

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of February 24, 1999 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on February 24, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. Report of the Chair Report of the President
2. Report of the President/Provost
3. Report of the Bylaws Committee on the George Resolution
4. Proposal for Implementing a Junior Faculty Mentoring Initiative
5. Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee
6. Old/new business

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

- he has constructed a draft of the Faculty Senate's preliminary calendar for the 1999/2000 academic year; dates for the Convocation and the Meeting of the Voting Faculty are not yet firm; bring problems to the Chair's attention by next week's meeting
- FSEC will charge the Athletics and Recreation Committee next week
- as a result of yesterday's Faculty Senate meeting, there are a number of important issues concerning Mission Review that we need to follow up on; reluctant to ask committees to change direction in midstream, but there are certain issues which can be addressed; Research and Creative Activities Committee can examine the emphasis for suggested directions; we can obtain the report from Dean Lopos' committee on distance learning; the last two Senate meetings in April and May are reserved for action items coming out of the committees, so, depending on what comes out of committee, we may need to schedule a special meeting
- *Today's News: The Chronicle of Higher Education* of February 24 carried an article on the policy approved by the SUNY Board of Trustees for evaluating the job performance of SUNY campus

Presidents; President Greiner is quoted in the article; this policy was not formally discussed at the SUNY Senate meeting in Cortland and was not on the published agenda of the Board of Trustees

- he located a copy of the Cerny/Hyde report on appointment and reappointment to the Graduate Faculty; the report was submitted to Dean Triggles in January 1997; after FSEC has read the report, we can decide whether to discuss it; the Cerny/Hyde report proposes that rules for appointment and reappointment be developed by each Divisional Committee; reappointment is the controversial matter; the Cerny/Hyde report seems to be the most recent activity on this issue

- whose prerogative is it to decide the matter? (Professor Malone)
- not clear; need to explore Faculty Senate's role (Professor Nickerson)

- believe there has been more recent activity; rumor says that the College of Arts and Sciences made a proposal not to bother with this distinction, but it was not acceptable; wording in Provost Triggles's Mission Review document suggests that there has been further thinking on the issue (Professor Schack)

- concerning the impact of the SUNY General Education Requirement on UB, Associate Dean Gold has prepared a report on this; the Chair will ask permission to distribute the report to the FSEC and then we can discuss whether we need to charge our own committee

- the Academic Planning Committee organized the discussion of the Mission Review document at the February 23 Faculty Senate meeting; the Faculty Tenure and Privileges Committee continues to discuss the Hay Report on Centers and Institutes and has developed a motion suggesting a procedure which will both encourage faculty participation in Centers and Institutes and ensure that work in the Centers and Institutes is properly credited

Item 2: Report of the President/Provost

There was no report of the President/Provost.

Item 3: Report of the Bylaws Committee on the George Resolution

At the December 1998 Faculty Senate meeting, Professor George proposed inserting the following language into the *Charter of the Faculty Senate*: "The Senate shall discharge the powers and duties of the voting faculty regarding the graduate and professional degree requirements. These include, but are not limited to, educational requirements and other matters of academic policy common to the graduate and professional programs of the university." The proposal was sent to the Bylaws Committee for its review prior to discussion of the proposal at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Hopkins, Chair of the Bylaws Committee, presented the Committee's report. The Committee concluded, firstly, that since the *Charter* as it is presently worded gives the Faculty Senate substantial standing over issues of graduate education, no change to the *Charter* is necessary to empower the Faculty Senate to consider graduate issues. The Committee believes that Professor's George's proposed wording is narrower in scope than the existing articles. However, the Committee recognizes that the existing article authorizes the Senate only to make recommendations regarding graduate issues, not to establish standards as is the case for undergraduate issues.

Secondly, the Committee concluded that there is nothing in the proposed text which is inconsistent with or contrary to the existing text of the *Charter*. However, it would be necessary to make supporting changes in addition to the insertion of the proposed article, e.g., give the Senate authority to approve the appointment of faculty representatives to University-wide committees responsible for reviewing course and curriculum proposals.

