

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Minutes of December 1, 1999
E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on December 1, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. Report of the Chair
2. Report of the President/Provost
3. Budget Update
4. Classrooms continued
5. Report updates: Faculty Senate Grading Committee, Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions and Retention
6. Old/New Business

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

1. the past Chairs of the Senate are still working on the issue of when the Senate is to be informed of academic reorganization of departments or units and have a meeting scheduled with the Provost next week
2. Provost Triggie being ill in Florida, Vice Provost Sullivan is substituting for him at a meeting in Albany and is unable to join our discussions of the budget and classroom issues
3. the President of the Medical Faculty Council has informed him that mergers of the Departments of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine and of the Departments of Ear, Nose and Throat and Surgery are being considered; the Medical Faculty Council has appointed ad

hoc committees to examine the proposed mergers; the matter will not come to the FSEC for some time

4. the Provost Search Committee met this week; the Committee is reviewing applications and is being aided by a search firm
5. Faculty Senate Committees are active: the Budget Priorities Committee will meet next week; the Computer Services Committee will meet next week to discuss increasing faculty voice, power and influence in IT planning; the Grading Committee met last week to consider policies on academic good standing and progress toward the baccalaureate degree; the Teaching and Learning Committee will meet on December 3 to continue its discussion of alternative assessments of instruction and the culture of learning
6. am routing a number of documents for you to examine, e.g. a request by Vice Provost Goodman for nominations for the Nomination Committee for the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching

The Chair asked for questions:

- what is the status of Presidential action on the Charter revision passed by the Faculty Senate? (Professor Swartz)
- President has not taken action; has gotten a number of negative reactions from the Deans; will require more negotiation (Professor Nickerson)

Item 2: Report of the President/Provost

There was no report of the President/Provost.

Item 3: Budget Update

The Chair introduced Professor Hamlen, Chair of the Budget Priorities Committee, and Senior Vice President Wagner. The Senior Vice President said that he would talk about two items: the current budget and the SUNY 2000/2001 Budget Request. He distributed three

handouts, the first a summary of 1999/2000 budget figures, the second a copy of his explanation of the budget that was published in the *Reporter*, and the third a summary of the 2000/2001 SUNY budget request

With the Board of Trustees' approval of SUNY's 1999/2000 financial plan two weeks ago, UB finally has firm figures for its state tax support. The four month delay between the passage of the state budget and the approval of the SUNY financial plan had two causes. The first was the lack of funding in the state budget for ongoing costs in SUNY, especially ongoing salary costs, amounting to \$32 M. System Administration found and the Board approved the use of \$32 M in one time funds to fill this year's shortfall. The second was a still ongoing discussion of the three SUNY hospitals whose revenues are no longer adequate to pay their obligations, including an annual \$116 M payment to SUNY.

The Senior Vice President did not discuss the first two handouts because the FSEC had heard the 1999/2000 figures in earlier presentations. He will, however, go into more detail when he speaks to the Faculty Senate. Finally he noted that the 1999/2000 budget is not totally balanced, so that assuming all the projected figures hold firm, the University will go into 2000/2001 with a \$1 M holdover deficit.

The Chair asked for questions or comments on the first part of the Senior Vice President's presentation:

- (referring to handout which contained summary budget figures) would be helpful if these figures were also expressed as percentages; for example what percentage of UB's total budget is the \$5.4 M shortfall? (Professor Schroeder)
- will add where possible (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- why does bullet 2 on the summary sheet list \$5.4 M tuition and \$.7 M ICR as additional income, while bullet 3 only shows \$4.8 M tuition and \$.6 M ICR going to the Provost? (Professor Malone)
- the 90/10 revenue sharing distribution algorithm has been applied, giving 10% of the total to University Services (Senior Vice President Wagner)

The Board of Trustees also moved forward with the SUNY budget request for 2000/2001. The Governor will issue the Executive Budget within 45 days; he may choose to adopt all, some or none of the SUNY budget request. The legislative process will take place during the Spring.

