

# FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 25, 2001 - (approved)  
*E-MAIL: [ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU](mailto:ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU)*

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on April 25, 2001 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
3. [Director of Space Planning - Ann Newman](#)
4. [Report of the SUNY Senate meeting in Cobleskill, NY](#)
5. [Report on the survey of the Research and Creative Activity Committee - Professor Joseph Mollendorf](#)
6. [Old/new business](#)

## **Item 1: Report of the Chair**

Because of the Chair's continued incapacity, there was no report of the Chair. Professor Kramer, presiding in the Chair's absence, reported on the Chair. Professor Nickerson is recovering and is due to be released from the hospital into a nursing facility until he regains his strength. He hopes to be at the May 2 meeting of the FSEC.

## **Item 2: Report of the President/Provost**

There was no report of the President/Provost.

## **Item 3: Director of Space Planning-Ann Newman**

Ann Newman, Director of Space Planning, explained that her goal is to centralize space planning and to more closely align it with academic planning. Her office's web site, which is available through the Provost's web site <<http://www.provost.buffalo.edu>> under the heading Provostial Areas, details how the office functions.

Ms. Newman is responsible for all space on campus, excluding only the residence halls. Her guiding principles are that all space belongs to the University and that space allocation and use should always be in support of the mission of the University. Final decisions on space are made by the Provost and the Senior Vice President.

- important that Ms. Newman's office know as soon as possible about plans that have space implications, e.g. hiring, planning new programs and teaching initiatives, or new research; a small scale renovation takes about three months, but a large project could take a year or more to complete; finding new space also requires a long lead-in time
- when an academic unit makes a space request, Ms. Newman will look at whether the unit is using its existing space as well as possible or if a reconfiguration could recapture space for new uses
- requests for space must go through the appropriate Dean or Vice President to ensure that planning resources will be used on activities which they support; will give ball park estimates on costs prior to getting decanal approval
- Ms. Newman will undertake space utilization studies that examine a variety of factors, including student, faculty and staff FTE's and research dollars per square foot; she will then collect benchmark data from peer institutions identified by the Deans and Vice Presidents; when those processes are completed a University wide committee will be formed to develop a space allocation policy in the form of guidelines for her office to use
- her office is involved in issues other than space: will be working with a committee to develop standards for public corridor design, e.g., entrances and hallways; the capital request planning process, including the possibility of new buildings; interestingly, the SUNY Construction Fund does not have provisions dealing with space for funded research and the Provost will be talking with Chancellor King about that lack

There were questions from the floor:

- do you analyze space utilization independently of space requests?; in the Dental School some senior faculty have multiple offices (Professor Easley)
- will be studying Dental School space soon; will not mechanically impose the 120 sq.ft. standard for faculty offices, but in some cases faculty have office space in excess of what is reasonable (Ms. Newman)
- unexplained measuring has been going on in the Ellicott Complex making staff very nervous that their offices will be unceremoniously moved; when will you inform people of the purpose of such measuring? (Professor Booth)
- measuring is being done by the Space Inventory Manager from Facilities Planning and Design who is trying to build an accurate inventory; nothing will happen just from taking measurements (Ms. Newman)
- how do you factor in study, computer space, social space, etc. for students in the residence halls and campus apartments? (Professor Booth)
- meet bi-weekly with the Vice President for Student Affairs on matters of providing non-dormitory space for such activities (Ms. Newman)
- how are you proceeding with space allocation issues before completing allocation guidelines? (Professor Booth)
- Facilities Planning and Design have used informal standards which I continue to use; if am working with a group, begin with the standard used by the group (Ms. Newman)
- although all space is under your purview, how do you handle space that department chairs have traditionally controlled? (Professor Fournier)
- don't want to micromanage department space, but if a chair makes a request for space, will look at how existing space is being used (Ms. Newman)
- will research dollars generated/sq.ft. determine allocation of laboratory space in the sciences? (Professor Fournier)
- University has an obligation to provide faculty with research space regardless of funding; however, the amount of space may be less than that given a researcher with a large grant who has staff working for him (Ms. Newman)
- MIT experience convincingly demonstrated that there is gender related bias in assigning research space to women; are gender issues on your agenda? (Professor Noble)

