

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of January 24, 1996 (approved)**

**revised 10/3/95)**

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

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in the Jeannette Martin Room of Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the minutes of November 8 and December 6, 1995](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Projected Capital Campaign](#)
5. [Academic Integrity and Academic Good Standing Policies](#)
6. [Old Business](#)
7. [New Business](#)

### **ITEM 1: Approval of the minutes of November 8 and December 6, 1995**

Professor Welch asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of November 8, 1995 and December 6, 1995. There being no corrections or additions, the minutes were approved unanimously. Professor Welch announced that the minutes would be available on Wings within a few days and that posting of the resolutions was progressing.

### **ITEM 2: Report of the Chair**

Professor Welch reported that:

- He had met with President Greiner and Provost Headrick and had urged responses to resolutions related to appointments and reappointments of Chairs, revisions of the Bylaws and Charter, the evaluation of Deans and faculty participation in student recruitment.
- Budget strategies were being discussed by the Deans for coping with a possible \$92 million state tax support reduction related to "Managing Our Fate". Professor Welch explained that teams of Deans had been organized to deal with graduate professional education, doctoral education and undergraduate education.
- The Budget Priorities Committee was discussing fees and overheads and policies for administration of grants and service. It was noted that reimbursement rates were variable.
- Proposed TAP reductions had disproportionate impact on public institutions, with 90% of the cut affecting SUNY and CUNY students. It was noted that one-quarter of students used TAP and Pell in combination. The problem was related to cutting rates of maximum awards with the result that a higher percentage of tuition in public institutions was left uncovered.
- Discussions at the SUNY Senate had been videotaped including comments by the new trustees regarding "Rethinking SUNY".
- Attendance at the Faculty Senate meeting on January 30, 1996 was important in discussing UTAs.
- The FSEC meeting on January 31, 1996 would be an Executive Session hosted by the Provost.
- The Faculty Senate Committee on Governance and the Environmental Task Force would be reporting at the February 7, 1996 meeting.
- The Library Committee Chair would discuss the impact of funding reductions on the acquisitions budget on February 14, 1996. Professor Welch commented on the serious nature of the issue. He added that there would be an update on the sesquicentennial.
- At the February 28, 1996 meeting, the Committee on Research and Creative Activity would be discussing the responsible conduct policy and Professor Danford, Chair of the Facilities Planning Committee would discuss classroom adequacy, safety and accessibility. He stated that ideas would be shared with the PRB regarding faculty tenure and privileges. Vice Provost Fischer would discuss issues related to teaching and learning at a future date.
- Professor Nickerson reported that the FSA had a new director.

- Difficulties with enrollment in MFC were mentioned and it was noted that the new Dean of MFC, George Lopos and Acting Vice President John Sheffer would participate in a future FSEC meeting.
- Future topics for FSEC meetings included the status of searches and updates on NCAA activities. Professor Welch discussed an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education titled "Upholding Standards". He mentioned "partial qualifiers" as students who did not meet NCAA academic requirements for admission and therefore were ineligible for athletic participation. He reported that there had been a proposal to change the standard to a 720 combined SAT score and a 2.75 average in high school. The vote was 161 in favor of reducing the standards and 163 against the change. It was noted that UB had voted in favor of proposed reduced standards. Professor Welch stated that the University was pledged to high academic standards. Professor Malone voiced surprise that the IAB had been neither consulted or informed about the matter. Provost Headrick stated that he was also unaware of the action. It was announced that the NCAA was being restructured with changes in Division I that provided for a major role for campus Presidents. Professor Welch noted that a new faculty representative to the NCAA had not been appointed by President Greiner.
- Professor Welch stated that 13,000 undergraduate student records had been reviewed and that 28% of the students were not in academic good standing. He added that 150 students had not been dismissed due to a computer glitch. Professor Malone reported that many grades had not been submitted on time. Provost Headrick stated that the administration encouraged compliance with grading procedures. Professor Nickerson stated that completed grade forms were handled in a timely manner by Records and Registration and that the office should be complimented. Professor Horvath commented on the prevalence of late grades. Professor Schuel questioned whether the administration had checked the impact of the new rules for academic good standing prior to promulgation. Professor Welch replied that the effect had only been estimated. Professor Wooldridge questioned the impact of the winter curtailment on the prevalence of late grades.
- A memo had been distributed around the University to Professor Welch regarding the simplification of the knowledge areas of the general education requirements. He noted that all

courses in departments would be assigned to specific knowledge areas. He noted the absence of gatekeeping regarding teaching.

