

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of November 1, 1995 (approved)

revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the minutes of September 20 and September 27, 1995](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President or Provost](#)
4. [Approval of agenda for Faculty Senate meeting of November 14, 1995](#)
5. [Capital Campaign](#)
6. [Future of Graduate Education](#)
7. Old Business (none)
8. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the minutes of September 20 and September 27, 1995

Professor Welch requested additions or corrections to the minutes. The minutes of September 20, 1995 were unanimously approved as submitted. Professor Jameson, commenting on the 9/27/95 minutes, proposed changes to Professor Boot's report on the SUNY Senate meeting. It was suggested that the proposed changes be reviewed by Professor Boot and that approval of the minutes be deferred to the next regular meeting.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch commented on the following:

- The Faculty Senate Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC) had met with the Provost on 10/27/95 to discuss the Faculty Senate resolution on undergraduate teaching assistants (UTAs), academic forgiveness for adult students returning after lengthy absence and the criteria for awarding credit to courses that have substantial "non-academic" character, are exclusively remedial in nature, or seem repetitious of courses required for graduation from high school or admission to the University.
- The Faculty Senate Computer Services Committee would meet on 11/8/95 to examine Vision 99, the Educational Technology Action Fund, Computer Information Technology (CIT) visits to Deans, the Access to Data policy and "green computing".
- The Faculty Senate Athletics and Recreation Committee would discuss a draft report with the FSEC on either 12/6/95 or 12/13/95.
- The President has agreed, that on the urging of the Faculty Senate Public Service Committee, an award for faculty members carrying out outstanding public service should be created.
- The Faculty Senate Academic Planning Committee has met with the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Letters.
- The Budget Priorities Committee of the Faculty Senate has inquired about the number of decanal units that have established comparable units.
- The Faculty Senate Governance Committee has been asked to report to the FSEC by mid-December on a draft report which is in progress.
- The Chair of the Faculty Senate Information and Library Resources Committee, Dr. Lee, would meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) at the 11/29/95 meeting which would be held on the south campus.
- The Faculty Senate homepage has been updated.
- Provost Headrick had indicated to Professor Welch regarding the Faculty Senate resolution on extension of the tenure clock that he was "leaning against a formal policy, and more toward a University understanding to be implemented by Deans, with appeal to the Provost if conflict between the faculty member and the Dean". Professor Acara expressed surprise and stated that the joint committee composed of

Deans and Faculty Senate members had decided to advise the Provost to accept the Faculty Senate resolution.

- The FSEC must nominate faculty candidates for the local committee for the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Librarianship and that this topic would be discussed under new business.
- The Faculty Tenure and Privileges Committee should be asked to examine the criteria for promotion, particularly to full professor, in light of proposals made by the Provost and the President in terms of service and teaching.
- Upcoming agenda items would include a dialogue with Vice Provost Goodman regarding faculty advisement and discussion regarding the Environmental Task Force with the FSEC, a second reading of the revisions of the Faculty Senate Charter and Bylaws of the Voting Faculty with the Faculty Senate and an FSEC meeting on the south campus highlighting campus safety and discussions with members of the faculty councils of the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Information and Library Services Committee.
- A letter requesting nominations for the positions of SUNY-wide Senators from units other than the Health Sciences would be distributed to both the Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Senate, as part of the electoral unit.
- A call for nominations for the position of Secretary of the Faculty Senate would be distributed within the next two weeks.

ITEM 3: Report of the President or Provost

President Greiner discussed the importance of leadership and relationships throughout the SUNY system. He noted that the planning process of the Board of Trustees would have significant effects throughout SUNY and on higher public education in general. President Greiner reported that he had been working closely with Provost Headrick and Senior Vice President Wagner in preparing materials for the study of the operations, structure and mission and vision of SUNY. He emphasized that maximal efficiency was required to "do better with less" in reference to state tax support cuts. President Greiner emphasized the importance of flexibility at the campus level. He stated that it was necessary to re-examine the

way the academic mission was defined and delivered. President Greiner mentioned the California model and differential tuition. He noted the importance of the University keeping revenue generated by tuition. He stated that it was imperative to separate tax and revenue funding. He stated that the revenue generated should remain at the campus with the University responsible and accountable to the System Administration. Provost Headrick stated that close coordination and consultation on the academic side were present among the university centers. President Greiner stated that he could provide a report to the campus through the Reporter and emphasized that the University must keep moving forward in its academic mission.

