

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of March 17, 1999 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on March 17, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. Approval of the Minutes of February 24 and March 3, 1999
2. Report of the Chair
3. Report of the President/Provost
4. Update on the Campaign for UB
5. Report from the Educational Policy and Planning Committee
6. Report from the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee
7. Old/new business

Item 1. Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

- the Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Urban Affairs is sponsoring a symposium on April 12, 1999 which will focus on providing a reward structure for accommodating scholarship that is based on public service; the Faculty Senate Public Service Committee is working with the Vice President in the planning and implementation of the symposium
- he needs nominations for faculty to serve on the Athletics and Recreation Committee
- FSEC met in special session last week to discuss the Mission Review Document; agreed that the Academic Planning Committee should receive, deliberate and summarize additional faculty input on the document; have asked Senators to go to their units to solicit faculty input to be passed on to the Committee
- your e-mail message to that effect is biased toward having individuals communicate directly with you and the Chair of APC; that leaves out the potentially valuable process of faculty deliberating together (Professor Swartz)

- Faculty Senate, in addition to its role of keeping open lines of communication between faculty and administration, should promote discussion among the faculty; should sponsor discussion sites targeted at specific issues on the Faculty Senate web page; as a first case should have a site where comments about the Mission Review Document could be posted (Professor Schack)
- because the Mission Review Document's view of Nursing is opposite to the faculty's, the faculty is organizing itself to respond to the Document; are working in groups and that process is helping us articulate our mission in a more sophisticated and accurate way (Professor Thompson)
- having a formal role for APC doesn't preclude other additional methods of responding to the Provost; will look into the feasibility of setting up site (Professor Nickerson)
- he attended the Professional Staff Executive Committee which talked about advocacy issues related to the budget and internships for professional staff in administrative areas; the PSS Mentoring Committee is working on facilitating the development of mentoring relationships within the professional staff
- the Provost met with the Deans last Monday; Senior Vice President Wagner talked about the state budget, Senior Counselor to the President Headrick talked about the method of budget allocation at UB, and Vice President Landi talked about our declining sponsored research activity; a report about this will be referred to the Research and Creative Activity Committee; the Deans have submitted written enrollment strategies to the Provost; faculty may be able submit electronically the annual report required by the Board of Trustees; Honorary Degree nominations are due by March 19
- President Aceto has asked for volunteers to serve on the University Faculty Senate's committees
- he attended the UB Council meeting; Vice President Black reported that the 620 units at Hadley Village have been rented, and he talked about planning for two other units
- President Greiner has taken note of the Faculty Senate's resolution relating to the Department of Statistics; he indicates that UB officers, in the spirit of collegiality, should have had formal communication with the Faculty Senate about the matter and offers a mea culpa on behalf of the administration; he also indicates that

in the spirit of collegiality it is time to move on to other matters; he thanks the FSEC for submitting names for the Provost's Search Committee which will be formed soon

- the following Faculty Senate Committees have been active: Academic Planning Committee will review the formation of the School of Information Studies in April it will review planning in the Health Sciences with Vice President Bernardino, and it will also deal with the Mission Review Document; the Educational Policy and Programs Committee reports today; the Public Service Committee will continue to discuss the Chair of PRB's document on evaluating academic scholarship; the Admissions and Retention Committee reports at the March 31, 1999 FSEC meeting

- there will be no FSEC meeting on March 24, 1999

Item 2: Report of the President/Provost

There was no report of the President/Provost.

Item 3: Update on the Campaign for UB

Vice President Stein presented an update on the Campaign for UB. In the last two and a half years over \$56 M has been raised and \$140 M in solicitations are outstanding. Our final goal is \$250 M.

The amount of gifts from corporations has been a pleasant surprise. For example, the Center for Computational Research was made possible by a \$1.2M gift from IBM and a \$700 K gift of computer equipment from Silicon Graphics. Keck contributed \$1 M for structural biology. Biogen endowed a \$1.5 M Chair in Neurology. Many of the corporate donors have been from outside Western New York. The slowness of local and regional businesses to contribute so far has been disappointing.

