

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of April 24, 1996 (approved) (revised 10/3/95)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

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

1. [Approval of the Minutes of March 6, 1996](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Report from the Graduate School Executive Committee](#)
5. [Update from the Budget Priorities Committee](#)
6. [Future of the University Honors Program](#)
7. [Recruitment and Admissions](#)
8. [Low enrollment courses](#)
9. [Report from the University Faculty Senate meeting](#)
10. [Draft resolution on the Educational Opportunity Center](#)
11. [Approval of the Faculty Senate Agenda for April 30, 1996](#)
12. [Old Business](#)
13. [New Business](#)

ITEM 1: Approval of the Minutes of March 6, 1996

Professor Welch asked for additions or corrections to the minutes. There being no changes, Professor Bennett moved that the minutes be approved as submitted and Professor Danford seconded the motion which was passed unanimously.

ITEM 2: Report of the Chair

Professor Welch reported that:

1. The new Bylaws and Charter of the Faculty Senate were in effect and that the Deans were invited to participate as ex officio Faculty Senate members commencing on April 30, 1996.
2. A memorial service would be held for Professor Bullough on May 9, 1996 at 5:00 p.m. in 250 Baird Hall.
3. A workshop would be held on April 27, 1996 on multiculturalism/diversity.
4. Provost Headrick had responded to the Faculty Senate Resolution on Faculty Input to the Appointment and Reappointment of Chairs in a Memo to the Deans. He stated in the Memo that decanal units and departments were free to develop their own governance mechanisms for a procedure to define the nature of faculty consultation in the process of appointment/reappointment of Chairs. He further stated that he would expect a full and clear account of the nature and degree of faculty consultation in the recommendation process for appointment/reappointment of Chairs.
5. Reports from the Standing Committees of the Faculty Senate were being received and would be distributed to the Faculty Senate.
6. Concern was present regarding courses considered to be an "easy A". It was noted that the Faculty Senate Educational Programs and Policies Committee was studying internships and the maximum number of allowable credits. Internships were acknowledged as crucial components of various programs and it was stated that guidelines would be useful and might be available through review of course outlines.
7. A meeting of the Budget Priorities Committee had been held which focused on base budgets for academic units, expenses and all funds budgeting.

ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost

Provost Headrick stated that President Greiner had met with aides to the Governor and might meet with Governor Pataki to discuss the University and SUNY.

ITEM 4: Report from the Graduate School Executive Committee

Professor Nickerson referred to literature available on social and other relationships between graduate and other faculty. He questioned the existence of a policy. Provost Headrick stated that the absence of rules could also be considered a policy.

ITEM 5: Update from the Budget Priorities Committee

Professor Gates, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee, distributed the annual report and reviewed the charge of the committee to communicate faculty concerns about budget allocations to central administrators.

He noted that decentralization of budget policy had evolved and that decisions that influenced academic policy occurred most frequently within the decanal units.

Professor Gates stated that the SUNY allocation constituted only about one-third of yearly revenues for the University and as a result concern had shifted to an all-funds overview of accounting, reporting and budgeting for the University.

Models of budgeting were mentioned that included responsibility-centered budgeting in which units are credited with a variety of revenue sources and charged with a variety of basic costs and value-centered budgeting in which missions and priorities are quantified and linked to incentives.

It was acknowledged that taxes, endowments and sponsored programs could no longer be assumed to provide the only means of support for units. User fees, entrepreneurship and differential tuition were mentioned as future foci for budgeting.

Professor Gates emphasized that each decanal unit should have a budget advisory process.

Professor Adams asked for clarification regarding fees and Professor Gates replied that no central policy guided the amounts charged and that the Budget Priorities Committee (BPC) had worked with administrators on drafts of a policy that would rationalize and smooth out the wide variations in user fees at the University.

Professor Jameson commented on proportional cuts between the service and academic sides of the University. Provost Headrick replied that the budget for the next year was not known and that only contingent numbers had been allocated which were subject to further negotiations. He noted that for the last year, allocations between the academic and the service sides had been based on existing allocations.

Professor Welch stated that additional discussion of budget matters would be on the agenda at the Faculty Senate meeting during the next week.

