

## **FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Meeting of May 8, 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 Room 567 Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Appreciation of Robert Rossberg](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Plans for 1996-1997](#)
4. [Report of the President](#)
5. [Report on Summer Sessions](#)
6. [Update on University Development](#)
7. [Old Business](#)

---

### **ITEM 1: Appreciation of Robert Rossberg**

After briefly outlining Dr. Rossberg's decades of service to the University at Buffalo, Professor Welch asked for a period of silence.

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

Professor Welch, who had attended a recent meeting of Deans and other senior university administrators at which the future of UB had been examined at length, began discussion of UB's image and how to market the University. He quoted Dean Kerry Grant's summary of what guides said about the University at Buffalo, that it is "big, cold, research-oriented", and noted that, according to many of those present at the meeting, the issue of our image had become one of

marketing. He said that we must be aware of the differing perceptions of our campus, and warned that what we laud as our main focus and strength (i.e., the commitment to research) may be viewed by others as a weakness. In forging a sense of identity, he suggested that we must analyze links among the various University programs, develop a better sense of community, and urge the faculty to become more sensitive to undergraduates.

Professor Adams expressed concern over UB's relatively low four-year graduation rate (compared with the 70% rate at Binghamton); she noted that this will become a critical factor in recruiting students and must improve. She was also disappointed that our stated goal by the year 2000 was only a 50% four-year graduation rate, which would still lie far below the competition. Professor Henderson asked what the reasons for this were, to which Professor Adams replied that there were several, one of the main ones being access to majors. Professor Welch added that whereas Binghamton is a residential campus, many students at UB live off campus and must devote much time to their jobs, and consequently cannot afford to take more than 12 credit hours per semester.

Professor Albini drew another comparison between UB and Binghamton, saying that the average class size is too big at UB; as a result, undergraduates complain that UB is too impersonal and that they cannot reach the professors. Professor Welch said there are several steps we can take, for instance, offering greater opportunities for internships for our top students, who can set the tone for an institution. Professor Wetherhold advised caution in interpreting the aforementioned graduation-rate percentages, noting that several students switch majors, which necessarily cause delays in graduating. Professor Welch then reported that the percentage of incoming freshmen who were in the top 20% of their class had shrunk in the last few years from 59% to 51%.

Professor Nickerson asked whether UB's negative perception by The Buffalo News had been discussed at the meeting, to which Professor Welch replied that it had not.

Professor Ferry pointed out that several graduate TAs could not speak English very well, and that this represented another hurdle to overcome. Professor Welch responded that first, UB is an international campus with several non-English-speaking students, and secondly, that some TAs, who are accepted on the basis of their scores in quantitative tests, barely pass the SPEAK test. Professor Nickerson

suggested that the administration should form focus groups to investigate these problems. Professor Welch said that this should be relegated to the Provost's office.

Professor Horvath noted a further problem in that the faculty are not rewarded or supported enough for their efforts in advising students; this takes time away from research and related projects, decreases chances for advancement and promotion, and thus constitutes negative encouragement. Professor Schuel noted that the problem was aggravated by the fact that the number of faculty has shrunk over recent years, while the student body has grown. Professor Henderson wondered whether the number of administrators at UB had changed or remained the same, to which Professor Welch cited a Rutgers report which stated that the cost of administration at UB is very low. Calculations of these costs, however, omitted areas in which administration is conducted outside the State payroll, and thus the study may well have understated the total costs. Professor Welch further noted that faculty could be more productive with "certain key types of assistants", such as student advisors. Professor Henderson noted that two Vice-Presidencies had been created in the past eight years, and expressed concern that the administration has grown quite substantially. Professor Acara remarked that the administration should be held as accountable as the faculty as to what they are doing.

Professor Jameson wondered to what extent the UUP was "on board" when former Chancellor Bruce Johnstone's Report on Faculty Productivity, which had been circulated to the Faculty Senate for discussion, was being written. Professor Nickerson pointed out that the document is still a draft, a draft intended, as Professor Welch pointed out, to lead to discussion and areas of agreement. Professor Jameson doubted that the UUP even wanted there to be discussion, since non-elected members took part in it and thus would seem to have been to some extent an infringement on collective bargaining rules; the present document implies a hybrid forum rather than strictly discussion between labor and management. Professor Wetherhold expressed concern about any clear next step. Professor Henderson objected to the negative spirit of the document, which focussed too heavily on faculty NON-productivity. Professor Albini added a positive note, saying first that six Republican Assemblyman had formed a coalition supporting SUNY, and that one at least was surprised that SUNY faculty receive so little for doing so much. Professor Albini suggested that this type of information should be disseminated, and that the faculty need not apologize. He added that the danger of the

document under discussion is that it can acquire a life of its own and can become construed as fact rather than perception.

