,000M (9%) and other income of \$1,179,000B (38%). In 1998/1999>

Transfer interrupted!

f \$1,620,300B (34%), tuition of \$575,300M (12%), and other income of \$2,533,800B (54%). The President summarized, saying that tuition has doubled, tax support for SUNY has been flat, and other income has replaced tax support.

The way in which SUNY spends state tax support has changed. Tax support for the operation of the campuses is down by \$177M. SUNY wide programs, which provide direct revenue to the campuses, such as equipment replacement money, are down \$94.7M. These two programs are of the most interest to the campuses. Offsetting these decreases are increases of \$119.2M to debt service, \$97.4M to fringe benefits, and \$61.4M to TAP. Debt service is up because of a building boom on the campuses.

UB's revenues are a changing mix. State tax revenue declined from 1989 to 1993, flattened out from 1993 to 1995, at which point it began to rise again. However, state tax revenue in unadjusted dollars is 5.9% less in 1999 than in 1989. Student fees have risen by 3,831% and tuition by 103%. Research overhead has increased 5.9%.

Contractual salary costs have been an underfunded mandate. UB has added \$59.8M to salaries, but received only an allocation of \$26.8M, covering the \$33M gap by shifting resources.

The student/faculty ratio has tracked fairly well. In 1989 the ratio was 13.580, moving to a low in 1995 of 13.38, and rising again by 1999 to 13.921. In 1989 there were 1,687 FTE faculty, in 1995 1,583 and in 1999 1,537.

The relationship between tenure track and non tenure track faculty has changed. In 1989 there were 1,250 tenure/tenure track to 437 non-tenure track faculty; in 1999, 1,118 tenure/tenure track faculty to 419 non-tenure track. Although the total number of non-tenure track faculty is down, the change in relationship between the two is very worrisome to faculty.

The President spoke to the loss of faculty by academic area. Loss of faculty has occurred most dramatically in the Health Sciences areas. In 1989 there were 586 FTE faculty, and in 1999 477. By contrast in the non-health sciences professional schools there were 393 FTE faculty and in 1999 379. In 1989 the College of Arts & Sciences had 552 and in 1999 535.

He then went to the College and School level. The Law School and the School of Social Work have experienced an increase in their faculty numbers. The Law School has increased its faculty by 14 FTE's. As a unique program in SUNY, the Law School sets its own tuition; in order to implement a new curriculum it successfully raised tuition and hired additional faculty, most of whom are not tenure track. The increase in the School of Social Work is tied to increased sponsored research.

There have been varying levels of loss in the other units. Loss of faculty occurred most dramatically in the School of Medicine, whose faculty FTE dropped by 93 between 1989 and 1999. However, while state tax support fell, the Medical School added practice plan income and was able to take advantage of its endowment. Given that tuition income is mostly generated by undergraduates, that tuition income has gone mostly to where the undergraduates are, forcing the Medical School to rely on other kinds of state support.

State capital program initiatives in the 1990's have amounted to about \$200 M. Of that sum all but \$4 M. went to academics. There was a price to pay for the improvements,

however, in that funds that might otherwise have gone for the operating budget went for debt service.

During the decade UB has made 603 tenure/tenure track hires: 231 in the College of Arts & Sciences, 204 in the non-health sciences professional schools and 158 in the Health Sciences. The President is optimistic about UB because of the quality of the faculty we have been able to attract.

The President turned to BAP/RAM. He believes UB will recover \$1.5 M in tax support from the 1999/2000 running of the BAP/RAM and hopes to recover the full \$3 M. that was lost. SUNY is discussing how to improve BAP/RAM, including creating a "firewall" to separate tuition from tax support, protecting the research support base, increasing stability and predictability, and permitting differential tuition at the graduate level.

For the FY 2000/2001 UB's projected budget outcome is a total appropriation of \$246.7M, an increase of \$12.3M over this year, being the sum of \$161.3 M in state tax support and \$85.1 M in revenues. Key to the projection is success in meeting enrollments and in increasing sponsored research. UB's financial plan shows salaries funded, a modest growth in tax funds beyond salaries, the implementation of revenue sharing with the units, beginning an effort to reduce the structural imbalance and approval of a spending plan and allocations before July 1, 2000.

The President ended with a discussion of UB's urgent priority. There has been a very significant investment in undergraduate instruction and support in the last decade. 90% of students who stay 4 years at UB, graduate. UB must, now reestablish the primacy of its research and graduate education mission. Sponsored program funding must increase, we must focus on quality, not quantity, in Ph.D programs, and we should increase Master's enrollments.