- how often has the Governor supported the Trustees' budget request? will the fact that this is an election year influence the budget? (Professor Welch)
- last year SUNY requested a \$54 M increase but the Governor requested none; this year's requested increase is \$93 M and the cast of characters is the same; however if the Board of Trustees doesn't ask for an increase, the Governor is certainly not going to volunteer one; Controller McCall is projecting that next year will be fiscally tougher than this year; the Legislature, but not the Governor, faces an election year (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- the 2000/2001 budget requests \$10.7 M for inflation; how would that be divided within SUNY? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- division is formula driven; UB's share would be \$1.1 M about half of which is library acquisitions (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- does the Legislature have to approve the request for performance funding? (Professor Nickerson)
- if the Governor includes it, the Legislature may adjust it, but they won't remove it (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- politically how can SUNY argue for an increase for salaries when SUNY doesn't allocate out to the campuses the salary money requested on the basis of the actual salaries on the campuses? (Professor Schack)
- SUNY found one time money to cover the \$32 M in negotiated salary increases and put it in the budget pot; however SUNY did not have enough money to fully cover the totality of its obligations to the campuses, so it reduced the total given to each campus (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- did the UB Research Foundation also get money to cover salary increases for its personnel? (Dr. Coles)

- the Research Foundation funds increases from money it earns; it gets no state tax money (Senior Vice President Wagner)

Professor Hamlen focused on the \$9.7 M assessment assigned to the Provost. \$9.2 M of that will be passed on to the units. Provost Triggles has devised a formula for dividing that sum among the units: units will be asked to give 30 % of their normal budget; tuition and sponsored research revenue shortfalls are returned 100 %; units will pay their own development costs. These measures amount to \$4 M of the total assessment. The remaining \$5.2 M is achieved by asking units to pay 2.57 % of their all-funds base budget. In this environment units are being given incentives to meet their enrollment and sponsored program targets, free up endowment money and to identify new sources of funding. On the debit side units will need to keep their staffing down.

The Budget Priorities Committee has a number of concerns arising from this environment. Units scramble every year to cope with budget crises, making it very difficult to do long term planning. The pressure to increase enrollments could lead to a decrease in the quality of programs. Making program changes will also be more difficult to accomplish. The funding formula is subject to local politics leading to a sense that the budget process is mysterious. The Budget Priorities Committee is very concerned that there be open communication. Senior Vice President Wagner has been very helpful and responsive to the Committee. It is important that faculty get accurate figures and understand the budget process as budget management becomes a unit activity in which faculty will be involved. We need more articles in the *Reporter*; a web site would be useful. The Budget Priorities Committee is trying to talk to the Deans to get input into the unit process. For example, the Committee has scheduled a meeting with Dean Grant to discuss the College of Arts & Sciences' situation and what the program implications are.

There were comments and questions for Professor Hamlen:

- has the message on budget gotten out to faculty? is there a need for better communication (Professor Nickerson)

- always nice to know things, but if we can't influence the situation, why spend the effort to master the budget? (Professor Boot)
- very frustrating to plan and then have the plans thwarted; we could plan to get worse, thus creating a sense of accomplishment (Senior Vice Provost Levy)
- increased enrollment will not provide the \$9.2 M to be given this year (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- 90 % of tuition revenue in excess of target was given to the units, so they have more money in their budget with which to pay (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- the budget formula approach sets up a rational system that takes the mystery out of the budget process; to what extent is there room for high level discretion for educational leadership or for doing hidden deals? (Professor Swartz)
- we have started a process to track budgets and to tie budget to unit performance; there will be fewer centrally managed discretionary funds and the allocation decisions will be made at the unit level (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- my question is about the extent of executive discretion, not a criticism of the budget formula (Professor Swartz)
- UB expenditures run about \$650/700 M annually from all sources (the all-funds budget); about 1/3 (\$234 M) comes from the state which tends to support faculty salaries; about \$6/10 M of that is managed by the Budget Committee, the rest is managed in the units; we are trying to decrease even that small amount of centrally managed money; throughout UB the pressures of budget reductions and other outside factors, like managed care, have reduced to a minimum the amount of discretionary money available; additionally costs which have been centrally borne will increasingly be the responsibility of the units; for example, the Senior Vice President has proposed that the Provost and the Deans be responsible for funding merit scholarships rather than having their cost treated as an institutional cost (President Greiner)
- the state is responsible for only \$4.3 M of the \$12.2 M shortfall; \$7.9 M arises from decisions made locally; the FSEC and the Budget Priorities Committee should know what elective choices we have made, how much they cost and what we are giving up