Professor Welch informed the Committee of a nascent Roundtable series of discussions regarding the problems of education and research missions at American universities. Imperative for such discussions is a report stating the "points of convergence and divergence between faculty and administrators", as well as an outlined agenda for action. Professor Welch quoted from this report to emphasize that the FSEC alone could be "mobiliseable" for such a discussion.

### **ITEM 3: Plans for 1996-1997**

Professor Welch mentioned two items about which he was concerned, the first being the resolution on privacy in electronic communications and current American law as it deals with said communications. He reported having received much information on the topic and welcomes any comments or suggestions.

The second issue concerned the current Senate Elections and re-apportionment. The Bylaws of the Voting Faculty specifically include Geographical Full-Time faculty (GFTs) as voting members. Although about 42% of UB faculty are on the staff of the School of Medicine, only 15% of the Faculty Senate represent the Medical School. Professor Welch pointed out that there is also a disjuncture between the composition of the Voting Faculty and the powers which reside primarily within the Senate itself. Most importantly, for example, while the Senate has responsibilities over undergraduate education and admissions criteria (among others), the Senate does not have such powers or responsibilities relative to graduate or professional programs. A possible happy medium being sought is a revision to the Charter of the Faculty Senate, which would not allow any unit to have more than 25% representation on the Faculty Senate.

Professor Acara reported that representatives of the Medical School had met with the Bylaws Committee; the Medical School thought that 40% representation was too much, but that 25% was both reasonable and generous. Professor Wetherhold asked for clarification about the term "Geographical Full-Time". Professor Welch replied that, according to the Policies of the Board of

Trustees, GFTs were "persons available on a full-time basis to a Medical School for instructional purposes", and that they are members of the Voting Faculty. Professor Acara stated that there were two criteria: GFTs must be working at University-affiliated hospitals, and must be members of the University Medical School' Practice Plan. Professor Adams wondered if the GFTs are interested in serving on the Senate, and expressed concern that many or most GFTs were not really involved with campus issues. Professor Acara pointed out that most of the Medical School Senators are GFTs and that they do attend. Professor Horvath asked if other GFTs are included. Professor Welch clarified that GFTs are affiliated with a medical Center (instead of School). The problem then is that there are other unrepresented GFTs who serve at a non-Medical center. Professor Acara pointed out that the matter under discussion is not whether GFTs are members of the Voting Faculty, which they are, but rather reapportionment on the Faculty Senate. Professor Schuel noted that this date marks the adoption of the new constitution in South Africa based on "one person, one vote", and suggested that this policy could be implemented here as well. Concern was also expressed that many in the professional schools might not know "what it's like down in the trenches". Professor Ferry wondered whether issues to be voted on could be separated, thus only those Senators directly involved in undergraduate programs could vote on issues relating to those programs and that people from the professional schools be excluded, whereas University-wide matters would concern the entire Senate. Professor Welch suggested we find ways to improve the "linkage" between undergraduate education and future studies in the professional schools to reenforce a unified Senate mentality. Professor Albini argued first, that GFTs teach as much as anybody in the Medical School and secondly, that they are teaching undergraduates; hence he does not understand why there is such exclusion of GFTs. He added that GFTs were created out of financial considerations, and that some GFTs are among those who have the "highest teaching load". Professor Jameson wondered why the Medical School objected to her proposal that Senate representation be based on number of student FTE. In addition, she expressed concern that if the Senate were to have a disproportionately high representation by the Medical School, other governance units would be formed to handle certain issues, thus reducing the Senate's credibility. Professor Albini responded that the Senate is not interested only in teaching matters, and that if the University (or parts of it) were to lose interest in the Senate because of the high representation of the Medical School, then some other criterion for reapportionment must be sought.

[\(This item continues](#) following President Greiner's Report.)