Professor Henderson mentioned indirect cost recovery as part of budget planning and suggested streamlining the sponsored program process. Provost Headrick replied that Senior Vice President Wagner had recommended that purchasing should be consolidated. Professor Henderson suggested that the consumers should be involved in the planning process. Professor Welch added that Senior Vice President Wagner would be present at the Faculty Senate meeting during the next week.

Professor Horvath asked for suggestions in setting up Budget Priorities Committees in the units. Professor Gates stressed that it was important to inform colleagues of the importance of involvement in the budget process and the possibility for impact at the decanal level.

ITEM 6: Future of the University Honors Program

Professor Welch provided an introductory statement on the Honors Program which was established in 1981.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that Provost Bloch had wanted a formal review of the Honors Program by outside experts. He reported that a self-study had been prepared by the University Honors Council by Professor Ludwig, the Self-Study Coordinator in Spring, 1995. He noted that the idea of an outside review was not advised by Provost Headrick. Vice Provost Goodman remarked that the University Honors Program was a strong and successful program.

Professor Herreid, the Academic Director of the Honors Program, expressed gratitude to Professor Ludwig for writing the self-study. He stated that the mission of the Honors Program was to recruit and retain academically gifted students. He noted the increase from 20 initial freshmen in 1981 to the current 400 students in four different programs including a Freshmen Recruitment Program, a Performing and Creative Arts Program, a Transfer Recruitment Program and a Current UB Program. He noted that the Honors S

ITEM 6: Future of the University Honors Program

Professor Welch provided an introductory statement on the Honors Program which was established in 1981.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that Provost Bloch had wanted a formal review of the Honors Program by outside experts. He reported that a self-study had been prepared by the University Honors Council by Professor Ludwig, the Self-Study Coordinator in Spring, 1995. He noted that the idea of an outside review was not advised by Provost Headrick. Vice Provost Goodman remarked that the University Honors Program was a strong and successful program.

Professor Herreid, the Academic Director of the Honors Program, expressed gratitude to Professor Ludwig for writing the self-study. He stated that the mission of the Honors Program was to recruit and retain academically gifted students. He noted the increase from

20 initial freshmen in 1981 to the current 400 students in four different programs including a Freshmen Recruitment Program, a Performing and Creative Arts Program, a Transfer Recruitment Program and a Current UB Program. He noted that the Honors Students received financial support from endowment funds, priority registration, counseling from faculty mentors and guidance from the Honors staff.

Entrance requirements for the Freshmen Recruitment Program were noted to include a 1360 or greater SAT score and a high school GPA of 93% or greater. The Performing and Creative Arts Program was noted to require a 1210 or greater SAT score, a high school GPA of 90% or greater and an audition for admission. The Transfer Recruitment Program was noted to require Junior status, a GPA of 3.8 or greater, a personal statement and references. Admission requirements for the Current UB Program were noted to include Junior status, a 3.8 GPA or greater from UB courses, a personal statement and references. Retention and graduation requirements from the Honors Program were noted to be a 3.2 GPA for the first year and an overall GPA of 3.5.

It was noted that the Honors Program has graduated over 1000 students and has an overall retention rate of approximately 89% with 55% graduating as Honors Students. Professor Herreid stated that approximately 75% of the Honors alumni attend graduate or professional schools.

A substantial anonymous donation was noted to support twenty students with full scholarships to cover all University expenses over a four year period. These Distinguished Honors Scholars would also receive the regular benefits of the Honors Program.

Professor Nickerson mentioned documentation of research and creative activity by students in the Honors Program. Ms. Capuana, the Administrative Director of the Honors Program, reported that the students were actively involved in research and creative activity. She noted that dual majors were encouraged and that approximately 80% of Honors Students attended graduate programs with the majority at the Ph.D. level.

Professor Horvath requested additional information regarding the selection process.

Professor Herreid replied that faculty from the Honors Council ranked the candidates and considered quantitative data and items such as personal statements, references and student leadership abilities in Transfer and Current UB Student categories.

Ms. Capuana stressed that the students were encouraged to feel comfortable with being bright and that work on M.A. degrees was occasionally started in the Senior year. It was noted that minority recruitment was hindered by the fact that complete financial support was not available at UB as compared to other institutions.