ITEM 4: Approval of Agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting of 11/14/95

It was suggested that the Report of the Chair precede the Report of the President/Provost. With acceptance of this change, the agenda was unanimously approved.

ITEM 5: Capital Campaign

Professor Welch commented that he was familiar with funding appeals through private higher education. He introduced Vice President Stein to discuss the capital campaign. Vice President Stein stated that private fundraising was an imperative and that immediate implementation of a planned process was advisable. He noted the funds raised in 1993 to be \$600,000, in 1994 to be \$1.2 million and in 1995 to be \$1.7 million. He stated that the University had received its largest cash gift in history of \$1.6 million, to which \$800,000 had been added for a total of \$2.4 million, to attract distinguished undergraduate honor students with demonstrated financial need. He commented that the gift was funded for three years and that it was hoped that the gift would be endowed.

Professor Jameson asked Vice President Stein to explain the process of solicitation. Vice President Stein stated that there had been no process in the past and that activities had been intuitive in nature. He stated that the current process included a list of 126,000 alumni and friends. He mentioned an electronic screening process to

identify prospects and noted that 100 individuals had been identified with a financial worth of \$10 million and above, 130 individuals worth \$5 to 10 million and 3000 individuals worth \$2.5 to 5.0 million. Vice President Stein stated that these individuals had never communicated with the University in the past. He stressed the importance of building relationships and partnerships through personal solicitation.

Professor Jameson stated that she was under the impression that individuals could only be approached by the unit issuing the last degree received at the University. Vice President Stein replied that this was not true. He explained that each alumnus/alumna had a prospect manager, a development officer, supervising solicitations. He stated that it was not desirable to have more than one individual soliciting an alumnus/alumna. Vice President Stein remarked that in the past the problem has been a lack of prospects. He emphasized that it was important to ascertain the interests of the prospective donor.

Professor Horvath questioned the procedure for changing donations from specific areas to unspecified University funds. Vice President Stein stated that the current policy was to work on a gift to the University and that no attempts were made to try to redirect the donations. He stated that coordination was desired but that development officers and faculty were free to solicit prospects.

Professor Henderson stressed that development was not done in a vacuum and that faculty should play a consultative role in general public relations. Vice President Stein agreed and stated that the number one comment from alumni was that they had not been contacted by the University in thirty years. The number two comment according to Vice President Stein was that a "great education" had been received at the University. He stated that development is alumni relations and that the process is initiated with students prior to entering the campus. He noted that development was the end of a long process based on building relationships. He stated that it was everyone's job to participate in development and that the Deans and Vice President Palmer had been educated about attitudes related to the capital campaign. He noted that the relationship to be developed was a relationship with an individual faculty member. Professor Henderson asked about monitoring of the process and Vice President Stein replied that the

process was very public and that results were reported. Professor Welch commented on projections for 1994-1995 and asked for projections for 1995-1996. Vice President Stein replied that the projections were being developed and Professor Welch commented that it was important to provide a sense of goals. Professor Adams noted that the proposal for the capital campaign was oriented to schools and requested that additional units such as the Libraries and Student Affairs be included in the process. She stated that the Libraries were in the process of recruiting for a development officer. Vice President Stein commented that the intent of the campaign was to include all units of the University including the Schools and Faculties, the University Libraries, the Division of Athletics, Public Service and Urban Affairs, University Services, Student Affairs, WBFO, the Provost's Office and Undergraduate Education. Professor inquired into the projections. Vice President Stein replied that solicitations of four prospects usually resulted in one gift. He noted that projections were based on the number of prospects and the availability of a development officer within the unit.