#### **ITEM 4: Report of the President**

President Greiner opened with a remark that the concerns with issues relating to Health Sciences are quite justified. He noted that not only does Health Sciences make the University more interesting and diverse, but also that the future of UB depends very heavily on what we do with (read: in cooperation with) the Health Sciences. He pointed out that although the overwhelming preoccupation of the Faculty Senate with undergraduate education this does not represent the breadth of issues facing UB, and hence the Senate is in some ways less central to the complete life of the University. He suggested we find a Senate that reflects this broader range and that have an effective representation. President Greiner doubted that GFTs have the same degree of interest in University affairs, and stated that one of the problems special to GFTs was a lack of identification with the University. He suggested we find a creative solution to the problem, one that makes the Senate "more than it's been".

In response to President Greiner's comment about the Senate's preoccupation with undergraduate education, Professor Adams pointed out that the Charter placed most of the Senate's responsibilities with undergraduate students and their education.

President Greiner asked the Committee to read a press release by Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver. President Greiner warned that, in his opinion, Silver's proposal would portend disaster for the SUNY system, since it includes no change in existing governance procedures, no differential tuition, a zero tuition increase, and a restoration of approximately \$20 million. He stressed that it would not benefit the institution nor the students. Having said this, President Greiner left.

#### **ITEM 3 (contd): Plans for 1996-1997 (continued)**

Professor Horvath addressed the issue of incorporating GFTs into the Senate as GFTs, and noted that without such incorporation, the GFTs would not receive proper representation. Professor Welch noted that such allocation within the unit is done by the unit itself. Professor Acara stressed that the "25% proposal" was a

compromise, that the Medical School was not demanding full representation. Professor Horvath concluded by saying that if such a sub-partitioning were to happen, then what will happen at the Senate meetings is that when certain issues arise for discussion, a different number and type of people will show up at those meetings. Consequently, the same people will show up at the Senate meetings that already do so. Professor Schuel affirmed that the 25% compromise would not represent any catastrophe in representation. Professor Welch then proposed a two-year transition period, during which the number of Senators from the Medical School would be increased without reducing numbers from other Schools or Faculties. Professor Horvath asked whether the Elections Committee included the changes in populations of other faculties as well; Professor Welch replied that these would be updated, according to the revised Bylaws approved this past year, every five years. Professor Jameson expressed concern about units who have elected Senators for two-year terms, and then have their numbers cut . Professor Welch responded that this is not a cause for concern, since the proposal would gradually scale the corresponding representation. The question also arose as to whether apportionment could be based on units rather than the number of people within those units. Professor Welch responded that that would require a major revision of the entire Charter. Professor Welch then stated the entire proposal of first increasing the number of Senatorial seats for the Medical School so that, over the next two years, its number of seats would increase from 16 to 25; also over the next two years, the reapportionment would be carried out, and the number of Senate seats scaled again to 100. Professor Horvath wondered when the apportionment was last carried out; he noted that the composition of the faculty in all units has changed tremendously over the past ten years, and that we cannot wait until the year 2000 for the next reapportionment. Professor Welch restated the proposal in the form of a resolution. Professor Jameson questioned whether we can suspend our own rules as stated in the Bylaws. Professor Welch replied that the better interests of everyone would be served by such a suspension. The proposal to increase the elected Senate membership of the Medical School to 25 over a two-year period, and FSEC membership of the Medical School

to four, and to gradually adjust the representation of other units, was approved.

### **ITEM 5: Report on Summer Sessions**

Dean George Lopos displayed the new poster for the UB Summer Session. He then reported that enrollment for the 1996 Summer Sessions increased by about 2000, which he attributes to earlier announcements and BIRD, but down about 3000 from 1994. He posed the question as to how to make Summer Sessions at UB more attractive. He noted that the calendar seemed to be about right, but that he would address the question of the calendar for 1997, since some faculty expressed concern over the lack of sufficient contact hours.

Professor Horvath asked how well the start of UB Summer Sessions coincided with the end of High School schedules, and what kind of recruitment of juniors and seniors is being done. Dean Lopos responded that the Second Session is well coordinated with the end of High School schedules. He is interested in developing "Jump-Start" program which would enable new students to begin their college education before the Fall semester begins. Professor Jameson inquired into the feasibility of a Summer program for the elderly, to which Dean Lopos responded that such a program requires special services UB normally does not provide, and entails many problems UB is not yet ready to handle. He noted that various ideas are being investigated, among them a non-credit academic "Adventures in Learning" series; he also stressed that we should do something with the Toronto Film Festival, and wanted to replicate the Iowa writers' workshop held every summer.

