

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of February 3, 1999 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on February 3, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

- [1. Approval of the Minutes of January 20, 1999](#)
- [2. Report of the Chair](#)
- [3. Report of the President/Provost](#)
- [4. Charging the Teaching and Learning Committee](#)
- [5. Motion referred to FSEC - how do we handle this?](#)
- [6. Old/new business](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

The Professional Staff Senate has asked FSEC to nominate a member of the faculty to serve on its Outstanding Service Award Committee; this is the highest award given by PSS and recognizes professional staff who have given excellent service to UB; circulating a nominating sheet. The President has asked FSEC to nominate members of the faculty to serve on the Task Force on Racial and Ethnic Diversity at UB; have received some nominations from FSEC's E-list; circulating a nominating sheet for more names at the February 23 Faculty Senate meeting propose discussing the Mission Review document with prior FSEC review of the document on February 17; the Academic Planning Committee has reviewed three iterations of the document and would lead the Senate's discussion; although the document will be available from the President's Office only just prior to the meeting; want to expedite the Senate's discussion since SUNY Central is sending a visitation team to discuss our Mission Review and Faculty Senate input prior to the visit would be desirable; if there is

delay in this time table may cancel the February Faculty Senate meeting; the second agenda item for February 23 could be a report by Dean Grant on some issues arising from the College of Arts & Sciences which is perhaps more pressing than a report from the SUNY Senators on the SUNY Senate meeting; for the March 23 Senate meeting have invited the Provost to outline where he is headed and will also schedule a discussion of Professor George's resolution on Senate oversight of graduate education:

- perhaps Professor Headrick would speak to FSEC and Faculty Senate to expand on the plans being developed to move more responsibility away from the Provost's Office to the academic units; Faculty Senate tends to react to well developed plans rather than contributing towards their development (Professor Swartz)
- the plan is for "responsibility centered management" (RCM) (Professor Malone)
- not just budgetary decentralization, but decentralization of decision making, for example, Dean Grant rather than the Provost's Office would be responsible for issues in the Arts & Sciences (Professor Schack)
- need to bring a revised resolution on the Statistics Department to the Senate; want to express dissatisfaction with the Mission Review process; SUNY expected the reviews to be produced collaboratively by administration, faculty, staff and students, but UB's Review is a one man show; not sufficient for only the Academic Planning Committee to have input; not sufficient that the Senate be given a week to react to the Review; in that time frame we can only be glorified editors (Professor Boot)
- are we being set up for a squeeze play, not being given enough time to do anything but agree? (Professor Holstun)
- the urgency is because of the impending arrival of the visitation team; want the Senate to have commented on the Review before they arrive, understanding that the Review will have been sent to SUNY prior to our seeing it; am asking for FSEC approval of these suggested agendas now because need adequate time to invite speakers, etc. (Professor Nickerson)
- rather than waiting for the fully completed Review, would it be possible to distribute the version of the Review that the Academic Planning Committee examined (Professor Woodson)
- will check again with the President's Office about the earliest possible availability of the document (Professor Nickerson)

- since we meet with the Provost on February 10, February 17 is the earliest FSEC can discuss the document and that is the schedule the Chair has already suggested (Professor Schack)
- the Affirmative Action Committee, the Budget Priorities Committee and members of the Task Force on Women met together in January; they examined data that showed that the first two rounds of discretionary awards addressed but did not resolve the issue of women faculty's pay disparity; no data on minorities yet available which concerned the two committees; conveyed the sentiments of the group and their analysis to the administration which is working on guidelines for the third round of discretionary awards; will schedule the two Faculty Senate committees with FSEC and the Senate to discuss the issues
- will disparity be defined? (Professor Swartz)
- ten years ago there was a joint UUP/NYS study of women's salaries; regression analysis done which showed positive correlation with gender; perhaps the committees did the same kind of analysis (Professor Boot)

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes of January 20, 1999

The Minutes of January 20, 1999 were approved.