to support them, there was no faculty consultation before establishing the merit scholarships, yet their substantial cost is now impacting other programs; the cost of faculty set ups in the sciences may be preventing UB from doing something else we would rather be doing; athletics is another discretionary activity; with the decentralization of budget management, it is especially important that Deans be accountable for the decisions they make; for example, the College of Arts & Sciences has fouled up its budget by 5 % in less than a year and the Dean and his staff should be held accountable (Professor Schack)

- no organization can guarantee what its budget is going to be from year to year; should set directions, understanding that there will be changes and disruptions (Professor Baumer)
- will the decanal units apply the same formula to the units in allocating out assessments? (Professor Sridhar)
- how large is the UB Research Foundation budget and how isolated is it from the state budget? are we any closer to understanding and managing the shortfall in the College of Arts & Sciences? (Dr. Coles)
- Research Foundation budget over which UB has control is about \$15 M and is essentially indirect cost recovery; the remainder of the research budget is under the control of investigators subject to their contracts; Professor Baumer's comment is absolutely accurate; we have taken risks like merit scholarships, but without risks the institution doesn't move forward (President Greiner)
- decentralized management does provide more opportunity for management risk; will be bringing to the Budget Priorities Committee a document outlining accountability issues and provisions for some central oversight (Senior Vice President Wagner)
- the Vice President's answer appropriately treats accountability as an accounting problem; in the College of Arts & Sciences, we did not provide adequate accounting controls to assist the Dean, underestimating the difficulty of merging three faculties into what is the largest college in the SUNY system; if accountability means who is responsible then the President, the Vice President, the Provost and the Deans are responsible (President Greiner)

- bad book keeping gives a budget error of 1%/2%; the College of Arts & Sciences had a 5% budget error; people who make an error of that magnitude should not expect to be the people correcting the error without being able to convince everyone that they are capable of correcting it; accountability in this case is ascertaining why we should have confidence in the managers and what will be done if we don't to find managers we will have confidence in (Professor Schack)
- the Budget Priorities Committee has been out of the loop in the setting of priorities; it would be a better system if the faculty were involved in setting priorities rather than just getting the paperwork after the decision has been made (Professor Hamlen)
- the allocation formula could work at any level; the Deans will be working with departments on how the model should be utilized (Senior Vice President Wagner)

Item 4: Classrooms continued

The Chair introduced Professor Foster, Chair of the Classroom Utilization Committee, and Professor Gold, Chair of the Classroom Quality and Attribute Committee; Questions unanswered in this session will be transmitted to Vice Provost Sullivan.

Professor Foster reported that the Classroom Utilization Committee has not met this year because it is not clear what the Committee would investigate. Its charge is to deal with questions of classroom capacity and utilization, but until the Student Services Building is on-line the status quo prevails except for a remodeling of the Moot Court in O'Brian Hall which will provide up to 6 additional classrooms. The Committee has identified spaces now being used for offices that are appropriate for classrooms and has rehabilitation plans ready. The Committee is concerned that other uses will be proposed for some of those spaces and hopes that such grabs will be fended off.

The classroom utilization rate on both campuses is about 90%, leaving little wiggle room. There is some free time early in the morning and late in the day, but it is not clear what inducements would be effective in encouraging use of time outside the 9 AM to 3 PM slot.