### **ITEM 6: Update on University Development**

Dr. Ronald Stein, Vice-President for Advancement and Development, summarized the major recommendations and conclusions of the Marts & Lundy report On the Feasibility of a University Capital Funds Campaign which he distributed at the meeting. Among these:

- extending the normal campaign time from five to seven years, the first three of which would constitute the "quiet" phase; during this phase, UB would not only build relationships with alumni, but also try to get an idea of the size of the campaign;
- that the campaign be a federated campaign, a "blend" of small capital campaigns of individual professional schools with broad university-wide needs. The alumni who were interviewed as part of the study also suggested the need for UB to focus, to decide which few areas in which we would be outstanding, and to be realistic in our numbers. He concluded by stating first, that for the campaign to be successful, all must be involved; and secondly, that we as teachers can have the greatest influence on the alumni.

Professor Jameson asked whether there are any model schools we should follow. Vice-President Stein replied that we must look at other public institutions, particularly in the Northeast, all of whom have done better jobs at creating a warm feeling. Professor Jameson then asked what these schools do to make it that way, to which Vice-President Stein replied that we should invite a representative from those institutions to tell us. He also pointed out that several of these institutions had only begun their campaigns recently. On the point in the report of not only meeting but exceeding goals, Professor Welch asked how we could insure this. Vice-President Stein replied that it was important to find the right people and the right thing in which they would be willing to invest. Professor Hyde asked whether those interviewed were interested in improving instruction primarily in the professional schools; Vice-President Stein replied that they felt we needed to invest heavily in all undergraduate education. Professor Wetherhold commented that the donations should be perceived as something permanent, and not as monies which are used up and disappear. Professor Henderson asked about the Public Relations effort as a precursor to the request for donations; Vice-President Stein replied that this is a number one priority which must be addressed. Professor Welch noted that we also need to project a clearer image of the University, something we do not yet have. Professor Henderson asked who would take the responsibility for doing this; Vice-President Stein

replied that Senior Vice-President Robert Wagner is. Professor Horvath asked whether the priorities mentioned in the report would be followed, or would these be changed. Vice-President Stein replied that he was simply reporting the results; the decisions are being made in the academic areas. He also mentioned that it would be helpful to have specific plans, and to explain clearly to prospective donors, why the contributions would be beneficial to UB. Professor Welch pointed out that alumni primarily identified themselves with particular schools or faculties, and that under these circumstances, the notion of an interdisciplinary center would be difficult for them to understand. Professor Jameson suggested that scholarships could be developed around specific faculty members who were particularly successful. Vice-President Stein considered this a good idea, one that would maintain the faculty-student connection. Professor Henderson mentioned that a big target audience would be the women alumni of UB, noting that this was our largest affinity group as far as alumni were concerned. Professor Hyde asked whether there was enough regional support, to which Vice-President Stein replied that we need first to build regional support. Professor Adams expressed the hope that work was being done in promoting our "star" professors. In conclusion, Professor Welch encouraged members of the Executive Committee to relay the message to their colleagues that we should treat our students as leaders of the future.

#### **ITEM 7: Old Business**

Professor Jameson asked for clarification of President Greiner's remarks about (and reactions to) the press release by Assembly Speaker Silver. Provost Headrick explained that by signing on to the Silver proposal, we would in fact be going along with Governor Pataki's budget cuts; the proposed restoration level is equivalent to the amount which would come from the tuition increase. Professor Schuel remarked that it would be helpful if, before meeting with representatives in the State Senate to discuss the funding situation, a clear statement of what the impact of Silver's scheme would be. Professor asked how much money would be gained by the tuition

increase; Provost Headrick replied that it would be between \$26-28 million. Provost Headrick thanked the Committee with hopes that a congenial and helpful relationship will continue in the coming years.

Professor Welch asked for a vote on sending the "Dissection Choice Policy" (distributed at the beginning of the meeting) to the EPPC for consideration. The vote was unanimously in favor.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing

Secretary of the Faculty Senate

---

**Those present:**

University Officers: W. Greiner, T. Headrick

Senate Officers: C. Welch, R. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: J. Fradin

Dental Medicine: G. Ferry

Educational Opportunity Center: S. Bennett

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: R. Stevenson

Health Related Professions: P. Horvath

Law: E. Meidinger

Management: R. Ramesh

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

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: ?

Nursing: P. Wooldridge

Pharmacy: N.

Social Sciences: D. Henderon

SUNY Senators: M. Jameson, P. Nickerson

University Libraries: J. Adams

**Guests:** G. Lopos, R. Stein