

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes of November 1, 2000 - (approved)
E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on November 1, 2000, in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. [Approval of the minutes of October 18, 2000](#)
2. [Report of the Chair](#)
3. [Report of the President/Provost](#)
4. [Distinguished Teaching and Service Professor Committees - new procedure for the review of dossiers](#)
5. [Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee - Professor Susan Hamlen, Chair](#)
6. [Resolution from the Student Assembly on dissection](#)
7. Old/new business

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

1. following up on the FSEC's discussion of late grades, he found that although the Faculty/Staff Handbook does not mention grade submission, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution in 1987 calling on instructors to submit grades within four working days after the end of final exams; the Registrar uses department contact persons to follow up on late grades and does not directly contact faculty members themselves, their department chairs or their deans; he believes the mechanism to ensure that grades are submitted in a timely fashion should be strengthened; he wrote a letter stressing the importance of timely grade submission which will be published in next week's Reporter
 - in spending time on this issue we are blurring the line between faculty governance issues, which are the Faculty Senate's appropriate focus, and administrative issues, which are not (Professor Swartz)
 - our role is to ask the administration to strengthen the procedure (Professor Nickerson)

- our role is also to exert moral suasion on our colleagues (Professor Malone)
2. the FSEC's meeting schedule should have included, but did not, a meeting on November 29; no meeting room is now available in which to schedule an additional meeting for November 29; the Faculty Senate is scheduled to meet on December 12 but there are no pressing issues it needs to consider and the date is in the middle of final exams
 - there was consensus not to add a meeting to compensate for the missed November 29 FSEC meeting and to cancel the December 12 meeting of the Faculty Senate
 3. the Teaching and Learning Committee meets on November 3 to work on a proposal for a new Office of Teaching; the Public Service Committee meets with the Provost on November 10

Item 2: Report of the President/Provost

The Provost announced the appointment of Ann Newman as the University Space Planner. Ms. Newman held a similar position at MIT before coming to UB. She will look at both campuses in planning for future space needs and in assigning space so people can function optimally.

On November 3 there will be a retreat for department chairs, who are the most important campus administrators because they deal directly with the day to day business of the University. Both she and President Greiner will try to give the chairs perspective on UB's future directions and to update them on University management tools. Senior Vice Provost Levy will talk about revised tenure and promotion procedures.

She has visited all the Faculties excepting Pharmacy and Social Work. She has gotten good suggestions on everything from parking to the campus intellectual climate.

- need to do something to slow down vehicles on Putnam Way; especially in front of Cooke and Hochstetter Halls where there is a straight stretch of road that encourages speeding (Professor Fourtner)
- install speed bumps (Professor Boot)
- bring up the issue when Chief Grela meets with the FSEC (Professor Nickerson)

- when you formalize your request that faculty identify the best programs in their fields and set criteria by which to measure progress in improving programs, distribute it to the entire academic community, not just the deans (Professor Swartz)
- have talked with the deans but have not yet written a memo; will do so soon (Provost Capaldi)
- if the Graduate School intends to require reappointment of graduate faculty every five years, that needs to be discussed with the Faculty Senate; preparing for and undergoing reappointment will be very time consuming, will offer no benefits and will possibly cause serious harm (Professor Boot)
- believe that each School will establish its own reappointment procedures rather than having to conform to common procedures (Professor Nickerson)
- the College of Arts & Sciences was told that declining to require a reappointment review was not an option; that position should be discussed with the Faculty Senate (Professor Schack)
- have been debating whether to even have graduate faculty for the past 20 years (Professor Malone)
- will schedule a session with Dean Triggle

Item 3: Approval of the minutes of October 18, 2000

The minutes of October 18, 2000, were approved.

Item 4: Distinguished Teaching and Service Professor Committees

Senior Vice Provost Levy has been asked to convene the committees which review nominations for Distinguished Service Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor and the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching.