Item 3: Charging the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Chair introduced the new Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, Professor Gentile. The *Standing Orders* gives the Teaching and Learning Committee responsibility for consulting, reviewing, reporting and recommending to the Senate matters concerning the conduct of teaching, procedures for evaluating teaching and means of assessing student learning. The Chair also welcomed Vice Provost Fischer and Vice Provost Goodman. The Chair asked for suggestions for the Committee:

- Engineering takes the position that students may access the numerical data from Teaching Evaluations, but not the written comments; is there a University policy on this? (Professor Malone)

- no University policy on student access to Teaching Evaluations; would be useful for the Committee to consider a uniform instrument for teaching evaluation; important for the Committee to work on assessing student learning (Vice Provost Goodman)
- consider the role of teaching in the tenure and promotion process (Professor Malave)
- the tenure and promotion checklist is being revised to require a teaching dossier; the weight it will be given is hard to calculate, but it is a first step; peer evaluation rather than student evaluation of teaching is what is needed to give weight to that component (Vice Provost Fischer)
- the Committee at least needs to be aware of the expectations of the University with regard to teaching and teaching evaluation (Professor Malave)
- the Office of Teaching Effectiveness offered very helpful programs in the past; is there anything like that now? (Professor Sridhar)
- the Office of Teaching Effectiveness hasn't existed for several years; the new Educational Technology Center should be up and running soon, and it will offer support for integrating technology into teaching; hope that the Center will offer broad pedagogical support in the future (Vice Provost Fischer)
- the Committee may want to monitor what is going on in the area of support for teaching (Professor Nickerson)
- the issue of how teaching is used in tenure and promotion is more appropriately one for the Faculty Tenure and Privileges Committee (Professor Malone)
- Teaching and Learning Committee can look at the issue for ground, rather than for recommending new policy (Professor Gentile)
- helpful for the Committee to think about guidelines for evaluating the extent to which technology is enhancing the pedagogical effectiveness of a course; also give guidance on what are acceptable and unacceptable technology driven practices (Vice Provost Goodman)
- the Committee should be affiliated with Access '99 planning and activities; for example, meeting with the Faculty Development Working Group which is shepherding six large, primarily freshman enrolled courses toward technology development (Vice Provost Fischer)
- might want to consider a memo from Dean Grant questioning whether junior faculty should be nominated for the Chancellor's Awards (Professor Nickerson)

- Dean Grant suggests only that Deans should not support nominations of junior faculty (Professor Sridhar)
- nomination can't go forward without a Dean's recommendation, so would effectively bar junior faculty from receiving (Professor Schack)
- the role of the Dean not clear, nor is it clear whether the award is given by the University administration or governance bodies; it is an explosive issue which the Committee might well wish to consider (Vice Provost Goodman)
- how to maintain scientific, technical and production quality in distance learning needs in depth consideration (Professor Baier)
- SUNY has complex policies on distance learning; Dean Lopos chaired a UB committee last year that reported on distance learning (Professor Malone)
- the many and complex issues in distance learning would absorb the Committee for a long time (Vice Provost Goodman)

Item 4: Report of the President/Provost

The President spoke about the complex issues arising from the management of clinical training and research in the Health Sciences. With the consolidation and restructuring of area hospitals and the changes in the way health care is being delivered, there is a revolution in the way health care professionals are being trained.

UB's lack of a teaching hospital never prevented us from offering excellent medical training, and given the revenue losses being incurred and the general difficulty of managing hospitals, it is probably good that UB doesn't own one. However, state and federal laws and regulations require that much of the funding for medical education be funneled through hospitals. That needs to be changed so the money comes directly to us. There are a whole set of negotiations going on around that.

Another area of concern involves UB's practice plans. SUNY practice plans are legislated by state law and Trustees' policy and are subject to collective bargaining. State law and Trustees' policy tend to reflect the pattern of hospital ownership of the other three SUNY Health Sciences campuses. UB, however, developed a unique pattern of practice plans, 24 plans for 20 departments with an unknown number of side arrangements. The clinical departments have tended to carry on the University of

Buffalo Medical School's tradition of using volunteer faculty. So long as money to support medical education was readily available UB's system worked well, but with support drying up, it is under tremendous pressure. At present one department's practice plan is functionally bankrupt and other practice plans are close to bankrupt. These plans have been managed with little oversight by the University; we need to centralize their management for reasons of economy and responsibility. If practice plans go into Chapter 11, there will be questions of whether the University is responsible for their debts. There will also have to be changes in how we deliver the services and instruction for which compromised practice plans had been responsible. Relationships with area hospitals will be disrupted in part.