There were comments from the floor:

- if we adopt this proposal, assume the Faculty Senate would have to set degree requirements for every graduate degree program (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- would only have responsibility for those requirements common to all graduate degree programs, e.g. credits required for the degree, dissertation required for the Ph.D., qualifying exams, etc. (Professor Schack)
- the point of the resolution is that decisions are made about the graduate programs, and there is no elected representative body making them (Professor George)

- if UB is moving away from undergraduate education and towards more graduate work, then perhaps we do need greater oversight of graduate programs (Professor Thompson)
- this is not an issue of bylaws; it's an issue of unexercised responsibility; we should show interest in the area before changing the *Charter* (Professor Welch)
- goal is to create a true University Senate whose responsibilities are consistent with its membership; the Graduate School *Bylaws* and *Charter* create only selected, not elected, committees which means that three quarters of UB's programs have no elected, representative body looking after them; at other institutions the trend is to do away with Graduate Faculty; the Senate's *Charter* does not give the Senate graduate responsibilities and so there is no incentive for the Provost or the Dean of the Graduate School to talk with us; retain the administrative structure for the Graduate School and don't micromanage either undergraduate or graduate education; if we don't enlarge the Senate's responsibilities, then we should call it the Undergraduate Senate; the Bylaws Committee report claims the proposal will diminish the Senate's power over graduate education, but the proposal is to add another article, not to replace the existing one; Provost Trigg's comment that there is no commonality to graduate education overstates the commonality of undergraduate education; recognize that there will have to be a series of changes in the *Charter* as we grow in experience with graduate issues (Professor George)
- the current language of the *Charter* does not give the Senate parallel power over undergraduate and graduate issues; if there were parallel power, then it would be possible for the Senate to tell the Provost that it is not his business to manipulate who gets on the Graduate Faculty (Professor Harwitz)
- the Graduate Faculty was created in the 1950's and reconfirmed in the 1960's to ensure that faculty who were overseeing Ph.D. programs had shown a capacity for research and knew what they were doing; the Divisional Committees were created to parallel the creation of the Faculties; at that time the Divisional Committees and the Executive Committee of the Graduate School were elected; the Senate assumed responsibility for undergraduate issues because the Senate was common to all the

schools and departments; before proposing to the Faculty Senate that basic responsibility for graduate education be moved to the Senate, FSEC needs to carefully consider the relationship between the Faculty Senate/Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Divisional Committees/Graduate School Executive Committee; graduate faculty status was also a way of identifying persons in affiliated institutions like Roswell Park who were not otherwise University faculty and allowing them to conduct Ph.D. studies; the idea of denying reappointment to the Graduate Faculty to increase the teaching load of faculty who aren't doing enough research will lead to workload arguments at the bargaining table (Professor Baumer)

- not suggesting that we insert the Faculty Senate into running of the Graduate School which is properly the function of the Graduate School Executive Committee and the Divisional Committees; Faculty Senate would exercise oversight just as we do with undergraduate education (Professor George)
- share Professor George's concern with the lack of effectiveness of the Graduate Faculty and am not opposed to the proposal, but we need to have defined what the respective relationships will be; in essence we are proposing that the Faculty Senate replace the Graduate Faculty (Professor Baumer)
- if we had obligations, not just opportunities, in the *Charter* for graduate education we would learn how to exercise them and develop committee structures which could give impact to our positions (Professor Schack)
- the proposal says the Senate has power over graduate and professional degree requirements, including, but not limited to, policy common to the graduate and professional programs; this could lead to mischievous meddling; exercise the power already in the *Charter* (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- discussion has focused on the philosophy of the proposal; would be happier to arrive at an operational description of the change; what exactly would the Faculty Senate do with the change that it is not doing now? (Professor Malone)
- faculty understand that control of graduate education resides in departments, so there will not be undue interference; what do other schools do about responsibility for graduate education? (Professor Sridhar)

- suspect that Senate has the power to interfere in departmental details of undergraduate programs, but knows better than to do so; would be the same from graduate programs; consider defining the Graduate School Executive Committee as having operational responsibility for graduate programs and the Faculty Senate as having responsibility for new policy (Professor Baumer)
- hard to understand why the Faculty Senate would disregard graduate education, especially since the majority of our students are graduate students; issues discussed by Faculty Senate are not relevant to what most faculty do every day, and that discourages graduate faculty participation in the Faculty Senate (Professor Malave)

Professor Schack proposed (seconded) that FSEC forward to the Senate the George proposal, the Bylaws Committee report/revised report and a position paper from Professor George if he wishes to provide one. The Chair asked for discussion of the motion

- also forward Provost Triggles' response to the Bylaws Committee (Professor Malone)
- should the additional *Charter* changes that will be necessary to implement this proposal also be forwarded to Faculty Senate (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- additional changes will develop over time (Professor George)
- something parallel to the explicit listing of responsibilities for undergraduate education might be developed by the Bylaws Committee for graduate education; this might provide a structure under which the Divisional Committees would become elective Faculty Senate Committees; the Graduate Faculty construct was a solution to a specific problem (unqualified graduate faculty) which we have overcome, so the structure's usefulness may be outgrown (Professor Harwitz)
- should think about the possibility that the faculty would defeat the this change to the *Charter*; alternatively, administration might decide they like things as they are (Professor Malone)
- once the Faculty Senate has decided that this is the way we're going to go, there should be wide-ranging discussion of what the role of the Senate should be; one operational difference under this proposal would be that the committee structure would be elected (Professor George)

Professor Schack's motion to forward the proposal with accompanying documentation passed.