There were questions and comments:

- have difficulty figuring out how many faculty in my Department (Professor Fournier)

- take roster from the Department and run it against the FTE count; reporting system should be able to give these kinds of numbers (President Greiner)
- what did the Chairs find most striking in your presentation? (Professor Nickerson)
- the relationship between the tenure track, non-tenure track lines, and our lack of a simple, computer based accounting system (President Greiner)
- in the hard sciences, funding is available for research at the edge, and for that we need bright, new faculty (Professor Malone)
- our existing faculty follow the developments in their disciplines and will write proposals, but they need some stability and infrastructure support; we have to buy into the idea that UB is increasingly an income driven institution and what we do as faculty members has to be responsive to that reality (President Greiner)
- non tenured people are less likely to bring in external funding; because of the CAS hiring freeze, faculty in my Department are spending their energy meeting teaching obligations, and I have been criticized for grant writing activities because they cut into my ability to teach (Professor Jorgensen)
- non tenure track faculty can free up tenure track faculty for more profitable uses of their time, but each department has to decide whether the use of non tenure faculty makes sense in its context; departments in the CAS which have no tradition of the use of non tenure track faculty find the practice troublesome; the CAS budget situation should be ameliorated significantly in the coming fiscal year; situations of departments on campus are very different, so need a common quantitative language (President Greiner)

Item 3: Report on the Division of Athletics Budget

Professor Cerny, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Athletics and Recreation, presented a draft of his Committee's report on the Division of Athletics budget, especially focusing on intercollegiate athletics. The Committee on Budget Priorities looked at the draft and made a number of suggestions, which will be made. Recognizing that this is a work in

progress and that it lacks the piece on recreation, the Chair believes it important to get the preliminary to the Faculty Senate at its May meeting.

Professor Schack raised a general issue of Faculty Senate procedure. The Budget Priorities Committee felt this report was not yet ready to go to the Faculty Senate; nonetheless it is on the agenda. It is bad practice to send out a document known to need revision; faculty read the first iteration and nothing more. Faculty Senate should not be casual in releasing unfinished documents.

Professor Cerny first spoke about the Division's approved budget of \$10.2M for 1999/2000. Student fees generate \$3.2M, Programs, \$2.5M and there is \$4.4M in state support, which is the only money which could theoretically be available for use elsewhere on campus if there were no intercollegiate athletics. The Committee on Athletics believes that UB receives more in revenues from the student athletes and from grants in aid than the \$4.4 M of state support. Grants in aid of \$2/2.5 M, for example, flow to the University. The Budget Priorities Committee, however, questions this conclusion, and the Committee on Athletics will re-examine it.

- does the grants in aid include what comes to the University for room and board and tuition? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- yes; the Committee additionally believed that some of the 300 athletes who participate in athletics but receive no money would not have come to a UB which lacked Division I athletics, which if true would equate to additional income for UB (Professor Cerny)
- the Budget Priorities Committee felt that since grants in aid paid for tuition and room and board, it could not also be counted as an offset for the cost of athletics; without Division I a group of students may indeed not have come to UB, but that is not to say that some other equal group would have (Professor Schack)
- grants in aid not really different from paying a student from a grant and also offsetting that money to the benefit of a department ; no evidence that another

group would be attracted to UB because it lacked Division I athletics (Professor Cerny)

- large athletics fee disadvantages UB in recruiting (Professor Boot)
- if athletes didn't come, UB would accept lower profile students in order to meet enrollment targets; athletes as a group have a higher retention rate than the average student; can make the argument that having athletics improves the student profile; double counting students is frequently done; it would be interesting to see how much revenue is generated by physical education courses that rely on facilities improvements brought about by Division I (Professor Fournier)
- only count dollars once (Professor Schack)
- size of UB's fees is irrelevant to those students whom we would most like to recruit but who instead go to Cornell, Syracuse, etc.; athletics do attract students, e.g., Duke University has risen on its basketball (Professor Baumer)
- given the current climate on campus, it is important to get information on the athletics budget out to the faculty (Professor Adams-Volpe)

Professor Cerny turned to the figures for revenue generated by the Division of Athletics. The Budget Priorities Committee asked that these figures be broken down, and he will do so.

Parenthetically he acknowledged the references to Syracuse and Duke, but he stated UB does not aspire to be in athletic competition with them. Their budgets are many times the size of UB's, and there is no desire to enlarge UB's athletics budget to a similar size.

