

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of March 31, 1999 (Approved)**

E-MAIL: [ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU](mailto:ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU)

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on March 31, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

- [1. Approval of the Minutes of March 10 and March 17, 1999](#)
- [2. Report of the Chair](#)
- [3. Report of the President/Provost](#)
- [4. Advocacy at UB -- Janet Penksa, Associate Vice President for University Services](#)
- [5. Report of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee](#)
- [6. Budget update on General University Service Fee](#)
- [7. Old/new business](#)

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

The Chair reported that:

- he attended a three hour video conference, Meeting the Challenge of Student Retention; Student Affairs offices across the nation are concerned with this issue and many institutions are having problems with retention; all students are at risk to varying extents; 3/4 of those who leave are in good academic standing; females are more likely to ask for help than are males; there has been a huge increase in binge drinking among females; 48 % of all campuses require a freshman seminar, some academic, others like UB 101 non-academic
- the Search Committee for Provost is beginning to function but has not yet met; he is on the Committee, but no list of members has yet been circulated; comments on a draft job description are welcome

- there is a general meeting of interested faculty with the Chair of the PRB on April 22 at 3:00 PM in 330 Student Union; younger faculty, those preparing dossiers and members of personnel committees should be encouraged to attend
- the following Faculty Senate Committees have been active: the Budget Priorities Committee has discussed all funds management, endowment spending formula, 1999/2000 budget update, budget presentations to Deans, student fees in SUNY, impact of RAM on unit budgets, and the role of goals as performance indicators; the Educational Policy and Programs Committee is discussing assessment and a policy for class attendance; the Student Life Committee has discussed faculty advisement for student clubs and organizations and academic integrity; on April 2 the Teaching and Learning Committee will consider student evaluations of faculty, in particular whether written evaluations should be published, whether junior faculty should be eligible for Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching and the loss of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness.

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

There was no report of the President/Provost.

## **Item 3: Advocacy at UB -- Janet Penksa, Associate Vice President for University Services**

The Chair introduced Janet Penksa, Associate Vice President for University Services, and asked her to talk about her ground and her plans for UB advocacy. Associate Vice President Penksa has a BA and an MA in Political Science from SUNY Albany and spent 14 years with the New York Assembly's Fiscal Committee helping negotiate the state budget.

She has been planning UB advocacy efforts. Our top priority is restoration of the SUNY budget base. The Governor's budget does not fund negotiated salary increases, inflation costs and revenue loss. As a consequence SUNY estimates it will suffer a \$52 M budget shortfall, of which \$6 M is UB's share. Other priorities are assistance for UB's practice plan, funding to help the athletics program, funding for biotechnology and Centers for Advanced Technology, and funding for a host of SUNY projects.

She described the unpromising state of budget negotiations in Albany. The bad news is there won't be a budget for a while. The good news is that it gives us more time to advocate for UB. As ground to the budget negotiations are the varying economic and revenue forecasts accepted by the Senate and the Assembly. The Assembly believes there is an additional \$3 B to spend; the Senate \$1.6 B beyond the Governor's estimate. The lack of agreement among the Senate, the Assembly and the Governor as to how much money there is to spend is the key to the budget stalemate.

- is there no central forecasting agency? (Professor Harwitz)

- each Chamber maintains its own fiscal staff and uses an outside service; the Senate uses Wharton Econometrics and the Assembly uses DRI; the Legislature instituted the consensus forecasting process, which is essentially a conference approach (Associate Vice President Penksa)

Associate Vice President Penksa also noted there is a major philosophical argument between the Senate and Governor both of whom want to save more of the budget surplus against low revenue years, and the Assembly, which believes high revenues will continue into the future and so wants to spend more of the surplus. Legislated multi-year tax cuts also complicate the equation, since they will result in reduced revenues.

She summarized the posture of the two Chambers on various SUNY funding issues. Based on the Governor's budget SUNY projects a \$201.1 M shortfall. The Senate would restore \$188.95 M of that shortfall, and the Assembly would fully restore and add roughly \$7 M to SUNY's budget.

Neither the Senate nor the Assembly funded Enrollment Growth nor Sponsored Activity, both of which are necessary to run the RAM. SUNY put the RAM in place without the approval of the Legislature, which doesn't believe in it and doesn't appear willing to support it. Although not in SUNY's budget, the Senate and the Assembly both would fund additional faculty lines for technology; the Assembly also funded Child Care, EOP Restoration, and Summer Opportunity. The Assembly would earmark \$1.2 M for gender equity in athletics for UB only. Other items not in SUNY's budget but receiving support in the Legislature were the Centers for Advanced Technology (CAT's) and Technology Transfer. The Legislature fully restored TAP.