- will the classroom space opening up be of the appropriate configuration, i.e. will there be the right mix of large, medium and small rooms? (Professor Welch)
- the problem is not large lecture rooms but with small classrooms for 30 students or less (Professor Foster)
- what is the merit of having some classroom space managed by the units rather than centrally? (Professor Boot)
- some pedagogies require specific configurations; the question is how intensively utilized the space is (Professor Foster)
- is space as tight in Ellicott as on the spine? (Professor Meacham)
- classrooms in Fillmore are quite underutilized; the trend has been to move from Ellicott to the spine (Professor Foster)
- Fillmore 170 has been rehabilitated and is increasingly being used, but it is subject to vandalism; the English Language Institute, which is not part of the regular scheduling process, takes up a lot of space in Fillmore (Professor Gold)
- if someone in each department had access to what rooms at what times are available, it would make scheduling easier and more efficient (Professor Sridhar)
- have suggested a web site, but the schedulers say that is impossible (Professor Foster)

Professor Gold, Chair of the Classroom Quality and Attribute Committee, reported that the Committee had three agenda items for this year. First the Committee submitted a \$300 K budget for classroom rehabilitation to be done this summer. Last year's rehabilitation was aimed at upgrading the technology in three large lecture halls; the aim was to make the technology inter-changeable in all the large lecture halls. This year's rehabilitation will also focus on technology upgrades for classrooms. Second the Committee arranges for the routine replacement of chairs, tables, and chalkboards. There are a large number of different models of chalkboards on campus, making replacing difficult. Last year the Committee surveyed all spine classrooms and created an "extra large" category for chalkboards to meet the needs of the mathematicians. Third during the semester break the Committee will patrol all the classrooms to check on quality indicators like chalkboards, lights, etc.

There were comments from the floor:

- some classrooms in Park Hall are so brightly lit that it's impossible to show a video (Professor Welch)
- chairs need to be cleaned between semesters; some are unusable because of spilled food (Professor Jorgensen)
- will refer your request to the classroom maintenance people (Professor Gold)
- most classrooms have tablet armchairs, but in the School of Graduate Education, need tables to do group work (Professor Schroeder)
- at the end of this semester or the start of Spring semester there will be a survey of the faculty to see what teaching facilities we need that we don't have (Professor Gold)
- more appropriate for an administrative officer to do the work of monitoring classrooms rather than a faculty committee (Professor Schroeder)
- the Committee is an administrative committee; the Faculty Senate requested the inclusion of faculty on it (Professor Gold)
- faculty most appropriate to decide on the quality of a classroom (Professor Schack)
- have taught in all the South Campus classrooms and about half are atrocious; some have been renovated (Carey 134 and 244, Kimball 111 and 125) but in some cases the renovation made the classrooms worse; other classrooms haven't been renovated in decades (Diefendorf 146, 147 and 148 and Wende 114); there has been little investment in South Campus classrooms and as a consequence the classroom situation is far worse than anything on the North Campus (Professor Zambon)
- will refer the issue to Vice Provost Sullivan (Professor Nickerson)
- Vice Provost Sullivan has said that there is more classroom space on the South Campus than is needed; thought there was a group on the South Campus studying classroom needs and capacity prior to rehabilitation investment being made (Professor Foster)
- the Committee on Classroom Quality and Attribute, of which I am a member, is not a good mechanism for communication between the faculty, who know what is needed,

and Facilities, which is responsible for doing the work; for example five years ago discovered that a classroom in which I was scheduled to teach the next week was in the midst of rehabilitation, but with no work going on because Facilities didn't realize the Dental School's calendar starts two weeks before the University's; after many telephone calls, the work in the room was finished in time for the class, but the room which had been ugly but functional was pretty but non-functional; Facilities did not communicate with faculty to ask what needed doing; have been trying ever since to get Facilities to undo their mistake but with no success; the amount of money allotted for rehabilitation isn't sufficient to take care of all the problems (Professor Acara)