We have also been successfully connecting with alumni and friends. For example a School of Pharmacy alumnus has made a \$1.6M contribution for scholarships for pharmacy students. Further gifts have been made to the Distinguished Honors Scholars Program by the initial anonymous donor, who is hoping to see other donors come forward.

The School of Engineering has begun a faculty/staff campaign which has been very successful with 46% participation by faculty and staff. One anonymous faculty member has made a bequest of \$2.5 M to support scholarships in engineering.

There were questions from the floor:

- are there continuing plans for an Eye Research Institute which was announced about 2 years ago in the *Reporter*? at the Institute for Food Technology meeting in Rochester, the Statler Foundation and representatives of the local food industry were looking to make investments in Cornell and Rochester; would be good to work on that segment of local business for funding (Professor Baier)
- will provide Medical School's case statement which sets out its priorities for funding; sometimes difficult to attract private foundation money to public institution (Vice President Stein)
- when will the public campaign be announced? (Professor Nickerson)
- when half of the money is committed; we are not officially in a campaign but are raising money for a campaign (Vice President Stein)
- how are individual schools doing in meeting their goals? (Professor Sridhar)
- Engineering and Pharmacy are in front of everyone; the School of Medicine mounted its campaign early and has been very successful; are re-negotiating the goals of those schools which are successful (Vice President Stein)
- is the anonymous donor who funded the Honors scholarships considering permanently endowing the program? (Professor Schack)
- the donor currently is making an annual gift of \$800 K; will consider endowing the program after matching gifts are found; we are working hard on identifying gifts for that area (Vice President Stein)

Item 4: Report from the Educational Programs and Policy Committee

Professor Meacham, Chair of the Educational Programs and Policies Committee, brought two report items and one action item to FSEC. First, EPPC has had several discussions of

computing skills for undergraduates. EPPC found that the Libraries are doing a significant amount of skills training, and that Senior Vice Provost Tufariello's Office is also working on programs. EPPC discussed a course requirement for computer skills but that discussion was moved to the College of Arts and Sciences. Professor Walters will be chairing a committee to take up the issue.

Secondly EPPC had an extensive discussion with Vice Provost Goodman on the extension of the General Education requirements to all undergraduate students. EPPC was satisfied by the progress of and the planning for the extension.

Vice Provost Goodman shared a summary showing how programs which had not before imposed the requirements will be implementing them. He noted the absence of a language requirement for the programs to which the general education requirement were being extended; that requirement was not present in the original Undergraduate College report, but was added by the Faculty Senate. The Vice Provost has not been successful in selling the language requirement outside of the College of Arts and Sciences. He acknowledged the Board of Trustees' language requirement. Beginning Fall semester 1999 all freshmen will be subject to the College of Arts and Sciences General Education requirement, minus the language requirement. He hopes that by next year the requirements will be imposed on transfer students as well. The Vice Provost invited questions:

- the key to the summary says that "req" means already required or recommended for the major; what is the distinction? (Professor Welch)
- a specific course recommended for a program may be used to satisfy a requirement; if a student chooses not to take the recommended course she is still responsible for otherwise fulfilling the requirement of General Education (Vice Provost Goodman)
- do computer science courses fulfill the Math requirements? (Professor Thompson)
- mathematics, statistics and computer science courses can fulfill the requirement, and the courses may be offered outside of those Departments; the courses must, however, be at a sufficiently high level; for example, Computer Science 101 is considered too basic to satisfy the mathematics requirement (Vice Provost Goodman)