She discussed other legislative recommendations for higher education. The Senate would restore SUNY 5 year Capital Projects program, establish a working group to evaluate the administrative and financial status of the SUNY Research Foundation, establish a working group to review flexibility issues and the status of revenues at SUNY teaching hospitals, and create a new Office of Higher Education and Technology. The latter proposal is especially exciting; the Senate believes New York's future lies with research and is earmarking almost \$200 M for research to be funneled through the CAT's. Unfortunately for UB which lacks a CAT, there is no money provided for new CAT's. The Assembly would eliminate funding for the Charter School Institute, add 150 new science, engineering and

technology faculty lines, enhance TAP by \$20 M, merge the Higher Education Services Corporation into the State Education Department, propose a \$75 M package of tax credits and reductions for businesses and other taxpayers involved in university sponsored research and technology transfer and restore the SUNY 5 year Capital Projects program.

The Chair asked for questions and comments:

- did other institutions get special funding for their CAT's or did they carve seed money out of their own budgets? (Professor Welch)
- the process was competitive; the last competition was written in such a way as to ensure Stony Brook's getting another CAT; we hope that the competition will be opened again but with language that would favor a UB/Roswell Park CAT (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- are we in a worse position because we once had a CAT and lost it? (Professor Malone)
- it comes up, but can convince them that we have the capability now (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- since the Legislature didn't like RAM, SUNY has changed its name to Budget Allocation Process (BAP) (Professor Malone)
- SUNY Connect and SUNY Virtual Library came through on member bills; do you monitor member bills that affect SUNY? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- rare for member items to have state wide scope; usually they are local in nature (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- is gender equity money strictly for sports or could it be used for salary disparity?(Professor Baier)
- for athletics (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- Governor Pataki said that the Technology Transfer Center is Buffalo's substitute for a CAT; could it serve as a funding vehicle for us? (Professor Baier)
- good question; will have to do some research; would be preferable to have a CAT through which funding could come directly to UB in addition to Technology Transfer Center (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- is there money for the Health Care Business Service Center in the budget? (Professor Baier)
- the Center is really sponsored by the Health Care Industries Association, and although it's housed at UB, it's not really part of UB (Associate Vice President Penksa)
- the Associate Vice President helped the Professional Staff Senate draft letters for its member for the Legislature (Dr. Coles)
- UB is planning for advocacy at the federal level and is conducting a search for someone to get the program up and running (Associate Vice President Penksa)

#### **Item 4: Approval of the Minutes of March 10 and March 17, 1999**

The Minutes of March 10 and March 17, 1999 were approved.

#### **Item 5: Report of the Faculty Senate Admissions and Retention Committee**

Professor Adams-Volpe presented the report of the Admissions and Retention Committee. The Committee wants direction from FSEC on four items it is considering.

The *Undergraduate Catalog* lists courses that a freshman applicant should have in order to be adequately prepared for admission to UB: four years of English and social studies; three years of science, a second language, and college preparatory math. The Committee is considering substituting the following statement: "It is highly recommended that students have a New York State Regents' degree or its equivalent..." The Committee is also considering adding the following statement: "It is further recommended that all students considering engineering and science careers have completed four continuous years of mathematics and science courses." The Committee believes that given the future state requirements for Regents' diplomas, it would be more effective to specify a Regents' diploma rather than listing courses. Professor Malone added that when all diplomas are Regents' diplomas, this provision will be automatic, but it is reasonable to begin using it now.

One of the three criteria established by the Faculty Senate for admission to UB is percentile rank-in-class. However, many New York high schools no longer report that figure. The Committee is concerned that Admissions continues to list and use rank-in-class as a criterion. The Committee is considering suggesting that the admissions criteria use performance on Regents' examinations and optional advanced placement examinations to replace rank-in-class:

- although three criteria were established for admission, it was the intent that only the two best would be used in selection; an applicant could then botch one of the three and still be admitted; substitution of performance on the Regents' examinations is reasonable if rank-in-class is no longer provided; deletion of specific recommended courses is a serious weakening; it effectively gives the Board of Regents the power to set our admissions criteria (Professor Baumer)

The third item the Committee is considering recommending is that prospective students provide supplemental information about their personal interests, talents and circumstances. That information would be available to staff contacting applicants who are in the mid-range of our acceptance profile to improve the acceptance yield. The information would also be available for individualized admissions.