What it means to be a faculty member in a clinical department in the Medical School will have to be redefined. Is the faculty member a hospital employee, an independent practitioner or some hybrid? In the basic sciences, the Dental School, and the Nursing School faculty are on state lines. The preferred situation in the Medical School would be that clinical faculty drew two checks; one from the state and one from a related entity that is UB controlled and handles money derived from contracts with the hospitals.

The Senate needs to decide how much it wants to be involved with these issues. They are some of the most critical issues of reorganization facing the University. Perhaps Vice President Bernardino should update the Senate regularly.

Professor Albini, who in addition to being a Senator is Chair of the Medical Faculty Council, expressed pleasure that the President had brought up these issues. The survival of the Medical School depends on Vice President Bernardino and Dean Wright successfully dealing with these issues. A major problem is that many of the clinical faculty feel little loyalty or connection to UB. Another problem is that the residents are paid through the hospitals and it would be better if they were paid by the University. The President agreed, but noted that the hospitals would resist since the residency program brings them about \$20 M.

Professor Smith endorsed bringing more University oversight to the practice plans; daylight on their operations will make it possible to calculate what medical training costs at UB. The President noted that the Medical School's culture of having Chairs with long lived appointments and much authority

may make some of these changes seem threatening. However, it is necessary that a broader range of faculty be included in how the Medical School is funded and managed. The President added that he believes that the financial pictures of the other SUNY Health Sciences hospitals are perhaps also not completely clear.

The Chair asked for questions for the President:

- your charge to the Task Force on Racial and Ethnic Diversity seems to aim at having UB "reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of our society;" have three concerns: that language is likely to be interpreted as requiring numerical targets, ethnicity introduces a new, vague and expandable category into identity politics, and the language of the charge reflects political rather than academic judgments; this opens the University up to criticism that it has no special expertise in political matters (Professor Swartz)
- because of historical legacies our society has dealt with issues of race and gender; ethnicity also has a historical legacy which needs to be addressed; asking advice from the Task Force is prudent and reasonable and in no ways establishes policy (President Greiner)
- the Task Force should consider not just the make up of society in general, but also the make up of the cohort from which faculty can be recruited (Professor Malone)
- true as to faculty, but not true as to the staff and students; communicate concerns and ideas directly to the Task Force (President Greiner)

Item 5: Motion referred to FSEC--How do we handle this?

At its January 27, 1999 meeting Faculty Senate referred the Boot resolution censuring the administration for its handling of Statistics to FSEC for redrafting. The Chair suggested that a small committee, consisting of former Chairs of Faculty Senate currently serving on FSEC, should work on the resolution and then report to FSEC. There was a motion (seconded) so stating. The Chair asked for comments on the motion:

- subcommittee a good idea; it should consider a full range of options from returning the resolution to Faculty Senate to not returning it; composition acceptable because it includes

Professor Boot; consider adding Vice Provost Goodman who was also a Chair of Faculty Senate and has strong views on the matter (Professor Malone)

- Vice Provost Goodman would be in the category of people being censured by the Boot resolution as it now stands ; the resolution should be a purely faculty product; the motion on the floor would create a subcommittee of Professors Boot, Welch, Malone, Baumer and Nickerson (Professor Schack)
- committee needs members who can craft effective language that retains the specific objections raised by Senators (Professor Harwitz)
- Vice Provost Goodman's comments about Professor Nickerson were misrepresentations; the impetus to add Professor Nickerson to the Trigg II committee came from Professor Guttman because of Professor Nickerson's involvement with the Medical School's Grant Committee rather than from the administration because of his role as Chair of the Faculty Senate; Professor Nickerson was copied with the letter announcing the student stop much later than the letter was first released; there was no committee vote on the two page report, which was signed only by Dean Trigg; the report was re-issued several times, but not until August 4, 1998 was an effective date for the transfer given which was the first time the report became a concrete proposal appropriate for FSEC review; at the first meeting of FSEC in August Statistics was in fact discussed; prior to that time there was no reason for Professor Nickerson to share the details of the discussion with FSEC (Professor Boot)
- Vice Provost Goodman cited the date of the letter copied to Professor Nickerson as January 1997 which was before Professor Nickerson would have begun his term as Chair (Professor Woodson)
- the date of the letter was January 1998, not 1997 (Professor Boot)
- the subcommittee should also suggest a procedure by which such issues as Statistics would be brought to the Faculty Senate (Professor Malone)
- in addition to devising a procedure, should try to reach an agreement with the administration about when and how issues are brought to Faculty Senate; motion on the subcommittee contemplated that it would have broad authority, not just authority to word smith (Professor Schack)