Professor Henderson inquired into how the students ranked the components of the program. Ms. Capuana replied that the merit based financial support was the primary consideration. She noted that priority registration, faculty contact and interaction with other bright students were important features of the program. She noted that the seminars for Honors Students opened doors and increased awareness of various disciplines.

Professor Malone inquired into use of the criterion of high school class rank in the selection process. Professor Herreid replied that rank in class was not always available and that additional criteria included auditions, portfolios, letters of reference and personal statements.

Ms. Capuana named various feeder schools including City Honors, Williamsville, Amherst, Tonawanda, Nichols and Bronx Science.

Professor Jameson questioned the 2:1 male to female ratio of students. Professor Herreid stated that he was concerned regarding the ratio and ethnic diversity. He explained that Science and Engineering were dominated by males and that two additional programs, the Performing and Creative Arts Program and the Transfer Program, had been created to allow for greater selection of females. Mr. Durkin, Director of Admissions, stated that recentering of scores attempted to address gender and ethnic biases and that a natural change in the ratio should occur over time.

Ms. Capuana stated that faculty involvement with the Honors Program included participation in seminars and acting as faculty mentors. Professor Herreid stated that participation by faculty occurred by invitation, suggestions of Chairs and student recommendations.

Professor Stevenson inquired into the desirability of expansion of the program. Professor Herreid mentioned higher administrative costs and concern regarding increasing class size within the Honors Program. He noted the hiring of an additional staff person and the availability of a lounge/library next to the office.

Professor Welch remarked that the Honors Program was a means of recruiting highly qualified high school seniors. He noted that recognition for honors also existed within departments.

Professor Acara expressed concerns regarding gender and ethnicity issues and Professor Eberlein questioned the recruitment process for the current UB Program. Ms. Capuana replied that names of students with a GPA of 3.8 or greater were obtained and that these students were contacted and asked to write a personal statement and supply two letters of recommendation. She commented that approximately 25% of the students contacted did not respond to the recruitment process.

Professor Hyde questioned the reasons for failure to graduate within the Honors Program. Professor Herreid cited transfer to another school, less than a 3.2 GPA at the end of the freshmen year and a GPA of less than 3.5 at the end of the sophomore year as reasons for discontinuation in the program.

Professor Herreid, responding to a question regarding the selection process, stated that the Admissions Committee reviewed all applications and exercised judgment on a variety of factors including gender, ethnicity and intended majors in addition to consideration of the quantitative data.

ITEM 7: Recruitment and Admissions

Professor Welch commented that the future of the University rested significantly on the number of students which depended on recruitment, admissions and retention. He commented that Professor Harwitz was an effective Chair of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee.

Mr. Durkin, Director of Admissions, commented that potential enrollment included 2500 freshmen and 1500 transfer students for a total of 4000 new students. He noted that the freshmen deposit due date was May 1, 1996 and that the next six to seven days were critical. He noted that freshmen applications were 9% behind 1995 and had decreased 3% over the last three years. He stated that throughout SUNY, in all categories, there were no positive numbers.

Mentioning the single application form with multiple selections, Mr. Durkin stated that it was important to differentiate decreases in applications from decreases in applicants. He suggested counting single applications or first choice applications as a better method of determining actual numbers of applicants.

According to Mr. Durkin, the freshmen profile was comparable to 1995 with a mean high school average of 90 and a mean recentered SAT score of 1145. He noted that applications for Engineering and Management have declined nationally. He commented that smaller programs with the ability to meet student application demands represented an enormous draw. He noted that early decision applications had done well.

Mr. Durkin stated that the Open House had received favorable comments despite decreased attendance. He stated that he was cautiously optimistic regarding freshmen enrollment and less optimistic regarding transfer students. Factors having a negative influence on applications included possible tuition increases, changes in fees and comments in the press regarding decreased state support for higher education.

Addressing the issue of retention, Professor Harwitz referred to the Annual Report of the Admissions and Retention Committee of the Faculty Senate. He mentioned reviews of the literature on the relationship of admission criteria to student success and factors

contributing to successful retention once at the institution. He noted that the documentation was available in the Faculty Senate office.

Professor Harwitz stated that the Admissions and Retention Committee had concluded that admissions was not the problem and that what happens after admission was crucial.

