

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of November 13, 1996 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM in Room 567 Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Approval of the Minutes of October 30, 1996](#)
3. [University Image and Public Relations](#)
4. [University Athletics and Recreation Policy](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair announced two urgent items of business. The first concerned a new algorithm for the calculation of senatorial seats for the various units. Under the new plan, the Senate would have a slightly variable membership, rather than a fixed composition of 100 voting members. Any unit with a sufficiently high percentage of Voting Faculty would automatically have an upper limit of 25 senators; all other units would have one senator for every fifteen full-time faculty members; the smallest units would be assigned one senatorial seat. The Chair asked the FSEC for its approval to transmit the proposal to the Senate.

Professor Meacham moved to forward the proposal; Professor Kramer seconded the motion. Professor Faran noted some problems with the language, which would be addressed on the Senate floor. Senior Vice-Provost Levy asked whether the proposal allowed any unit other than the Medical School to increase to 25, given a sufficient increase in the number of the Voting Faculty in that unit. The Chair replied that it would. The motion to forward the proposal passed unanimously.

The second item concerned a draft memorandum to President Greiner (circulated prior to the meeting and prepared by the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Committee) on the distribution of Affirmative Action responsibilities among the various academic units. The Administration finds itself

at an impasse, since every entity except the Faculty Senate has given its approval to proceed on this matter. The Chair asked permission of the FSEC, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, to indicate to the President that the FSEC accepted the principles set forth by the University Committee. Professor Faran asked what is to be accepted from any discussion if the principles have already been accepted. Professor Welch said the point is to determine how effectively the principles have been carried out. Professor Faran wondered whether it should be brought before the full Senate. Professor Malone did not believe the matter needed to go before the full Senate, but remarked that it sounded rather gratuitous to submit the memorandum for the FSEC's consideration even though the Administration planned to proceed with it anyway. The Chair wished to keep the wording, since very often "there's the expectation of discussion that doesn't happen". Professor Meacham commented that the letter would be stronger if the FSEC could suggest a time limit for a response.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes of October 30, 1996

Pending the correction of two typographical errors, the Minutes of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting of October 30, 1996 were approved.

Item 3: University Image and Public Relations

Associate Vice-President Petro announced the development of a marketing initiative to look at the issue of UB's image and to develop some marketing strategy. The goals of the initiative are:

- to improve student recruitment;
- to increase public support of the University;
- to facilitate faculty recruitment;
- to encourage greater esprit.

Prior to moving forward with the initiative, she felt it necessary to have an assessment of the present state of UB, its needs, how to organize the initiative, how to reach out to our constituencies. For this purpose, UB hired Ms. Anne Duffield of Marts & Lundy, a consulting firm specializing in higher education.

Ms. Duffield stated that UB is confronting a problem which increasingly many public and private entities have been forced to face -- that of finding alternative sources of revenue, particularly outside funding for its needs and projects.

She had begun the communications audit by analyzing as many printed materials as possible from UB in terms of content, to whom they were addressed, and the average level of interest in these materials. She observed the following:

1. Although many of the materials were well designed, most lacked any common thread, nor did they give any indication that they emanated from the same institution.
2. The writing was good, and some of the materials had a good deal of creative substance to them.

One publication -- the UB Physician--- she found "first class" because of its interesting articles/stories and the pictorial layouts. Reading this, she added, gave one an idea of UB, the school, its identity. She also admired certain pieces in the recruitment package for undergraduates, which assumed that the new students knew nothing about the problems and experiences of college life; she wondered only why UB waited until matriculation to distribute these.

The bottom line, she concluded, was that UB's publications were extremely competent compared with most other university publications, but also like most, suffered in not being distinctive enough.

Ms. Duffield offered a preliminary assessment of UB's media programs and public relations efforts: UB, as a huge research university with various strengths and weaknesses, presented above all a fragmented image, of a university not known for its totality. Both internally and externally, UB is perceived as impersonal, a bit daunting, lacking a unified mission, lacking integration. She pointed out that this is not atypical, but that UB should decide whether it wants to be known for its parts or for its whole.

To achieve a more unified image, UB needs some component of its PR outreach and other outreach efforts to be drawn together. She noted that this is difficult, because it means that the institution would give permission, authority, to the unified Public Relations body to decide how UB presents itself and how it communicates with the outside world.

Organizationally, this means carving out a piece of the communications center(s), which are service-oriented and client-driven, and investing it with the responsibility of creating at least some of the publications on behalf of the University as a whole, such as campaign communications, an annual report, research reports, and alumni magazine --- all of which must have a unified image.