It was noted that identified needs included: \$69 million for interdisciplinary centers, \$50 million for leadership, \$44 million for scholarships and fellowships, \$39 million for infrastructure, \$26 million for new faculty startups, \$55 million for facilities rehabilitation, \$28 million for general funds with a total of \$311 million in the faculty area. Additional needs for the University Libraries, the Division of Athletics, University Services and Student Affairs resulted in a \$400 million total.

It was noted that 550 leading prospects had been identified and that a feasibility study would be done within the next few weeks. Professor Churchill inquired into "raiding" the endowments. Vice President Stein stated that a request had been made for the interest raised on a state held quasi-endowment which was allowed to be spent. Professor Churchill asked if this was a legal action and Vice President Stein stated that it was legal but required approval from the State.

Professor Horvath asked for figures and Vice President Stein stated that a preliminary review was in progress with results available within a week.

Professor Welch stated that the Faculty Senate had not yet received

access to the identified needs and that the Provost had promised to provide the information.

Vice President Stein referred to the Faculty-Staff Campaign which was scheduled from March 1 to April 15, 1996. He noted that internal support can be a valuable ingredient in promoting external support.

Vice President Stein stated that he would be pleased to meet with faculty members to discuss development. Professor Malone asked about restrictions in donations and Vice President Stein replied that a gift cannot be given to oneself or in violation of federal law. He remarked that preferences could be noted and that State held endowments might not be allowed to be spent due to changes in the law.

Professor Welch stressed that the voice of the faculty was important in two ways; in cultivation of prospects and identification of needs.

ITEM 6: Future of Graduate Education

Professor Welch commented that Dean Triggie had stated that the academic leadership of the University included all faculty members and administrators. He noted his comments on new realities of graduate education.

Vice Provost Triggie stated that his comments would appear in The Reporter on the following day. He commented that his remarks would focus on graduate education within the larger context of change within higher education. He noted three significant factors facing higher education: changes in organization in relationship to the significant impact of information technology, reductions or shifts in resources from the federal, state and private sectors, and public and political expectations based on disenchantment with escalating tuition and faculty productivity.

The significant structural and functional reorganization of SUNY in the next two to three years and the concept of distance learning were noted. Vice Provost Triggie stated that change was imminent which would have an effect on all aspects of education. He cited recent reports which summarized contrasting views on graduate education which included the National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine, W.F. Massy and C.A. Goldman and D.S. North. W.G. Bowen and N.L. Rudenstine were cited for analysis of

doctoral education.

Public attention to the National Research Council report and the need for further analysis of the data were noted. Vice Provost Triggles commented that the Graduate School had been downsized with a resultant emphasis on paperwork. He mentioned the self-study and the outside review of the Graduate School and noted that increased support and organizational changes were necessary. Four major areas to be addressed were organization and priorities, program quality, resources and graduate students.

It was noted that it would be necessary to be larger and more flexible in organization and expand beyond departmental boundaries to become interdisciplinary. An example cited was the Structural Biology initiative to enhance faculty competitiveness for funding. Program cooperation among campuses and selective utilization of resources were mentioned. Enhanced communication and data collection were noted and areas discussed included monitoring of the quality and sizes of graduate programs via the electronic network.

Evaluation of graduate programs and a system of rewards and penalties were discussed with an emphasis on cooperation between Deans, Chairs, graduate faculty and the Graduate School. The need for examination of the role of the graduate faculty with criteria for membership and continued membership was noted. Vice Provost Triggles stated that membership in the graduate faculty was not necessarily permanent.

Vice Provost Triggles remarked that limited funds were available for revitalization of the Graduate School and for program evaluations. He stated that it was important for the Graduate School to assume a larger role in recruiting of high quality students. He commented on pursuing housing dedicated to graduate students. Vice Provost Triggles remarked on the responsibility for promoting the interrelationship between graduate education, training and research.