He first differentiated the process for nominating a faculty member to the rank of Distinguished Professor from those for nominating to the ranks of Distinguished Teaching and Distinguished Service Professor. The nomination process to the rank of Distinguished Professor is neither quota nor cycle driven. A nomination dossier of 20/30 letters from outside referees is first

reviewed by a panel composed primarily of UB faculty who hold the rank of Distinguished Professor. It goes to the Provost, to the President and then to the Chancellor. In a 2/3 year process the Chancellor reviews the nomination de novo, constructing his own dossier which includes recommendations from the presidents of major societies and from SUNY's own referees. The nomination is voted on by the Board of Trustees.

By contrast UB is allowed to nominate up to 2 Distinguished Teaching, 2 Distinguished Service Professors and 10 Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching each year. In the past three different committees reviewed the nominations; recommendations for Distinguished Service Professor went to the Vice Provost for Graduate Education; recommendations for Distinguished Teaching Professor and for the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. After being reviewed again, they were forwarded to the Provost, to the President and to SUNY.

The Provost has suggested decreasing the layers of review. The Senior Vice Provost would convene the committees, but not vote in their deliberations or review their recommendations, passing them directly to the Provost. The Senior Vice Provost is considering consolidating the three committees into one larger committee which would review all three sets of nominations.

SUNY has almost identical criteria for membership on the three committees so there should be no difficulty in the same people looking at all three sets of nominations. One benefit would be that a single committee could cross-consider nominees for any one of these honors. It would also be easier for Senior Vice Provost Levy to deal with a single committee.

There were comments from the floor:

- also need to develop procedures for the newly established rank of Distinguished Librarian; the Distinguished Service and Distinguished Teaching ranks require recognition beyond the campus and evidence of recent scholarship (Professor Malone)
- haven't seen any guidelines for Distinguished Librarian rank; have talked with Associate Vice President van Wahlde about developing local guidelines which would allow UB to make a nomination (Senior Vice Provost Levy)

- Associate Vice President van Wahlde has expressed interest in developing SUNY wide guidelines for the Distinguished Librarian rank (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- consider streamlining the procedures for honorary degrees (Professor Boot)
- SUNY clearly wants faculty governance participation in the review process for Distinguished Service and Distinguished Teaching Professors (Professor Nickerson)
- SUNY wants to increase the visibility of the SUNY Distinguished ranks; a strategy that has been suggested is increasing a recipient's base pay by \$20K as is done in CUNY (Professor Malone)
- public universities seem very stingy with giving honors to faculty, unlike private institutions (Professor Swartz)
- have set up a decanal sub committee to look at honors; some schools set up internally named chairs (Provost Capaldi)
- many faculty work at a level very close to that of faculty holding Distinguished rank, so I would oppose a \$20K increase for being promoted to Distinguished rank; the title is in itself a reward (Professor Meacham)
- most significant award is an "A" parking permit (Professor Malone)

Item 5: Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Priorities Committee

Professor Hamlen, Chair of the Budget Priorities Committee, outlined the practices of the Committee. The Committee meets once a month; as Chair she confers with the Senior Vice President and the Provost regarding relevant agenda topics. Visitors are invited when appropriate. The Committee's membership is down, so new members are needed.

She then highlighted the Committee's 1999/2000 activities. The Committee kept abreast with matters in Albany, i.e., the 1999/2000 Executive Budget and its impact on UB, Assistant Vice President Penksa's budget advocacy activities in Albany, the Budget Allocation Process (BAP) and the ways it affects UB, and the work of the Performance Based Budgeting Advisory Committee (PPBA Committee). The Committee was involved, albeit somewhat indirectly, in UB's long term capital planning for 2003/2008. The

Committee studied UB's financial plan and its impact on units and also the process for resource allocation for campus IT and athletics initiatives. It studied and reported to the Faculty Senate on the College of Arts & Sciences budget shortfall, and made recommendations which are still valid for all units. As it does perennially, the Committee looked at the justification for student fees.