The final item of concern is the resources that are being used to recruit students who are at the margin of acceptance. The Committee had considered recommending that the Senate resolution on "Individualized Admission" be rescinded. However, Vice Provost Goodman pointed out that unintended consequences would result, for example, the elimination of the Collegiate Achievement Program (CAP), athletic and special admissions. The intent of the Committee is to use resources currently supporting individualized admission to recruit students who are in the mid-range of our acceptance profile. Individualized admissions could be carried out using the supplementary information provided by prospective students as a substitute to the current practice of directly contacting applicants who are at the margin of acceptance to learn about any special circumstances that might qualify the applicant.

Professor Malone stressed that the intent of the Committee was not to do away with individualized admissions. He also noted that it is not clear how much time would actually be involved, nor how the extra workload of the supplementary material would be handled.

Vice Provost Goodman commented that if the Regents' diploma becomes universal, he doesn't see the point of specifying it for admission. It is not clear, however, that the Regents' diploma will become universal. He is doubtful that we should commit to the Regents' curriculum without first studying whether it is the curriculum we want for our freshmen.

He clarified the use of the rank-in-class criterion. About one third of New York schools no longer provide that information. When rank-in-class is not provided, the Admissions staff make a projection based on SAT scores and grades as a substitute figure. The Vice Provost favors dropping rank-in-class as a criterion. Before adopting performance on Regents' examinations, however, we need to see if that is a valid predictor of academic success.

The Vice Provost favors gathering supplementary material. He is willing to discuss the issue of reallocating resources to recruitment from the mid-range acceptance pool.

Professor Malone stated that the Committee is looking for direction from FSEC and considers this document a preliminary draft. Furthermore the Committee is not looking to replace the suggested

distribution of courses recommended for admission. Professor Adams-Volpe concurred, adding it was assumed that the Regents' curriculum would consist of the kind of distribution we are using now.

There were comments from the floor:

- has been a tradition of admitting MFC students without reference to the suggested course distribution; should we indicate that in our literature? is there a correlation between advanced placement test results and the College Boards? (Professor Welch)
- the future of MFC is under active discussion since its enrollments have been drastically declining; if there is an MFC recruitment effort, your suggestion could be helpful; don't know what the correlation between AP test results and College Boards (Vice Provost Goodman)
- the work load that would be imposed by using the special points suggested by students as an aid for recruitment would be limited to January through May (Professor Welch)
- when will the Regents' requirement become effective? (Professor Churchill)
- not sure; believe it will be done in stages; it's likely we will have universal Regents' for graduation from public high schools beginning 2002 (Vice Provost Goodman)
- there was an amusing popular article in *Newsweek* about the difficulty of the admissions process at the University of Chicago, where they admit one out of seven applicants (Professor Churchill)
- will need to provide out of state students with information about equivalent requirements; it may be difficult to collect supplemental information if the questions are too personal (Professor Sridhar)
- an optional interview process to be requested by special education and special circumstances students could eliminate the need for calling students to identify special factors (Professor Baier)
- students with disabilities are admitted regularly and then contact the Office of Disability Services for needed accommodations; they are not admitted through this process (Vice Provost Goodman)
- the current statement in the *Catalog* listing a course distribution for prospective students provides more information and is therefore better than the Committee's substitute statement; at a bare minimum need a study of the correlation to academic success of Regents'

examination results; admission based on Regents' will discourage private school graduates and out of state graduates from applying; should not drop rank-in-class but attempt to convince all schools to supply that information; a request for supplemental information, even if optional, erects another barrier for an applicant to overcome, so it could decrease applications (Professor Schack)