- this will mean a huge increase in students taking World Civilization and American Pluralism; the increase in World Civilization students in particular will impact the Libraries; how will the extra teaching load be accommodated? will American Pluralism meet the Board of Trustees' requirement for American history? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- Dean Grant is committed to making teaching resources available; the budget process that is being put in place will offer financial incentive for instruction; the old knowledge area requirements are being replaced by the General Education requirements, which should also free up some instructional resources; the SUNY requirements are embodied in a single sentence which is difficult to parse; a SUNY committee is studying how to implement the curriculum; at this point can't really tell whether American Pluralism will satisfy SUNY; we do not seem to be in compliance with the SUNY language requirement (Vice Provost Goodman)
- is there going to be further consideration of a computer skills test? should computer science courses be treated as the equivalent of math courses? (Professor Malone)
- have worked to implement and extend the General Education requirement, but not to change the curriculum; the impetus for change needs to come through the appropriate structure in the College of Arts and Sciences (Vice Provost Goodman)
- in adopting the General Education requirement Engineering gave up its own requirement that there be depth in at least two areas; that is a loss (Professor Malone)

Professor Meacham then introduced his action item. EPPC has drafted a resolution dealing with undergraduate independent study and would like it to go to Faculty Senate for a first reading in April.

There is considerable variation across campus in what is considered to be independent study, what the expectations are for student work and for faculty supervision, and the extent to which undergraduate students enroll for independent study. It is, therefore, difficult to assess what role independent study plays in the University. There is potential for abuse of independent study. For example some undergraduate students have graduated

cum laude based on A's from as many as 50 Independent Study and Tutorial credits although the remainder of their course work was in the B/C range.

The resolution proposes that no more than a total of 18 credit hours of tutorial course work, i.e. independent study, and within that total no more than 12 graded credit hours count toward the 120 credit hour requirement for graduation effective for May 2001 graduates. The resolution also asks that all independent study courses in the undergraduate catalog be designated as Tutorial courses to enable monitoring.

Professor Meacham asked for comments and questions:

- why 18 hours total rather than some other number? (Professor Boot)
- allows students to take one three hour tutorial for each of six semesters (Professor Meacham)
- to receive American Chemical Society approval, a research report must be incorporated into such courses; suspect that it is illegal for a student to be in a Chemistry Lab without being registered for a course, so that may increase the number of students taking Tutorials in the lab sciences (Professor Churchill)
- resolution does not apply to lab courses, only tutorials; in any event, the resolution provides that a student may petition to have the restriction raised (Professor Meacham)
- the third be it resolved clause recommends rescinding the current limit allowing faculty to supervise a maximum of three independent studies each semester; this restriction was carefully considered and rested on the policy that independent studies require "initial faculty guidance followed by repeated, regularly scheduled individual student conferences" (Professor Welch)
- recommend lifting the three student limit because some independent study programs do not require close supervision of faculty and may involve large numbers of students, e.g., writing for the *Spectrum* (Vice Provost Goodman)
- such programs may better be designated "activity supervised as a group laboratory" (Professor Welch)

- another reason to lift the three student restriction is that in Engineering undergraduate courses with an enrollment of less than ten are not taught; sometimes independent studies on the course's topic will be offered to six or seven students with the notation on their transcript that the independent study is the equivalent of the course; would the three student restriction apply to internships external to the University and to cooperative programs? (Professor Malone)
- internships would probably come under "activity supervised as a group" (Professor Meacham)
- why not combine clauses 4 and 5 of the resolution? (Professor Baumer)
- the issue of how many total credits may be accumulated from independent study is separable from how many letter grades may be accumulated; will facilitate discussion in the Faculty Senate (Professor Meacham)
- why limit letter graded independent studies to 12 hours? (Professor Baumer)
- Committee felt that 18 credit hours was too much to count toward the QPA; 12 hours is a compromise that allows students to count two years of independent studies towards their QPA (Professor Meacham)
- this is really a way to duck the issue of garbage courses being offered (Professor Baumer)
- too difficult to monitor all tutorials given at the University and to write general guidelines appropriate for the diversity of activities going on across the campus; a cap is a reasonable substitute (Professor Meacham)
- Professor Baumer's question is really how to implement a University wide process of ensuring the quality of the curriculum; this resolution does not address that question, but would be grateful for Faculty Senate ideas on that question (Vice Provost Goodman)
- is it necessary that the full Faculty Senate deal with this matter? can't come to a rational conclusion on this highly specific matter about which have no expertise; consider revising procedures so the Faculty Senate is not dealing with this kind of minutiae (Professor Swartz)