- am aware of the issue; prefer gender neutral policies; don't think issues of gender discrimination can be resolved through space utilization guidelines (Ms. Newman)
- if space is denied to a faculty member, what avenues should she follow? (Professor El Solh)
- talk with the chair and the Dean; am willing to supply data for such a discussion to the faculty member (Ms. Newman)
- what are the space guidelines for service and support units? (Professor Booth)
- no standard formula; have to look at how the unit functions, e.g., who needs a private office, who works in teams, etc.; will rely on librarians for guidance on library space; allocation guidelines formulated by a university wide committee will ensure appropriate expertise on the space needs of the different disciplines (Ms. Newman)
- in terms of library space need to also consult teaching faculty on how they expect students to use the library (Professor Kramer)
- social space for faculty is non-existent at UB (Professor Easley)
- the issue of a faculty club hasn't arisen; am, however, concerned with providing collaborative meeting and working space for faculty in academic buildings; development of Parcel B might offer an opportunity for a faculty club (Ms. Newman)
- Dental School has a need for lecture space (Professor Easley)
- SUNY Construction Fund considers all teaching space in figuring utilization rates; in its view, UB has too much teaching space; we know what the utilization rates are in centrally controlled classrooms, but not in departmentally controlled classrooms and we need those figures to argue for more teaching space; along with Vice Provost Sullivan am looking at the South Campus in particular to see what is being taught and what space is needed (Ms. Newman)
- are you involved in the planning to use Undergraduate Library space for student services? are you aware of the FSEC's resolution opposing the use of library space for other than library uses? (Professor Baumer)
- am chairing the planning committee; am aware of the resolution; independently we are looking at a storage facility for the Libraries, but we are also looking for ways to improve customer service to the students by means of consolidated student services; Capen and Lockwood Libraries combined have 326K sq.ft., and we are considering 60/70K sq.ft. from Capen; a storage facility will allow the relocation of books, and existing services will be moved

into freed up space; will provide an opportunity to invest in the Libraries' infrastructure and aesthetics (Ms. Newman)

- Center for Computational Research is not a major use point for students, but is located in what was central student space in Norton; consider relocating it (Professor Baumer)
- large amount of money spent in rehabbing Norton for computer space; don't want to lose that investment (Ms. Newman)
- there are limited options for relocating libraries because of floor load issues; storage space not an adequate replacement for undergraduate space (Professor Baumer)
- looking at moving lesser used material into non-prime space and at whether the space freed up by doing so would allow undergraduate library services to be accommodated in other areas of Capen and Lockwood; will take the opinion of the FSEC into consideration in making a final decision (Ms. Newman)
- when will a final decision be made? (Professor Boot)
- not next week; perhaps within several months (Ms. Newman)
- putting books in storage eliminates the possibility of finding related material by browsing (Professor Easley)
- storage facility will not free up a large amount of usable space; library shelves are completely full now in many areas so a storage facility will only relieve the immediate pressure, but the Libraries continue to add new material for which space is also needed (Professor Booth)
- hoping for a facility that would house 1.5M volumes (Ms. Newman)
- if building working library space is more expensive than building other space, would seem existing library space should be used more intensively rather than being reduced (Professor Bono)
- Big Ten schools are building new libraries; might be easier to get funding for a new central library than for a student services building (Professor Easley)
- speaking for Professor Nickerson, urge that you include faculty, not just deans, in your decision making process (Professor Kramer)
- need more small classroom space to support increased graduate programs (Professor Bono)
- top priority in reconfiguring library space is to create more study areas (Professor Adams-Volpe)

- need more study space in the libraries but also outside the libraries (Ms. Newman)

**Item 4: Report on the SUNY Senate meeting in Cobleskill, NY** Professor Adams-Volpe

reported on the SUNY Faculty Senate 128th Plenary Meeting, April 19-21 at the College of Technology at Cobleskill.