- grossly inconsistent of us to allow the Board of Regents to set our admissions curriculum, when we are exercised at the Board of Trustees setting requirements for the freshman curriculum; if an application lacks rank-in-class data, don't fudge a rank-in-class, just take use the other two criteria; we are wasting time and money by chasing marginal students; use resources to go after top students (Professor Baumer)
- too much looseness in the phrase "strong level of college preparation in the basic academic disciplines; in comparison requirements for math and science majors have been tightened (Professor Holstun)
- agree that "basic academic disciplines" is too vague a phrase to replace a listing of recommended courses; am quite concerned that the Committee's suggestion will give even greater weight to standardized test scores which are discriminatory towards minorities and not strong predictors of academic achievement; perhaps the supplementary information will remedy this bias, but that needs to be clarified; 30 % of New York students are minorities but they are highly underrepresented on campus, so we need to make special efforts to recruit minorities (Professor Malave)
- intent of Committee is not to do away with Individualized Admissions, but to make the process less time consuming and faculty intensive (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- from 1994 to 1998 there were 278 individualized admissions based on special skills and leadership and 589 through CAP, which is an affirmative action program; studies of the predictive ability of UB's T scores runs between .6/.7 which is pretty good for the social sciences (Vice Provost Goodman)
- Educational Testing Service data says that the tests are predictive only of the first 2 years (Professor Malave)
- understood that the use of supplementary information would be to increase yield; the University could choose to target students with high test scores, but it could also choose other

profiles to be sensitive to competing interests; believe what is central is to invest energy in recruiting when students are still choosing which college to attend (Professor Welch)

- cooking up an equivalent of rank-in-class is troublesome; some high schools routinely add points to their students' averages, so that data is not reliable (Professor Malone)
- being aware of this inflation problem, Admissions uses the actual grades earned, not the reported GPA (Vice Provost Goodman)

The Chair summarized the discussion, saying that the Committee should proceed but also gather the ground information suggested today.

#### **Item 6: Budget Update on General University Service Fee**

The Budget Priorities Committee considered this item last semester. Because of a rush at the end of the semester the Chair was unable to schedule a discussion of the issue then and lost track of it. The General University Service Fee (GUSF) has been promulgated in the interim. It is, however, never too late to discuss an issue.

Senior Associate Vice President Snyder related the history of the GUSF. UB's Disclosure Policy establishes what funds are subject to the GUSF: "Any and all funds derived from or related to sponsored programs, projects, activities and services which involve University employees in the course of their University duties, or which involve the use of University equipment or facilities." Revenue generating activities at UB are conducted through the State (Income Fund Reimbursable (IFR)), Research Foundation (RF), University at Buffalo Foundation (UBF), and the Faculty Student Association (FSA). These entities each had its own policies and guidelines for administration of funds, which were neither integrated nor consistent. In 1997/1998 Dean Grant chaired the Campus Revenue Generating Policies and Guidelines Committee which was asked to develop consistent and integrated policy and guidelines regarding the charges imposed by these entities. The Committee made recommendations in June 1998 that were thoroughly reviewed, including review in October by the Budget Priorities Committee, and promulgated by Senior Vice President Wagner in December.

The Vice President established a committee (GUSF Committee) to guide the implementation of the new system, make recommendations for any changes that might be necessary, and to make certain

that the GUSF is generating enough revenue to meet the buyout costs of the transition to the new rate of 7 %. Account holders have all been informed of the changes and accounts have been reviewed for applicability of the GUSF. There have been about 10 challenges to the imposition of GUSF, but these have not resulted in any policy changes.

Professor Hamlen, Chair of the Budget Priorities Committee, said that the Committee believed the consistency of the GUSF would eliminate the costs of negotiation and rate shopping that had been the prior practice and would save money. The Committee, therefore, endorsed the GUSF.

The Committee has two concerns, however. First, it believes that there should be special provisions for start up projects. Senior Associate Vice President Snyder responded that waivers for start ups will not be granted, and individual units, schools and colleges will have to subsidize start ups that are not self supporting. Second the Committee believes that faculty should be well represented on the GUSF Committee. The Senior Associate Vice President agreed, saying there are currently three faculty members on the Committee. The Provost has been asked to name another faculty member to replace one of the three. The Chair suggested that it would be more appropriate to ask the Faculty Senate for names. The Senior Associate Vice President deferred to the Chair.