Creating a unified image also entails purposeful internal discussion with the faculty centered on identifying and demonstrating how UB is a great place -- this cannot be "painted on" with a general remark about UB being a "quality institution". Prospective students will not attach themselves to a university whose view book sounds like that of any other institution; moreover, we now must communicate with a population which is very sophisticated about communications, and one which is under increasingly strict time constraints. UB must identify its distinctive sides, and decide how best to present them.

Professor Hare wondered how much control we had over our image, since images are often a matter of history, and asked if any university has succeeded in changing its image from a fragmented to a unified one. Ms. Duffield replied that the University of Pennsylvania has been very successful over the past 15 years in recruiting students after serious discussion about planning and its academic programs.

Professor Bruckenstein asked how we compare with state universities in adjacent states, our chief competitors, and how they manage the same problem. Ms. Duffield replied that Pennsylvania State's football teams help a lot. President Greiner underscored this, noting that admission to the Big Ten was very helpful. Ms. Duffield added that Penn State also has farm teams, as other schools in the state feed into the main campus.

Professor Danford wondered why a university could NOT "paint an image" for the outside world, and cited as an example the administration's decision to change letterhead from "SUNY at Buffalo" to the "University at Buffalo". Ms. Duffield responded that this was indeed possible; she suggested that UB spend the money to design a beautiful publication to help with the media and to position the University to increase its enrollment over the next few years. She warned, however, that if UB does not live up to its image, it will fall farther behind than before. She agreed with Professor Danford's

remark that people buy into an image once that image is communicated in a purposeful way, and added that UB should also get the community to participate in the development of that image.

Professor Frisch observed that image is related to reality, and the simplest name for it in this case is "Buffalo"; UB needs to associate itself fully with that moniker. He noted that there are special problems in building an identity for a place with its particular limits and liabilities.

Professor Nickerson asked what criteria should be used to determine whether we are successful in our efforts. Ms. Duffield mentioned retention, the amount of money raised, whether we are attracting creative faculty to the community, and whether one is able to walk around the institution and hear people speak favorably about it. Other tangible measures would include strong attendance at the Center for the Arts activities and at sports events. Professor Faran asked if she had looked at the University's web site; she replied that she had not yet had the chance, but that it would be important to do so. On a positive note, she concluded that the people here truly like each other, and have a strong sense of loyalty to the institution.

Item 4: University Athletics and Recreation Policy

Professor Welch introduced members of the Athletics and Recreation Committee who were present: Professors Jameson (Chair), Chatov (former Chair), Price (Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board), Malone (Faculty Representative to the NCAA), Fournier, Bradford, Paolo, and Prendergast.

The Chair remarked that the University's involvement in athletics underwent dramatic changes in the 1980's, partly as the result of deliberate decisions to upgrade the level of intercollegiate competition, and partly as the result of the new facilities.

The Faculty Senate endorsed in May 1986 a series of recommendations toward developing the intercollegiate athletics program; shortly thereafter the Board of Trustees established a preliminary set of considerations as to how higher-level athletics programs should be carried out. In 1988 the Board of Trustees adopted an additional set of guidelines on the creation of intercollegiate athletics boards at the SUNY campuses.

The standing of the Faculty Senate is a matter of some complexity: On the one hand, the Senate has the opportunity and obligation to examine the university's athletics policy as it affects our academic programs; on the other hand, the Trustees' policies indicate the Presidential responsibility is especially high in terms of the selection of the members of the Intercollegiate Athletics Board (IAB) and in the conduct of an effective program. The Senate's concerns are therefore largely academic --- academic good standing, the question of a physical education requirement, the limit on the number of student-athletes accepted through the Individualized Admissions Program, and the like.

Director of Athletics Nelson Townsend began by explaining that the Division of Athletics comprises three distinct areas:

1. Basic Instruction

Despite the loss of the two-hour Physical Education requirement five years ago, enrollments and contact hours have continued to rise.

Recreation and Intermurals

Townsend reported a sharp increase in the number of hours available to faculty and staff over the past few years, from six to seventeen hours per day. In addition, Clark Hall was re-opened to accommodate unforeseen demand. The Division also offers "tremendous service to the surrounding community". He cited in particular the Gloria Parks Center, which runs programs for youths and senior citizens alike out of the facility of Clark Hall.