- Joseph Hildreth of the College of Potsdam was elected President of the Senate for 2001-2003
- SUNY intends to focus more on teacher education; Trustee de Russy has proposed the following reporting requirements for SUNY's teacher education programs: distribution of final course grades, average and median SAT or ACT scores of candidates in teacher education programs, listing of undergraduate secondary education majors with course requirements, and distribution of final course grades by each department of a teacher education program; the Board of Trustees is unlikely to adopt the proposal; the Advisory Council on Teacher Education has also made recommendations
- Provost Salins is leaning towards a decentralized approach in Phase 2 of the General Education Program, including campus decision making on course requirements and assessment
- the Senate passed several resolutions: a resolution in support of the Advisory Council on Teacher Education's report and recommendations; a resolution urging a meeting of the Chancellor, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Campus Governance Leaders to "advance the understanding of the excellence of our teacher education programs"; a resolution asking the Chancellor to seek an exemption for SUNY faculty from being barred from serving as an expert witness against New York (Public Officers Law, Section 73.3); and, a resolution reaffirming support for campus based assessment of student outcomes in General Education

### There were comments from the floor:

- by November our Faculty Senate should have approved a local assessment process (Professor Malone)
- thought the administration was responsible for approving a local process; a UB committee on assessment was appointed by the administration; its report has been sent to the Deans (Professor Fournier)

Professor Meacham, who serves on the SUNY-wide committee for assessment, says it is the responsibility of campus governance (Professor Malone)

**Item. 5: Report on the survey of the Research and Creative Activity Committee - Professor**

**Joseph Mollendorf** In support of the University's goal of significantly increasing faculty research and creative activity, the Faculty Senate Research and Creative Activity Committee developed a survey designed to get a sense of what is on the minds of faculty involved in such activities. Professor Mollendorf, Chair of the Committee, described the survey instrument and demographics of the respondents.

- survey had 80 questions with an additional 10 demographic questions
- Committee hired a company, Buffalo Research and Survey, to review the survey and eliminate bias
- survey was done by e-mail; responses contained user names to prevent multiple inputs, but the user names were kept strictly confidential
- were 308 responses from a pool of 1200, giving a 25% response rate; 150 included written comments
- of respondents, 302 had been PI's; 82% were full time faculty on a state line; of those 38% were professors, 24% associate professors, 22% assistant professors, and 9% clinical professors; 26% had 5 or less years at UB, 19% had 6-10 years, 17 % had 11-15 years, 36% had 15 or more years
- responses from schools were proportional to their size
- 40% of grants were below \$100K, 25% were between \$100/250K, and 11% were more than \$500K

He also highlighted some of the Committee's findings.

- written comments asked for: improved direct communication between researchers and the administration; improved infrastructure; improved responsiveness by Sponsored Programs, demystification of indirect costs, etc.

- 85% of respondents felt that SUNY funded tuition scholarships for graduate students are an important factor in supporting research
- 86% felt there should be uniform policy requiring periodic faculty review of deans; 88% felt there should be periodic faculty review of key administrators
- strong belief that parking impacts research
- 67% felt that the administration did not obtain adequate faculty input regarding policies related to research

## There were comments and questions for Professor Mollendorf:

- report has too much data; needs more conclusions (Professor Malone)
- results are influenced by current events, viz. the graduate student tuition issue (Professor Boot)
- have you broken down data by schools? (Professor El Solh)
- yes; will make data available to the schools (Professor Mollendorf)
- how will you handle the written comments? (Professor Farkas)
- to protect confidentiality, will not break the comments down by school; will make the uncondensed comments available electronically; will probably not try to categorize the comments (Professor Mollendorf)
- the answers to the survey's questions are very predictable (Professor Sridhar)
- the FSEC has been told that there are some 1700 faculty at UB, rather than 1200; qualify the survey response rate with an indication that there are varying tallies of the faculty which could lower the response rate (Professor Swartz)
- probably only about half of faculty are actively engaged in research, so in fact the response rate from the targeted population is actually higher than 25% (Professor Boot)
- to calculate response rate would need to know the number of active researchers (Professor Swartz)
- Grants and Contracts could tell us how many active PI's there are; faculty who are doing research in areas in which there is not funding available probably felt that the survey was aimed at funded researchers and didn't apply to them (Professor Baumer)

- intended to survey both funded and unfunded researcher, but it is true that most respondents were PI's; may need to ask different questions in future iterations of the survey to capture non-funded researchers, especially in the humanities (Professor Mollendorf)

There was a motion (seconded) to add the Committee's report to the agenda of the May 8 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Item 6: Old/new business**

At its April 18 meeting, the FSEC had postponed a vote on a motion whose main provisions were: an electoral unit will be entitled to one Senate seat for every 15 members or major fraction thereof of its Voting Faculty, provided that each electoral unit is entitled to at least one Senate seat and that no electoral unit will be entitled to more than 30% of the seats. During the interim Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Bylaws Committee, electronically distributed Professor Baumer's above formulation and an alternate formulation from Professor Boot.