- how differentiate a proposed sponsored program (that is subject to 40/50 % overhead) from a project that is subject to the 7 % GUSF? because of the slowness of the University to accept industry money, and to book work; researchers have at times prefunded a project at some risk to themselves will the GUSF help or hinder the University in dealing with this problem? (Professor Baier)
- the GUSF Committee in conjunction with Sponsored Programs will determine on which side a project falls; process should be speeded up by the new procedures and policies should be clarified (Senior Associate Vice President Snyder)
- there is a persistent and growing lack of confidence in the Office of Sponsored Research on the part of Principal Investigators because the Office has been keeping them out of the communications loop during negotiations with funding agencies (Professor Baier)

- in addition to his UB duties the Dean of Architecture works for an architectural firm and has used University mail to support his extra work; will you subject his extra income to the GUSF? if the policy is seen as toothless, it will be useless (Professor Boot)
- Provost Headrick has already spoken to this issue, saying that he was fully aware of the situation (Professor Nickerson)
- revenue collected for the use of University mail for purposes outside University business would be subject to the GUSF (Senior Associate Vice President Snyder)
- some funding agencies refuse to pay associated overhead; what is the status of a service fee? should we concurrently apply to our Dean for funding for the service fee? (Professor Welch)
- sponsored programs are not subject to the GUSF; sponsored program regulations continue to apply (Senior Vice President Snyder)
- can ask for a waiver of overhead costs from Sponsored Programs (Professor Baumer)
- would a UUP grant going into an IFR account be subject to the fee? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- the state and UUP may have negotiated something different (Professor Nickerson)

Professor Welch made a motion (seconded) that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee take cognizance of the GUSF policy. The Chair called for discussion:

- puts our discussion of the policy on the record (Professor Welch)
- recognizes the Administration's effort to bring an issue to the Faculty Senate for discussion (Professor Malone)
- believe the GUSF policy is better than the policy it replaces; worry that if there is no enforcement mechanism the policy will be neglected (Professor Baier)
- the enforcement mechanism should be the supervisor of the offending faculty member; if a faculty member opens a bank account in the University's name without proper authorization, the faculty member may face criminal penalties (Professor Baumer)

The Chair asked for a vote on the motion. The motion passed.

#### **Item 7: Old/new business**

Professor Welch commented on the draft position description for the University Provost. Since this is the chief academic officer of the University, the person named to the post should be qualified for appointment as full professor. The description seems to focus on the Provost's role in change, but it should also include ensuring the quality of ongoing programs. Finally SILS should be given its new name, the School of Information Studies.

Professor Harwitz suggested looking at the description that was used in the search that identified Provost Bloch. It was a particularly good description.

In light of the resolution FSEC passed requesting that the Provost send only answers to SUNY's questions on mission review and not his Mission Review Document, Professor Schack asked whether the Provost had complied with our request. The Chair believed but did not have certain information that the Provost had sent his Mission Review Document. Professor Schack suggested informing SUNY of our resolution, which is the only faculty statement about the Document on record. The Chair felt further discussion at another meeting would be appropriate before so informing SUNY. Professor Schack replied that if the Chair didn't inform SUNY, someone else would. Professor Baumer responded that there would be opposition if the suggestion to inform SUNY were made as a motion. Professor Schack stressed the need for follow-up on this issue.

Professor Boot received a memo from the Provost outlining a uniform policy of giving one semester's leave with pay to retiring faculty. Individual negotiations will not be entertained. He likes the policy but dislikes the fact that there was no prior discussion of it with faculty. Professor Malone was assured that this policy would not interfere with a retired faculty member with unique expertise teaching a course that otherwise could not be taught.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 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 Education:** Lilliam Malave

**Law:** Louis Swartz

**Management:** John Boot

**Medicine & Biomedical Sciences:** Boris Albini, Cedric Smith

**Natural Sciences & Mathematics:** Melvyn Churchill, Samuel Schack

**Nursing:** Jacqueline Thompson

**Social Sciences:** William Baumer, Mitchell Harwitz

**SUNY Senators:** Judith Adams-Volpe, Dennis Malone, Claude Welch

**Guests:**

Nicolas Goodman, Vice Provost

Janet Penksa, Associate Vice President

Susan Hamlen, Chair, Budget Priorities Committee

Leonard Snyder, Senior Associate Vice President

H. William Coles, Professional Staff Senate

Christine Vidal, *Reporter*

John Celock, *The Spectrum*

Suzanne Ley, Undergraduate Student Association

**Excused:**

**Information and Library Studies:** George D'Elia

**SUNY Senators:** John Fisher

**University Libraries:** Dorothy Woodson

**Absent:**

**Architecture & Planning:** Shahin Vassigh

**Health Related Professions:** Luc Gosselin

**Pharmacy:** Nathan

**Ex-Officio:** Robert Hoeing