3. Intercollegiate Athletics Division

UB moved from Division III to Division II in 1989, then to Division I in 1991. For the past nine years, the Division has offered 17 sports (eight for women, nine for men), and there are plans to add three more sports for women --- crew, softball, and lacrosse.

Professor Danford asked about plans to move from Division 1AA to 1A (football) over the next several years and about our conference affiliations in the other sports. Townsend replied that, other than in football, we are members of the Mid-Continent Conference. There are plans to be in the Mid-America Conference by 1998 in all sports other than football, and to be in 1A football by 1999.

Professor Danford then questioned our choice of conference affiliations, noting that the schools of the Mid-America Conference are not our peer institutions. Moreover, various groups associated with that conference view the inclusion of UB as something of an oddity; many speculate that UB is using the conference as a stepping-stone to something else. Thus he wondered whether there might be a more appropriate choice of conference affiliation.

Director Townsend thought the Mid-America Conference an appropriate one to which to aspire, noting that its athletics programs are most similar to UB's of all those available to us. He surmised that the most appropriate conference in terms of size and academic scope would be the Big Ten. Professor Danford questioned then the disparity between academic and athletic notions of peer institutions. Townsend replied that, in joining the conference, we are upgrading our program to a new level, and that Mid-America "certainly fits the aspirations that we have for our program at this moment".

Professor Wetherhold asked first whether the distinction between 1A and 1AA pertained only to football (Townsend affirmed this); he then asked whether UB could "find a home", like the University of Delaware, in 1AA rather than in 1A. President Greiner said UB would be happy to give Mid-America a ten-year guarantee, and that it was not realistic to think of being invited to join the Big Ten. Director Townsend noted that Delaware has a very solid program and is long-established, whereas the teams UB plays against do not and cannot attract the same numbers; our best hope for attendance and exposure therefore is in 1A. President Greiner agreed that 1AA is good for UB at the moment, since it is less expensive and nevertheless affords us more exposure.

Professor Meacham questioned whether, in view of the costs associated with the program to increase our visibility in football, UB ought to "bail out" of the sport now, or whether the program could indeed work. President Greiner mentioned that there is not another conference at our level that brings us the visibility we now receive.

Professor Meacham then observed that the report of the former Chair of the Athletics and Recreation Committee (distributed prior to the meeting) raised the question about whether our program complies with the law in terms of gender equity. Director Townsend replied that the Intercollegiate Athletics Board has identified the problem, and that this is one reason for the decision to add three more sports for women. As soon as UB upgraded to Division I, it was understood that women's programs needed

to be upgraded as well. Chairman Price informed the FSEC that in the certification process, the Division of Athletics and Recreation (DAR) was asked to re-evaluate minority opportunities and gender equity; he reported that the members of the DAR were not satisfied, and committed themselves to adjust their five-year plan accordingly.

Professor Malone pointed out that NCAA requirements demand that specific steps be taken in terms of maintaining gender equity, and that as long as these steps are being followed, then UB is in compliance with the law.

Professor Welch thought that the key question for the Faculty Senate is to determine what areas of policy are most important. He believed that the Senate's involvement ought to lie in being consulted by the President on matters such as the membership of the IAB; he based this on the Trustees' guidelines which stipulate consultation with "appropriate governance bodies".

Professor Chatov, former Chair of the Athletics and Recreation Committee, explained that when he assembled the final report, he had been prompted by a committee member to get involved with the question of gender equity, since that member felt he had not devoted sufficient attention to it. He mentioned that he could find no one in the Law School who was an expert on Title IX, but that he did find an article (dated May 1994), which he read through and identified the criteria for compliance. He said he made clear in the report that although UB is not at the moment in compliance with Title IX, it will be.

Director Townsend noted that the Office of Civil Rights conducts workshops twice a year on the issue of compliance. He said the greater concern is that, at several institutions, women have been denied the same opportunity as men despite the amounts of money being spent on athletic programs; UB has absolute equality for both men and women athletes in terms of facilities, uniforms, playing floor, overnight stay, and so on. Our problem right now is that we do not have equal amounts of money being spent in our program.

The Chair said that the FSEC will expect a report on this from the IAB. He added that the Affirmative Action Committee has a sub-committee also investigating the issue of gender equity, primarily in its academic dimensions, and suggested the FSEC wait for Professor Moore's report.

Professor Faran asked the Director to consider the juxtaposition of three things: the upgrading of UB's football team, the imminent opening of a casino in Niagara Falls (Canada), and the recent problems with the football team at Boston College. He wondered whether any of these pose, or will pose, a concern for UB. Townsend responded that there is a daily concern that we operate a program that's "clean". He stressed that he and his colleagues stay on top of these issues as much as possible. He did not doubt that gambling would have some impact on the community as a whole, but did not know exactly what to do to prevent, for example, a student from gambling.