There was discussion of the motion.

- ran several algorithms: the first, a Senate of 100 with no electoral unit having more than 25% of the seats, the second, a Senate of 120 with no electoral unit having more than 25%, the third, a Senate of 100 with no electoral unit having more than 30%, the fourth, a Senate of 120 with no electoral unit have more than 30%, the fifth, a Senate of 100 with only the School of Medicine capped at 25%, and the sixth, a Senate with a floating number of seats apportioned at one seat for every 15 members of the Voting Faculty; the fifth algorithm results in a faculty member in the School of Medicine being counted as 1/2 of a faculty member in other electoral units; the first algorithm results in faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences being counted as worth only 2/3 of members of all other electoral units, excepting the School of Medicine; given the involvement of the College of Arts & Sciences in undergraduate education across the University, find the first algorithm unacceptable, and also believe the fifth algorithm can not be justified on the basis of the large number of clinical faculty in the School of Medicine since many of the clinical faculty are deeply involved in the

affairs of the University; an across the board cap can be justified to prevent a large electoral unit from packing a meeting in order to push through a measure of interest to the unit (Professor Baumer)

- a Senate of 120 with an across the board cap of would produce a Senate in which the School of Medicine and the College of Arts & Sciences control less than 50% of the Senate; other formulations give them more than 50% of the seats; would the School of Medicine be able to find enough faculty who are willing to come to Faculty Senate meetings? (Professor Sridhar)
- when difficult matters are before the Senate, everyone shows up; formulation should be geared to those occasions; in thinking about caps, consider the faculty member to Senate seat ratio; highly disparate ratios are not supportable (Professor Baumer)
- support Professor Boot's formulation which caps only the School of Medicine at 25% in a Senate of 100 (Professor Sridhar)
- has a correlation between the number of students taught by an academic unit and its number of Senate seats been considered? such a correlation would be a rationale for capping the School of Medicine but not the College of Arts & Sciences; the overwhelming number of faculty in the College of Arts & Sciences devote all their time to the College, but is that true of the clinical faculty in the School of Medicine? (Professor Bono)
- the School of Medicine agreed to the 25% cap; the creation of the College, on the other hand, was not intended to affect the size, structure or composition of the Faculty Senate; fifth algorithm is easy to understand and to apply (Professor Boot)
- would prefer an algorithm that produced a lower number for the health sciences as a block (Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Health Related Professions), minimizing the possibility that health sciences concerns would overwhelm undergraduate issues (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- 100 seat Senate/25% cap on the Medical School algorithm prevents a major shift in the composition of the Senate because of an administrative action, the creation of the College of Arts & Sciences; existing composition is a reasonable reflection of the jurisdiction of the Senate (Professor Fourtner)
- the fifth algorithm is the best for now; consider other possibilities later (Professor Swartz)
- fourth algorithm provides a more appropriate ratio of faculty representation for all the units (Professor El Solh)

There was a motion (seconded) to amend by substituting the fifth algorithm (100 seat/25% cap on the School of Medicine. The amendment passed. The motion as amended passed.

There being no other old/new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn McMann Kramer  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

**Present:**

**Secretary:** M. Kramer

**Parliamentarian:** D. Malone

**Arts & Sciences:** W. Baumer, J. Bono, C. Fourtner

**Dental Medicine:** M.. Easley

**Engineering & Applied Sciences:** R. Sridhar

**Graduate School of Education:** L. Malave

**Health Related Professions:** G. Farkas

**School of Informatics:** J. Ellison

**Law:** L. Swartz

**Management:** J. Boot

**Medicine:** B. Noble, C. Pruet, A. El Solh, S. Spurgeon

**SUNY Senators:** J. Adams-Volpe, J. Boot

**University Libraries:** A. Booth **Guests:** J. Hopkins, Chair, Bylaws Committee

L. Stewart, Office of Equity, Diversity and Affirmative Action

A. Newman, Director of Space Planning

C. Bailey, Office of Space Planning

J. Mollendorf, Chair, Research and Creative Activity Committee

J. Lewandowski, *Reporter* **Excused:** **Chair:** P. Nickerson **Absent:** **Architecture:** R. Shibley

**Arts & Sciences:** M. Jardine

**Nursing:** E. Perese

**Pharmacy:** R. Madejski

**SUNY Senators:** H. Durand