Professor Welch requested comments from FSEC members. Professor Adams stated that Vice Provost Triggles's vision was hopeful and engaging. She commented that she was troubled by the emphasis on membership in the graduate faculty and noted a stigma attached to exclusion from the graduate faculty that could be destructive and have a negative effect on the undergraduate

faculty. Professor Adams suggested integrating graduate education as part of the institution. Vice Provost Triggles replied that the quality of graduate programs needed to be increased and that he hoped everyone would participate in education. He recognized that changes would occur over a period of time. He referred to membership in the graduate faculty as a form of recognition and stated that he did not believe that there would be a problem with attachment of stigma to non-membership in the graduate faculty. Professor Horvath voiced agreement with Professor Adams regarding membership in the graduate faculty. Vice Provost Triggles stated that examination of the issue was necessary and that the distinction might not be necessary. He stressed that the issue was to monitor the quality of graduate education.

Professor Acara noted that the effect of affinity groups geographically leaving departments for the new research building of the Medical School was unclear. Vice Provost Triggles responded that linkages were important and that perhaps departments have outlived their "usefulness". He mentioned creation of new departments and acknowledged that departments nurtured faculty. He stated that he would be seeking advice regarding this issue and mentioned analysis of the roles of education, teaching and research. Professor Stevenson remarked that the Graduate School could play a role in identifying linkages in departments that were traditionally unidisciplinary. Vice Provost Triggles noted his vision of the Graduate School as a catalyst for change.

Professor Jameson questioned the effect of the interdisciplinary emphasis on thorough training within one discipline. Vice Provost Triggles agreed with Professor Jameson and stated that training should occur in depth in each discipline and that opportunities should be offered in a variety of contiguous departments. Professor Jameson questioned how this type of organization would save money and Vice Provost Triggles replied that resources would be shared.

Professor Schuel noted that he was supportive of interdisciplinary organization and stated that better programs would result from combination of departments.>br>

ITEM 8: New Business

Professor Acara, Chair of the Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee, inquired if the charge to review criteria for promotion should be elaborated in view of Provost Headrick's comments on expanding the criteria for promotion to full professor.

Professor Horvath moved that the committee review the proposals mentioned by the Provost at the University Convocation.

Professor Hare commented that it appeared that Provost Headrick felt differently about full rank as opposed to tenure decisions.

Professor Schuel stated that tenure was the most important decision and that the committee should consider promotion to associate professor. Professor Jameson agreed with Professor Schuel and stated that the committee should examine the mechanisms by which teaching and service were evaluated for both promotions.

Professor Hare stated that the criteria for promotion for tenure need not be changed but that the criteria for promotion to full professor needed study. He commented that he was concerned about changes in the criteria in general. Professor Welch remarked that a dialogue was needed. Professor Acara suggested that input was needed from Provost Headrick. She noted that he had mentioned that the main criteria for promotion to the associate level involved research and scholarship. Professor Jameson remarked that the criteria do not demand excellence in teaching and service.

Professor Horvath rephrased his proposal to direct the Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee to approach two topics: excellence in teaching and service in addition to research, and different criteria for promotion to full professor. The proposal was seconded by Professor Ferry. Professor Jameson requested a written proposal. Professor Welch suggested that the proposal be finely tuned for the next meeting by Professors Hare, Jameson and Horvath.

Professor Churchill presented a resolution of sympathy to the family and student involved in the violent incident near the south campus which expressed the concern of the FSEC with lawlessness and violence in the University district. Professor seconded the motion which was passed unanimously. Professor Ferry noted safety warnings listed in Squire Hall.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: W. Greiner, T. Headrick, D. Triggler, R. Stein

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: M. Hadighi

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, H. Schuel

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill, P. Eberlein

Pharmacy: N.

Social Sciences: P. Hare, D. Henderson

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone

University Libraries: J. Adams

Guests:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

Professional Staff Senate: M. Stokes

Reporter: S. Cox

Those excused:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Those absent:

Arts & Letters: M. Hyde

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Law: E. Medinger

Management: R. Ramesh

Social Work: L. Sloan
SUNY Senator: J. Boot