### **ITEM 3: Report of the President/Provost**

#### Provost Headrick opened the floor for discussion.

Professor Malone inquired about the timetable for the "Managing Our Fate" process by the Deans. Provost Headrick replied that President Greiner was working on a report to the University community regarding the issues in "Rethinking SUNY" for publication in The Reporter.

Professor Jameson asked about the minority faculty hiring initiative. Provost Headrick responded that hiring was allowed within a 95% envelope plus turnover in positions. Professor Jameson asked if the initiative was funded by Albany. Provost Headrick replied that the initiative was not funded centrally and that local support had been available for faculty appointments during the past year. Professor Jameson commented on nonrenewals and eliminations of positions and the negative effect on the diversity profile of the University. She noted that the percentage of minority and female faculty would decline with decreases in the overall percentages.

Professor Malone questioned the initiative to update computing facilities. Provost Headrick stated that applications were being acted upon as received and that the deadline had been January 15, 1996. He noted that there were three portions of the initiative which included connections, hardware and staff support. He stated that all connections had been approved and that hardware and staff support applications had required further refinement to enhance cost efficiency. He stated that funds for consulting had been approved.

Professor Schuel asked if tuition increases would cover the proposed reductions in state tax support. Provost Headrick replied that the proposed \$92 million reduction in state operating funds would not be covered by tuition increases. He noted a possible \$4 million reduction in state funding for UB and a \$3 million reduction in capital equipment funding. He mentioned differential tuition which would allow for increased tuition to selected units and programs in addition to an overall general tuition increase of

between \$200 to \$500. Central savings and sources of revenue which were proposed included \$24 million savings in hospital support, \$8 million in savings from the statutory colleges, \$1 million in savings from system administration, \$9 million in revenue generation from the Minnesota Plan involving high school students in college courses and \$26 million in revenue generated through tuition increases.

Professor Malone cited the need for capital equipment replacement. He noted that programs which were lab oriented would be "hard hit" and he questioned if funding was available for replacement equipment in instructional programs. Provost Headrick responded that SUNY needed to push the legislature to increase funding for capital equipment. Professor Malone questioned the status of fees. Provost Headrick stated that problems existed with fees and that specific user fees had been approved and that the University was looking for greater flexibility with fees. He warned that it might be necessary to decrease expenditures.

#### **ITEM 4: Proposed Capital Campaign**

Vice President Stein commented on the planned Spring, 1996 faculty-staff solicitation and the feasibility study. He shared video segments of distinguished UB alumni from a wide variety of disciplines. He recounted that alumni had been personally visited and asked to identify personal needs and opinions regarding the proposed capital campaign.

It was noted that 61 alumni had been identified with net worth in excess of \$10 million and 5000 alumni worth \$1 million. Vice President Stein noted that the alumni had been "very poor" during school and stated that "they owed everything to UB". The negative side revealed that numerous alumni had never previously been contacted by UB subsequent to graduation.

The primary question according to Vice President Stein was how to get UB on the "favorite charity list" of the alumni. He cited the need to supply points of pride in the University. He commented that individuals outside of Western New York viewed UB as a regional University since recruitment did not occur on the national level and there was no national sports program. He stated that the memories

recounted by alumni were primarily about faculty. Alumni stated that they were happy to help raise funds and were willing to contribute to the University. Vice President Stein voiced concern about the size of the contributions. He stated that alumni found an invitation to return to campus to be appealing. Vice President Stein stated that "philanthropy cultivation" was a crucial part of all job descriptions and that the faculty played a major role in solicitation of contributions.

Professor Schuel stated that he was impressed with the success of the UB graduates. He commented on the importance of public and private support for the University with the possibility of pressure being placed on legislators.

Vice President Stein mentioned affinity groups and reunions and stressed the need to connect early. It was noted that alumni had loyalty to their "area of nurturing" while at the University and a recurrent problem was that alumni had not been contacted by the University subsequent to graduation.

Professor Albini stated that department ties were important. Professor Hyde inquired as to the perception of the alumni of the mission of the University.