President Greiner, speaking as a private citizen, thought a casino should be built on this side of the Niagara River in order to avoid the same fate that befell Detroit, which loses millions of dollars of recreation money to the casinos of Windsor, Ontario. He did not see any connection between gambling and young athletes, who typically do not have enough money anyway. He added that his office contained more files of unethical behavior involving faculty and staff than those involving any students in the athletics program. He urged the need to stay on our course, and deplored the tendency at UB to "plant the tree, and every six months tear it up to see if it's growing".

He then took the opportunity to talk about M. Cox, a former student athlete, basketball star, and graduate of UB who may face charges of narcotics possession. President Greiner spoke of Mr. Cox's achievements and character, and accused the UB student newspaper of treating him "disgracefully". He cited an editorial headline which stated that the former basketball star "faces prison term", even though Mr. Cox had not been indicted, nor had a preliminary hearing. The editorial also "had the temerity to talk about his SAT scores, and how he struggled academically, when, frankly, I know more about his SAT scores and his academic record than they ever will". He said the editorial then suggested that this University has a supervisory responsibility in such matters; President Greiner voiced the opinion that "maybe it's time that we impose some academic standards on The Spectrum, which is a student newspaper for which credit -- academic credit -- is given for the writing", and suggested some kind of quality test or accuracy test. Professor Jameson shared the President's loyalty for Mr. Cox, but considered it the best editorial team yet on The Spectrum, and objected quite strongly to what she considered his overly negative relation "with this bunch of bright kids". President Greiner said he had a good working relationship with the editor, but also the right to voice a difference

of opinion about editorials in the paper. He did not believe that the way to advance our young people was to treat them as children, and found it absolutely fine to tell them when they go too far.

Addressing an earlier question by Professor Meacham, Professor Danford pointed out that at many institutions, men's programs provided funding for women's sports; he expressed optimism that in the long run, both would generate revenues into the programs. He also considered the programs important for the quality of student life at UB. Finally, he emphasized alumni identification with an institution through its sports teams, and cited the University of Cincinnati as an example -- after its basketball team had been ranked at the top, well-wishers, alumni, and others interested in the University called in such numbers that the telephone system broke down repeatedly.

Professor Banks asked about the possibility of expanding use of the facilities for faculty/staff. Chairman Townsend replied that the only way would be to expand the facilities themselves. At present, they are operating at 17 hours per day; remaining open until 2 or 3 AM had been considered, but this would make the facilities more accessible to students than to faculty and staff.

Professor Welch mentioned that, as the Committee shapes these questions, it will present them and ask for clear answers to them.

Professor Malone advised against the idea of dropping football, saying that in Western New York in particular, athletics IS football. Professor Meacham countered by saying he did not mean to suggest that we drop the program; secondly, he commended the Committee for its work over the past few years, but did not feel the FSEC had discussed the issues enough.

Professor Fournier wanted the FSEC to issue a specific charge for the Athletics and Recreation Committee; Professor Welch pointed out that a charge had been drafted by the Professor Jameson and approved by the FSEC earlier this academic year.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

THOSE PRESENT:

University Officers: William R. Greiner, Thomas Headrick, Ken Levy

Chair: Claude Welch

Secretary: Robert G. Hoeing

Architecture: G. Scott Danford

Arts & Letters: Michael Frisch, Nathan Grant

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Robert Wetherhold

Health-Related Professions: Atif Awad

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Management: Ramaswamy Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albin, Bernice Noble

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: Stanley Bruckenstein, James Faran

Nursing: Mattie Rhodes

Pharmacy: Nathan

Social Sciences: Peter Hare, Jack Meacham

SUNY Senators: Maureen Jameson, Dennis Malone, Peter Nickerson, Claude Welch

University Libraries: Marilyn Kramer

Guests:

REPORTER: Sue Wuetcher

Other Guests:

Associate Vice-President Carole Petro

Ms. Anne Duffield (Marts & Lundy)

Members of the Athletics and Recreation Committee: Nelson Townsend, Director of Athletics;

David Banks; Peter Bradford; Charles Fournier; Karianne Paolo; Neville Prendergast

Absent:

Dental Medicine: William Miller

Graduate School of Education: James Hoot

Law: Errol Meidinger

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Herbert Schuel