- if we aspire only to be a second tier program, we should not be talking about the benefits that accrue to higher tier programs (Professor Schack)
- University of Connecticut is more like UB, and their basketball program has increased applications dramatically (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- University of Connecticut spends significantly more than UB (Professor Cerny)

Each coach and unit within the Division submits a budget which is reviewed by the Athletics Director and his chief financial officer. The budget is currently distributed as

follows: football, 28%; men's basketball, 8%; other men's sports, 11%; women's basketball, 7%; other women's sports, 15%; support services/administration, 32%. The size of the budget has increased from \$2M in 1992/1993 to \$10M in 1999/2000 in a linear progression. During the years 1990-1996 the Division ran up a planned deficit; there is a pay plan in place.

- the Budget Priorities Committee would have liked more detail about the deficit and pay plan, especially since the deficit involved was larger than that of the College of Arts & Sciences (Professor Schack)
- to avoid the deficit, student fees would have to have been raised from \$35 to \$60; the campus decided to phase in the increase over time thus causing the deficit; the number of students who participate is greater than just the 500 student athletes, and the program adds intangible value to the University (Professor Fournier)
- the question is not whether athletics gives us value for our \$10M, but what value we could have gotten from other uses of the money (Professor Schack)
- wouldn't have \$10M to spend if we didn't have athletics; athletics brings in philanthropy more than other endeavors (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- it is certain we would have \$4.4M that we could choose to spend in other ways; the student fees which were imposed to fund athletics could have been imposed for other purposes with other benefits; whether money is given to sports more than to other activities is still an open question (Professor Schack)
- fund raising for non-athletic purposes may benefit from the presence of an athletic program (Professor Baumer)
- most of the money for athletics goes for personnel so the only way to free up the money is to get rid of the people; as a member of the same union as those people, I would object to doing that (Professor Malone)
- reality is that the students are opposed to the athletics fee (Professor Boot)
- students voted for the athletics fee (Professor Cerny)

Professor Cerny has asked for information on philanthropy directed to the athletics program. At minimum there is an endowment that generates \$60K, and restricted gifts of \$320K. The Capital Campaign has also set a target for the Division of Athletics.

One of the goals of the athletics program is to increase out-of-state enrollment which is currently 98%:2%. In fact many of the student athletes are out-of-state students. If out-of-state recruitment is more successful because of the athletics program, the tuition differential between in-state and out-of-state students should be counted as an offset to the cost of the athletics program.

Scholastically, student athletes do well at UB. 83% graduate, and 45% achieve a GPA of 3.0 or better. 30 student athletes have a GPA of 3.6. This is much better than the general student population's performance.

The report is still a draft, and the Committee will make the additions requested by the Budget Priorities Committee. Professor Cerny asserted, however, that as it stands the report paints an accurate picture of athletics at UB.

- where does money for women's scholarships come from? (Professor Booth)
- they are supported by gifts and by state money; UB is committed to gender equity (Professor Cerny)
- the development of an athletics program takes at least a generation; development officers believe athletics give undergraduates an emotional tie to the university that would be otherwise missing in most alumni (Professor Fournier)
- in 1986 we were told that there would be an immediate pay in that older alumni would reconnect to an athletics program; experts often believe in cause and effect relationships that can't be proven (Professor Schack)

Item 5: Old/new business

Professors Fourtner and Schack had earlier raised a concern that the proposed academic calendar gives only thirteen weeks to each of the Spring semesters. Fourteen weeks and an exam week are required. Professor Fourtner asked for an update. The Chair will look into the matter.

There being no other old/new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn McMann Kramer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: P. Nickerson

Secretary: M. Kramer

Architecture: R. Shibley

Arts & Sciences: W. Baumer, C. Fourtner, J. Meacham, S. Schack

Engineering & Applied Sciences: D. Malone

Education: T. Schroeder

Health Related Professions: J. Tamburlin

Information Studies: C. Jorgensen

Law: L. Swartz

Management: J. Boot

SUNY Senators: J. Adams-Volpe, J. Boot, H. Durand, J. Fisher

University Libraries: A. Booth

University Officers: W. Greiner, President

Guests:

W. Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

M. McGinnis, *Reporter*

J. Celock, Red Jacket Hall Council

P. Graser, *The Spectrum*

Excused:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini, Cedric Smith

Absent:

Arts & Sciences: Charles Smith

Dental Medicine: M. Easley

Nursing: E. Perese

Pharmacy: N.