- not necessary to have a new procedure; the *Bylaws* and the *Charter* say there should be consultation with the Senate (Professor Albini)
- in the past the Senate became involved only when an issue came to the Provost; the question is when should it come to the Senate (Professor Nickerson)
- subcommittee should report in this academic year so that the issue is not carried over into a new Senate (Professor Malave)

The Chair asked for a vote on the motion to establish the subcommittee. The motion passed.

Item 6: Old/new business

Professor Malone stated that the General Education Requirement is one of the most important issues to come before the Senate in recent years. He fears that prescribed criteria by which required courses will be evaluated and prescribed syllabi will also be imposed. We should put together a group to examine the implications on this campus. There were comments from the floor:

- identify specific steps for the Faculty Senate to get involved (Professor Baumer)
- Provost's Advisory Task Force on General Education came out of the meeting of the SUNY Presidents with Provost Salins; there is no one from UB on the Task Force (Professor Nickerson)
- the SUNY Presidents should speak against the Requirement as a group (Professor Woodson)
- faculty who were involved in developing UB's general education program should be mobilized to make the case that our program is the result of considered deliberations (Professor Harwitz)
- communicate directly to Provost Salins our position that the UB Faculty Senate is an important voice that should be heard (Professor Malave)
- we should put together an ad hoc committee that will quickly report on the Requirement's academic suitability and practicality for UB; include faculty who worked to develop the Undergraduate College (Professor Schack)
- how will the report be used? (Professor Malave)

- the Faculty Senate voted in favor of a modern language requirement some years ago; we will have to harmonize that fact with any criticism of the Trustees' language requirement (Professor Boot)
- agree that we need to request UB representation on the Provost's Advisory Task Force on General Education (Professor Sridhar)
- is there value in complaining about the process? (Professor Woodson)
- rather than complain about the process, assert our expertise in teaching general education; the language requirement is the only thing we aren't already doing, and three hours of language is a joke (Professor Baumer)
- the only way to have influence on the implementation of the Requirement is to be on the Provost's Task Force; a local report will be only an academic exercise if we can't share the results with the decision makers (Professor Malave)
- our best strategy is to produce a concise report about the program we have developed and why it deserves SUNY support; our objection to their process is that they didn't get the information they needed (Professor Schack)
- will not be fruitful to request a UB presence on the Task Force, since our absence is not an oversight (Professor Malone)

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Kramer

Secretary of Faculty Senate

Present

Chair: Peter Nickerson

Secretary: Marilyn Kramer

Arts & Letters: James Holstun

Dental Medicine: Robert Baier

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Ramalingam Sridhar

Graduate School of Engineering: Lilliam Malave

Health Related Professions: Judith Tamburlin

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Law: Louis Swartz

Management: John Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albini, Cedric Smith

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: Melvyn Churchill, Samuel Schack

Social Sciences: William Baumer, Mitchell Harwitz

SUNY Senators: Dennis Malone

University Libraries: Dorothy Woodson

University Officers: William Greiner, *President*

Guests:

Nicolas Goodman, Vice Provost

William Fischer, Vice Provost

Kenneth Levy, Senior Vice Provost

Steven Cosme, Student Association

Suzanne Ley, Undergraduate Student Association

William Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

Sue Wuetcher, *Reporter*

John Celock, *The Spectrum*

Excused:

Pharmacy: Nathan

SUNY Senators: Judith Adams-Volpe, John Fisher, Claude Welch

Absent:

Architecture & Planning: Shahin Vassigh

Nursing: Powhatan Wooldridge

Ex-Officio: Robert Hoeing