Professor Harwitz stressed that information gathered as part of the admissions package could be useful for student placement and improved advisement. Examples of information gathered that should not be used to determine admissions standing but potentially useful for placement decisions included writing samples and the SAT 2 which are equivalent to the former Achievement Tests. Professor Harwitz stated that access to timely and well focused advisement might be key factors to student success and improved retention. He noted the high retention and completion rate in the Honors Program.

Recommendations of the Admissions and Retention Committee included establishing an intensive advisement structure, acknowledging that faculty and professional staff provided the largest pool of personnel for advisement and determining the appropriate forum and format for the advisement process.

Professor Malone stated that he was not surprised that the admission criteria did not correlate well with retention and performance. He mentioned problems with rank in class not being provided in various cases. Professor Harwitz stated that determining the rigor of high school courses was not easily accomplished.

It was acknowledged that research related to the variables involved in admissions and retention would be complex. Vice Provost Goodman stated that the most important way to increase retention was to produce communication among students. He referred to the issue of building community and the positive effects of advisement. He stated that it was critical for students to have easy, unintimidating access to advisement. He recommended creating relationships between faculty and students to discuss careers and suggested that "mentoring" might be a better term than "advising".

Professor Nickerson stated that it was essential to have student participation on the committee.

ITEM 8: Low enrollment classes

The topic of low enrollment classes was not addressed at the meeting due to the need for further information.

ITEM 9: Report from the University Faculty Senate meeting

Professor Nickerson reported on a resolution adopted by the University Faculty Senate on April 20, 1996 regarding faculty participation on SUNY College Councils. He explained that the resolution required a change in the education law to allow the Campus Governance Leaders to have full voting status on College Councils. Currently the two campus governance leaders at UB have observer status and are excused during executive sessions. The integral role of faculty in governance and the value of collaborative decision-making were noted in support of the resolution.

A proposed academic agenda was mentioned with the emphasis on being faculty driven rather than budget driven.

The draft document on "Public Higher Education and the Imperative of Productivity: The Voice of the Faculty" was noted to be the first faculty statement on productivity and the first academic collaborative project on this topic between New York and California.

The initial segment of a series of videos on effective grant writing was presented by Professor Armstrong, the Chair of the Graduate Committee. Professor Nickerson reported that it was anticipated that the series would be broadcast to all campuses. Professor Malone reported that the executive committees of the Senates for SUNY and CUNY agreed that restoration of funds for TAP and the operating budgets were the highest priorities.

The SUNY Senate Executive Committee for the 1996-1997 academic year was reported to include Senator Malone representing the University Centers and Senator Nickerson representing the Health Science Centers.

ITEM 10: Draft Resolution on the Educational Opportunity Center

Professor Welch provided a brief summary of the governmental proposal that the Educational Opportunity Center (EOC) be tied with the Department of Labor. He stated that the EOC had traditionally been academically oriented. He noted that the Professional Staff Senate had passed a similar resolution and that the EOC was attempting to build support for continued affiliation with the Department of Education. He explained that the EOC had become a political bargaining chip and that EOC faculty had concerns related to loss of UUP representation and benefits, tenure, TIAA-CREF contributions, changes in retirement and years of service to the state.

Professor Adams suggested a friendly amendment that the issue should also be aired at the SUNY Senate. Agreement was voiced for the amendment and the amended resolution was passed directing the Chair of the Faculty Senate to convey strong opposition to the proposed transfer of the Buffalo Educational Opportunity Center from the Department of Education to the Department of Labor.

ITEM 11: Approval of the Faculty Senate Agenda for April 30, 1996

It was suggested to change the timing of the second reading of the Library Committee resolution to accommodate Professor Nickerson's schedule. The agenda was approved as amended.

ITEM 12: Old Business

There was no discussion of old business.

ITEM 13: New Business

There was no discussion of new business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Those present:

University Officers: T. Headrick

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: G.S. Danford

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin, M. Hyde

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Management: R. Ramesh

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

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Eberlein

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N.

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, D. Henderson

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson

University Libraries: J. Adams

Guests:

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

Reporter: S. Cox

Other Guest(s): M. Harwitz

Those excused:

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Those absent:

Law: E. Meidinger

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill

SUNY Senator: J. Boot