- the presumption of our conversation is that independent studies are easy A's; if that is so, should either abolish independent studies or reform them; the department is the appropriate locus for monitoring the quality of the curriculum; a formal plan for a proposed independent study outlining what will be covered, the schedule for faculty involvement and the evaluation criteria should be filed with the department
(Professor Schack)
- requiring individual plans for each independent study would generate too much paper and faculty would resist the extra work load; the resolution says you get 18 credit hours without paper work, but beyond that paper work will be required
(Professor Meacham)

A motion (seconded) to forward the resolution to the Faculty Senate was made. The motion passed.

Item 5: Report of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee

The Chair welcomed Professor Boot, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee, and Loyce Stewart, Director of the Office of Equity, Diversity and Affirmative Action.

Professor Boot noted that the issue of consensual sexual relations between a faculty member and a student has been an evolving one, and discussed several times by FSEC. The Committee, with one strong dissent, endorsed the present report and resolution. Before beginning the discussion, however, Professor Boot asked that changes be made to the text of the *Alert for Instructional Staff*, viz. in the first paragraph "may make them liable" be changed to "may lead to"; in paragraph three "competent and confidential treatment" be changed to "competent and confidential discussion." Additionally, in light of the discussion on the FSEC e-list, Professor Boot suggested deleting the phrase "by virtue of power differential and special professional responsibility" in the third paragraph. The Chair asked Ms. Stewart to comment on the effect of deleting that phrase. Ms. Stewart said that a regulatory agency examining a complaint would look at whether the person complained of

had the power to influence the complainant's academic standing, so the issue of power is very important.

There were comments from the floor:

- if you have a rule like this when there is a failed consensual relationship, the power differential between faculty and student shifts away from the faculty member who can be in jeopardy of losing a career; should avoid using the term "power differential" as though this were an immutable thing; would retain the phrase as "by virtue of special professional responsibility" (Professor Schack)
- the University, rather than the faculty member, will be held liable in a case of sexual harassment; failed sexual relationships can turn into a complaint of sexual harassment (Ms. Stewart)
- as a point of order, Professor Boot has not yet made a statement of the rationale of the resolution, but we are now discussing its details; as a member of the Committee ask to speak about the report (Professor Swartz)
- do not wish to make a statement; let the report stand on its own (Professor Boot)
- (addressed to Professor Swartz) will recognize you as speaker in established order (Professor Nickerson)
- understand the thrust of Professor Schack's comments to be that the alert puts the faculty member in more jeopardy; in fact the alert will make no difference in either legal liability or personal damage; this is a good statement and the inclusion of the phrase "power differential" gives faculty more warning (Professor Baumer)
- agree that the statement is stronger with the phrase retained (Professor Boot)
- this situation is risky for the student as well as the professor; students' careers have been side lined because of a collapsed sexual relationship, while few professors suffer the loss of career (Professor Woodson)
- this statement is needed for moral and ethical reasons and also to protect the University from the kind of liability imposed by courts on other institutions which have not made efforts to provide an atmosphere free of sexual harassment ; would

like to offer three amendments to the report which would have the effect of further protecting the University (Professor Adams-Volpe)