- South Campus student numbers have been relatively steady for years; why is it taking decades to get a plan in place (Professor Cedric Smith)
- would be willing to teach in either Ellicott or the South campus if I could get a permit that would assure me parking and a meal pass so I could have breakfast or lunch with students at those locations (Professor Meacham)
- part of the problem with holding classes away from the spine is that it blocks students from scheduling classes close together (Professor Foster)
- class hours on the two campuses are no longer staggered as they once were so students don't want to take classes on the South Campus because of the transportation time between campuses (Vice Provost Goodman)
- the rehabilitation plan for the South Campus has changed and been postponed repeatedly; the School of Medicine can accommodate all its classes in the three rooms it controls, so the centrally scheduled classrooms on the South Campus are not heavily utilized (Professor Gold)

Item 5: Committee Report updates

Professor Baumer, Chair of the Grading Committee, reported that the Committee is looking at questions of "good academic standing" and "satisfactory progress toward the degree". Advisement staff have been using their judgment in deciding on the good academic

standing and satisfactory progress status of some 400 students a semester. They do so with the best of intentions, but the University runs the risk that their decisions could be arbitrary, capricious and at variance with the rules governing financial aid allocation. The Grading Committee, therefore, is thinking of making two recommendations: first that the issues of good academic standing and reasonable progress be separated, and second that a series of steps for reasonable progress be established. The Committee is also considering a third recommendation. Because a student who is not making reasonable progress is ineligible for financial aid, a student who relies on financial aid has *de facto* been dismissed from the University by the judgment that he is not making reasonable progress. The Committee is, therefore, considering recommending that *de jure* such a status should result in dismissal.

Professor Baumer asked for the FSEC's comments:

- the document says that when credit hours attempted are 105 - 120, the minimum cumulative QPA requires the student to achieve a GPA of at least 3.0 in the remaining credit hours to be attempted; would you elaborate on the genesis of the GPA's established below the 105 credit hour limit; could we change the phrase reasonable progress to satisfactory but undistinguished progress? (Professor Schack)
- the federal requirement is satisfactory progress, but the Committee substituted the phrase reasonable progress, not feeling comfortable in labeling such lackluster progress satisfactory (Professor Baumer)
- avoid the phrase "satisfactory academic progress" because that means something completely different in NCAA terminology (Professor Malone)
- Committee felt that the suggested progression of improvement up to 90 credit hours attempted is reasonable; it's a judgment call (Professor Baumer)
- will the current "satisfactory progress toward the degree" remain in place? (Professor Schroeder)
- no; the recommended provisions would replace all the current provisions except the requirement that students elect a major at the beginning of their junior year; if a student is in good academic standing, he will also be making reasonable progress toward the degree (Professor Baumer)

- did you discuss the impact of grade replacement on GPA's? (Professor Tamburlin)
- yes; grade replacement is part of the reason the Committee thinks these recommendations will work (Professor Baumer)
- does the sentence "When credit hours attempted are 105 - 120, the minimum cumulative QPA requires the student to achieve a GPA of at least 3.0 in the remaining credit hours to be attempted" mean that the 3.0 is arithmetically required for the student to graduate or that in the judgment of the Committee a 3.0 should be required? (Professor Meacham)
- 3.0 is required to achieve a 2.0 with a 120 credit hours (Professor Baumer)
- he is saying that he wants to come out with an average of 2.0 and 120 credits; presuming the student can take 10 credit hours with a 3.0 average; what average must he have had with the other 110 credits to do that; the answer is 1.9, and that is the origin of the cutoff (Professor Schack)
- setting such specific thresholds means a student's last several semesters are being micromanaged with no appreciable benefit (Professor Charles Smith)
- setting up criteria that can be administered mechanically (Professor Baumer)
- why not set criteria at 90 and 120 credit hours, rather than establishing criteria for each 5 credit hour steps above 90? (Professor Charles Smith)
- set increasingly narrow thresholds to ensure that the student will be able to graduate (Professor Baumer)
- does the 120 credit hour limit include transfer credits? (Dr. Durand)
- includes transfer credits (Professor Baumer)

Professor Fournier, noting that the meeting had been a long one, promised a brief presentation. He reminded the FSEC that the Admissions and Retention Committee had formulated four propositions relating to admissions last March. The Committee's subcommittee heads met with the Provost who expressed support for three of the four propositions. The Provost supports a change in the language of what are expectations are with respect to students and a change in the admissions requirements to eliminate rank in class, substituting for it scores on Regents' exams. Assuming that the FSEC approves, the

Committee has arranged for the Office of Institutional Analysis to run a two year test to see if those scores are predictive of grades earned at UB.