She proposed activities for the Committee for this academic year. At the Albany level the Committee would continue to monitor UB's position in BAP, the activities of the PBBA Committee and tuition and fees. The Committee would also look at UB's 2000/2001 Financial Plan and new budget system, provide feed to the Provost on budget allocation policies, especially performance based allocations. The Committee will also try to promote dialogue between faculty and administration on budget issues and on communication to UB's academic community. She asked the FSEC to suggest other tangible projects for the Committee to tackle.

There were suggestions from the floor:

- would be worthwhile to take a look at library funding (Professor Fournier)
- look at changes in the new Provost's budgeting process (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- would like the Committee to annually be presented with an all funds budget report whose format remains the same from year to year to facilitate comparisons (Professor Meacham)
- such an all funds report has not been compiled in the past; am working with Senior Vice President Wagner to create such an annual report that will be shared with anyone who is interested (Provost Capaldi)
- students will be voting on keeping/increasing the activities fee in mid-November (Mr. Rupan)
- Committee could inquire about expenditures from secret pockets that never get mentioned, e.g., \$3M to move the College of Arts & Sciences Dean's Office or \$600K to pay a penalty for athletics violations (Professor Boot)
- agree that the Committee should look at library funding (Professor Ellison)
- the finances of the bookstore and its relationship to Follett's have always been kept secret, even from the Bookstore Committee; perhaps the Budget Priorities Committee could do some exploration in this area (Professor Noble)

- have been told that the bookstore arrangements are made between two private corporations, Follett's and the UB Foundation, and are not reviewable by third parties (Professor Malone)

Item 6: Resolution from the Student Assembly on Dissection

In December 1999 the Student Association Assembly unanimously passed a resolution affirming the right of students who conscientiously object to participating in the dissection of animals to be offered an alternative way of satisfying a dissection requirement. The Chair introduced Shawn DeLeo, the student who spearheaded the campaign for "student choice".

Mr. DeLeo hoped to complete a major in Environmental Studies. However, Biology 200 (Evolutionary Biology) is required for the major, which course includes dissection exercises. Mr. DeLeo registered for the course but asked the instructor to set an alternative method of satisfying the dissection requirement. The instructor cited the College of Arts & Sciences policy on dissection that states "no student is obligated to kill animals, or dissect euthanized animals, but no student is excused from participating in the established exercises or experiments". Mr. DeLeo's beliefs prevented him from participating, and so he resigned from the course. The Department of Environmental Studies refused to waive its requirement of Biology 200; the Department did say, however, that it would offer its own course on evolutionary biology if it had the funds to do so.

This issue is one which Mr. DeLeo believes affects many students. He collected over 700 signatures on a petition asking for a change in the dissection policy. He pointed out that the present policy may force students to choose a different career path than the path they want.

He also noted that the College's policy is not uniformly applied. A friend taking Biology 200 was allowed to study anatomy materials outside of class during dissection exercises, and he passed the course.

There were comments from the floor:

- would on line simulations be an acceptable alternative to students and to faculty? (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- National Anti-Vivisection Society offers acceptable simulations and models; studies show that students learn just as well from these methods (Mr. DeLeo)
- medical and health related education is moving more and more toward modeling rather than hands on dissection (Professor Noble)
- if a two track approach to dissection is adopted, undergraduate transcripts should reflect whether the student had actual dissection experience to help medical and dental schools make admissions decisions (Professor Easley)
- this matter is not a proper subject for Faculty Senate discussion; it is a curricular matter to be decided within a department or College and is outside of the role established for the Faculty Senate by its Charter (Professor Fournier)
- for Mr. DeLeo this is an ethical issue, not a curricular issue (President Monyo)
- it is very different to see a thing done rather than to do it; modeling may not be adequate for all purposes, especially for prospective doctors, so if a student can't participate in dissection, he should choose a career path that doesn't require him to do so (Professor Boot)
- would allow an alternative to dissection only for students whose ethical or religious objections met established criteria; dissection is required for all students, not just those going on to medical school, and for many students modeling is sufficient (Mr. DeLeo)
- scheduled this discussion to allow airing of the academic freedom issues (Professor Nickerson)
- to have an effective university requires that the faculty determine what is relevant and important to their subjects and what they are going to teach; the proper approach to this issue is to convince the department to waive the requirement; object to choosing what are or are not approved ethical or religious objections (Professor Schack)
- a student's anti-dissection belief is no different in kind than his anti-evolution belief and neither should govern the content of a course; in this matter the Faculty Senate at best can give an advisory opinion (Professor Malone)
- choose not to study biological sciences or medicine because of my own beliefs and think that is the appropriate response if one can not fulfill the requirements of a field (Professor Sridhar)