- Professor Swartz as the minority view of the Committee should be allowed to speak to the report first (Professor Schack)
- will continue the general discussion of issues, but return to your amendments (Professor Nickerson)
- concede that Professors Baumer and Woodson are correct and have effectively rebutted my earlier comment about the power differential issue (Professor Schack)
- in the Committee it was asserted that the University may be liable for a case of sexual harassment under the circumstances of a failed sexual relationship; asked for a statement from a legally informed person to that effect, but my request was ignored; the issue of how this alert would impact teaching assistants was a matter of some debate in FSEC, but the Committee's discussion of this issue amounted to a few sentences from the Chair; this is illustrative; my view is that we should leave things as they are; if we decide to go ahead with a rule, there needs to be a great deal of work in drafting protective procedures, and the Committee has not shown itself willing to do that work; it is not clear if we want to take a zero tolerance stance or to apply good judgment case by case; do we want to extend the rule to cover relationships between tenured and untenured faculty or between any kind of supervisor and supervisee? we seem to be taking the Scarlet O'Hara approach of worrying about it tomorrow (Professor Swartz)
- at the Committee it was suggested that rather than seeking legal opinion we read Titles 9 and 7 which are the law; this is an advisory statement, not a policy which would require procedure (Ms. Stewart)
- hard to believe that if we needed a statement we would not have been so advised by SUNY counsel (Professor Swartz)
- we have been so advised (Ms. Stewart)
- first paragraph of the *Alert* reading "Members of the teaching staff should be aware that any romantic involvement with their students may make them liable for formal action against them if a complaint is registered by a student" with the addition of the

following conclusion "and therefore you're a damned fool if you let it happen" summarizes what we need; in the second paragraph "will be held accountable" should be changed to "may be held accountable" since the complaint may be unfounded , in the third paragraph change "Students who are directly or indirectly affected" to "Those who are directly or indirectly affected" to allow for the possibility of a faculty member who is the one being harassed (Professor Malone)

- accept the change to the second paragraph; object to widening the scope of the third paragraph (Professor Boot)
- understand that another committee is working on procedures for a sexual harassment complaint which we will see in due course (Professor Baumer)
- the committee's quite extensive document has been returned from review by SUNY counsel with a few suggestions; the document should be ready soon (Ms. Stewart)
- the major decisions holding a university liable in a sexual harassment complaint are *Korf vs. Ball State University* and *Naragon vs. Wharton*; policies of Yale, Wisconsin and Minnesota discuss a university's liability; have three amendments to offer (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- wait for amendments till general discussion is finished (Professor Nickerson)
- the *Alert* is like a sign on a ski slope warning of the slope's level of difficulty which does not change the liability of the skier or the ski resort; this is not a regulation, it's just a warning (Professor Harwitz)

Professor Welch moved (seconded) that FSEC recommend adoption of the uncorrected version of the Committee's report and resolution to the Faculty Senate.

- move an amendment to the motion, viz. in the first paragraph change "may make them liable for" to "may lead to;" in the second paragraph change "will be held accountable" to "may be held accountable;" in the third paragraph change "treatment" to "discussion" (Professor Boot)
- amend the text of the *Alert* after dealing with the motion to recommend adoption (Professor Welch)

- do we want to recommend adoption or only forward the *Alert* to the Faculty Senate for its consideration? (Professor Schack)
- customary procedure is to recommend for adoption when there is wide spread support for a resolution among FSEC members (Professor Welch)

The Chair asked if there were any objections to making the changes to the text suggested by Professor Boot. Hearing none, the Chair ruled that the changes were incorporated into the *Alert*.

Professor Adams-Volpe moved (seconded) that the title of the *Alert* be changed to *Advisory for Instructional and Administrative Staff*. She stated that the word "advisory" shows more leadership within the University to create an environment that is conducive to study, giving the University more protection from legal liability.