Item 4: Proposal for Implementing a Junior Faculty Mentoring Initiative

The Chair welcomed Vice Provost Fischer and invited him to discuss his draft of a Proposal for Implementing a Junior Faculty Mentoring Initiative.

In September 1998 Faculty Senate passed a resolution recommending the development of a mentoring initiative. The spirit of the resolution was to offer voluntary mentoring opportunities to all junior faculty. Vice Provost Fischer has developed an implementation plan; the guts of the proposal are that each unit create a mentoring opportunity for junior faculty, that the junior faculty member's participation be voluntary, and that the mentoring procedure reflect unit custom and choice. Three units, Law, Engineering and Nursing, already have formal mentoring procedures in place and these would be preserved. The mentoring policy should also include decanal accountability for ensuring implementation of procedures. Additionally Chairs and Deans should be especially alert to making disciplinary culture welcoming to junior women faculty and junior faculty from underrepresented groups.

The Vice Provost has added a role for department chairs. Chairs would be required to meet annually with junior faculty to discuss expectations and written criteria for promotion to tenure in the discipline as practiced in the department; and the junior faculty member's teaching, research and service accomplishments. Chairs would be responsible for writing a letter which summarizes the discussion and indicates degree of progress, strengths and areas for improvement if any, and extent of department support. Provost Headrick wanted Faculty Senate discussion of this addition.

The Deans have not yet seen the proposal. Given the level of anxiety over enrollment issues, it is not clear when the Deans would be able to focus on it.

The Chair asked for comments:

- neither Chair nor Dean can say to a junior faculty member, do A, B, and C and you will get tenure; dangerous to build a paper trail of such assurances to junior faculty;

it is the junior faculty's responsibility to build a tenurable dossier, not a Chair's to direct as to what needs to be done (Professor Boot)

- not suggesting a laundry list approach, but instead reasonable self-articulation within the discipline as to expectations (Vice Provost Fischer)
- the danger in a paper trail arises with the marginal candidate; Chair can not predict how faculty will vote on such a dossier (Professor Churchill)
- the value of a Chair's letters will be apparent three or four years into the junior faculty's stay in the department when reappointment is decided, not at the tenure decision (Vice Provost Fischer)
- mentor should be present at the annual meeting of Chair and junior faculty to ensure that communications between Chair and junior faculty are mutually understood (Professor Churchill)
- Electrical Engineering put together a series of documents outlining departmental policies on a variety of issues, including expectations for tenure; that approach does not raise the contract issue; believe that junior faculty should be given a document that outlines expectations (Professor Malone)
- applaud the procedure's conceptualization, but believe the procedure should be more forcefully stated, i.e. "will be done" not "may be done" (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- a Chair who is unwilling to tell a junior faculty that the faculty member isn't doing well, will also be unwilling to write a letter saying so; the danger is that the chair will write seven letters that don't address problems, and the rejected junior faculty will sue successfully (Professor Baumer)
- Libraries have written criteria document, creates opportunities for collaboration between senior and junior faculty, and has a formal review of reappointment dossiers which identifies and informs junior faculty who are not on the right track (Professor Woodson)
- congratulate Vice Provost Fischer on this process in which Faculty Senate set out a principle and administration is following through with implementation (Professor Welch)

- this proposal assumes that Chairs will write well crafted letters which artfully set out boundaries for junior faculty while not committing the department to a course of action; Chairs will do no better at providing written advice than they do in oral advisement; the Faculty Senate proposal was an attempt to disarm incompetent Chairs; anticipate that if a paper trail is generated, Chairs will feel bound to their prior advice, damaging the marginal candidate's chances (Professor Schack)
- agree that paper trail can be dangerous for the institution (Professor Sridhar)
- faculty have a responsibility to write down clearly the characteristics of personality and productivity that they want; Nursing has struggled through several versions of such a document trying to get it right; mentoring is the responsibility of faculty, not Deans and Chairs (Professor Thompson)
- any faculty member has the right to know what is expected and what the criteria are; there is a problem when senior faculty, who themselves couldn't meet the expectations faced by junior faculty, are in the position of judging junior faculty; since UB is not free of bias against women and underrepresented minorities, and the process of judgment is very subjective, the protection of written expectations and criteria is necessary; written expectations and evaluations protect junior faculty from a Chair's change of mind about what is desired and valued (Professor Malave)
- Chairs are faculty with additional supervisory responsibilities and are in need of support in doing their job; in the tenure process because their letters are so influential, Chairs need to write them well; writing the annual letter would be good practice (Vice Provost Fischer)

Item 5: Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee update

Professor Hamlen talked about issues that the Committee will be addressing in the Spring.