- everything we have learned in medicine at some level involved the use of animals, hopefully in a proper and humane fashion (Professor Pruet)
- would not be out of line to ask faculty to at least explore the use of technological alternatives for majors in which hands on dissection experience is not obviously critical (Professor Adams-Volpe)
- if Faculty Senate is not the correct venue for this discussion, what is? (Mr. Rupan)
- the policy on dissection should be, but seemingly is not, uniformly enforced (Ms. Woodman)
- a TA that does not enforce the dissection policy can be fired, and I would have no difficulty doing so; the belief that animals are more worthy of ethical consideration than plants demonstrates an ignorance of intricacies of biological and environmental systems (Professor Fournier)
- beliefs about what can appropriately be killed and eaten are culturally, rather than scientifically, driven (Professor Sridhar)
- there are two issues here; first is the possibility of selective enforcement of a policy; second is the role of the Faculty Senate (Professor Malave)
- vegans and anti-vivisectionists aren't favoring animals over plants; they are recognizing that animals have central nervous systems and plants do not; not fair to force students to choose other careers because of their ethical beliefs (Mr. DeLeo)
- appropriate forum for this discussion is with the Department of Environmental Studies; if the Department will not waive the dissection requirement or make alternate arrangements, a dissenting student should choose another field of study (Professor Schack)
- this not a one person issue; it affects all students (Mr. Rupan)

There was a motion (seconded) to table the Student Association resolution. The motion passed.

- we are not saying that the Student Association was wrong to bring its resolution to the Faculty Senate; we are only saying that the Faculty Senate can not dictate curricular content (Professor Malone)

- would be possible to take a course outside of UB and transfer it here, avoiding the dissection requirement; the faculty in the Department of Biology have thoroughly discussed the issues raised by the Student Association resolution (Professor Fournier)

There being no old/new business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn McMann Kramer
Secretary of Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: P. Nickerson

Secretary: M. Kramer

Parliamentarian: D. Malone

Arts & Sciences: C. Fournier, J. Meacham, S. Schack

Dental Medicine: M. Easley

Engineering & Applied Sciences: R. Sridhar

Graduate School of Education: L. Malave

School of Information Studies: J. Ellison

Law: L. Swartz

Management: J. Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: B. Noble, C. Pruet, S. Spurgeon

SUNY Senators: J. Adams-Volpe, J. Boot, P. Nickerson

University Officers: E. Capaldi, Provost **Guests:** R. Rupan,

Academic Clubs Coordinator, Student Association

M. Monyo, President, Student Association

K. Woodman, University Council

S. DeLeo, student

J. Lewandowski, *Reporter*

K. Levy, Senior Vice Provost

S. Hamlen, Chair, Budget Priorities Committee **Excused Arts & Sciences:** C. Smith **Absent: Architecture:** R. Shibley
Arts & Sciences: W. Baumer
Health Related Professions: G. Farkas
Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: A. El Sohl
Nursing: E. Perese
Pharmacy: R. Madejski
SUNY Senators: H. Durand
University Libraries: A. Booth