- haven't even begun to think about expansion of this to administrative staff (Professor Swartz)
- move (seconded) to change *Advisory for Instructional and Administrative Staff* to *Alert for Instructional and Administrative Staff* (Professor Baumer)
- can't amend an amendment (Professor Malone)
- the word "advisory" is stronger than the word "alert" and shows the direction of University policy (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- advice to a faculty member is rejected almost as quickly as advice to a teenager; poll FSEC to see whether alert is considered the stronger word (Professor Schack)
- there were calls to vote on the motion
- in military facilities, "alert status" carries more impact than "advisory" does; agree with Professor Swartz that we need legal advice before we do anything more (Professor Baier)
- National Weather Service hierarchy is weather watch to alert to advisory to warning (Professor Welch)
- every time we talk about this issue, we find reasons to delay; need to move on (Professor Malave)

The Chair asked for a vote on Professor Baumer's amendment of "Advisory for Instructional and Administrative Staff" to "Alert for Instructional and Administrative Staff." The motion failed.

The Chair asked for discussion of Professor Adams-Volpe's amendment.

- the Committee wanted to focus on the faculty/student relationship; in the best of all possible worlds the amendment is an improvement to the *Alert*, but it will jeopardize its passage (Professor Boot)

The motion failed.

Professor Adams-Volpe moved (seconded) another amendment adding the following sentence at the end of the second paragraph of the *Alert*: "Complaints may also be made by students not involved in a relationship on the grounds of diminished opportunity resulting from actual or perceived favoritism to other students." Important to add the concept of liability for diminished opportunity which has been an active legal issue.

- move to amend by deleting the first five words and substituting the following phrase: "Concerns may also be brought" (Professor Baumer)
- accept the change (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- if the word "student" in the third paragraph of the *Alert* were changed to "those," that would eliminate the need for the proposed added sentence (Professor Smith)
- the idea of diminished opportunity is implicit in the phrase "indirectly affected;" loath to vote for something only to protect the University's side; much more interested in voting for something that will produce behavior change; don't think Faculty Senate can make an institution wide warning, but can only warn our colleagues (Professor Harwitz)
- we are talking about three different things: advice concerning good behavior, an alert concerning possible sexual harassment proceedings, and an alert concerning possible disciplinary proceedings; because of imprecise framing of the issues, we are bouncing around among the three; this motion re-enforces the concept of third party

aggrievement, but we should consider doing so carefully since there will be no end to the persons who consider themselves aggrieved (Professor Swartz)

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

Professor Smith moved (seconded) to change the word "Students" in the third paragraph of the *Alert* to "those." There was no discussion of the motion. The motion carried.

Professor Adams-Volpe moved (seconded) the addition at the beginning of the *Alert* of the following: "The University at Buffalo considers relationships of a sexual nature between instructional or administrative staff and their students to be unacceptable professional conduct." The *Alert* is much too weak; the addition is a statement of how the institution feels about the issue.

There was discussion of the motion:

- offer an amendment stating: "The University at Buffalo considers unacceptable any coercive and otherwise professionally unethical behavior connected with sexual relationships between instructional or administrative staff and their students" (Professor Holstun)
- would accept the substitution if "coercive" were removed (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- this is not a statement of institutional policy, but rather an alert to faculty (Professor Boot)
- lacking a second, the amendment dies (Professor Nickerson)
- does this resolution cover amorous, but nonsexual relationships? (Professor Malone)
- against the amendment; it takes us even further out on the thin ice that Professor Swartz described; should not say conduct is unacceptable without putting in place enforcement provisions (Professor Baumer)
- this amendment would prohibit me from having a sexual relationship with my wife if she were in my class; badly crafted documents lead to disrespect; need to be very clear what we mean; for example, recent events make it clear how difficult it is even to know what "sexual relations" means (Professor Schack)

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

The Chair then asked for discussion of Professor Welch's motion to recommend adoption of the report and resolution:

- think the report and resolution are unclear and not well done; unacceptable, for example, that there are no legal citations on which to base claims that the University would be legally liable (Professor Schack)
- there is not an instructor at the University who doesn't understand that you should not have sex with your student; understanding and controlling one's behavior are, however, two different things; need to do this (Professor Thompson)
- Ms. Stewart has already stated that Titles 9 and 7 are all the law one needs (Professor Woodson)
- do Titles 9 and 7 say that a university will be not in compliance with regulations, or will be held liable, if it does not have a statement about the acceptability of consensual relations? (Professor Schack)
- not quite that clear (Ms. Stewart)
- romantic involvement may be only in the mind of one of the parties; this could make faculty very cautious about having contacts with students (Professor Swartz)
- if perfection of language is to be required of this, it may never be adopted (Professor Albini)
- this is only an alert; it is not an attempt to defend the University or to set policy; policy will come later with the report on sexual harassment (Professor Baumer)
- we need a statement because the University does have a problem, to which Ms. Stewart can attest (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- thank the Committee for its tolerance; would have liked to have voted for some of the amendments offered today, but they would have decreased the likelihood of the Senate's adoption (Professor Malave)
- possible to hate sexual harassment with a holy rage and still be against the *Alert* because it is not about sexual harassment (Professor Holstun)

Professor Baumer moved (seconded) to close debate. The motion passed.

Professor Malave asked that Ms. Stewart be given the opportunity of making final remarks. The Chair ruled that Ms. Stewart could speak after the vote on the motion to recommend adoption of the report and resolution. The motion passed.

Ms. Stewart said that once the policy on sexual harassment is in place, with appropriate protective procedures, a stronger statement on consensual relations could be considered.

Item 6: Approval of the Minutes of February 24 and March 3, 1999

The Minutes of February 24 and March 3, 1999 were approved.

Item 7: Old/new business

Professor Schack moved (seconded) the following resolution: "The Faculty Senate Executive Committee urges the President and Provost to proceed with the Mission Review as follows: (1) provide SUNY, as soon as possible, direct responses to its 37 questions, referring, where necessary, to Provost Headrick's planning reports; and (2) suspend work on revisions to the Provost's Mission Summary document until they establish, and receive reports from, appropriate committees of faculty and librarians, charged to study the issues raised in the present and recent drafts."

He noted that whether or not one likes the Provost's summary is unimportant. Because there is considerable discontent and controversy over the summary, the issues raised deserve considerable faculty discussion, research and attention. It is urgent only to answer SUNY's 37 questions referring when necessary to Provost Headrick's planning reports. Work on Provost Trigg's summary should be suspended, not abandoned, until we have studied the questions it raises.

The Chair asked for questions:

- it follows from this motion that the Academic Planning Committee, which meets next week, should suspend its review of the Triggles document and focus only on the answers to the 37 questions (Professor Malone)
- further review of the Triggles document by APC might be profitable in that APC could advise FSEC on what issues to send to what committees (Professor Schack)
- the resolution doesn't affect Senate committees; it says to the administration, don't send any more copies to Albany and stop inundating us with slightly revised versions (Professor Baumer)
- it also says form committees to study the areas you think are crucial (Professor Schack)
- this is a high priority item; can't assume the document is anything other than hard planning (Professor Swartz)
- would guess the documents have already gone to Albany (Professor Malone)
- if it has, then this will be a too late resolution that acknowledges our displeasure that the documents were sent (Professor Schack)

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 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: Judy Adams-Volpe, Dennis Malone, Claude Welch

University Libraries: Dorothy Woodson

Guests:

Vice President Ronald Stein

Vice Provost Nicolas Goodman

Jack Meacham, Chair, Educational Programs and Policy Committee

Loyce Stewart, Director, Office of Equity, Diversity and Affirmative Action

Margaret Acara, Task Force on Women

John Celock, *The Spectrum*

Sue Wuetcher, *Reporter*

Suzanne Ley, Undergraduate Student Association

Excused:

Health Related Professions: Judith Tamburlin

SUNY Senator: John Fisher

Absent: Architecture & Planning: Shahin Vassigh

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Pharmacy: Nathan

Ex-officio: Robert Hoeing