There were comments from the floor:

- why not take Regents' exam scores for students who were admitted in, for example, 1995 to see if they correlated with the students' UB grades? (Professor Schack)
- more students over a broader spectrum will be taking Regents' exams, and we want to see how predictive the exams are for this broader group (Professor Fournier)
- there will still be students who don't take Regents' exams (Professor Schack)
- very small number; since now are relying on two predictors, it is important to identify a third, so admissions can be based on the two best (Professor Fournier)

The Chair asked for and received agreement for the Committee to undertake the test.

The Committee also discussed with the Provost the idea of a supplemental application which would give recruiters information on an applicant's interests and strengths. The Provost favored the idea. The Committee is proposing to run a several year experiment comparing groups of applicants within a mid-rank SAT score range who would be sent a supplemental application with similar groups who did not receive supplemental applications to see if the admission yield was affected by the supplementary application.

There were comments from the floor:

- the Admissions Office has been much more aggressively recruiting applicants than in the past; there is much more communication and tracking of information about applicants; would be reluctant to add this test without knowing the effect on existing procedures; should at least consult with the Director of Admissions before the Faculty Senate gives a mandate to do the test (Vice Provost Goodman)
- would do the test in concert with Admissions; have the Provost's endorsement, but am not attempting to over-ride anyone (Professor Fournier)

- Admissions is already experimenting to produce the same outcome that the Committee's proposed test would aim for so won't be able to measure its success (Professor Schack)
- suggest that the Committee look at non-cognitive admissions criteria (Dr. Durand)
- think the Director of Admissions would be receptive to ideas which might help her efforts (Dr. Coles)
- if other institutions are using supplemental applications, ask what their results have been rather than run a several year test (Professor Baumer)
- attitude at UB is that we have to do our own study with our own population so the results are valid for us; will do a survey of other institutions if I am sure what question the FSEC wants asked (Professor Fourtner)
- who is doing it, with what results in whatever format they have the information (Professor Baumer)

Item 6: Old/New Business

There was no old/new business.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn McMann Kramer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: P. Nickerson

Secretary: M. Kramer

Parliamentarian: D. Malone

Architecture: R. Shibley

Arts & Sciences: W. Baumer, C. Fourtner, J. Meacham, S. Schack, Charles Smith

Engineering & Applied Science: R. Sridhar

Graduate School of Education: T. Schroeder

Health Related Professions: J. Tamburlin

School of Information Studies: C. Jorgensen

Law: L. Swartz

Management: J. Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Cedric Smith

Pharmacy: N.

SUNY Senators: J. Adams-Volpe, J. Boot, H. Durand

University Officers: W. Greiner, President

R. Wagner, Senior Vice President

Guests:

M. McGinnis, *Reporter*

C. Welch, Chair, Academic Planning Committee

S. Hamlen, Chair, Budget Priorities Committee

M. Acara, Chair, Faculty Tenure and Privileges Committee

W. Fischer, Vice Provost

K. Levy, Senior Vice Provost

N. Goodman, Vice Provost

H. Foster, Chair, Classroom Utilization Committee

P. Gold, Chair, Classroom Quality and Attribute Committee

J. Zambon, Associate Dean, Dental Medicine

W. Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

G. Pape, Preprofessional Special Interest Housing

Excused:

SUNY Senators: J. Fisher

University Libraries: D. Woodson

Absent:

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Albini

Nursing: J. Thompson