An ongoing problem is that meetings of the Committee are briefing sessions in which the Committee is informed about decisions that have already been made. She is struggling to have discussion of issues before decisions are reached in addition to giving feed about the budget. This will be difficult to accomplish, but she is determined not to give up.

One issue for the Committee is discretionary salary increases. In concert with the Affirmative Action Committee and the Task Force on Women, the Committee drafted a resolution indicating that the first two rounds of discretionary salary increases had not adequately addressed salary disparity because of gender and race. The resolution urged that the third round also be directed at this disparity. However, there is a deeper question to be explored as to whether it is appropriate to use union negotiated merit money for disparity issues or whether other sources of money should be found for disparity. The Committee is also interested in increasing the transparency of the allocation process in order to make the process more motivational to faculty.

Another issue for the Committee arises from the Resource Allocation Methodology (RAM). It is not clear what RAM's implications are for programs, choices, and what activities are supported. Will we maximize our short term revenue generation at the expense of our long term reputation? One hypothetical scenario would be a department deciding to divert its best teachers to a revenue producing external program, substituting part time adjunct faculty to keep campus based programs running. The Committee would like to examine what can be done to monitor the full cost and benefits of decisions, not just their short term revenue production potential.

The Chair asked for discussion:

- doesn't RAM model the consequences of resource allocations? (Professor Harwitz)
- RAM uses modeling, but the numbers are how much money comes in with each student and how much money is paid out by the unit; reputation is not factored in (Professor Hamlen)
- long term monitoring could be done by regularly flagging the levels of diversions from primary responsibilities (Professor Harwitz)
- greater concern with RAM is that faculty will offer popular courses which will entertain, but not educate, students (Professor Boot)
- would guess that a standard model for discretionary raises is to reward faculty who are bringing in money to the department, keeping them happy and the money

coming in; this model leads to discrepancies in salaries and we are now proposing to give the discretionary money to those whose salaries are low; seems counter productive in some respects; another problem is for faculty, 35-45 years old, who are often the most important in a department, but who are being seriously underpaid; discretionary raises are no help with this; these faculty get outside offers for more money and we either meet the offers or lose the faculty (Professor Churchill)

- if someone doesn't like the outcome of applying RAM algorithms, the outcome gets changed by SUNY; this community almost never discusses what are its budget priorities; the Committee should just decide what it considers should be the top two priorities for the campus; priorities will be different for the long and short terms; in the long term we need to build our reputation; in the short term we need to address the enrollment crisis (Professor Malone)
- it's a problem if we only deal with the short term priorities (Professor Hamlen)
- has the administration looked for other sources of money to address salary disparity; this is an important issue and other money could probably be found; RAM may lead to less cooperation between departments if there are economic penalties for cooperation (Professor Sridhar)
- the Committee asked about seeking other sources of funding; the answer was a pregnant silence (Professor Schack)
- one of the outcomes of the Committee's resolution is that data for disparity by race, which was lacking, is being produced (Professor Nickerson)
- in departments with no women or underrepresented minority faculty, there was no impact from the directive to aim discretionary money toward these two groups of faculty; in other departments small amounts of money were given to women and minority faculty while large amounts went to the traditional recipients; campus wide disparity was not adequately addressed; if RAM is to be used to decide what programs are cost effective, need to take into account the amount of grant money faculty bring in and the salary differentials among departments and schools (Professor Malave)

Item 6: Old/new business

There was no old/new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Kramer

Secretary of Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: Peter Nickerson

Secretary: Marilyn Kramer

Arts & Sciences: James Holstun

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Ramalingam Sridhar

Graduate School of Engineering: Lilliam Malave

Health Related Professions: Judith Tamburlin

Law: Louis Swartz

Management: John Boot

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: Melvyn Churchill, Samuel Schack

Nursing: Jacqueline Thompson

Social Sciences: William Baumer, Mitchell Harwitz

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

University Libraries: Dorothy Woodson

Guests:

Judith Hopkins, Chair, Bylaws Committee

William Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

Sue Wuetcher, *Reporter*

Michelle Burger, OAP case study

Radlike Suresh, OAP case study

Becky Brierley, OAP case study

William George, Faculty Senator

Martin Weiss, *The Spectrum*

Steven Cosme, Student Association, Office of Academic Affairs

Excused:

Dental Medicine: Robert Baier

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albini, Cedric Smith

Pharmacy: Nathan

Absent:

Architecture & Planning: Shahin Vassigh

Ex-Officio: Robert Hoeing