Vice President Stein stated that he would report to the FSEC upon completion of the alumni interviews towards the end of February, 1996. He stated that the decision regarding a capital campaign would be made in March, 1996.

Professor Hyde suggested a second layer of preparatory research to identify alumni interested in education. Professor Horvath stressed the importance of faculty serving as advocates of the University. Professor Meidinger stated that a sense of historical distinction, merit and need were important components of development of a niche for the University.

Vice President Stein announced that a faculty-staff solicitation would occur during the Spring, 1996 and that letters would be distributed to faculty and staff homes through a "soft" solicitation approach.

Professor Schuel stated that student morale was increased with a sense of "following in the footsteps of illustrious predecessors".

Professor Welch stated that responsibility for a successful capital campaign and with development of the alumni program in general rested with the faculty.

#### **ITEM 5: Academic Integrity and Academic Good Standing Policies**

Professor Welch stated that 13,000 of 17,000 students had received their grades in a timely manner. Vice Provost Goodman replied that the Spring, 1996 semester had started a week earlier than usual resulting in an unusual number of late grades. He stated that he would check into the problem. He added that differences in the number of undergraduates were due to consideration of full-time and part-time status. He stated that there were no Senate rules regarding academic good standing for part-time status and that it was an appropriate issue to consider.

Professor Welch noted that approximately 28% of undergraduates were on academic probation based on the Senate criteria for academic good standing. Professor Wooldridge stated that the criteria could easily be modified to consider the grade point average of the last 12 credit hours. He noted that this criteria would be the functional equivalent to the grade point average of the last semester.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that he believed the criteria to be appropriate as a measure of progress towards graduation. He noted the need for consultation with Millard Fillmore College.

Professor Schuel stated that the policy was a source of embarrassment. Vice Provost Goodman disagreed stating that the policy was an example of high standards at the University. Professor Schuel questioned whether a computer model had been explored on data from the previous academic year to check the percentage of students that would be placed on probation due to promulgation of the policy. Vice Provost Goodman stated that the current rules were an interpretation of the traditional rules. He noted some ambiguity regarding the 75% rule and stated that the Senate might choose to modify the condition. He stated that no computer models had been run since it was only possible recently to run the program. He noted that prior reviews had required manual work and had been extremely time consuming involving several weeks for the academic advisement staff. He stated that only currently was there an appropriate data base and equipment to perform the process in a uniform manner. He

remarked that the current method of processing was a technological achievement, requiring only eight minutes of computing time.

Professor Malone expressed puzzlement over Professor Schuel's remarks about the criteria for academic good standing. He questioned adjusting the academic standards to fit with the results of a computer pre-run. Professor Welch stated that the implications of probation warranted careful consideration. Vice Provost Goodman stated that a letter of probation would be sent to students not in good academic standing which included the reasons for the action. He noted that students would be advised to contact their academic advisors and take steps to return to academic good standing. He commented that after three semesters on probation, students would be considered for dismissal. He noted that the process for dismissal was not automated and would be completed through individual record reviews. He noted that departments could dismiss students from programs due to grade point averages being below 2.5 within the department or 2.0 overall. He stated that a number of extracurricular activities were being monitored in relationship to academic good standing. He stated that intercollegiate athletes were certified according to NCAA eligibility criteria for academic good standing. It was reported that Dean Black of the Division of Student Affairs was monitoring governance leadership, clubs and fraternities and sororities. Vice Provost Goodman stated that the system was in a state of flux. He remarked that probation should be thought of as a signal that performance was inadequate and that there was a need to focus on academics rather than extracurricular activities.

Professor Welch questioned the responsibility of the Division of Athletics and the Division of Student Affairs to monitor academic good standing of students. Vice Provost Goodman and Provost Headrick stated that the responsibility was with the Division of Undergraduate Education headed by the Vice Provost. It was stated that the Divisions of Student Affairs and Athletics implemented the decisions of the Division of Undergraduate Education.

Mr. Stokes requested clarification regarding the definition of part-time. Vice Provost Goodman replied that the wording needed tightening. He stated that a student must complete 75% of registered credit hours unless not completing the 75% left the student in full-time status. He stated that students who initially registered for a full-time load were considered to be full-time. Professor Wooldridge stated

that the determination of full-time status was difficult since a switch from full-time to part-time status could occur at mid-semester. He questioned why a student should be penalized for "biting off more than he/she can chew".

Vice Provost Goodman stated that it was appropriate for the Senate to modify the criteria for academic good standing. He noted that the current criteria were consistent with traditional rules.

Professor Schroeder mentioned probation as being viewed as a "black mark". Professor Horvath commented that further study was needed regarding the implications for full-time vs part-time status. Vice Provost Goodman stated that financial aid was a crucial issue. He referred to the undergraduate catalog on pages 12-13 which states the criteria for federal financial aid and TAP being adequate progress to a degree and full-time status. He added that NCAA criteria required full-time status for participation.

Professor Welch asked if the names of students not in academic good standing had been transmitted to the Division of Athletics and Division of Student Affairs. Vice Provost Goodman responded that lists were being generated and would be shared with the Division of Athletics, the Division of Student Affairs and academic departments.

Provost Headrick stated that he shared the concerns expressed during the discussion. He noted that the number of students not in academic good standing was large and reflected the current policy. He commented that advisement would be unable to service such a large group of students. He expressed the hope that the Senate would rethink the applicability of the rule.

Professor Welch stated that the Faculty Senate Grading Committee would review the policy on academic good standing.

Vice Provost Goodman addressed the issue of academic integrity and the need to raise consciousness regarding the matter. He mentioned a video conference dealing with this serious issue. He asked the FSEC to endorse a statement on academic integrity to be promulgated and appear in University publications.

The draft statement was worded as follows:

The university has a responsibility to promote academic honesty and integrity and to develop procedures to deal effectively with instances of academic dishonesty. Students are responsible for the honest completion and representation of their work, for the appropriate citation of sources, and for respect for other's academic endeavors. By placing their name on academic work, students certify the originality of all work not otherwise identified by appropriate acknowledgements.

Professor Malone commented that it was a fine statement but that it lacked explicit information that allowing use of one's work by another student was dishonest. Vice Provost Goodman sympathized with Professor Malone but stated that a need existed for a sense of consensus. He stated that faculty needed to communicate explicitly what was permitted. He noted that the draft statement did not "step on peer pedagogy". He suggested that explicit information could be included in course syllabi.

Professor Nickerson stated that a statement on professional behavior was necessary in addition to academic integrity. Vice Provost Goodman replied that research integrity was an additional issue.

Professor Welch suggested that the Faculty Senate Grading Committee should be consulted. Professor Schroeder expressed concern that students were unaware of academic misconduct. He noted that the responsibility for education of students regarding academic integrity was with the faculty. He remarked that he was generally in favor of the draft statement.

Vice Provost Goodman stated that student leadership changed in March and therefore it was necessary to move quickly so as not to lose the entire year.

Professor Meidinger stated that he was prepared to endorse the draft statement despite the fact that it had a "top-down" feeling. He mentioned "policing" and the greater efficacy of promoting truth as the means for membership in the academic community for students and faculty.

Professor Welch commented on integrity in faculty research. Professor Meidinger stated that integrity was mutual and reciprocal rather than hierarchical.

Professor Nickerson advised endorsement of the draft statement with modifications possible through the Grading Committee.

Professor Jameson suggested endorsing the draft statement in principle. She noted that she was ill at ease with the footnote regarding the degree of originality and corrected the spelling of acknowledgement.

It was decided to endorse the scope and thrust of the draft statement on academic integrity. Professor Welch commented that study of the matter would continue in the Grading Committee.

#### **ITEM 6: Old Business**

The scope and thrust of the policy on "green computing" was endorsed by the FSEC.

#### **ITEM 7: New Business**

There was no discussion of new business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Sellers

Faculty Secretary Senate

#### **Those present:**

University Officers: N. Goodman, T. Headrick, K. Levy, R. Stein

Senate Officers: C. Welch, C. Sellers

Architecture & Planning: S. Danford

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin, M. Hyde

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidinger

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: M. Acara, B. Albini, H. Schuel

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, D. Malone, P. Nickerson

**GUESTS:**

Professional Staff Senate: M. Stokes

Reporter: S. Cox

**Those excused:**

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: P. Eberlein

Pharmacy: N.

University Libraries: J. Adams

Academic Affairs Director: L. Cornwall

**Those absent:**

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenso

Management: R. Ramesh

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: M. Churchill

Social Sciences: M. Farrell, D. Henderson

SUNY Senator: J. Boot